

From: [Liz Poitras](#)
To: [Chris Roberts](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Debbie Tarry](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [Keith McGlashan](#); [Keith Scully](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Will Hall](#)
Subject: Comments for Sept 26 City Council meeting
Date: Friday, September 23, 2016 2:59:11 PM
Attachments: [2016-09-26 notes.docx](#)

Attached is a letter with my comments for the agenda item at the Sept 26, 2016 City Council meeting. Thank you.

Liz Poitras

Liz Poitras
Shoreline resident

Comments regarding the 145th Subarea Plan for the City Council meeting on Sep 26, 2016

I would like to make several comments in response to proposed amendments to the 145th station subarea zoning map. Taking these amendments in alphabetical order:

First, I support Amendments #D and E when taken together. #E will keep a consistent look along 155th while driving east or west. #D will provide extra density very close to the station.

Second, I support Amendment #F1. Since there is a stream running through that area I believe it should remain R6 zoning. You have heard many arguments in favor of that.

Third, if amendment #E passes, I support amendments F2 and G2 to provide a transition from the MUR-70 to any areas east of it.

Fourth, I do not support Amendment M, continuing MUR-35 up 5th Ave NE to 165th for the following reasons:

It seems to me that some folks are envisioning a mini boulevard of cute retail shops, coffee shops and restaurants lining 5th Ave. Since you can have retail in MUR-35 when on arterials does not mean you will. Businesses need density. You have received comments from a business owner on 165th St. (Sept 12 Public comments) and Councilmember Salomon quoted from it during a council session. It discusses how hard it is for businesses to succeed in this area due to lack of density. Quoting from her letter: "it is not easy owning a business in Ridgecrest" and "we don't think the area could support a full restaurant anytime soon" and "we are in a unique position to see that Ridgecrest is currently unable to support a viable, much less vibrant, commercial area, for a number of reasons, including lack of population density." There are no provisions to increase the density in this area. Both sides of 5th will remain R6 for a good long while and they should. And the upper portions of 5th would be a substantial hike for the new residents in the MUR-70 areas below. From 165th to 155th is ½ mile. When density occurs down by the station, those residents would probably rather shop down there. 5th Ave between 155th and 165th may never support a walkable community or at least not for decades until the higher density around the station starts spreading outward.

To succeed, businesses in this area (5th Ave above 155th St.) will need to rely on bus or car traffic to bring customers to them. I wonder if the Café Aroma could stay in business if they didn't have their drive-thru? But where will these customers park? Some parking is required on site. It was proposed at some point to convert 5th Ave into 3 lanes and 2 bike lanes which would remove parking from one or both sides of the street so there won't be any parking on the street if that is still on the drawing board (and I hope it is).

We may see some businesses make a try at it and then fold and stand empty, possibly for years. Or we may see "destination sites" which will bring in a lot of vehicle traffic.

Most likely developers will analyze the situation and decide that town homes or apartments are best suited for the street. But most of this street is outside the walkshed to the station. Will we then see an increase in bus traffic or car traffic to accommodate these new residents? And will that cause congestion with those using 5th from north and west trying to get to the station garage? In the distant future those townhomes will be harder to convert to businesses than if they had been left as single-family homes.

Even the staff report (page 8) which states: "Additional housing styles could begin to increase population density in ways that would support emerging local businesses, which in turn help to create a sense of place.", appears to agree that businesses need density.

Fifth, I support Amendment #N – Phasing.

Perhaps if 5th Ave was in a phase 2 along with the rest of MUR-35 north of 155th, density could develop below 155th and then support businesses on those MUR-35 arterials years from now. I would support a Phase 1 following the streets indicated in the Planned Action Boundary Map of the planning commission or any map that included a Phase 2 consisting of areas outside the walkshed. In the city's staff report (page 8a-7), where they discuss their support of no phasing, and include an excerpt from the April 7, 2016 staff report for the public hearing for scenarios to be studied in the FEIS, they say "In contrast to the zoning alternative that was adopted for the 185th Street Station Subarea, the Compact Community Hybrid alternative encompasses a smaller geographic area and does not include corridors that connect the subarea to Aurora Avenue or the Ridgecrest commercial district at 165th Street." If we start adding the corridor(s) back in, we should definitely have phasing.

Tom will be sending you a separate email, hopefully by Saturday.