

2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Amendment No.3

Policy PR21: Explore the establishment of a city-wide park impact fee.

Amendment No. 5

LU63: Require land use decisions on essential public facilities to meet the following criteria to be made consistent with the process and additional criteria set forth in LU65
LU62:

- a. The facility meets the Growth Management Act definition of an essential public facility, ref. RCW 36.70A.200(1) now and as amended; or
- b. The facility is on the statewide list maintained by the Office of Financial Management, ref. RCW 36.70A.200(4) or on the countywide list of essential public facilities; and
- c. The facility is not otherwise regulated by the Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC).

LU64: Participate in efforts to create an interjurisdictional approach to the siting of countywide or statewide essential public facilities with neighboring jurisdictions as ~~encouraged by Countywide Planning Policies FW-32 (establish a countywide process for siting essential public facilities) and S-1 (consideration of alternative siting strategies)~~. Through participation in this process, seek agreements among jurisdictions to mitigate against the disproportionate financial burden, which may fall on the jurisdiction that becomes the site of a facility of a state-wide, regional, or countywide nature.

~~The essential public facility siting process set forth in LU65-LU62 is an interim process. If the CPP FW-32 siting process is adopted through the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC), the City may modify this process to be consistent with the GMPC recommendations.~~

LU65: Use this ~~interim~~ Siting Process to site the essential public facilities that meet the criteria in LU63 ~~LU60~~ in Shoreline. Implement this process through appropriate procedures incorporated into the SMC.

~~Interim~~ EPF Siting Process

1. Use policies LU63 ~~LU60~~ and LU64 ~~LU61~~ to determine if a proposed essential public facility serves local, countywide, or statewide public needs.
2. Site EPF through a separate multi-jurisdictional process, if one is available, when the City determines that a proposed essential public facility serves a countywide or statewide need.
3. Require an agency, special district, or organization proposing an essential public facility to provide information about the difficulty of siting the essential public facility, and about the alternative sites considered for location of the proposed essential public facility.
4. Process applications for siting essential public facilities through SMC Section 20.30.330 — Special Use Permit.
5. Address the following criteria in addition to the Special Use Permit decision criteria:
 - a. Consistency with the plan under which the proposing agency, special district or organization operates, if any such plan exists;
 - b. Include conditions or mitigation measures on approval that may be imposed within the scope of the City's authority to mitigate against any environmental, compatibility, public safety or other impacts of the EPF, its location, design, use or operation; and
 - c. The EPF and its location, design, use, and operation must be in compliance with any guidelines, regulations, rules, or statutes governing the EPF as adopted by state law or by any other agency or jurisdiction with authority over the EPF.

LU66: After a final siting decision has been made on an essential public facility according to the process described in LU65 ~~LU62~~, pursue any amenities or incentives offered by the operating agency, or by state law, other rule, or regulation to jurisdictions within which such EPF is located.

LU67: For EPF having public safety impacts that cannot be mitigated through the process described in LU64 ~~LU61~~, the City should participate in any process available to provide comments and suggested conditions to mitigate those public safety impacts to the agency, special district or organization proposing the EPF. If no such process exists, the City should encourage consideration of such comments and conditions through coordination with the agency, special district, or organization proposing the EPF. A mediation process may be the appropriate means of resolving any disagreement about the appropriateness of any mitigating condition requested by the City as a result of the public safety impacts of a proposal.

Amendment No. 7

Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan

(Delete the following policies.)

~~T6: Implement improvements along 15th Ave. to revitalize business, increase pedestrian and bicycle safety and usability, and add vehicle capacity where necessary.~~

~~PR6: Redevelop paths in Paramount Open Space to ensure at least one year-round connection between the east and west sides of the Ridgecrest Neighborhood.~~

~~CD13: Improve the area around 145th St. and 15th Ave. with place-making treatments, such as lighting, benches, and landscaping, to identify it as a gateway to the City.~~

(Update Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan title)

Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan

May 24, 2010 December 12, 2016

(Replace Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan map)

(Delete Existing Subarea Map)

(Adopted New Subarea Map)



(Delete unneeded first paragraph of the subarea plan as inaccurate and redundant of the map.)

~~The Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea is bounded on the south by 145th Street, on the west by 8th Avenue, on the north by 155th and 150th Streets, and on the east by Lake City Way. It contains portions of both the Ridgecrest and Briarcrest neighborhoods, and is comprised predominately of single-family households, most of which were constructed after WWII.~~