



PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, October 5, 2017
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber · Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Ave N
Seattle, WA 98122

	<u>Estimated Time</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	7:00
2. ROLL CALL	7:01
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	7:03
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7:04
a. September 21, 2017 Draft Minutes	

Public Comment and Testimony at Planning Commission

During General Public Comment, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not specifically scheduled later on the agenda. During Public Hearings and Study Sessions, public testimony/comment occurs after initial questions by the Commission which follows the presentation of each staff report. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the podium to have their comments recorded, state their first and last name, and city of residence. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Generally, individuals may speak for three minutes or less, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. When representing the official position of an agency or City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes. Questions for staff will be directed to staff through the Commission.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	7:05
6. STUDY ITEMS:	7:15
a. 2017 Development Code Amendments - Continuation	
• Staff Presentation	
• Public Comment	
7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT	8:15
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	8:20
9. NEW BUSINESS	8:21
10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	8:22
11. AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 19, 2017 (2017 Development Code Batch #3)	8:23
12. ADJOURNMENT	8:25

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 801-2236

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

September 21, 2017
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Craft
Commissioner Chang
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Mork
Commissioner Thomas

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Montero

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Craft called the Public Hearing meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by Ms. Hoekzema the following Commissioners were present: Chair Craft, and Commissioners Chang, Malek, Maul, Mork and Thomas. Vice Chair Montero was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of September 7, 2017 were approved as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING: 2017 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

Chair Craft briefly reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the hearing.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that the State's Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to once a year, with limited exceptions. To ensure the public can review the proposals in a city-wide context, the GMA directs cities to create a docket of amendments to be considered. The City Council set the 2017 docket in March, with 8 amendments. Following a brief description of the 8 amendments, Commission questions, and public testimony, the Commission will be asked to forward a recommendation on each of the amendments to the City Council. He reviewed each of the amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 1** would amend Policy LU47, which states “*Consider annexation of 145th Street adjacent to the existing southern border of the City.*” The City is currently engaged in the design and environmental review of the 145th Street Corridor, from Interstate 5 to Aurora Avenue North, and is evaluating annexation of the entire corridor. Due to the legal complexity of the issues, the timeline has been extended, and staff is recommending the amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 2** is carried over from the 2016 final docket and calls for “*considering amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan that may have applicability to reflect the outcomes of the Richmond Beach Transportation Beach Corridor Study as described in Policy PW-9.*” It also calls for “*considering amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that could result from the development of Interlocal Agreements as described in Policy PW-13.*” The corridor study has been delayed, and staff is recommending that the amendment be carried over and placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 3** considers amendments to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Elements Goals and Policies and updates the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Master Plan. The PROS Plan was updated in 2017, and is centered on the themes of “*Securing our Foundation and Shaping our Future.*” There are two proposed changes. The first will adopt the new PROS Plan and the second will update and replace the goals and policies in the park element.
- **Amendment 4** considers amendments to the Capital Facilities Element Goals and Policies and update the Surface Water Master Plan. The update of the Surface Water Mater Plan is still in progress, and the work of staff and consultant will continue into 2018. Staff is recommending that the amendment be carried over to the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 5** considers amendments to the Master Street Plan of the Transportation Master Plan. The amendment relates to Sound Transit's 145th and 185th Street Light Rail Stations. Currently, the Master Street Plan exempts the 185th Street Bridge from required amenity zones. However, review of Sound Transit's design plans for the 185th Street Bridge has identified the need to add the following language to the Master Street Plan to more clearly require non-landscaped amenity zones on bridges for streetscape amenities such as hard surface design treatment, light poles, signage, etc.

DRAFT

City of Shoreline
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2017 Page 2

- **Amendment 6** deletes a duplicate utility policy in the 185th Street Light Rail Station Subarea Plan. The policy calls for “*considering the use of alternative energy in all new government facilities.*”
- **Amendment 7** would change “*Ronald Wastewater District*” to “*City of Shoreline*” throughout the Comprehensive Plan, as the City will become the wastewater provider before the end of 2017. The amendment also adds language, “*effective upon the date of formal assumption.*” Staff recommends approval of the amendment.
- **Amendment 8** would update the Comprehensive Plan by amending the Capital Facilities Element to incorporate by reference the Shoreline Fire District’s Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan and Mitigation and Level-of-Service Policy so as to support the imposition of fire impact fees as authorized by Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 82.02. Staff recommends approval of the amendment.

Commissioner Chang referred to **Amendment 2**. While the Staff Report indicates that the Transportation Corridor has been delayed, according to the Richmond Beach Rechannelization Study Frequently Asked Questions, the City and the developer have reached an impasse. Director Markle clarified that, rather than an impasse, the study has been delayed and there is no firm decision as to whether or not it will go forward. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor added that there are still working negotiations going on, specifically related to methodologies. Commissioner Malek asked about the corridor study’s connection with Snohomish County’s work relative to the Point Wells project. Director Markle answered that the study is independent of Snohomish County’s work. The original intent was to line the work up, but that is no longer the case.

Public Testimony

There was no public testimony.

Commission Deliberation and Action

- **Amendment 1** – Amend Policy LU-47 which states, “*Consider annexation of 145th Street adjacent to the existing southern border of the City.*”

COMMISSIONER MORK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT AMENDMENT 1 BE CARRIED OVER TO THE 2018 DOCKET. COMMISSIONER THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 2** – Consider amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan that may have applicability to reflect the outcomes of the Richmond Beach Transportation Corridor Study as described in Policy PW-9. Also, consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that would result from the development of Interlocal Agreements as described in Policy PW-13.

DRAFT

City of Shoreline
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2017 Page 3

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THAT AMENDMENT 2 BE CARRIED OVER TO THE 2018 DOCKET. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 3** – Consider amendments to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Element Goals and Policies and update the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 3, WHICH WOULD INCORPORATE THE PROS PLAN, AS DRAFTED IN ATTACHMENT 2, AS AN APPENDIX TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN THAT WILL SERVE AS THE SUPPORTING ANALYSIS FOR THE PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. THE AMENDMENT WOULD ALSO AMEND THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS SHOWN IN ATTACHMENT 3. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Mork commented that a lot of people worked very hard on the PROS Plan update, and she appreciates this effort. She requested additional information about the proposed changes associated with Amendment 3. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor clarified that the goals and policies represented in Attachment 3 were extracted out of the PROS Plan. They represent a wholesale repeal and replacement of the existing goals and policies that are currently in the PROS element.

Commissioner Mork asked staff to provide additional information about why the policy relative to a park impact fee would be deleted. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor clarified that Policy 21 in the existing PROS Element calls for exploring the park impact fee concept. A rate study has now been done, and a new regulation pertaining to park impact fees was adopted by the City Council. The new regulation is slated to become effective January 2018. Although the GMA authorizes cities and counties to impose impact fees, the regulations that implement them are not housed within the Comprehensive Plan.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 4** – Consider amendments to the Capital Facilities Element Goals and Policies and update of the Surface Water Master Plan.

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT AMENDMENT 4 BE CARRIED OVER TO THE 2018 DOCKET. COMMISSIONER CHANG SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 5** – Consider amendments to the Master Street Plan of the Transportation Master Plan.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF PART 1 OF AMENDMENT 5, WHICH AMENDS THE LANGUAGE IN THE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (APPENDIX D, MASTER STREET PLAN, p. 253, 5TH paragraph, 2nd bullet). COMMISSIONER THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

DRAFT

Commissioner Mork clarified that the proposed amendments refer to amenity zones on bridges. Mr. Szafran concurred. He explained that, as proposed, the following sentence would be added, “*Amenity zones that are along bridges do not need to include landscaping, but can include streetscape amenities such as hard surface design treatments, light poles, banners, wind screens, public art elements and/or signage.*”

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor pointed out that there are actually two parts to Amendment 5. The first part (Attachment 4) would clearly require non-landscaped amenity zones on bridges. The 2nd part would add language to the Master Street Plan to consider the 185th Street Multimodal Corridor Strategy when determining the required right-of-way and planned curb-to-curb width along 185th Street. Upon further discussions with the City Attorney, it was determined that the 2nd part is unnecessary. Staff is recommending approval of the language in Attachment 4, but denial of the second part of the amendment.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Mork asked for an explanation for why the 2nd part of Amendment 5 is unnecessary. Mr. Szafran explained that the amendment was intended to correct the 10-foot discrepancy in the cross-section widths in the Master Street Plan (66 feet) and the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan (76 feet). Staff determined that no changes are necessary because the width in the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan would supersede the width in the Master Street Plan.

COMMISSIONER MORK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL DENIAL OF PART 2 OF AMENDMENT 5, WHICH WOULD AMEND THE LANGUAGE IN THE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (APPENDIX D, MASTER STREET PLAN, p. 262 and 263, table). COMMISSIONER THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Chang questioned why staff does not support changing the Master Street Plan so that the numbers are consistent. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor advised that the Master Street Plan will be updated as part of the next Transportation Master Plan update. Until that time, the subarea plan will be the controlling emphasis and will serve as a more refined plan for that specific subarea.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **AMENDMENT 6** – Delete duplicate utility policy, “*Consider the use of alternative energy in all new government facilities.*”

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 6 RELATIVE TO THE 185TH STREET STATION SUBAREA PLAN AS SHOWN IN ATTACHMENT 5. COMMISSIONER CHANG SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Szafran commented that the policy is listed twice in the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan. Staff is proposing that one be eliminated.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **AMENDMENT 7** – Change the “*Ronald Wastewater District*” to “*City of Shoreline*” throughout the Comprehensive Plan as the City will be the wastewater provider. The amendment would also add additional language, “*effective upon the date of formal assumption.*”

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 7, WHICH RENAMES THE “RONALD WASTEWATER DISTRICT” TO “CITY OF SHORELINE” THROUGHOUT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS THE CITY’S WASTEWATER PROVIDER EFFECTIVE UPON THE DATE OF FORMAL ASSUMPTION (ATTACHMENT 6). COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **AMENDMENT 8** – Update the Comprehensive Plan by amending the Capital Facilities Element to incorporate by reference the Shoreline Fire District’s Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan and Mitigation and Level-of-Service Policy so as to support the imposition of fire impact fees as authorized by RCW 82.02.

Chair Craft reminded the Commission that it does not have the authority to change the language within the Shoreline Fire District’s planning documents. Mr. Szafran noted that there are several parts to Amendment 8, and the Commission might want to take separate action on each one.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF PARTS 1 AND 2 OF AMENDMENT 8, WHICH AMEND THE CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE TO INCORPORATE, BY REFERENCE, THE SHORELINE FIRE DISTRICT’S CAPITAL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT PLAN (ATTACHMENT 7) AND MITIGATION AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE POLICY (ATTACHMENT 8). COMMISSIONER CHANG SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Mork thanked Chief Cowan for his detailed work to prepare the proposed amendments. Although outside of the Commission’s purview, she advocated for increasing the deduction allowed for sprinklers in private residences.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF PART 3 OF AMENDMENT 8, WHICH WOULD AMEND THE GOALS AND POLICIES IN THE CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE AS SHOWN IN ATTACHMENT 9. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF PART 4 OF AMENDMENT 8 TO AMEND THE CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT SUPPORTING ANALYSIS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS

SHOWN IN ATTACHMENT 10, AND INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE PUT FORWARD BY STAFF:

“Capital resources for SFD consist of the previous listed fire stations, fire apparatus (vehicles used for fire and rescue), staff vehicles and the related equipment, tools and associated personal protection equipment needed to safely and legally provide fire and rescue services. Current inventories of all SFD resources are listed in the Shoreline Fire Department Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan. The Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan can be found at <http://shorelinewa.gov/> and the Mitigation and Level-of-Service Policy can be found at <http://shorelinewa.gov/>.”

COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Szafran summarized that a City Council study session on the proposed amendments is scheduled for October 23rd, with final adoption anticipated on November 13th.

Chair Craft closed the public hearing.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director Markle announced that the City received a development permit application today for the post office site in North City. She also announced that the Planning and Development Services Department will be relocating to the 3rd floor of City Hall. The new permit center will open on October 10th. The department will be closed on October 6th and 9th.

Commissioner Thomas requested details about the permit for the post office site. Director Markle said the proposal is for a 243-unit multi-family project. It will include a nice plaza area and some retail space. The post office lease runs through the end of 2017. Commissioner Thomas asked if the project would include any “affordable” units. Ms. Markle answered that it is not mandatory at that site, and she does not know if the project includes any. Commissioner Thomas asked if the City has information about the future of the post office. Director Markle said, to her knowledge, there will be no new location. Shoreline’s only post office will be located on 145th Street.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no reports or announcements from Commissioners and/or committees.

DRAFT

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran announced that the October 5th agenda will include a continued study session on the 2017 Development Code amendments, and the discussion will focus on the policy amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Easton Craft
Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission

Planning Commission Meeting Date: October 5, 2017

Agenda Item: 6a.

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Continuation of 2017 Development Code Amendments
DEPARTMENT: Planning & Community Development
PRESENTED BY: Steven Szafran, AICP, Senior Planner
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager

Public Hearing Study Session Recommendation Only
 Discussion Update Other

Introduction

The purpose of this study session is to:

- Provide information for issues identified on Sept 7 by Commission;
- Introduce Policy-related Amendments;
- Respond to Commission questions and concerns; and
- Gather public input.

Amendments to Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) Title 20 (Development Code) are processed as legislative decisions. Legislative decisions are non-project decisions made by the City Council under its authority to establish policies and regulations. The Planning Commission is the reviewing authority for legislative decisions and is responsible for holding an open record Public Hearing on the proposed Development Code amendments and making a recommendation to the City Council on each amendment.

Amendments Needing Further Analysis

At the September 7 meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed the Administrative and Clarifying Development Code amendments of the 2017 batch. The staff report and attachments for September 7 can be found at <http://www.cityofshoreline.com/home/showdocument?id=32073>

The Commission requested more information regarding Amendment #4, Amendment #21, Amendment #26, and Amendment #30.

New Policy-Oriented Amendments

Time permitting, staff will present the remaining amendments listed as **Type P** in the Table of Contents of Attachment A for the Commission to discuss.

Approved By:

Project Manager 

Planning Director 

Amendment #4 – SMC 20.20.024 – Hardscape Definitions

Based on the Commissions discussion, staff continues to work on this amendment and will present it at the next Commission meeting October 19th.

Amendment #21

SMC 20.50.040 – Allowing Eaves to Project into Setbacks

Currently, if a property owner is building an addition to their existing home which does not meet current setbacks then they cannot match the eaves of the addition. This proposed amendment will provide some flexibility for only the eaves (not walls) of building additions to line up with the eaves of an existing structure. Currently, the code does not allow eaves to project into a five-foot side yard setback, so that the home owner has two choices, either move the addition further from the setback to allow space for the eave or do not provide an eave at all.

The Commission commented that the amendment was unclear and hard to understand the way it was presented at the September 7 meeting. Staff has amended the proposed language to make the provision easier to administer and understand:

SMC 20.50.040 (I) Projections into Setbacks

3. Eaves shall not project ~~more than:~~
 - a. ~~Eighteen inches~~ Into a required five-foot setback, ~~and shall not project at all into a five-foot setback;~~
 - b. More than thirty-six inches into front and rear yard required setbacks.

Exception SMC 20.50.040(I)(3): When adjoining a legal, non-conforming eave, a new eave may project up to 20% into the required setback or may match the extent of the legal, non-conforming eave, whichever is lesser.

The proposed code language makes it clear that eaves may not project into required side yard setbacks unless there is a legal, nonconforming structure that is less than 5 feet from the property line. In those cases, the proposed exception will allow the eave to project into the required side-yard setback up to 20 percent which would be, for example, 1-foot into the minimum 5-foot setback.

To be consistent with the existing setback requirements in the front and rear yards, the same exception applies. Eaves may not project more than 36 inches into the required front and rear yard setback unless there is an adjoining legal, nonconforming structure that is not meeting setbacks. The proposed exception will allow a total of 20 percent projection into the required front and rear setback which includes the allowed stated projection in SMC 20.50.040 (I)(3)(b) above. This translates to a 4-foot eave (additional 1-foot change) projection into the front yard setback and a 3-foot eave projection (no change) into the rear-yard setback (in the R-6 zone). Staff will present a diagram illustrating the proposed amendment at the October 5 meeting.

Amendment #26 SMC 20.50.410(F) – Parking Design Standards

This amendment adds a provision stating that structural columns or permanent structures cannot be placed within the minimum parking stall dimension, impede the opening of vehicle doors or the ability of passengers to walk from the parking space. Staff wanted to add this provision because the City is seeing more structured parking with columns. Also because the City currently has the lowest parking ratios in the area (other than Seattle) it important to ensure the minimum required number of parking spaces are actually functional.

The Commission stated that if the column or structure is located within the parking stall and the vehicle door can be opened without impediment, than the parking stall should be allowed to count towards the total number of required parking spaces. The Commission also stated that buildings with structured parking are tight on space and every inch of these garages is needed to accommodate all of the zoning requirements, therefore the City should allow columns and other structures to be located within parking stalls if the space can still function. The Commission also stated that current parking garage stalls are frequently too small to be usable.

Based on Commission's comments, staff has amended the proposed language:

F. The minimum parking space and aisle dimensions for the most common parking angles are shown in Table 20.50.410F below. For parking angles other than those shown in the table, the minimum parking space and aisle dimensions shall be determined by the Director. For these Director's determinations for parking angles not shown in Table 20.50.410F, parking plans for angle parking shall use space widths no less than eight feet, six inches for a standard parking space design and eight feet for a compact car parking space design. Structural columns or permanent structures cannot ~~be placed within the minimum parking stall dimension~~, impede the opening of vehicle doors or the ability of passengers to walk from the parking space.

Amendment #30 SMC 20.80.025(A) – Critical Area Maps

This amendment clarifies the steps it takes to identify the existence of a critical area on a specific property. The Commission had questions about who makes the site inspection when determining if a critical area is present. Staff agrees the language should further clarify who makes the inspection. Staff proposes the following change in **bold**:

A. The approximate location and extent of identified critical areas within the City's planning area are shown on the critical areas maps adopted as part of this chapter,

6a - Staff Report - 2017 Development Code Amendments

including but not limited to the maps identified in SMC 20.80.222, 20.80.272 and 20.80.322. These maps shall be used for informational purposes as a general guide only for the assistance of ~~only to assist~~ property owners and other interested parties. Boundaries and locations indicated on the maps are generalized. Critical areas and their buffers may occur within the City, which have not previously been mapped. A site inspection or an application's Critical Area Worksheet may also indicate the presence of a critical area. A site inspection by staff or an application's Critical Area Worksheet may also indicate the presence of a critical area.

Development Code Criteria

The decision criteria for a Development Code amendment in SMC 20.30.350 (B) states the City Council may approve or approve with modifications a proposal for a change to the text of the land use code if:

1. The amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan; and
2. The amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare; and
3. The amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.

The proposed amendments to the Development Code are included in **Attachment 1**. Each amendment includes a description of the amendment, justification for the amendment and staff recommendations for the amendment.

Next Steps

The 2017 batch of Development Code amendments schedule is as follows:

October 5	Planning Commission meeting: Discuss 2017 Batch Amendments (part 2)
October 19	Planning Commission meeting: Discuss 2017 Batch Amendments (part 3)
November 2	Planning Commission Public Hearing: 2017 Batch Amendments (all)
January 22, 2018	City Council meeting: Discuss 2017 Batch Amendments

Attachment

Attachment 1 – Proposed 2017 Development Code Amendments

Attachment 2 – 2017 Development Code Amendment Public Comments received 9/22-9/28/2017

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT BATCH 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A = Administrative
C = Clarification
P = Policy

Number	Section	Topic	Type
1	20.20.012	Brewpubs	P
2	20.20.016	Apartment, driveways	C
3	20.20.018	Engineer, Enhancement	A and C
4	20.20.024	Hardscape	C
5	20.20.034	Microbrewery, Microdistillery and Mitigation	P and C
6	20.30.045 & 20.30.050	No Neighborhood Meetings for certain Type B Permits	P
7	20.30.060	Numbering Change Only	A
8	20.30.400	Adding Lot Merger to Lot Line Adjustment	A
9	20.30.430	Site Development Permits	A
10	20.40	Numbering Change Only	A
11	20.40.130	Adds Brewpubs, Microbreweries, and Microdistilleries to Table 20.40.130	P
12	20.40.160	Adds Brewpubs, Microbreweries, and Microdistilleries to Table 20.40.160	P
13	20.40.210	Accessory Dwelling Units – Delete Owner and Parking Requirements	P
14	20.40.235	Removes Catalyst Program and Clarifies Affordable Housing Requirements	C
15	20.40.438	Updates SMC Reference Only	A
16	20.40.505	Fixes Numbering Mistake Only	A
17	20.40.504	Clarifies Self-Storage Indexed Criteria	C
18	20.50.020(1)	Densities and Dimensions in Residential Zones	A
19	20.50.020(3)	Creates setback between MUR and Commercial zones, Raise Height In MB to 70-feet	P
20	20.50.021	Add Director of Public Works	A
21	20.50.040	Allow Eaves in Setbacks up to Four Feet and Clarify No Projects into 5-Foot Setback	C and P
22	20.50.240	Deletes Ground Floor Commercial Standards, Deletes ADR Process for Access in Station Areas	P
23	20.50.310	Moves Emergency Exemptions for Tree Removal and Add Tree Protection in the MUR-70' Zone	C and P
24	20.50.350	Update Reference and Clarify Tree Exceptions	A and C
25	20.50.360	Require Tree Retention and Replacement in the MUR-70' Zone	P

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

26	20.50.410	Columns and Parking Stall Clearance	C
27	20.50.470	Clarify Street Front Parking Lot Landscaping Standards	C
28	20.50.490	Clarification of Multifamily	A
29	20.70.440 (New Subchapter)	Access Widths for New Development	C
30	20.80.025(A) and (B)	Clarify How to Check for Critical Areas	C
31	20.80.030(F)	Updates Reference Only	A
32	20.80.040(C)	Allowed Activities in Critical Areas	P
33	20.80.045(B)	Critical Area Reports Required	C
34	20.80.050	Current Condition of Critical Areas	P
35	20.80.080	Critical Area Reconnaissance	P
36	20.80.090	Existing Condition of Buffer Areas	P
37	20.80.350	Clarify Wetland Mitigation Areas	C
38	20.230.200(B)(4)	Updates Reference Only	A
39	13.12.700(C)(3)	Updates Reference Only	A
40	20.40.130 and 20.40.150	Shipping Containers	P

DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

20.20 Amendments

Amendment #1 (SS)

20.20.012 – B Definitions

Justification – The City has seen an increased interest in locating brewpubs and microbreweries in various neighborhoods. The Shoreline Development Code does not have a listed land use for brewpub or microbrewery. The definition and use of a microbrewery is a related amendment. This amendment will add a definition of brewpub. This use will also be listed in the use tables, Table 20.40.130 and Table 20.40.160 (see Amendment #11 and #12 below).

Brewpub - A restaurant that manufactures fermented malt beverages on premises for either consumption on premise in hand-capped or sealed containers in quantities sold directly to the consumer.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #2 (SS)(TJ)

20.20.016 – D Definitions

There are two amendments to the “D” definitions.

1. *Justification – The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the difference between an apartment structure and a single-family attached dwelling structure. This definition of apartment has been misinterpreted to include single-family attached dwellings. This issue came to light from a request to build townhomes in the MUR-70’ zone. Single-family attached dwellings are not allowed in the MUR-70’ zone. The applicant called their proposed project “apartments” when the project was actually townhomes.*

Staff proposes to strike the word “usually” which then means apartments must always be located above one another. In all of the recent mixed-use buildings in Shoreline, the apartment units have been located above one another. Staff is also proposing to add the sentence, “Apartments are not considered single-family attached dwellings”. These changes will make it clearer that apartments are not single-family attached dwellings.

Dwelling, Apartment – A building containing multiple dwelling units that are usually located above other dwelling units in a multi-unit configuration and/or above commercial spaces. Apartments are not considered single family attached dwellings.

2. *Justification – This amendment clarifies that a shared driveway serves up to four dwelling units, not properties. This change will make the definition of shared driveways consistent with the Engineering Development Manuals standards for shared driveways.*

Driveway, Shared – A jointly owned and maintained tract or easement serving up to four dwelling ~~two or more units~~ properties.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that these amendments be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #3 (TJ)(PC)

20.20.018 – E Definitions

There are two amendments to the “E” definitions.

1. *Justification –Delete the term City Engineer. City Engineer is not used anywhere in the Development Code. The term Public Works Director is used in the Development Code and that term will stay in the Development Code.*

~~Engineer, City – City Engineer having authorities specified in State law or authorized representative.~~

2. *Justification – Chapter 20.80 SMC, critical areas regulations, uses these terms, under the general term of “mitigation”, to refer to the restoration, remediation, resource creation, or compensatory mitigation of damaged critical areas. The standards and the meaning are either the same or overlapping and many have no definition. This causes confusion when looking for the separate standards that might be applied to each. The only standards in the CAO are under “mitigation standards” in each subsection. That section has the list of preferred actions in the current definition so are redundant and regulatory in the definition section. Staff proposes to retain the enhancement definition because that is for a project to improve and existing critical area without current impacts. However, staff proposes to remove all the terms other than “mitigation” as separate definitions and remove them from the text of the CAO. The list of criteria under “mitigation” is regulatory and specified in each of the critical area mitigation performance standards.*

Enhancements - Alteration of an existing resource to improve or increase its characteristics and processes without degrading other existing functions.

Enhancements are to be distinguished from ~~resource creation or restoration~~ mitigation projects.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that these amendments be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #4 (PC)

20.20.024 – H Definitions

Justification – The existing definition of impervious surface (20.20.026 I) is almost identical to the proposed amendment for hardscape except that the proposed hardscape definition includes pervious pavement, open decking, landscape rockeries, and gravel. These surfaces were included in hardscape to address the topic of “heat islands”, which can hold heat and warm the surrounding area. However, there is no evidence of how much hardscape may contribute to global warming or if it is detrimental to the local environment. Rock or concrete is capable of countering with “cold islands” in the cooler months. The City’s Development Review Engineers (DREs) allow impervious concrete, decks, and rockeries because these items allow water to be absorbed into the ground by moving through or around these objects. However, DREs use the hardscape calculation as their impervious surface calculations. Developers frequently confuse the two definitions.

The intent of regulating hardscape is to limit the development footprint/envelope/massing and increase vegetated areas. The City’s current definition of hardscape was intentionally adopted in order to limit the footprint/envelope of development and mass of built structures and increase vegetated areas.

Recommendation - Staff recommends using consistent and parallel definitions for impervious surfaces and for hardscape. This also ensures consistency with dimensional standards of tables 20.50.020 for the sake of consistency and explanation to the public which already utilized the term hardscape.

Hardscape – Any structure or other covering on or above the ground that includes materials commonly used in building construction such as wood, asphalt and concrete, and also includes, but is not limited to, all structures, decks and patios, paving including gravel, pervious or impervious concrete and asphalt. a non-vegetated surface that either prevents or retards the entry of water into the soil mantle as under natural conditions prior to development and causes water to run off the surface in greater quantities or at an increased rate of flow over pre development natural conditions. Common impervious surface areas are rooftops, patios, walkways, driveways, parking area constructed from either concrete, asphalt, compacted gravel, oiled dirt, concrete or packed earth. Rock garden and walls, pervious pavements, gravel foot paths, decks that drain to open ground underneath, pavers with pervious joints less than 4 square feet each are not included. Artificial turf with subsurface drain fields has a 50% hardscape and 50% pervious value.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #5 (SS)(PC)

20.20.034 – M Definitions

There are three proposed amendments to “M” definitions.

1. *Justification –The City has seen an increased interest in locating micro-distilleries and microbreweries in various neighborhoods. The Shoreline Development Code does not have a listed land use for such uses. Both uses are a small, often boutique-style operation producing beer or spirit alcohol products in small quantities. This amendment will add a definition of microbrewery and micro-distillery. They will also be listed in the use tables, Table 20.40.130 and Table 20.40.160 (See Amendments #11 and #12).*

Microbrewery – A facility for the production and packaging of alcoholic beverages for distribution, retail, or wholesale, consumption on or off premise. The development may include other uses such as a standard restaurant, bar or live entertainment as otherwise permitted in the zoning district.

Microdistillery – A small operation that produces distilled spirits. In addition to production, tastings and sales of products for off premises use are allowed.

Justification - The CAO uses the “Mitigation” definition to also list regulatory criteria. That criteria belongs in the regulations which already exists under SMC 20.80.053 provisions and each of the types of critical area.

In addition, in the definition and in the mitigation code sections there are a wide variety of terms or mitigating actions that have no definition and are frequently redundant or overlapping of each other (restoration, remediation, resource creation, rehabilitation, revegetation, compensatory mitigation, replanting). These terms may be useful in describing the actions or issues that need to be addressed. The code also use these terms with “plan” such as a “restoration plan”. Since these terms are used under mitigation plan performance standards it is confusing to know what these other plans are and should include since there are no standards that accompany them. Is the mitigation plan the same as the restoration plan? Rather than sort out these terms staff recommends that the city retain the terms except to remove “plan” if it follows that term.

Mitigation – The action taken to minimize, rectify, reduce, or eliminate adverse impacts over time and/or compensate for the loss of ecological functions resulting from development or use. Avoiding, minimizing, or compensating for adverse impacts, including use of any or all of the following actions listed in descending order of preference:

- A. ~~— Avoiding the impact by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;~~
- B. ~~— Minimizing the impact by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, by using appropriate technology or by taking affirmative steps to avoid or reduce the impact;~~
- C. ~~— Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating or restoring the affected critical area or buffer to the conditions existing at the time of initiation of the project;~~
- D. ~~— Minimizing or eliminating the hazard by restoring or stabilizing the hazard area through biological, engineered, or other methods;~~
- E. ~~— Reducing or eliminating the impact or hazard over time by preservation or maintenance operations during the life of the development proposal;~~
- F. ~~— Compensating for the impact by replacing, enhancing or providing substitute critical areas and environments; and~~
- G. ~~— Monitoring the hazard or required mitigation and taking appropriate corrective measures when necessary.~~

Mitigation for individual actions may include a combination of the above measures.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that these amendments be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

20.30 Amendments

Amendment #6 (SS)

20.30.045 Neighborhood meeting for certain Type A proposals.

20.30.050 Administrative Decision – Type B

*Justification – The proposed Development Code amendment will strike the requirement of a neighborhood meeting for 1) Developments of more than one single-family detached dwelling unit on a single parcel, 2) Binding Site Plans (building parcels or pads in a commercial zone), and 3) Preliminary Short Subdivisions. In place of the neighborhood meeting, The City is proposing to send a Notice of Development to adjacent property owners within a 100-foot radius of the proposed development site. See **Attachment 2** for an example of a Notice of Construction from the City of Mukilteo and **Attachment 3** for an example of a 100-foot notification radius).*

The Notice of Development is a new type of notice for the City and is intended to alert the adjacent homeowners when a specific development proposal has been approved. The City will continue to send a Notice of Application to residents within 500-feet of the project. The Notice of Development will include more specific development information and will alert neighbors that a development project has been approved by the City.

There are three main reasons for this proposal. The first reason is neighborhood meetings give neighbors and the community a false expectation that comments gathered at the neighborhood meetings can change a development proposal. This is especially true for subdivisions. If an applicant meets all of the requirements of the Development Code, Engineering Design Manual, and the State requirements for a subdivision and the City finds that the proposed subdivision has made the appropriate provisions for the public health, safety, welfare and requirement elements and that the public use and interest will be served, the subdivision will be approved. The neighbors can comment and give suggestions to a potential developer but the developer does not have a duty to change their plans based on community input.

For example, the City has processed 45 short plat applications between 2010 and 2017. For those 45 neighborhood meetings, there were 197 people in attendance. The City received comments from the neighborhood meeting in the form of a neighborhood meeting report submitted by the applicant as part of the application submittal package. Comments mostly

spoke to four topics: trees, traffic, parking, and density (more homes where one home existed before). Although the City received well-thought out and articulate comments, as long as the applicant meets all City and State requirements, staff will approve the application.

The second reason is in most cases, such as a townhome development, a project can be built then later subdivided. The building permit for a townhome project does not require a neighborhood meeting. If a project meets all of the Development Code standards for setbacks, density, and building height, the City will issue a building permit and construction may occur. When and if the developer decides to subdivide the townhomes into individual lots, the subdivision process currently requires a neighborhood meeting. The meeting occurs after the project is built in most cases. From a procedural standpoint, this process does not make sense.

Lastly, the notices for a neighborhood meeting are sent to property owners up to 500-feet from the development proposal. A wide notification radius is helpful for projects that can have a larger impact on a neighborhood such as a Special Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit. But for a subdivision or multiple homes on one lot, it is the adjacent property owner that experiences the impact of new construction. The City will implement a new form of notice that informs the adjacent property owner of a new development approval. The notice will include the specifics of the project, contractor information, and a contact at the City.

As part of the proposal, staff is recommending a 100-foot notification radius for the Notice of Development. A notification radius of 100 was chosen to ensure that not only neighbors adjoining the site are notified but also properties across the street are notified as well.

It should be noted that the City is still sending a Notice of Application and a Notice of Decision (if requested) to all residents within 500-feet of the proposed project. The proposed Notice of Development is a third notice which will replace the neighborhood meeting.

20.30.045 Neighborhood meeting for certain Type A proposals.

A. A neighborhood meeting shall be conducted by the applicant for temporary use permits for transitional encampment proposals.

B. A neighborhood meeting shall be conducted by the applicant or owner for the following in the R-4 or R-6 zones:

~~1. Developments consisting of more than one single-family detached dwelling unit on a single parcel. This requirement does not apply to accessory dwelling units (ADUs); or~~

~~1. 2-~~ Developments requesting departures under the Deep Green Incentive Program, Chapter 20.50 SMC, Subchapter 9.

~~This neighborhood meeting will satisfy the neighborhood meeting requirements when and if an applicant or owner applies for a subdivision (refer to SMC 20.30.090 for meeting requirements).~~

20.30.050 Administrative decisions – Type B.

Table 20.30.050 – Summary of Type B Actions, Notice Requirements, Target Time Limits for Decision, and Appeal Authority

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

Action	Notice Requirements: Application and Decision ^{(1), (2), (3)}	Target Time Limits for Decision	Appeal Authority	Section
Type B:				
1. Binding Site Plan <u>(4)</u>	Mail	90 days	HE	20.30.480
2. Conditional Use Permit (CUP)	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	90 days	HE	20.30.300
3. Preliminary Short Subdivision <u>(4)</u>	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	90 days	HE	20.30.410
4. SEPA Threshold Determination	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	60 days	HE	20.30.490 – 20.30.710
5. Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, Shoreline Variance and Shoreline CUP	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	120 days	State Shorelines Hearings Board	Shoreline Master Program
6. Zoning Variances	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	90 days	HE	20.30.310

Key: HE = Hearing Examiner

(1) Public hearing notification requirements are specified in SMC 20.30.120.

(2) Notice of application requirements are specified in SMC 20.30.120.

(3) Notice of decision requirements are specified in SMC 20.30.150.

(4) These Type B Actions do not require a neighborhood meeting. A Notice of Development will be sent to adjacent properties.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that these amendments be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #7 (SS)

20.30.060 Quasi-judicial decisions – Type C.

Justification – This is a numbering change only in Table 20.30.060(7) – SCTF Special Use Permit. There are no substantive changes to the provision itself.

Table 20.30.060 – Summary of Type C Actions, Notice Requirements, Review Authority, Decision Making Authority, and Target Time Limits for Decisions

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

Action	Notice Requirements for Application and Decision ^{(3), (4)}	Review Authority, Open Record Public Hearing	Decision Making Authority (Public Meeting)	Target Time Limits for Decisions	Section
Type C:					
1. Preliminary Formal Subdivision	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	HE ^{(1), (2)}	City Council	120 days	20.30.410
2. Rezone of Property and Zoning Map Change	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	HE ^{(1), (2)}	City Council	120 days	20.30.320
3. Special Use Permit (SUP)	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	HE ^{(1), (2)}		120 days	20.30.330
4. Critical Areas Special Use Permit	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	HE ^{(1), (2)}		120 days	20.30.333
5. Critical Areas Reasonable Use Permit	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	HE ^{(1), (2)}		120 days	20.30.336
6. Final Formal Plat	None	Review by Director	City Council	30 days	20.30.450
7. SCTF – Special Use Permit	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	HE ^{(1), (2)}		120 days	20.40.5025
8. Master Development Plan	Mail, Post Site, Newspaper	HE ^{(1), (2)}		120 days	20.30.353

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #8 (BL)

20.30.400 Lot line adjustment and lot merger – Type A action.

Justification – Lot mergers and lot line adjustments are similar in nature and should follow the same process. A Lot Merger is an administrative process to join one or more lots and is

included in the Type A action table. The process for Lot Mergers is not addressed in the Development Code so this amendment will add lot mergers into SMC 20.40.400.

20.30.400 Lot line adjustment and lot merger – Type A action.

A. Lot line adjustment and lot merger ~~are~~ is exempt from subdivision review. All proposals for lot line adjustment and lot merger shall be submitted to the Director for approval. The Director shall not approve the proposed lot line adjustment or lot merger if the proposed adjustment will:

1. Create a new lot, tract, parcel, site or division;
2. Would otherwise result in a lot which is in violation of any requirement of the Code.

B. Expiration. An application for a lot line adjustment and lot merger shall expire one year after a complete application has been filed with the City. An extension up to an additional year may be granted by the City, upon a showing by the applicant of reasonable cause.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #9 (SS)

20.30.430 Site development permit for required subdivision improvements – Type A action.

Justification – Currently, the Development Code requires an applicant submit a Site Development Permit when a Preliminary Short Subdivision is applied for even if a prior Site Development Permit was approved during the building permit stage of the development process. The proposed Development Code amendment will state that a separate, or second, Site Development Permit, is not required if one was approved or is in the process of being approved through a building permit.

Engineering plans for improvements required as a condition of preliminary approval of a subdivision shall be submitted to the Department for review and approval of a site development permit, allowing sufficient time for review before expiration of the preliminary subdivision approval. A separate Site Development Permit is not required if a Site Development Permit was reviewed and approved through a building permit. Permit expiration time limits for site development permits shall be as indicated in SMC 20.30.165.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

20.40 Amendments

Amendment #10 (SS)

Subchapter 3. Index of Supplemental Use Criteria

Justification – This amendment is a numbering change only. There are no substantive changes to the provision itself.

20.40.5025 Secure community transitional facility.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #11 (SS)

20.40.130 Nonresidential uses.

Justification – The following amendment is related to Amendments 1, 5 and 12. This proposed amendment will add Brewpubs, Microbreweries, and Microdistillery to the nonresidential use table. Brewpubs are proposed to be an allowed use in the NB, CB, MB, and TC-1, 2, and 3 zones. Microbreweries and Microdistillery are proposed to be an allowed use in the CB, MB, and TC 1, 2, and 3 zones. Brewpubs are most like Eating and Drinking Establishments and are proposed to be in the same zones. Microbreweries and Microdistilleries are a more intense use that can have more of a wholesale and distribution component. Because of this, Microbreweries and Microdistilleries will be prohibited in the Neighborhood Commercial zone and allowed in the CB, MB, and TC 1, 2, and 3 zones.

Table 20.40.130

NAIC S #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	R4-R6	R8-R12	R18-R48	TC-4	NB	CB	MB	TC-1, 2 & 3
	<u>Brewpub</u>					<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>Microdistillery</u>						<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>Microbrewery</u>						<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #12 (SS)
20.40.160 Station area uses.

Justification – This amendment is related to Amendments 1, 5, and 11 and will add Brewpubs, Microbreweries, and Microdistilleries to the Station Area Use Table.

Table 20.40.160 Station Area Uses

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	MUR-35'	MUR-45'	MUR-70'
COMMERCIAL				
	Book and Video Stores/Rental (excludes Adult Use Facilities)	P (Adjacent to Arterial Street)	P (Adjacent to Arterial Street)	P
	<u>Brewpub</u>	<u>P (Adjacent to Arterial Street)</u>	<u>P (Adjacent to Arterial Street)</u>	<u>P</u>
	House of Worship	C	C	P
	Daycare I Facilities	P	P	P
	Daycare II Facilities	P	P	P
	Eating and Drinking Establishment (excluding Gambling Uses)	P-i (Adjacent to Arterial Street)	P-i (Adjacent to Arterial Street)	P-i
	General Retail Trade/Services	P-i (Adjacent to Arterial Street)	P-i (Adjacent to Arterial Street)	P-i
	Individual Transportation and Taxi			P -A
	Kennel or Cattery			C -A
	Marijuana Operations – Medical Cooperative	P	P	P
	Marijuana Operations – Retail			

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

Table 20.40.160 Station Area Uses

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	MUR-35'	MUR-45'	MUR-70'
	Marijuana Operations – Processor			
	Marijuana Operations – Producer			
	<u>Microbrewery</u>	<u>P (Adjacent to Arterial Street)</u>	<u>P (Adjacent to Arterial Street)</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>Microdistillery</u>	<u>P (Adjacent to Arterial Street)</u>	<u>P (Adjacent to Arterial Street)</u>	<u>P</u>
	Mini-Storage		C -A	C -A
	Professional Office	P-i (Adjacent to Arterial Street)	P-i (Adjacent to Arterial Street)	P
	Research, Development and Testing			P-i
	Veterinary Clinic and Hospital			P-i
	Wireless Telecommunication Facility	P-i	P-i	P-i
P = Permitted Use C = Conditional Use S = Special Use -i = Indexed Supplemental Criteria A= Accessory = Thirty percent (30%) of the gross floor area of a building or the first level of a multi-level building.				

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #13 (Private - Dittbrenner)/(PC)
20.40.210 Accessory dwelling units.

Justification – There are three proposed amendments to the Accessory Dwelling Units indexed criteria. Two of the amendments are citizen initiated and the last amendment is city-initiated.

*First, a private citizen, Cindy Dittbrenner, has proposed two changes to the Accessory Dwelling Unit indexed criteria. For the applicant’s justification for this amendment, refer to **Attachment 4**.*

The first proposal is to eliminate the requirement for the property owner to occupy either the main residence or the accessory dwelling unit. The second proposal is to eliminate the required parking space for the ADU.

Staff is concerned that this proposal will change the character of single-family neighborhoods throughout Shoreline. This amendment will literally allow single-family neighborhoods to transition to multifamily neighborhoods by outright allowing for rent duplexes or detached dwelling units on every parcel zoned R-4 and R-6.

The current conditions that are required for the establishment of ADUs are there to minimize the impact to single-family neighborhoods. The requirement of the owner living in one of the units ensures that the property is maintained. The requirement for an additional off-street parking space ensures that the neighborhood streets are not burdened by additional cars. ADUs are a way to increase density of existing single-family neighborhoods, provide homeowners with the option of additional living space and rental potential, and maintains the character and aesthetic of the single-family neighborhood.

Second, the additional amendment to this section is staff proposed. Accessory structures and Accessory Dwelling Units are two different land uses. Accessory structures by code are uninhabited spaces (sheds, garages, storage). Many older accessory structures do not meet current setbacks. Currently, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) may be able to convert accessory structures to an ADU with substandard setbacks. The minimal that an accessory structure can be demolished in order to reestablish the same setbacks is the old foundation. All dwelling units should meet setbacks for safety and the privacy of the adjoining property.

A. Only one accessory dwelling unit per lot, not subject to base density calculations.

B. Accessory dwelling unit may be located in the principal residence, or in a detached structure.

~~C. Either the primary residence or the accessory dwelling unit shall be occupied by an owner of the property or an immediate family member of the property owner. Immediate family includes parents, grandparents, brothers and sisters, children, and grandchildren.~~

~~—Accessory dwelling unit shall be converted to another permitted use or shall be removed, if one of the dwelling units ceases to be occupied by the owner as specified above. [Reflects Private Citizen-Initiated Amendment]~~

C. D. Accessory dwelling unit shall not be larger than 50 percent of the living area of the primary residence.

Exception to SMC 20.40.210(D): An accessory dwelling unit interior to the residence may be larger than 50 percent of the primary residence where the unit is located on a separate floor and shares a common roof with the primary residence.

~~E. One additional off-street parking space shall be provided for the accessory dwelling unit. [Reflects Private Citizen-Initiated Amendment]~~

D. F. Accessory dwelling unit shall not be subdivided or otherwise segregated in ownership from the primary residence.

E. G. Accessory dwelling unit shall comply with all applicable codes and standards. Dwelling units that replace existing accessory structures must meet current setback standards. [Reflects Staff Proposed Amendment]

F. H. Approval of the accessory dwelling unit shall be subject to the applicant recording a document with the King County Department of Records and Elections prior to approval which runs with the land and identifies the address of the property, states that the owner(s) resides in either the principal dwelling unit or the accessory dwelling unit, includes a statement that the owner(s) will notify any prospective purchasers of the limitations of this Code, and provides for the removal of the accessory dwelling unit if any of the requirements of this Code are violated.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that the two citizen-initiated ADU amendments be excluded from the 2017 Development Code amendments batch and the city-initiated ADU amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #14 (RM)(MR)

20.40.235 Affordable housing, light rail station subareas.

Justification – There are several proposed amendments to SMC 20.40.235.

The first set of amendments add a reference to SMC 3.27, which is the Chapter for property tax exemptions (PTE), and reference code language regarding permit and impact fee reductions or waivers. In order for a project to be eligible for PTE, the project must comply with eligibility standards and guidelines described in SMC 3.27.040. A new provision also explains that to be eligible for PTE, as per State code, a developer must also build 20 percent of the units to the affordability standard (as opposed to the 10 percent option also available in 20.40.235). Another new provision explains that to be eligible for permit and impact fee reductions or waivers, units must be affordable to those earning 60% or less of the King County Area Median Income.

Another amendment will strike the reference to the City's Catalyst Program related to Transfer of Development Rights. The City will revisit the issue of TDR's when Council provides direction at the end of 2017 or early 2018.

The last amendment reflects that fee-in-lieu for mandatory affordable housing is only available for partial units.

A. The purpose of this index criterion is to implement the goals and policies adopted in the Comprehensive Plan to provide housing opportunities for all economic groups in the City's light rail station subareas. It is also the purpose of this criterion to:

1. Ensure a portion of the housing provided in the City is affordable housing;

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

2. Create an affordable housing program that may be used with other local housing incentives authorized by the City Council, such as a multifamily tax exemption program, and other public and private resources to promote affordable housing;
3. Use increased development capacity created by the mixed-use residential zones to develop voluntary and mandatory programs for affordable housing.

B. Affordable housing is voluntary in MUR-35' and mandatory in the MUR-45' and MUR-70' zones. The following provisions shall apply to all affordable housing units required by, or allowed through, any provisions of the Shoreline Municipal Code:

1. The City provides various incentives and other public resources to promote affordable housing. Specific regulations providing for affordable housing are described below:

	MUR-70'+	MUR-70'	MUR-45'	MUR-35'
Mandatory Participation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Incentives (3)(4)	Height may be increased above 70 ft.; <u>no density limits; and may be eligible for: 12-year property tax exemption (PTE) upon designation authorization by City Council pursuant to RCW 84.14 and SMC 3.27; permit fee reduction pursuant to 20.40.235(F); and impact fee reduction pursuant to Title 3 and no density limits.</u>	<u>Entitlement of 70 ft. height; no density limits; and may be eligible for 12-year property tax exemption (PTE) upon designation authorization by City Council pursuant to RCW 84.14 and SMC 3.27; permit fee reduction pursuant to 20.40.235(F); and impact fee reduction pursuant to Title 3 and entitlement of 70 ft. height and no density limits.</u>	<u>Entitlement of 45 ft. height; no density limits; and may be eligible for 12-year property tax exemption (PTE) and permit fee reduction upon designation authorization by City Council pursuant to RCW 84.14 and SMC 3.27; permit fee reduction pursuant to 20.40.235(F); and impact fee reduction pursuant to Title 3 entitlement of 45 ft. height and no density limits.</u>	<u>No density limits; and may be eligible for 12-year property tax exemption (PTE) and permit fee reduction upon authorization or designation by City Council pursuant to RCW 84.14 and SMC 3.27; permit fee reduction pursuant to 20.40.235(F); and impact fee reduction pursuant to Title 3</u>

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

	MUR-70'+	MUR-70'	MUR-45'	MUR-35'
				and no density limits.
Studio, 1 bedroom <u>(3)(4)</u>	20% of rental units shall be affordable to households making 60% or less of the median income for King County adjusted for household size; or 10% of rental units shall be affordable to households making 50% or less of the median income for King County adjusted for household size.	20% of rental units shall be affordable to households making 70% or less of the median income for King County adjusted for household size; or 10% of rental units shall be affordable to households making 60% or less of the median income for King County adjusted for household size.		
2+ bedrooms <u>(3)(4)</u>	20% of the rental units shall be affordable to households making 70% or less of the median income for King County adjusted for household size; or 10% of the rental units shall be affordable to households making 60% or less of the median income for King County adjusted for household size.	20% of the rental units shall be affordable to households making 80% or less of the median income for King County adjusted for household size; or 10% of the rental units shall be affordable to households making 70% or less of the median income for King County adjusted for household size.		

2. Payment in lieu of constructing any fractional portion of mandatory units is available upon City Council's establishment of a fee in lieu formula. See subsection (E)(1) of this section. Full units are not eligible for fee in lieu option and must be built on-site.

~~3. Catalyst Program. The first 300 multifamily units constructed for rent or sale in any MUR zone may be eligible for an eight-year property tax exemption (PTE) upon designation by the City Council pursuant to RCW 84.14 and SMC 3.27 with no affordability requirement in exchange for the purchase of transfer of development right (TDR) credits at a rate of one TDR credit for every four units constructed upon authorization of a TDR program by City Council.~~

3. In order to be eligible for a property tax exemption pursuant to SMC chapter 3.27, 20% of units must be built to affordability standards.

4. In order to be eligible for permit or impact fee reductions or waivers, units must be affordable to households making 60% or less of the King County Area Median Income.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #15 (JT)

20.40.438 Light rail transit system/facility.¹

Justification – This amendment will strike the reference to SMC 3.01.010 and replace with SMC 3.01. Section 3.01.010 is a reference to Planning and Community Development fees. Light rail transit system/facilities are subject to all fees imposed by the City and not just Planning and Community Development Department fees.

F. Project and Permitting Processes Light Rail System/Facility.

1. Accelerated Project and Permitting Process.

a. All City permit reviews will be completed within a mutually agreed upon reduced number of working days within receiving complete permit applications and including subsequent revisions in accordance with a fully executed accelerated project and permitting staffing agreement between the City and the project proponent.

b. The fees for permit processing will be determined as part of the accelerated project permitting staffing agreement.

c. An accelerated project and permitting staffing agreement shall be executed prior to the applicant's submittal of the special use permit application; or the applicant may choose to utilize the City's standard project and permitting processes set forth in subsection (F)(2) of this section.

2. Standard Project and Permit Process.

a. All complete permit applications will be processed and reviewed in the order in which they are received and based on existing resources at the time of submittal.

b. Cost. Permit fees will be charged in accordance with Chapter 3.01 SMC ~~SMC 3.01.010~~. This includes the ability for the City to charge its established hourly rate for all hours spent in excess of the estimated hours for each permit.

c. Due to the volume of permits anticipated for development of a light rail system/facilities in the City, in absence of an accelerated project permitting staffing agreement, the target time limits for decisions denoted in Chapter 20.30 SMC may be extended by the Director if adequate staffing is not available to meet demand.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #16 (SS)

20.40.505 Secure community transitional facility.

Justification – This amendment only changes the numbering of the section. There are no substantive changes to the provision itself.

20.40.505~~2~~ Secure community transitional facility.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #17 (PC)

20.40.504 Self-storage facility.

Justification – There are two clarifications added to the screening and fencing requirements for self-storage facilities.

SMC 20.40.504(C)(4) is the section that requires loading docks, entrances, or bays be screened. The section does not say from where or what loading docks, entrances, or bays need to be screened. Staff is proposing to add types of screening and “from adjacent right-of-ways” since the intent is to screen these parts of the development from the street.

SMC 20.40.504 (C) (5), The code is currently unclear if fences and walls are required for self-storage facilities so this amendment clarifies that if a fence or wall is provided, it needs to meet the provisions of 20.40.504 (C)(5).

The third amendment for SMC 20.40.504 (C) (9) is only to remove unnecessary formatting.

A. Location of Self-Storage Facilities.

1. Self-storage facilities shall not be permitted on property located on a corner on an arterial street. For the purposes of this criterion, corners are defined as all private property adjacent to two or more intersecting arterial streets for a minimum distance of 200 feet in length by a width of 200 feet as measured from the property lines that face the arterials.

2. Self-storage facilities shall not be permitted in the Aurora Square Community Renewal Area.

3. In the Community Business zone, self-storage facilities are allowed adjacent to Ballinger Way NE, 19th Ave NE and Bothell Way NE only.

B. Restrictions on Use of Self-Storage Facilities.

1. The only activities permitted in individual storage units shall be the rental of the unit and the pickup and deposit of goods and/or property in storage. Storage units shall not be used for activities such as: residences, offices, workshops, studios, hobby or rehearsal areas.

Self-storage units shall not be used for:

a. Manufacturing, fabrication, or processing of goods, service or repair of vehicles, engines, appliances or other electrical equipment, or any other industrial activity is prohibited.

b. Conducting garage or estate sales is prohibited. This does not preclude auctions or sales for the disposition of abandoned or unclaimed property.

c. Storage of flammable, perishable or hazardous materials or the keeping of animals is prohibited.

2. Outdoor storage is prohibited. All goods and property stored at a self-storage facility shall be stored in an enclosed building. No outdoor storage of boats, RVs, vehicles, etc., or storage in outdoor storage pods or shipping containers is permitted.

C. Additional Design Requirements.

1. Self-storage facilities are permitted only within multistory structures.

2. Self-storage facilities shall not exceed 130,000 square feet.

3. All storage units shall gain access from the interior of the building(s) or site – no unit doors may face the street or be visible from off the property.

4. Loading docks, entrances or bays shall be screened with screens, fences, walls, or evergreen landscaping from adjacent right-of-ways.

5. If a Fences or and walls around and including entry is proposed then they shall be compatible with the design and materials of the building(s) and site. Decorative metal or wrought iron fences are preferred. Chain-link (or similar) fences, barbed or razor wire fences, and walls made of precast concrete blocks are prohibited. Fences or walls are not allowed between the main or front building on the site and the street. Landscape areas required by the design guidelines or elsewhere in this code shall not be fenced.

6. Each floor above the ground floor of a self-storage facility building that is facing a street shall at a minimum be comprised of 20 percent glass. All other building elevations shall include windows (or translucent cladding materials that closely resemble windows) such that not less than seven and one-half percent of said elevations provide either transparency or the illusion of transparency when viewed from the abutting street or property.

7. Unfaced concrete block, painted masonry, tilt-up and precast concrete panels and prefabricated metal sheets are prohibited. Prefabricated buildings are not allowed.

- 8. Exterior colors, including any internal corridors or doors visible through windows, shall be muted tones.
- 9. Prohibited cladding materials include: ~~(a)~~ unbacked, noncomposite sheet metal products that can easily dent; ~~(b)~~ smooth face CMUs that are painted or unfinished; ~~(c)~~ plastic or vinyl siding; and ~~(d)~~ unfinished wood.
- 10. Electrical service to storage units shall be for lighting and climate control only. No electrical outlets are permitted inside individual storage units. Lighting fixtures and switches shall be of a secure design that will not allow tapping the fixtures for other purposes.
- 11. Self-storage facilities are required to be Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

20.50 Amendments

Amendment #18 (MR)

20.50.020(1) and (2) – Densities and Dimensions in MUR Zones

Justification – As was done with the MUR zones along NE 185th and 145th Streets, setbacks need to be expanded along the entire length of NE 145th Street so that no new buildings extend into the area that may need to be acquired to expand the roadway. This can be accomplished simply by referencing the existing exception 14 to Tables 20.50.020 (1) and (2) below. An additional exception has been added to Table 20.50.020 (3) in Amendment #19 for the same purpose.

Table 20.50.020(1)

Residential Zones								
STANDARDS	R-4	R-6	R-8	R-12	R-18	R-24	R-48	TC-4
Base Density: Dwelling Units/Acre	4 du/ac	6 du/ac (7)	8 du/ac	12 du/ac	18 du/ac	24 du/ac	48 du/ac	Based on bldg. bulk limits

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

Residential Zones								
STANDARDS	R-4	R-6	R-8	R-12	R-18	R-24	R-48	TC-4
Min. Density	4 du/ac	4 du/ac	4 du/ac	6 du/ac	8 du/ac	10 du/ac	12 du/ac	Based on bldg. bulk limits
Min. Lot Width (2)	50 ft	50 ft	50 ft	30 ft	30 ft	30 ft	30 ft	N/A
Min. Lot Area (2) (13)	7,200 sq ft	7,200 sq ft	5,000 sq ft	2,500 sq ft	2,500 sq ft	2,500 sq ft	2,500 sq ft	N/A
Min. Front Yard Setback (2) (3) (14)	20 ft	20 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft
Min. Rear Yard Setback (2) (4) (5)	15 ft	15 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Min. Side Yard Setback (2) (4) (5)	5 ft min.	5 ft min.	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Base Height (9)	30 ft (35 ft with pitched roof)	30 ft (35 ft with pitched roof)	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft (40 ft with pitched roof)	35 ft (40 ft with pitched roof)	35 ft (40 ft with pitched roof) (8)	35 ft
Max. Building Coverage (2) (6)	35%	35%	45%	55%	60%	70%	70%	N/A
Max. Hardscape (2) (6)	45%	50%	65%	75%	85%	85%	90%	90%

(14) The exact setback along 145th Street (Lake City Way to Fremont Avenue) and 185th Street (Fremont Avenue to 10th Avenue NE), up to the maximum described in

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

Table 20.50.020(2), will be determined by the Public Works Department through a development application.

Table 20.50.020(2) – Densities and Dimensions in Mixed Use Residential Zones.

Note: Exceptions to the numerical standards in this table are noted in parentheses and described below.

STANDARDS	MUR-35'	MUR-45'	MUR-70' (10)
Base Density: Dwelling Units/Acre	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min. Density	12 du/ac (16)	18 du/ac	48 du/ac
Min. Lot Width (2)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min. Lot Area (2)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min. Front Yard Setback (2) (3)	0 ft if located on an arterial street 10 ft on nonarterial street 20 <u>22</u> ft if located on 145th Street (14)	15 ft if located on 185th Street (14) 0 ft if located on an arterial street 10 ft on nonarterial street 20 <u>22</u> ft if located on 145th Street (14)	15 ft if located on 185th Street (14) 20 <u>22</u> ft if located on 145th Street (14) 0 ft if located on an arterial street 10 ft on nonarterial street
Min. Rear Yard Setback (2) (4) (5)	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Min. Side Yard Setback (2) (4) (5)	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Base Height (9)	35 ft (15)	45 ft (15)	70 ft (11) (12) (15)
Max. Building Coverage (2) (6)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Max. Hardscape (2) (6)	85%	90%	90%

Exceptions to Table 20.50.020(1) and Table 20.50.020(2):

- (1) *Repealed by Ord. 462.*
- (2) *These standards may be modified to allow zero lot line and unit lot developments. Setback variations apply to internal lot lines only. Overall site must comply with setbacks, building coverage and hardscape limitations; limitations for individual lots may be modified.*
- (3) *For single-family detached development exceptions to front yard setback requirements, please see SMC 20.50.070.*
- (4) *For single-family detached development exceptions to rear and side yard setbacks, please see SMC 20.50.080.*
- (5) *For developments consisting of three or more dwellings located on a single parcel, the building setback shall be 15 feet along any property line abutting R-4 or R-6 zones. Please see SMC 20.50.130.*
- (6) *The maximum building coverage shall be 35 percent and the maximum hardscape area shall be 50 percent for single-family detached development located in the R-12 zone.*
- (7) *The base density for single-family detached dwellings on a single lot that is less than 14,400 square feet shall be calculated using a whole number, without rounding up.*
- (8) *For development on R-48 lots abutting R-12, R-18, R-24, R-48, NB, CB, MB, CZ and TC-1, 2 and 3 zoned lots, the maximum height allowed is 50 feet and may be increased to a maximum of 60 feet with the approval of a conditional use permit.*
- (9) *Base height for high schools in all zoning districts except R-4 is 50 feet. Base height may be exceeded by gymnasiums to 55 feet and by theater fly spaces to 72 feet.*
- (10) *Dimensional standards in the MUR-70' zone may be modified with an approved development agreement.*
- (11) *The maximum allowable height in the MUR-70' zone is 140 feet with an approved development agreement.*
- (12) *All building facades in the MUR-70' zone fronting on any street shall be stepped back a minimum of 10 feet for that portion of the building above 45 feet in height. Alternatively, a building in the MUR-70' zone may be set back 10 feet at ground level instead of providing a 10-foot step-back at 45 feet in height. MUR-70' fronting on 185th Street shall be set back an additional 10 feet*

to use this alternative because the current 15-foot setback is planned for street dedication and widening of 185th Street.

(13) The minimum lot area may be reduced proportional to the amount of land needed for dedication of facilities to the City as defined in Chapter 20.70 SMC.

(14) (14) The exact setback along 145th Street (Lake City Way to Fremont Avenue) and 185th Street (Fremont Avenue to 10th Avenue NE), up to the maximum described in Table 20.50.020(2), will be determined by the Public Works Department through a development application.

(15) Base height may be exceeded by 15 feet for rooftop structures such as arbors, shelters, barbeque enclosures and other structures that provide open space amenities.

(16) Single-family detached dwellings that do not meet the minimum density are permitted in the MUR-35' zone subject to the R-6 development standards.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #19 (SS)(DE)(MR)
20.50.020(3) – Dimensional requirements.

Justification – There are three amendments below.

The first amendment adds a setback between commercial zones and MUR zones. The initial development regulations adopted to implement the 185th and 145th Street Station Subarea Plans failed to include a setback requirement when an MUR zone is adjacent to a commercial zone. The proposal is to allow a 0-foot setback for MUR-70' when adjacent to commercial zones. The MUR-70' zone is most like commercial zones in terms of development potential and should follow the same guidelines for development. The proposal for the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones is different. The MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones are less intense and are most like the R-12 through R-48 zones. The proposed setback standard is 15-feet from commercial zones, the same setback established for the R-12 through R-48 zones.

The second amendment changes the building height in the Mixed Business (MB) zone to 70 feet. A building height of 70 feet is currently allowed in the Town Center 1, 2, and 3 zones as well as MUR-70'. When the City developed the Town Center Subarea Zone, a 65 feet height limit was proposed. However, building designers encouraged an increase of 5' in the height limit to create better living spaces. A 65' six-story building typically has 8' ceiling heights in its

five wood-framed stories; adding 5' to the height allows those units to enjoy 9' ceiling heights with larger windows and an enhanced sense of volume. Meanwhile, a 5' increase is not sufficient to allow an additional story, so the change does not modify the impact of the building. The 70' height limit for the Town Center zones has validated the benefits of the increase, so Staff recommends that the height limit of the MB zone also be raised to 70'.

The third amendment adds an exemption to clarify that the setback along the length of 145th Street will be determined by Public Works through a development application.

Table 20.50.020(3) – Dimensions for Development in Commercial Zones

Note: Exceptions to the numerical standards in this table are noted in parentheses and described below.

Commercial Zones				
STANDARDS	Neighborhood Business (NB)	Community Business (CB)	Mixed Business (MB)	Town Center (TC-1, 2 & 3)
Min. Front Yard Setback (Street) (1) (2) <u>(5)</u> ; (see Transition Area Setback, SMC 20.50.021)	0 ft	0 ft	0 ft	0 ft
Min. Side and Rear Yard Setback from Commercial Zones and the <u>MUR-70' Zone</u>	0 ft	0 ft	0 ft	0 ft
Min. Side and Rear Yard Setback from R-4, R-6 and R-8 Zones (see Transition Area Setback, SMC 20.50.021)	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft
Min. Side and Rear Yard Setback from TC-4, R-12 through R-48 Zones, <u>MUR-35'</u> , and <u>MUR-45' Zones</u>	15 ft	15 ft	15 ft	15 ft
Base Height (3)	50 ft	60 ft	<u>70-65</u> ft	70 ft
Hardscape (4)	85%	85%	95%	95%

Exceptions to Table 20.50.020(3):

- (1) Front yards may be used for outdoor display of vehicles to be sold or leased.*
- (2) Front yard setbacks, when in transition areas (SMC 20.50.021(A)) and across rights-of-way, shall be a minimum of 15 feet except on rights-of-way that are classified as principal arterials or when R-4, R-6, or R-8 zones have the Comprehensive Plan designation of Public Open Space.*
- (3) The following structures may be erected above the height limits in all commercial zones:*
 - a. Roof structures housing or screening elevators, stairways, tanks, mechanical equipment required for building operation and maintenance, skylights, flagpoles, chimneys, utility lines, towers, and poles; provided, that no structure shall be erected more than 10 feet above the height limit of the district, whether such structure is attached or freestanding. WTF provisions (SMC 20.40.600) are not included in this exception.*
 - b. Parapets, firewalls, and railings shall be limited to four feet in height.*

- c. Steeples, crosses, and spires when integrated as an architectural element of a building may be erected up to 18 feet above the base height of the district.
 - d. Base height may be exceeded by gymnasiums to 55 feet and for theater fly spaces to 72 feet.
 - e. Solar energy collector arrays, small scale wind turbines, or other renewable energy equipment have no height limits.
- (4) Site hardscape shall not include the following:
- a. Areas of the site or roof covered by solar photovoltaic arrays or solar thermal collectors.
 - b. Intensive vegetative roofing systems.
- (5) The exact setback along 145th Street, up to the maximum described in Table 20.50.020(2), will be determined by the Public Works Department through a development application.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that these amendments be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #20 (TJ)

20.50.021 – Transition Areas

Justification – The proposed amendment clarifies that the Director of Public Works shall determine that all vehicular access to proposed development in nonresidential zones shall be from arterial classified streets, unless technically not feasible or in conflict with State law addressing access to State highways.

Development in commercial zones NB, CB, MB and TC-1, 2 and 3, abutting or directly across street rights-of-way from R-4, R-6, or R-8 zones shall minimally meet the following transition area requirements:

A. From abutting property, a 35-foot maximum building height for 25 feet horizontally from the required setback, then an additional 10 feet in height for the next 10 feet horizontally, and an additional 10 feet in height for each additional 10 horizontal feet up to the maximum height of the zone. From across street rights-of-way, a 35-foot maximum building height for 10 feet horizontally from the required building setback, then an additional 10 feet of height for the next 10 feet horizontally, and an additional 10 feet in height for each additional 10 horizontal feet, up to the maximum height allowed in the zone.

B. Type I landscaping (SMC 20.50.460), significant tree preservation, and a solid, eight-foot, property line fence shall be required for transition area setbacks abutting R-4, R-6, or R-8 zones. Twenty percent of significant trees that are healthy without increasing the building setback shall be protected per SMC 20.50.370. The landscape area shall be a recorded easement that requires plant replacement as needed to meet Type I landscaping and required significant trees. Utility easements parallel to the required landscape area shall not encroach into the landscape area. Type II landscaping shall be required for transition area setbacks abutting rights-of-way directly across from R-4, R-6 or R-8 zones. Required tree species shall be selected to grow a minimum height of 50 feet.

C. All vehicular access to proposed development in nonresidential zones shall be from arterial classified streets, unless determined by the Director of Public Works to be technically not feasible or in conflict with State law addressing access to State highways. All developments in commercial zones shall conduct a transportation impact analysis per the Engineering Development Manual. Developments that create additional traffic that is projected to use nonarterial streets may be required to install appropriate traffic-calming measures. These additional measures will be identified and approved by the City's Traffic Engineer.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #21 (KS)

20.50.040 Setbacks – Designation and measurement.

Justification – There are two proposed amendments for this section.

The first amendments will allow additions to single family homes to line up with the eave of the existing structure, provided the eave does not project closer than four feet to the property line. Currently, the code does not allow eaves to project into a five-foot side yard setback, so the home owner has two choices, either move the addition to allow space for the eave or don't provide an eave at all. If the addition is moved over, the addition appears piecemeal and not integrated into the original structure. If the eave is left off, no weather protection is provided and the addition does not match the original structure. This proposal will allow additions to appear integrated into the original structure and provide weather protection which contributes to better maintained homes.

The second amendment clarifies the need to make sure that projections, of any type, are not allowed into 5-foot minimum setbacks. For side yards, this is pretty well covered, but since we also have a number of zones where the rear yard setback is only 5 feet (R-8 through R-48, TC-4, all MUR zones), some of the wording leaves potential room for projections into 5-foot minimum rear yard setbacks which was not intended.

I. Projections into Setback.

1. Projections may extend into required yard setbacks as follows, except that no projections shall be allowed into any five-foot yard setback except:

a. Gutters;

b. Fixtures not exceeding three square feet in area (e.g., overflow pipes for sprinkler and hot water tanks, gas and electric meters, alarm systems, and air duct termination; i.e., dryer, bathroom, and kitchens); or

c. On-site drainage systems.

d. Where allowed by the International Building Code and International Fire Code minimum fire separation distance requirements, required yard setback distance from adjacent property lines may be decreased by a maximum of four inches for the sole purpose of adding insulation to the exterior of the existing building structural frame. Existing buildings not conforming to development standards shall not extend into required yard setback more than what would be allowed for a conforming structure under this exception.

e. Rain barrels, cisterns and other rainwater catchment systems may extend into a required yard setback according to the following:

i. Cisterns, rain barrels or other rainwater catchment systems no greater than 600 gallons shall be allowed to encroach into a required yard setback if each cistern is less than four feet wide and less than four and one-half feet tall excluding piping.

ii. Cisterns or rainwater catchment systems larger than 600 gallons may be permitted in required yard setbacks provided that they do not exceed 10 percent coverage in any required yard setback, and they are not located closer than two and one-half feet from a side or rear lot line, or 15 feet from the front lot line. If located in a front yard setback, materials and design must be compatible with the architectural style of the building which it serves, or otherwise adequately screened, as determined by the Director.

iii. Cisterns may not impede requirements for lighting, open space, fire protection or egress.

2. Fireplace structures, bay or garden windows, enclosed stair landings, closets, or similar structures may project into required setbacks, except into any five-foot yard required setback ~~a side yard setback that is less than seven feet~~, provided such projections are:

a. Limited to two per facade;

b. Not wider than 10 feet;

c. Not more than 24 inches into a side yard setback ~~(which is greater than seven feet)~~; or

d. Not more than 30 inches into a front and rear yard setback.

3. Eaves shall not project ~~more than~~:

a. ~~Eighteen inches into a required side yard setback and shall not project~~ At all into a five-foot required setback except eaves may be allowed in order to accommodate a single-family house addition to align with the existing structure, provided the eave shall not encroach closer to the side yard property line than four feet;

b. ~~More than~~ ~~Thirty-six inches into a front yard and/or rear yard setback. Eaves shall not project into any five-foot yard required setback, and shall not project more than:~~

a. ~~Eighteen inches into a required side yard setback and shall not project at all into a five-foot setback~~ except eaves may be allowed in order to accommodate a single-family house addition to align with the existing structure, provided the eave shall not encroach closer to the side yard property line than four feet;

- b. Thirty-six inches into a front yard and/or rear yard setback.
4. Uncovered porches and decks not exceeding 18 inches above the finished grade may project to the front, rear, and side property lines.
5. Uncovered porches and decks, which exceed 18 inches above the finished grade, may project five feet into the required front, rear and side yard setbacks but not within five feet of a property line.
6. Entrances with covered but unenclosed porches may project up to 60 square feet into the front and rear yard setback, but shall not be allowed into any five-foot yard setback.
7. For the purpose of retrofitting an existing residence, uncovered building stairs or ramps no more than 44 inches wide may project to the property line subject to right-of-way sight distance requirements.
8. Arbors are allowed in required yard setbacks if they meet the following provisions:
 - a. No more than a 40-square-foot footprint, including eaves;
 - b. A maximum height of eight feet;
 - c. Both sides and roof shall be at least 50 percent open, or, if latticework is used, there shall be a minimum opening of two inches between crosspieces.
9. No projections are allowed into a regional utility corridor.
10. No projections are allowed into an access easement.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #22 (PC)
20.50.240 (C) Site Frontage

Justification – There are two proposed amendments to this section.

The first amendment deletes the requirements for minimum space dimensions on the ground floor in commercial and mixed-use zones. The original code amendment to require 12-foot ceilings was proposed because staff believed that all commercial space per IBC were required to have that height. The intent was to set up the potential of commercial uses with the flexibility, in the meantime, to allow apartments in these spaces. However, the IBC does not require 12 feet for a commercial use. For the minimum habitable commercial or residential space, the Building Official suggests a minimum 10 foot ceiling to allow space for ceiling mechanical equipment, though not required, to ease conversion to commercial uses. Most every developer since the code change 5 years ago has requested to depart from the Commercial Design Standards to lower the ceiling height to use those spaces for apartments. From an aesthetic

concern, first floor frontages require 50% window area and awnings over sidewalks. The flexibility to use these first floor frontage spaces would remain.

The second amendment to this section is related to access in the 145th and 185th Street Station Subareas. The intent of the code section is desirable by staff and consistent with the intent of the Station Area Subarea Plans to discourage frequent driveway cuts directly on to both 145th and 185th. However, the phrase “unable to obtain access from side streets or alleys” is problematic when the City has no way of knowing whether a developer tried to or can obtain the preferred accesses nor require them to obtain it. In addition, Administrative Design Reviews (ADRs) under SMC 20.30.297, specifically refer to the standards under the sign code and the commercial design standards. Relying on an ADR to resolve a design problem that is black and white - either you have rights to access or you don't - is not the intent of that process. It is more direct and plausible if the City requires the alternative access if an adjoining public side street or alley exists or will be required to be constructed by Public Works. Also, the existing extent of this requirement on 185th and 145th Avenues does not match with the Subareas' boundaries. To be consistent with the Subareas and SMC 20.50.240(C)(1), this requirement should apply to all MUR zones on 145th and 185th.

C. Site Frontage.

1. Development in NB, CB, MB, TC-1, 2 and 3, the MUR-45' and MUR-70' zones and the MUR-35' zone when located on an arterial street shall meet the following standards:

a. Buildings and parking structures shall be placed at the property line or abutting public sidewalks. However, buildings may be set back farther if public places, landscaping and vehicle display areas are included or future right-of-way widening or a utility easement is required between the sidewalk and the building;

b. All building facades in the MUR-70' zone fronting on any street shall be stepped back a minimum of 10 feet for that portion of the building above 45 feet in height. Reference dimensional Table 20.50.020(2) and exceptions;

c. Minimum space dimension for building interiors that are ground-level and fronting on streets shall be 10~~2~~-foot height and 20-foot depth ~~and built to commercial building code~~. These spaces may be used for any permitted land use. This requirement does not apply when developing a residential only building in the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones;

d. Minimum window area shall be 50 percent of the ground floor facade for each front facade which can include glass entry doors. This requirement does not apply when developing a residential only building in the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones;

e. A building's primary entry shall be located on a street frontage and recessed to prevent door swings over sidewalks, or an entry to an interior plaza or courtyard from which building entries are accessible;

f. Minimum weather protection shall be provided at least five feet in depth, nine-foot height clearance, and along 80 percent of the facade where over pedestrian facilities. Awnings may project into public rights-of-way, subject to City approval;

- g. Streets with on-street parking shall have sidewalks to back of the curb and street trees in pits under grates or at least a two-foot-wide walkway between the back of curb and an amenity strip if space is available. Streets without on-street parking shall have landscaped amenity strips with street trees;
- h. Surface parking along street frontages in commercial zones shall not occupy more than 65 lineal feet of the site frontage. Parking lots shall not be located at street corners. No parking or vehicle circulation is allowed between the rights-of-way and the building front facade. See SMC 20.50.470 for parking lot landscape standards;
- i. New development in MUR zones on 185th Street and NE 145th Street; and 5th Avenue between NE 145th Street and NE 148th Street shall provide all vehicular access from an existing, adjoining public side street or public/private alley. ~~If new development is unable to gain access from a side street or alley, an applicant may provide alternative access through the administrative design review process;~~ and
- j. Garages and/or parking areas for new development on 185th Street shall be rear-loaded.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that these amendments be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #23 (KS)(Private - Walgamott)

20.50.310 Exemptions from permit

Justification – There are two proposed amendments to this section.

First, to clarify language in this section about when an after-the-fact permit may be required for removal of an active or imminent hazard tree. Currently, this provision is somewhat confusing and has been interpreted/administered differently by different staff. This amendment clarifies that an after-the-fact permit is only required if the City determines that emergency removal was not warranted. This amendment also includes a correction for a prior typographical error.

*Second, this is a citizen-initiated request to amend this section (**Attachment 5**). The proposed amendment would exclude the MUR-70' zone from SMC 20.50.310(A) which is the complete exemption from tree conservation, land clearing, and site grading section of the code. The applicant has stated that by exempting the MUR-70' zone from tree requirements, there will adverse effects on shade, habitat, climate control, pollution, and aesthetics. The Council discussed the issue of trees in the MUR zones at length during the adoption process of both the 145th and 185th Street Station Subarea Plans in 2015. It was determined at that time that tree retention and replacement standards are appropriate in the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones since those two zones are similar to other residential zones that have the necessary open space to retain and plant new trees. The MUR-70' zone is similar to other commercial and mixed-use zones throughout the City and the retention and replacement of trees will make development more difficult.*

In addition to proposing that developers in the MUR-70 zone not be completely exempt, this request proposed three suggested requirements: (1) provide incentives for the retention of large

trees, such as tax breaks, bonus height/units (2) require a 1 to 3 replacement ratio for trees of 30"+DBH and for these trees (street or habitat settings) to be located within ¼ mile of the site; (c) require a minimum of 1 tree that will mature to significant DBH be incorporated in landscaping plan for site. The proposed language for these new requirements are located in Amendment #27.

A. Complete Exemptions. The following activities are exempt from the provisions of this subchapter and do not require a permit:

~~1. Emergency situation on private property involving danger to life or property or substantial fire hazards.~~

~~a. **Statement of Purpose.** Retention of significant trees and vegetation is necessary in order to utilize natural systems to control surface water runoff, reduce erosion and associated water quality impacts, reduce the risk of floods and landslides, maintain fish and wildlife habitat and preserve the City's natural, wooded character. Nevertheless, when certain trees become unstable or damaged, they may constitute a hazard requiring cutting in whole or part. Therefore, it is the purpose of this section to provide a reasonable and effective mechanism to minimize the risk to human health and property while preventing needless loss of healthy, significant trees and vegetation, especially in critical areas and their buffers.~~

~~b. For purposes of this section, "Director" means the Director of the Department and his or her designee.~~

~~c. In addition to other exemptions of SMC 20.50.290 through 20.50.370, a request for the cutting of any tree that is an active and imminent hazard such as tree limbs or trunks that are demonstrably cracked, leaning toward overhead utility lines or structures, or are uprooted by flooding, heavy winds or storm events. After the tree removal, the City will need photographic proof or other documentation and the appropriate application approval, if any. The City retains the right to dispute the emergency and require that the party obtain a clearing permit and/or require that replacement trees be replanted as mitigation.~~

1. ~~2.~~ Removal of trees and/or ground cover by the City and/or utility provider in situations involving immediate danger to life or property, substantial fire hazards, or interruption of services provided by a utility. The City retains the right to dispute the emergency and require that the party obtain a clearing permit and/or require that replacement trees be replanted as mitigation.

2. ~~3.~~ Installation and regular maintenance of public utilities, under direction of the Director, except substation construction and installation or construction of utilities in parks or environmentally critical areas.

3. ~~4.~~ Cemetery graves involving less than 50 cubic yards of excavation, and related fill per each cemetery plot.

4. ~~5.~~ Removal of trees from property zoned NB, CB, MB and TC-1, 2 and 3, and MUR-70' unless within a critical area or of critical area buffer. [Reflects both Private Citizen-Initiated Amendment and staff amendment to fix prior typographical error.]

~~5. 6.~~ Removal and restoration of vegetation within critical areas or their buffers consistent with the provisions of SMC 20.80.030(E) or removal of trees consistent with SMC 20.80.030(G) unless a permit is specifically noted under SMC 20.80.030(E).

B. Partial Exemptions. With the exception of the general requirements listed in SMC 20.50.300, the following are exempt from the provisions of this subchapter, provided the development activity does not occur in a critical area or critical area buffer. For those exemptions that refer to size or number, the thresholds are cumulative during a 36-month period for any given parcel:

1. The removal of up to a maximum of six significant trees (excluding trees greater than 30 inches DBH per tree) in accordance with Table 20.50.310(B)(1) (see Chapter 20.20 SMC, Definitions).

Table 20.50.310(B)(1) – Exempt Trees

Lot size in square feet	Number of trees
Up to 7,200	3
7,201 to 14,400	4
14,401 to 21,780	5
21,781 and above	6

2. The removal of any tree greater than 30 inches DBH, or exceeding the numbers of trees specified in the table above, shall require a clearing and grading permit (SMC 20.50.320 through 20.50.370).

3. Landscape maintenance and alterations on any property that involve the clearing of less than 3,000 square feet, or less than 1,500 square feet if located in a special drainage area, provided the tree removal threshold listed above is not exceeded.

4. Emergency tree removal on private property. A tree may be removed in whole or part if it is creating an active and imminent hazard to life and structural property, such as tree limbs or trunks that are demonstrably cracked, leaning toward overhead utility lines or structures, or are uprooted by flooding, heavy winds or storm events, so as to require immediate action within a time too short to allow full compliance with this chapter. After removal, the property owner shall provide the City with photographic or other types of evidence to demonstrate the hazard and the need for emergency removal. If upon review of this evidence the City determines that emergency removal was not warranted, then the property owner will be required to obtain the necessary permits and mitigate for the tree removal as set forth in this chapter.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that the first amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch. Staff recommends the second, citizen initiated, amendment not be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #24 (KS)
Exception 20.50.350(B)

There are two proposed exceptions

Justification – The wording of this exception makes it unclear whether BOTH (1) AND (2) are required in order to grant the exception, or EITHER (1) OR (2) may be the basis for granting the exception. My initial understanding was that both are needed, based on the use of the phrase “in addition”, but the Director’s interpretation of this exception concluded that this meant (1) and (2) are two alternative sets of criteria and that the exception may be granted if either is fulfilled. If this is the case, then the wording needs to be made clearer. I am also recommending that we remove the phrase “and approve by the City” in regards to arborists as we no longer maintain lists of qualified professionals, and add additional wording to be consistent with our current code definition of a certified arborist.

Exception 20.50.350(B):

- 1. The Director may allow a reduction in the minimum significant tree retention percentage to facilitate preservation of a greater number of smaller trees, a cluster or grove of trees, contiguous perimeter buffers, distinctive skyline features, or based on the City’s concurrence with a written recommendation of an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or by the American Society of Consulting Arborists as a registered consulting arborist ~~and approved by the City~~ that retention of the minimum percentage of trees is not advisable on an individual site; OR.*
- 2. The Director may allow a reduction in the minimum significant tree retention percentage if all of the following criteria are satisfied: The exception is necessary because:*
 - There are special circumstances related to the size, shape, topography, location or surroundings of the subject property.*
 - Strict compliance with the provisions of this Code may jeopardize reasonable use of property.*
 - Proposed vegetation removal, replacement, and any mitigation measures are consistent with the purpose and intent of the regulations.*
 - The granting of the exception or standard reduction will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property in the vicinity.*
- 3. If an exception is granted to this standard, the applicant shall still be required to meet the basic tree replacement standards identified in SMC 20.50.360 for all significant trees removed beyond the minimum allowed per parcel without replacement and up to the maximum that would ordinarily be allowed under SMC 20.50.350(B).*
- 4. In addition, the applicant shall be required to plant four trees for each significant tree removed that would otherwise count towards the minimum retention percentage. Trees replaced under this provision shall be at least 12 feet high for conifers and three inches in caliper if otherwise. This provision may be waived by the Director for restoration enhancement projects conducted under an approved vegetation management plan.*

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #25 (Private - Walgamott)

20.50.360(C) Tree replacement and site restoration.

Justification – This is a privately initiated amendment (Attachment #5) and is related to Amendment #23. See Amendment #23 for justification.

C. Replacement Required. Trees removed under the partial exemption in SMC 20.50.310(B)(1) may be removed per parcel with no replacement of trees required. Any significant tree proposed for removal beyond this limit should be replaced as follows:

1. One existing significant tree of eight inches in diameter at breast height for conifers or 12 inches in diameter at breast height for all others equals one new tree.
2. Each additional three inches in diameter at breast height equals one additional new tree, up to three trees per significant tree removed.
3. Minimum size requirements for replacement trees under this provision: Deciduous trees shall be at least 1.5 inches in caliper and evergreens six feet in height.

Exception 20.50.360(C):

- a. No tree replacement is required when the tree is proposed for relocation to another suitable planting site; provided, that relocation complies with the standards of this section.
- b. The Director may allow a reduction in the minimum replacement trees required or off-site planting of replacement trees if all of the following criteria are satisfied:
 - i. There are special circumstances related to the size, shape, topography, location or surroundings of the subject property.
 - ii. Strict compliance with the provisions of this Code may jeopardize reasonable use of property.
 - iii. Proposed vegetation removal, replacement, and any mitigation measures are consistent with the purpose and intent of the regulations.
 - iv. The granting of the exception or standard reduction will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property in the vicinity.
- c. The Director may waive this provision for site restoration or enhancement projects conducted under an approved vegetation management plan.

4. Replacement trees required for the Lynnwood Link Extension project shall be native conifer and deciduous trees proportional to the number and type of trees removed for construction, unless as part of the plan required in subsection A of this section the qualified professional demonstrates that a native conifer is not likely to survive in a specific location.

5. Tree replacement where tree removal is necessary on adjoining properties to meet requirements in SMC 20.50.350(D) or as a part of the development shall be at the same ratios in subsections (C)(1), (2), and (3) of this section with a minimum tree size of eight feet in height. Any tree for which replacement is required in connection with the construction of a light rail system/facility, regardless of its location, may be replaced on the project site.

6. Tree replacement related to development of a light rail transit system/facility must comply with this subsection C.

D. Tree Retention and Replacement in the MUR-70' Zone. Tree removal in the MUR-70' zone shall comply with the following requirement:

1. Removal of 30-inch diameter or larger trees shall be replaced by three trees within a quarter mile of the property and maintained for three years.

2. One tree must be planted and maintained onsite.

3. Incentives for greater tree retention shall be provided by the Director. Incentives include tax breaks, additional building height, and reduced parking.

E. D. The Director may require that a portion of the replacement trees be native species in order to restore or enhance the site to predevelopment character.

F. E. The condition of replacement trees shall meet or exceed current American Nursery and Landscape Association or equivalent organization's standards for nursery stock.

G. F. Replacement of removed trees with appropriate native trees at a ratio consistent with subsection C of this section, or as determined by the Director based on recommendations in a critical area report, will be required in critical areas.

H. G. The Director may consider smaller-sized replacement plants if the applicant can demonstrate that smaller plants are more suited to the species, site conditions, and to the purposes of this subchapter, and are planted in sufficient quantities to meet the intent of this subchapter.

I. H. All required replacement trees and relocated trees shown on an approved permit shall be maintained in healthy condition by the property owner throughout the life of the project, unless otherwise approved by the Director in a subsequent permit.

J. I. Where development activity has occurred that does not comply with the requirements of this subchapter, the requirements of any other section of the Shoreline Development Code, or approved permit conditions, the Director may require the site to

be restored to as near pre-project original condition as possible. Such restoration shall be determined by the Director and may include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

1. Filling, stabilizing and landscaping with vegetation similar to that which was removed, cut or filled;
2. Planting and maintenance of trees of a size and number that will reasonably assure survival and that replace functions and values of removed trees; and
3. Reseeding and landscaping with vegetation similar to that which was removed, in areas without significant trees where bare ground exists.

K. J. Significant trees which would otherwise be retained, but which were unlawfully removed or damaged or destroyed through some fault of the applicant or their representatives shall be replaced in a manner determined by the Director.

L. K. Performance Assurance.

1. The Director may require a performance bond for tree replacement and site restoration permits to ensure the installation of replacement trees, and/or compliance with other landscaping requirements as identified on the approved site plans.
2. A maintenance bond shall be required after the installation of required site improvements and prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or finalization of permit and following required landscape installation or tree replacement. The maintenance bond and associated agreement shall be in place to ensure adequate maintenance and protection of retained trees and site improvements. The maintenance bond shall be for an amount not to exceed the estimated cost of maintenance and protection measures for a minimum of 36 months or as determined by the Director.
3. The Director shall exempt individual single-family lots from a maintenance bond, except where a clearing violation has occurred or tree replacement is located within critical areas or critical area buffers.

M. L. Monitoring. The Director may require submittal of periodic monitoring reports as necessary to ensure survival of replacement trees. The contents of the monitoring report shall be determined by the Director.

N. M. Discovery of Undocumented Critical Areas. The Director may stop work authorized by a clearing and grading permit if previously undocumented critical areas are discovered on the site. The Director has the authority to require additional studies, plans and mitigations should previously undocumented critical areas be found on a site.

Staff recommendation – *Staff does not recommend that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #26 (PC)

20.50.410(F) Parking Design Standards

Justification – Structural items, such as columns, are becoming more prevalent in underground parking areas. They are frequently placed between two parking spaces and tight enough in that space to make it difficult to park, open doors, and exit the vehicle. Staff not only calculates the number of parking spaces and their dimensions but also the ease of parking. If parking becomes difficult, then some of the required spaces become unusable.

F. The minimum parking space and aisle dimensions for the most common parking angles are shown in Table 20.50.410F below. For parking angles other than those shown in the table, the minimum parking space and aisle dimensions shall be determined by the Director. For these Director's determinations for parking angles not shown in Table 20.50.410F, parking plans for angle parking shall use space widths no less than eight feet, six inches for a standard parking space design and eight feet for a compact car parking space design. Structural columns or permanent structures cannot be placed within the minimum parking stall dimension, impede the opening of vehicle doors or the ability of passengers to walk from the parking space.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #27 (SS)

20.50.470 Street frontage landscaping

Justification – This proposed amendment makes it clear that SMC 20.50.470 (A) through (D) only applies to street-front landscaping between a building and the right-of-way. Currently, the Development Code language is unclear when this section applies to a specific development. Adding “for parking lots” in the title of the section will make it clear this section only applies to parking lots along the street frontage.

SMC 20.50.470 Street frontage landscaping for parking lots.

- A. Provide a five-foot-wide, Type II landscaping that incorporates a continuous masonry wall between three and four feet in height. The landscape shall be located between the public sidewalk or residential units and the wall; or
- B. Provide at least 10-foot-wide, Type II landscaping.
- C. All parking lots shall be separated from ground-level, residential development by the required setback and planted with Type I landscaping.
- D. Vehicle Display Areas Landscaping. Shall be determined by the Director through administrative design review under SMC 20.30.297. Subject to the Director's discretion to reduce or vary the depth, landscaped areas shall be at least 10 feet deep relative to the front property line. Vehicle display areas shall be framed by appropriate landscape materials along the front property line. While allowing the vehicles on display to remain plainly visible from the public rights-of-way, these materials shall be configured to

create a clear visual break between the hardscape in the public rights-of-way and the hardscape of the vehicle display area. Appropriate landscape construction materials shall include any combination of low (three feet or less in height) walls or earthen berms with ground cover, shrubs, trees, trellises, or arbors.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #28 (SS)

20.50.490 Landscaping along interior lot line – Standards.

Justification – This proposed amendment is a clean-up amendment. The Definitions of various types of dwellings were updated in 2016 which included multifamily development. At that time, the number of units that comprised a multifamily development was deleted. This amendment will delete the number of units from this section which is consistent with the definition of multifamily.

- A. Type I landscaping in a width determined by the setback requirement shall be included in all nonresidential development along any portion adjacent to single-family and multifamily residential zones or development. All other nonresidential development adjacent to other nonresidential development shall use Type II landscaping within the required setback. If the setback is zero feet then no landscaping is required.
- B. Multifamily development ~~of more than four units~~ shall use Type I landscaping when adjacent to single-family residential zones and Type II landscaping when adjacent to multifamily residential and commercial zoning within the required yard setback.
- C. A 20-foot width of Type I landscaping shall be provided for institutional and public facility development adjacent to single-family residential zones. Portions of the development that are unlit playgrounds, playfields, and parks are excluded.
- D. Parking lots shall be screened from single-family residential uses by a fence, wall, plants or combination to block vehicle headlights.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

20.70 Amendments

Amendment #29 (SS)(BL)(TJ)
20.70.440 – Access (New Subchapter)

Justification – There has been confusion about required driveway widths for certain types of development. This proposed Subchapter of the Engineering and Utilities Development Standards will list the appropriate driveway widths for certain types of development. The Public Works Department has recently updated the Engineering Development Manual and includes five types of driveways:

1. Residential
2. Shared
3. Multifamily
4. Commercial
5. Private Street

The Development Code has different types of development types and this amendment will marry the specific types to the appropriate driveway type in the Engineering Development Manual. Once the development type and number of units proposed are known, the applicant can then be referred to the Engineering Development Manual where the driveway type and specific design standards are located.

This amendment will clear-up any confusion about what type and width of driveway is required for a specific type of development.

The title page of Chapter 20.70 will also be updated to include the new Subchapter and Sections.

Subchapter 6. Access Standards

20.70.440 Purpose.

20.70.450 Access Widths.

20.70.440 Purpose.

The purpose of this subchapter is to establish basic dimensional standards for access widths when applied to certain types of development. Access widths are described and defined in the Engineering Development Manual.

20.70.450 Access widths

A. Table 20.70.450 – Access Widths

<u>Dwelling Type and Number</u>	<u>Engineering Development Manual Access Types and Width</u>
<u>1 unit</u>	<u>Residential</u>
<u>2-4 units</u>	<u>Shared</u>

<u>5 or more units</u>	<u>Multifamily</u>
<u>Commercial, Public Facility</u>	<u>Commercial</u>
<u>Circular</u>	<u>Per Criteria in EDM</u>
<u>5 or more units without adjacent development potential</u>	<u>Private Street</u>

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

20.80 Amendments

Amendment #30 (PC)
20.80.025(A) and (B) Critical area maps

Justification – Some refinements to the code are needed to further clarify whether or not a critical area exists on a property. Under SMC 20.80.025(A) the city describes resources to determine the existence of a critical area. However, in SMC 20.80.25(B) it leaves it open to the property owner and qualified professional to determine the presence or absence of a critical area. That could be applied and need to be proven for every property in the city. If the City does not have the resources to establish all critical areas for property owners to rely on then we cannot assume there is a critical area unless proven otherwise. The intent is to give the property owner clear steps to assure if they need to continue and comply with the CAO. Staff recommends that we provide clarity on this matter by amending this code section as follows.

A. The approximate location and extent of identified critical areas within the City’s planning area are shown on the critical areas maps adopted as part of this chapter, including but not limited to the maps identified in SMC 20.80.222, 20.80.272 and 20.80.322. These maps shall be used for informational purposes as a general guide only for the assistance of ~~only to assist~~ property owners and other interested parties. Boundaries and locations indicated on the maps are generalized. Critical areas and their buffers may occur within the City, which have not previously been mapped. A site inspection or an application’s Critical Area Worksheet may also indicate the presence of a critical area.

B. Based on an indicated critical area in subsection A., the actual presence or absence, ~~a type,~~ extent, boundaries, delineation and classification of critical areas shall be identified in the field by a qualified professional, and confirmed ~~determined~~ by the City, according to the procedures, definitions and criteria established by SMC 20.80.080(D)(1 and 2). In the event of any conflict

between the critical area location and designation shown on the City's maps and the criteria or standards of this chapter, the criteria and standards shall prevail.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #31

20.80.030 – Exemptions

Justification – *This amendment is related to amendment #23, amendment #38, and amendment #39. The amendment is simply updating the reference to SMC 20.50.310(B)(4).*

F. **Active Hazard Trees.** Removal of active or imminent hazardous trees in accordance with SMC 20.50.310(B)(4)(A)(1);

Amendment #32 (PC)

20.80.040 (C) Allowed activities.

Justification – *Chapter 20.80 SMC has a subsection that addresses structural modifications within critical areas. 1. The references to “additions” apply only to the last sentence of C. Additions into a critical area or buffer are not allowed activities unless they are vertical additions. 2. To make allowed modifications there will need to be a margin around the structure to allow construction access to make those modifications. 3. If existing, nonconforming structures are located in a critical area and a proposed addition is entirely outside the critical area then a proposed addition would not require conformance with SMC 20.80.*

C. Allowed Activities. The following activities are allowed:

1. Structural modification of, additions to, maintenance, repair, or replacement of legally nonconforming structures consistent with SMC 20.30.280, which do not meet the building setback or buffer requirements for wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, or geologic hazard areas if the modification, addition, replacement or related activity does not increase the existing building footprint of the structure or area of hardscape lying within the critical area or buffer. Within landslide hazard areas additions that add height to a nonconforming structure may only be allowed with review of a critical area report demonstrating that no increased risk of the hazard will occur. If such modifications, alterations, repair, or replacement require encroachment into a critical area or a critical area buffer to perform the work, than encroachment may be allowed subject to restoration of the area of encroachment to a same or better condition ~~Where nonconforming structures are partially located within critical areas or their buffers, additions are allowed with a critical area report delineating the critical area(s) and required buffers showing that the addition is located entirely outside the critical area or buffer;~~

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #33 (PC)

20.80.045 Critical areas preapplication meeting.

Justification - Critical area reports are expensive and their recommendations may become, in the final analysis, unnecessary especially for the single family owner. It is the City's responsibility to provide clarity to the property owner. A critical area report for development "adjacent" or "likely to impact" could encompass a huge area. However, it may be needed if an adjoining critical area could be classified to include the proposed development. If it is questionable that critical area report is needed, the City should allow the property owner to first submit a much reduced delineation study and then, if required, supplemental information to fill out a complete critical area report.

A. A preapplication meeting, pursuant to SMC 20.30.080, is required prior to submitting an application for development or use of land or prior to starting a development activity or use of the land that may be regulated by the provisions of this chapter unless specifically exempted in SMC 20.80.030.

B. A determination may be provided through the preapplication meeting regarding whether critical area reports are required, and if so what level of detail and what elements may be necessary for the proposed project. An applicant may submit a critical area delineation and classification study prior to the City determining that a full critical area report is required.

This determination does not preclude the Director from requiring additional critical area report information during the review of the project. After a site visit and review of available information for the preapplication meeting, the Director may determine:

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #34 (PC)

20.80.050 Alteration of Critical Areas

Justification – The provisions of this subsection clarify that critical areas shall be maintained in their natural state or current, legal condition. It includes critical areas in their natural state but does not include clarification of what "current condition" means. This is important considering

the amount of existing development on relatively small parcels where a critical area may be on the adjacent property and its buffer laps over onto the subject property.

In general, critical areas and their buffers shall be maintained in their existing, natural state including undisturbed, native vegetation to maintain the functions, values, resources, and public health and safety for which they are protected or allowed as the current, developed legally established condition such as graded areas, structures, pavement, gardens and lawns including developed areas such as grading, structures, pavement, gardens, and lawns. Alteration of critical areas, including their established buffers, may only be permitted subject to the criteria and standards in this chapter, and compliance with any Federal and/or State permits required. Unless otherwise provided in this chapter, if alteration of the critical area is unavoidable, all adverse impacts to or from critical areas and buffers resulting from a development proposal or alteration shall be mitigated using the best available science in accordance with an approved critical areas report, so as to result in no overall net loss of critical area functions and values and no increased risk of hazards.

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #35 (PC)

20.80.080 Critical Area Reports – Requirements

Justification – Critical areas can be on an adjacent property with the critical area’s buffers extending onto the property where development is proposed. Currently under SMC 20.80.080(D)(1) Reconnaissance of adjoining properties within 200-300 feet of the subject property are required to be included in the report. When the buffer area extends onto the property where the development is proposed and does not meet the isolated critical area standards, reconnaissance is restricted if a qualified professional is denied access to the property. This is a problem in a suburban/urban area where lots are smaller and have been previously altered.

A. Report Required. If uses, activities, or developments are proposed within, adjacent to, or are likely to impact critical areas or their buffers, an applicant shall provide site-specific information and analysis in the form of critical area report(s) as required in this chapter. Critical area reports are required in order to identify the presence, extent, and classification/rating of potential critical areas, as well as to analyze, assess, and mitigate the potential adverse impact to or risk from critical areas for a development project. Critical area reports shall use standards for best available science in SMC 20.80.060. Critical area reports for two or more types of critical areas must meet the report requirements for each type of critical area. The expense of preparing the critical area report(s) shall be borne by the applicant. This provision is not intended to expand or limit an applicant’s other obligations under WAC 197-11-100.

D. Critical Area Report Types or Sections. Critical area reports may be met in stages through multiple reports or combined in one report. A critical area report shall include one or more of the

following sections or report types unless exempted by the Director based on the extent of the potential critical area impacts. The scope and location of the proposed project will determine which report(s) alone or combined are sufficient to meet the critical area report requirements for the impacted critical area type(s). The typical sequence of required sections or reports that will fulfill the requirements of this section include:

1. Reconnaissance. The existence, general location, and type of critical areas in the vicinity of a project site (off site within 300 feet for wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and off site within 200 feet for geologic hazards, shorelines, floodplains, and aquifer recharge areas) of a project site (if allowed by the adjoining property owners). Determination of whether the project will adversely impact or be at risk from the potential critical areas based on maximum potential buffers and possible application of SMC 20.80.220(A)3), .280(D)(7) or SMC .330(G)(10) should be addressed;

Staff recommendation – *Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.*

Amendment #36 (PC)
20.80.090 Buffer Areas

Justification – Buffer areas are required to be an undisturbed area of native vegetation. One purpose of 20.80 is that critical areas are not impacted. The intent is that if there has been a previous buffer code violation where an ideal buffer existed then it should be restored. If a previously legally established use or activity has been in the buffer area, the City does not require restoration. In many cases, buffers are people’s yard with gardens and lawn, sheds, and driveways. Limited additional development in these buffers or mitigating damage or alteration to the native vegetation in order to not impact the critical area makes sense. However, to require that they remove all non-native vegetation and yard uses does not. Per 20.80.050, the existing condition of critical areas should be allowed to remain or mitigated if impacted by the proposed development.

The establishment of buffer areas shall be required for all development proposals and activities in or adjacent to critical areas. In all cases the standard buffer shall apply unless the Director determines that additional buffer width is necessary or reduced buffer is sufficient to protect the functions and values consistent with the provisions of this chapter and the recommendations of a qualified professional. The purpose of the buffer shall be to protect the integrity, function, value and resource of the subject critical area, and/or to protect life, property and resources from risks associated with development on unstable or critical lands. ~~Buffers shall consist of an undisturbed area of native vegetation established to achieve the purpose of the buffer. If the buffer area has previously been disturbed, it shall be revegetated pursuant to an approved mitigation or restoration plan.~~ Buffers shall be protected during construction by placement of a temporary barricade if determined necessary by the City, on-site notice for construction crews of

the presence of the critical area, and implementation of appropriate erosion and sedimentation controls. Restrictive covenants or conservation easements may be required to preserve and protect buffer areas.

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

Amendment #37 (CL)

20.80.350 Wetlands – Compensatory mitigation performance standards and requirements.

Justification - This proposal provides clarification that the unit of measurement for wetland mitigation is area (square feet). For example, if one (1) square foot of wetland is being impacted, then four (4) square feet shall be created or reestablished. Currently no unit of measurement is provided.

E. Wetland Mitigation Ratios¹.

Table 20.80.350(G). Wetland mitigation ratios apply when impacts to wetlands cannot be avoided or are otherwise allowed consistent with the provisions of this chapter.

Category and Type of Wetland²	Creation or Reestablishment (Area – in square feet)	Rehabilitation (Area – in square feet)	Enhancement (Area – in square feet)	Preservation (Area – in square feet)
Category I: Based on total score for functions	4:1	8:1	16:1	20:1
Category I: Mature forested	6:1	12:1	24:1	24:1
Category I: Estuarine	Case-by-case	6:1	Case-by-case	Case-by-case
Category II: Based on total score for functions	3:1	6:1	12:1	20:1
Category III (all)	2:1	4:1	8:1	15:1
Category IV (all)	1.5:1	3:1	6:1	10:1

Table 20.80.350(G). Wetland mitigation ratios apply when impacts to wetlands cannot be avoided or are otherwise allowed consistent with the provisions of this chapter.

Category and Type of Wetland ²	Creation or Reestablishment (Area – in square feet)	Rehabilitation (Area – in square feet)	Enhancement (Area – in square feet)	Preservation (Area – in square feet)
<p>¹ Ratios for rehabilitation and enhancement may be reduced when combined with 1:1 replacement through creation or reestablishment. See Table 1a or 1b, Wetland Mitigation in Washington State – Part 1: Agency Policies and Guidance – Version 1 (Ecology Publication No. 06-06-011a, March 2006, or as revised).</p> <p>² Category and rating of wetland as determined consistent with SMC <u>20.80.320(B)</u>.</p>				

Staff recommendation – Staff recommends that this amendment be included in the 2017 Development Code amendment batch.

20.230 Amendments

Amendment #38

20.230.200 – Land Disturbing Activity Policies

Justification - This amendment is related to amendment #23, amendment #31, and amendment #39. The amendment is simply updating the reference to SMC 20.50.310(B)(4).

B. Land Disturbing Activity Regulations.

1. All land disturbing activities shall only be allowed in association with a permitted shoreline development.

2. All land disturbing activities shall be limited to the minimum necessary for the intended development, including any clearing and grading approved as part of a landscape plan. Clearing invasive, nonnative shoreline vegetation listed on the King County Noxious Weed List is permitted in the shoreline area with an approved clearing and grading permit provided best management practices are used as recommended by a qualified professional, and native vegetation is promptly reestablished in the disturbed area.

3. Tree and vegetation removal shall be prohibited in required native vegetation conservation areas, except as necessary to restore, mitigate or enhance the native vegetation by approved permit as required in these areas.
4. All significant trees in the native vegetation conservation areas shall be designated as protected trees consistent with SMC 20.50.330 and removal of hazard trees must be consistent with SMC 20.50.310(B)(4)(A)(1).

SMC Title 13 Amendment

Amendment #39

SMC 13.12.700(C)(3) – Permits

Justification - This amendment is related to Amendment #23, Amendment #31, and Amendment #38. The amendment is simply updating the reference to SMC 20.50.310(B)(4).

C. Permit Exemptions. Activities that do not meet the definition of “development” in SMC 13.12.105 are allowed in the regulatory floodplain and do not require a floodplain development permit. The following are examples of activities not considered development or “manmade changes to improved or unimproved real estate”:

1. Routine maintenance of landscaping that does not involve grading, excavation, or filling;
2. Removal of noxious weeds and replacement of nonnative vegetation with native vegetation provided no earth movement occurs;
2. Removal of hazard trees consistent with the requirements of SMC 20.50.310(B)(4)(A)(1) or SMC 20.80.030(H);

Amendment #40 (PC)

Table 20.40.130 and Table 20.40.150– Shipping Containers

Justification – Shipping containers have been a contemporary land use that were previously addressed in the Development Code. They were previously allowed only in commercial areas with a Conditional Use Permit. Currently, shipping containers are not a listed land use but are allowed with design standards in the Commercial Design Standards which apply to all commercial zones. All buildings in commercial zones must comply with building design

2017 Development Code Amendments - Attachment 1

Updated September 28, 2017

standards in SMC 20.50.250. The exception is in self-storage development where they are prohibited (SMC 20.40.504 (B)(2)).

Since the Land Use tables do not list or address shipping containers, the City is receiving requests from single family development to place shipping containers on their property. Staff believes that the request to use shipping containers comes in waves/trends depending on their availability and cost. Normally, if a land use is not listed in the tables, we require a code interpretation to determine how an unlisted land use should be regulated.

Staff would like to clarify this land use issue by adding shipping containers as a land use in the land use tables and prohibits them in all Residential zones (R-4 through R-48) and to allow them in all commercial zones (consistent with the commercial design standards) and campus zones.

20.40.130 Nonresidential uses

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	R 4 - R 6	R8-R1 2	R18 - R48	TC -4	NB	CB	MB	TC- 1, 2 & 3
	<u>Shipping Container</u>					<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>

20.40.150 Campus uses.

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	CCZ	FCZ	PHZ	SCZ
	<u>Shipping Container</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>

2017 Development Code Amendment Comments - Attachment 2

From: [Plancom](#)
To: [Rachael Markle](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Easton Craft](#); [David Maul](#); [William Montero](#); [Paul Cohen](#); [Jack Malek](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Miranda Redinger](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Susan Chang](#); [Donna Moss](#); [Carla Hoekzema](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Proposal to modify Development code 20.40.210
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 12:42:01 PM

From: Michael Clayton[SMTP:MICHAELC@CEI-GROUP.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 12:41:50 PM
To: Plancom; City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposal to modify Development code 20.40.210
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To whom it may concern –

I am opposed to the modification of the Development Code Section 20.40.210 proposed by applicant Cindy Dittbrenner requesting the elimination of owner occupancy as a requirement for developing an ADU on the property.

The applicant has cited, as evidence to consider this change, other cities which have allowed such changes such as Portland, Vancouver, BC and Los Angeles. The applicant also states that Seattle is considering such a change. I submit that Shoreline is much smaller than any of these comparable Cities and possesses a more suburban character. Shoreline is not comparable to any of the cited examples in population or economy size or character thus the examples are not in any way comparable. Research these cities may have done may have failed to consider factors relevant to a much smaller community.

Shoreline is a mostly family-oriented residential community that still maintains a broad mix of development densities. By removing the requirement for owner occupancy of properties with ADUs, Shoreline will increasingly become a target for developers intent on developing additional rental capacity on properties that otherwise would not be suitable for further development due to their otherwise lower permitted density. Expect developers to push the limits of existing codes to maximize size, heights and impermeable area to maximize rental revenue. This would have a detrimental effect on the character of the City as a whole, adding noise, additional runoff and loss of tree canopy as well as adding traffic to otherwise quiet residential neighborhoods. Moreover, removing the owner-occupied requirement, amounts to a defacto stealth increase in zoning density across Shoreline.

Goal H II of the Comprehensive plan, as cited by the applicant, includes the statement, “increased residential density along arterials” as a desirable characteristic of the plan. ADUs do not, in general meet that requirement since most, if not all would appear in areas currently zoned R6 on less developed streets with insufficient traffic controls. By maintaining the requirement that owners occupy the property containing an ADU, it assures that owners, not just neighbors will bear the burden of additional density in the neighborhoods where they are built This will require the owner developing an ADU or the purchaser of such a property to consider the impact on their lifestyle and

2017 Development Code Amendment Comments - Attachment 2

neighborhood. Further, the requirement that owners occupy the property on which an ADU is built is a reasonable protection that both structures will be maintained and suitable for residential areas.

As a 60+ year resident of Shoreline, I have seen many changes occur. I accept that growth is necessary to accommodate a thriving region yet I believe that growth should be concentrated in those areas best suited to accommodate growth, not overbuilding the established residential areas and certainly not by way of a stealth up zone that that would result from this proposal. I am not opposed to ADUs, but I am strongly opposed to removing the owner occupancy requirement.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Michael Clayton
18044 Wallingford Ave N
michaelc@cei-group.com
(206) 264-5335

2017 Development Code Amendment Comments - Attachment 2

From: [Plancom](#)
To: [Rachael Markle](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Easton Craft](#); [David Maul](#); [William Montero](#); [Paul Cohen](#); [Jack Malek](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Miranda Redinger](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Susan Chang](#); [Donna Moss](#); [Carla Hoekzema](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Proposed amendment to ADU rules
Date: Monday, September 25, 2017 3:56:39 PM

From: Barbara Twaddell[SMTP:BARBTWADDELL@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2017 3:56:32 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed amendment to ADU rules
Auto forwarded by a Rule

September 25, 2017

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Dittbrenner Developmental Code Amendment Application which is asking to change the development code 20.40.210. Specifically it asks to do away with the owner occupancy rule and the off street parking rule. I have read the petitioner's request and it appears to me that this request is mainly to benefit this petitioner only, and will have a negative effect on the city of Shoreline. Presumably when her ADU was built she was aware of the very reasonable rules. Now when it isn't convenient she wants to change the rules and use the argument of affordable housing to support her request.

I do feel this amendment IS contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline. Some of the arguments for these code changes are comparisons to Seattle, Portland, Vancouver BC, and Los Angeles. I really hope we do not model our city after any of these other cities. I was raised in Seattle, lived in LA and have relatives in Vancouver. The quality of life in these cities is poor compared to Shoreline. The wonderful family neighborhoods of Seattle are now a dark shadow of their former selves.

I was quite taken aback when I saw the first ADU being built in my neighborhood. I hadn't heard anything about ADU's and the change in code that allowed them. Although I wasn't part of that process, I assume the rules that were put in place were to help retain the single family character of the neighborhoods of Shoreline. The argument that we will benefit from "in-filling" in the neighborhoods is really an argument for increased density without consideration of access to transit, etc. My home in particular is a fairly long distance from any bus or transit line. This same argument was used to justify the increased density proposal in the DEEP GREEN program. Most people do not want two homes on one single family lot especially homes in R6 zoning.

The issue of removing the off street parking is a mystery to me. This will definitely have an adverse effect on the neighborhoods. My street alone sometimes has cars parked on both sides of the street, effectively making the street a single lane in many places. This is a street that the school busses must maneuver and kids are walking on all the time. If we add to that many more cars from the ADU's that will be built, due to removal of rules, our streets will be like those in Seattle.

My request is that you keep the ADU rules as they are.

Sincerely,
Barbara Twaddell
Shoreline