



PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, May 3, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber · Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Ave N
Shoreline, WA 98133

	<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. April 19, 2018 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. PUBLIC HEARING	7:15
a. Development Code Amendment – Community Residential Facilities	
• Staff Presentation	
• Public Testimony	
7. DIRECTOR’S REPORT	8:00
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	8:05
9. NEW BUSINESS	8:06
10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	8:07
11. AGENDA FOR May 17, 2018	8:08
12. ADJOURNMENT	8:10

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

April 19, 2018
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Montero
Vice Chair Mork
Commissioner Davis
Commissioner Lin
Commissioner Malek

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

Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Maul

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Montero called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

SWEARING IN CEREMONY FOR RE-APPOINTED PLANNING COMMISSIONER

Director Markle swore in re-appointed Commissioner Mork.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 5, 2018 were approved as submitted.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

STUDY ITEM: COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. Szafran presented the Staff Report, noting that this is the Commission’s third study session on the proposed amendment. He reviewed that at the April 5th meeting, staff acknowledged that they attempted to provide clear definitions for Adult Family Home (AFH), Residential Care Facility (RCF) and Nursing and Personal Care Facility (NPCF), but some inconsistencies remained. He referred to the Staff Report, which outlines the changes that have occurred since the April 5th meeting and reviewed each one as follows:

- The definition for “Adult Family Home” was updated to include a reference to the State’s Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 70.128.
- The title, “Nursing Home and Personal Care Facility” was changed to “Nursing Facility.” The code does not have a personal care use, so there is no need for a definition for the term.
- The definition for “Community Residential Facility” (CRF) was completely removed and replaced with “Residential Care Facility (RCF).” Staff believes it is cleaner to create a new definition than to amend or bend the definition for CRFs.
- A new definition was added for “Residential Treatment Facility” (RTF).
- The proposed definition for nursing in the existing and proposed definitions for Community Residential Facility and Residential Care Facility excluded drug and alcohol detoxification. The State defines this use as a “Health Service,” which the code does not address. To correct this issue, “Residential Treatment Facility” was added to the Use Table in the mixed business zone.
- “Personal Care Facility” was removed from the Use Table, since the use of “Residential Treatment Facility” was added. Staff believes it makes it clear to have two separate and unique uses for “Nursing Facility” and “Residential Treatment Facility.”

Mr. Szafran advised that the proposed amendment will be presented to the Commission and public at a public hearing on May 3rd. The Staff Report for the hearing will present three options:

- **Option 1** is the applicant’s proposed amendment, which would change Table 20.40.120 so that CRF-IIs would be allowed in the R-4 and R-6 zones with approval of a CUP.
- **Option 2** is proposed by staff. This option would combine CRF-I and CRF-II into a more limited land use category called Residential Care Facilities (RCFs). As per this option, RCFs would be allowed in the R-4, R-6, R-8 and R-12 zones, but a CUP would be required. This option would

also add index criteria to address standards for parking and signage, require a 1,000-foot separation between RCFs, and limit occupancy to a maximum of 15 residents based on bedroom size. In addition, definitions would be added for AFHs and Nursing Facilities, and AFHs would be added as an allowed use in the Land Use Table.

- **Option 3** leaves the Development Code unchanged and addresses the topic of RCFs with other housing issues in the future.

Commissioner Malek recalled that, at the last meeting, the Commission discussed that perhaps this amendment should be bundled into a broader discussion of housing issues. He asked if it is possible to recommend one of the three options for application to a specific proposal (Ashley House), and allow the applicant to move forward as a test project. He cautioned that delaying the amendment for further study would have the same impact as placing a moratorium on the use. It would create a hardship on the applicant who is prepared to move the project forward. Again, he asked if it would be possible to allow this one project to go forward as a test case without making a broad, sweeping decision. This test case could be studied and examined when the concept comes before them as part of a broader housing discussion.

Commissioner Szafran said the issue with the applicant's proposal is related to the number of residents. Currently, a CRF-I is allowed in this location, but it cannot accommodate the larger number of residents the applicant ultimately wants. He said he does not know of a way the City could allow this one project to move forward as a test case without amending the code. Director Markle said a test case might be possible if they were to narrow the definition to specific locations where the use would be allowed, but it still would not apply to just this one property. Another option would be to create a City pilot program that would involve a lot of public input and changes in the Comprehensive Plan, but she would not recommend this approach, either.

Commissioner Malek expressed frustration that the code cannot be more flexible to address unique situations. The subject parcel is located in an eclectic neighborhood that was established a long time ago. Having more flexible codes would allow the City to take advantage of something that is unique to the area and consistent with the character of a neighborhood without having to make broad, sweeping changes.

Commissioner Davis asked if it would be possible for the Commission to recommend approval of Option 2, yet still include the concept in their larger discussion on housing issues. Any needed additional modifications could be made at that time. Mr. Cohen answered that the concept could still be included as part of the broader housing discussion even if the proposed amendment is adopted now. Mr. Szafran agreed that this would be an opportunity to change the code to address concerns related to the use.

Chair Montero requested more information about why staff is proposing that Residential Treatment Facilities should be restricted to the Mixed Business zone. Mr. Cohen explained that some people may feel this use is incompatible with residential communities, and that is why staff is proposing that it be restricted to commercial zones. Director Markle explained that the current code language for "Community Residential Facility" states that no alcohol or detoxification services are allowed, and the use is not currently listed in the code as a health service. Staff recognized this as a potential problem and felt it would be appropriate to address it as part of the proposed amendment. Staff is recommending that the use

be allowed in the Mixed Business zone as a starting place, but they can discuss whether or not it would be appropriate in other zones, as well.

Vice Chair Mork asked how existing group homes that currently provide detoxification or similar services would be impacted by the proposed amendment. Director Markle answered that most of the existing group homes fit under the definition of “Family” (8 or fewer unrelated people) and are not regulated. Vice Chair Mork pointed out that the State’s definition for “Adult Family Home” limits occupancy to six residents. Director Markle agreed and explained that she was referring to group homes that provide housing for people with special needs.

Ken Maaz, Fife, said he was representing Ashley House, the applicant for the proposed amendment. He reminded the Commission that Ashley House has provided care for medically-fragile children in single-family residences in neighborhoods since 1989. They recently entered into a cooperative project with Seattle Children’s Hospital to provide a more focused transition for kids who have been hospitalized for a long time back to their family homes. It has always been very important for them to do this in family settings and in neighborhoods. They believe that this very large house in Shoreline (12 bedrooms and 8 bathrooms) would allow them to serve this need in a family-oriented environment.

Mr. Maaz said his understanding is that the home has previously been used for a number of things that are probably more detrimental to the community than what Ashley House is proposing. They have purchased the home and filed an application for the code amendment. Not knowing the context that the amendment would be considered, the applicant simply asked that CRF-II facilities be allowed in R-4 and R-6 zones with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). However, after examining staff’s proposal and listening to the questions that have been asked, the applicant fully supports the staff’s recommendation for Option 2. They believe it will allow Ashley House and others who might do something similar to move forward. They do not believe the use would be detrimental to any community because a CUP would still be required to allow neighborhoods to consider each individual project on its own merits.

Mr. Maaz said he believes Ashley House’s proposal would be beneficial to the Shoreline community, and they have received good support from the neighborhood. Again, he said the applicant supports Option 2, and he believes that projects like this can be addressed without prohibiting future consideration of all of the other housing issues that need to be considered at some point in the future. He thanked the staff and Commission for their hard work and said he sincerely hopes the Commission will ultimately recommend Option 2 to the City Council.

Simon Simon, Gabbert Architects Planners, said he is part of the architectural team for Ashley House. He said he attended the Commission’s previous study sessions relative to the proposed amendment and felt that many of the fears relate to meeting the criteria that is required in the residential zones. However, as he has worked in Shoreline and other jurisdictions, he has come to realize that the CUP enables the City to streamline the process and alleviates community fears by allowing citizens to participate in the process of deciding what goes on in their neighborhoods. He expressed his belief identifying CUP criteria to consider when reviewing applications provides an opportunity for check and balance. It is an ideal process for distinguishing what projects are compatible with a neighborhood, and it gives all parties equal involvement in making that decision.

Mr. Simon voiced concern about the proposed parking requirement, which requires that all parking stalls over six must be totally enclosed. The goal is for the project to fit in with the neighborhoods, and constructing a parking garage to accommodate the parking would be out of character with surrounding development. He asked if the parking must be totally enclosed in a structure, or if the parking spaces would simply need to be screened from the street.

Jay Sundahl, Shoreline, said he is a member of the Echo Lake Neighborhood Association. He advised that representatives from Ashley House have presented at their association meetings and made great effort to address concerns. The general consensus is that the project would be a welcome improvement for this particular property. Because of the applicant's history and the way the facility would be staffed, the project would be a maintenance upgrade over what previously existed. He acknowledged that there has been some concern that the use not be allowed "willy-nilly" throughout the City. There must be an opportunity for the citizens to have input to make sure the uses fit in with the neighborhoods.

Marlin Gabbert, Shoreline, said he has been a resident of Shoreline for over 40 years, and he has been impacted by a condition that affects many families. He had a son with muscular dystrophy. As he was terminally ill, he was in and out of Seattle Children's Hospital numerous times. The final time he was sent home, equipment was brought into their home that enabled them to care for him. While he was only supposed to live for a month or two, he actually lived another two years. The Ashley House would have offered training to him and his wife on how to best care for their son, as well as respite care. He sees a real need for this type of facility and the type of service that Ashley House would provide to the community.

Vice Chair Mork commented that it appears that the greatest citizen concern is related to parking, and staff has taken real care to address the concern in as equitable a manner as possible. As proposed, on-site parking is required. The first six spaces must be screened, but all additional spaces must be enclosed. She asked if "enclosed" means a garage of some type. Mr. Szafran answered affirmatively, noting that these are the same rules that apply to all development in the single-family residential zones. Vice Chair Mork asked if a carport would be considered "enclosed," and Mr. Szafran answered no. Vice Chair Mork said she was delighted to see that the proposed amendment includes a minimum square foot requirement for each room.

Commissioner Lin clarified that the amendment would change "Nursing Home" to "Nursing Facility." However, the term "Nursing Home" shows up elsewhere in the code. Mr. Cohen agreed to search the language and make sure that "Nursing Facility" is used consistently throughout the code.

Again, Chair Montero announced that a public hearing on the proposed amendment is scheduled for May 3rd.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Markle did not have any items to report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Malek, a member of the Point Wells Subcommittee, announced that the Snohomish County Department of Planning and Development Services sent a 93-page recommendation to the Hearing Examiner, recommending denial of Blue Square Real Estate’s application to develop Point Wells as an Urban Center for the following reasons: failure to document feasibility, failure to provide acceptable traffic report, noncompliance of concurrency requirements, failure to provide appropriate building setbacks from taller buildings to lower-density zones, failure to satisfy access to public transportation, failure to provide adequate parking, failure to address shoreline management regulations, failure to comply with code provisions regarding critical areas and geological hazardous areas, etc.

Commissioner Malek summarized that it appears Snohomish County is calling attention to the important points, which is that the applicant has failed to comply with what has been asked of them over years, with numerous extensions. A public hearing before the Hearing Examiner is scheduled to begin on May 16th and continue through May 31st. Public comments can be made on May 17th starting at 1:30 p.m. and again on May 18th starting at 9:00 a.m. He suggested that the hearing information should be posted on the City’s Point Wells website. Director Markle agreed to get the information posted.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Montero announced that the May 3rd agenda will be a public hearing on the Development Code Amendment related to Community Residential Facilities.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

William Montero
Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

Planning Commission Meeting Date: May 3, 2018

Agenda Item: 6a

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON**

AGENDA TITLE:	Development Code Amendment – Community Residential Facilities Public Hearing		
DEPARTMENT:	Planning & Community Development		
PRESENTED BY:	Paul Cohen, Planning Manager Steven Szafran, AICP, Senior Planner		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing	<input type="checkbox"/> Study Session	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation	
<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> Update	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	

Introduction

A non-resident property owner, the Ashley House, has applied for a privately-initiated code amendment to SMC 20.40.120 to allow a Community Residential Facility II (CRF-II) to be located in the R-4 and R-6 zones (low density residential) subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) as provided in SMC 20.30.300.

The Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendments to SMC 20.40.120 on March 1, April 5, and April 19, 2018.

The staff report and attachments for the March 1 meeting can be found here:

<http://www.shorelinewa.gov/home/showdocument?id=37315>

The staff report and attachments for the April 5 meeting can be found here:

<http://www.shorelinewa.gov/home/showdocument?id=38517>

The staff report and attachments for the April 19 meeting can be found here:

<http://www.shorelinewa.gov/home/showdocument?id=38615>

Staff originally presented the Planning Commission with three (3) options:

- *Option 1* – Permit CRF-II as a conditional use in the R-4 and R-6 zones.
- *Option 2* - Amend the code to rename the CRF use to Residential Care Facility (RCF); possibly allow RCFs in the R-4 to R-12 zones as a Conditional Use; add index criteria including separation requirements.

Approved By:

Project Manager 

Planning Director 

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

- *Option 3* - Do not amend the Development Code at this time but consider the topic in the future with other housing issues.

At the above meetings, the Commission heard testimony about Shoreline’s need to provide skilled nursing care to a wide variety of people and ages outside of a hospital setting.

As a result of information provided to the Commission at the March 1 meeting, Option 2 was subsequently expanded to include the addition of definitions for adult family home, residential care facility, and nursing facilities. At the April 5 meeting, staff acknowledged that they had attempted to provide clear definitions of Adult Family Homes (AFH), Residential Care Facilities (RCF), and Nursing and Personal Care but some internal inconsistencies still remained. At the April 19 meeting, staff presented updates to the proposed RCF Development Code amendment that included:

- Change the term of “Nursing and Personal Care” to “Nursing Facility” to remove possible similarities and confusion with RCF, AFH, and the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) reference number.
- Modify the RCF definition to clarify that “Residential Treatment Facility” is not included within the RCF use and updated terminology along with ensuring consistency
- Add the land use and definition for “Residential Treatment Facility” as a permitted use in the Mixed-Business (MB) zone since it is not allowed in any of the proposed land uses.

Thus, over the past few months Options 1 and 3 have remained the same through the Commission study sessions, but Option 2 has evolved into the final set of proposed amendments shown below.

Option 1

This option is the Applicant’s proposed amendment. The applicant has proposed to change Table 20.40.120 only to make CRF II a Conditional Use in the R-4 and R-6 zones. No other modifications to the CRF land use is proposed.

TABLE 20.40.120 Residential Uses

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	R4-R6	R8-R12	R18-R48	TC-4	NB	CB	MB	TC-1, 2 & 3
GROUP RESIDENCES									
	Boarding House	C-i	C-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i
	Community Residential Facility-I	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	R4-R6	R8-R12	R18-R48	TC-4	NB	CB	MB	TC-1, 2 & 3
	Community Residential Facility-II	<u>C</u>	C	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i
721310	Dormitory		C-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i

Recommendation – Staff does not recommend this option. This option allows an applicant to apply for a CRF-II in the R-4 and R-6 zones which, by definition, does not have an upper limit to the amount of residents and staff that may occupy a home in the low-density residential neighborhoods. With no occupant limitation, a CRF-II could become an intense use that is not consistent with the character of the surrounding community and the intent of the low-density zoning district designation.

Option 2

This option is proposed by staff because the City anticipates the demand for more residential care facilities as the population starts to age and more of these types of uses will increase pressure in the single-family neighborhoods. Staff proposes the following amendments:

Adult Family Home

A residential home in which a person or persons provide personal care, special care, room, and board to more than one but not more than six adults who are not related by blood or marriage to the person or persons providing the services and licensed by the State pursuant to Chapter 70.128 RCW, as amended.

Nursing Homes and Personal Care Facility

Any place that operates or maintains facilities providing convalescent or chronic care, for 24 consecutive hours for any number of patients not related by blood or marriage to the operator, who by reason of illness or infirmity, are unable properly to care for themselves. Convalescent and chronic care may include but not be limited to any or all procedures commonly employed to people who are sick, such as administration of medicines, preparation of special diets, giving of bedside nursing care, application of dressings and bandages, and carrying out of treatment prescribed by a licensed practitioner of the healing arts. It may also include care of mentally challenged persons. Nothing in this definition shall be construed to include general hospitals or other places which provide care and treatment for the acutely ill and maintain and operate facilities for major surgery or obstetrics, or both. Nothing in this definition shall be construed to include any boarding home, guest home, hotel or related institution which is held forth to the public as providing, and which is operating to

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

give only board, room and laundry to persons not in need of medical or nursing treatment or supervision except in the case of temporary acute illness. The mere designation by the operator of any place or institution such as a hospital, sanitarium, or any other similar name, which does not provide care for the acutely ill and maintain and operate facilities for major surgery or obstetrics, or both, shall not exclude such place or institution from the provisions of this Code; provided, that any nursing facility providing psychiatric treatment shall, with respect to patients receiving such treatment, comply with the provisions of RCW 71.12.560 and 71.12.570.

Community Residential Facility (CRF)

~~Living quarters meeting applicable Federal and State standards that function as a single housekeeping unit and provide supportive services, including but not limited to counseling, rehabilitation and medical supervision, excluding drug and alcohol detoxification which is classified as health services. CRFs are further classified as follows:~~

~~A. CRF-I— Nine to 10 residents and staff;~~

~~B. CRCF— Eleven or more residents and staff.~~

~~If staffed by nonresident staff, each 24 staff hours per day equals one full-time staff member for purposes of subclassifying CRFs. CRFs shall not include Secure Community Transitional Facilities (SCTF).~~

Residential Care Facility (RCF)

A state licensed facility that provides, on a regular basis, personal care, including dressing and eating and health-related care and services for not more than fifteen (15) functionally disabled persons and which is not licensed under RCW Chapter 70.128. A residential care facility shall not provide the degree of care and treatment that a hospital provides.

Residential Treatment Facility

A facility in which 24 hour on-site care is provided for the evaluation, stabilization, or treatment of residents for substance abuse, mental health, or co-occurring disorders. The facility includes rooms for social, educational, and recreational activities, sleeping, treatment, visitation, dining, toileting, and bathing.

Secure Community

A residential facility for persons civilly committed and conditionally released to a less restrictive community-based alternative under

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

Transitional Facility (SCTF)

Chapter 71.09 RCW operated by or under contract with the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. A secure community transitional facility has supervision and security, and either provides or ensures the provision of sex offender treatment services. SCTFs shall not be considered Residential Care Facilities ~~community residential facilities~~.

TABLE 20.40.120 Residential Uses

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	R4-R6	R8-R12	R18-R48	TC-4	NB	CB	MB	TC-1, 2 & 3
GROUP RESIDENCES									
	<u>Adult Family Home</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>				
	Boarding House	C-i	C-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i
	Residential Care Facility-Community Residential Facility-I	<u>C-i</u>	<u>C-i</u> <u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
	Community Residential Facility-II		<u>C</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>

Table 20.40.140 Other Uses

NAICS #	SPECIFIC USE	R4-R6	R8-R12	R18-R48	TC-4	NB	CB	MB	TC-1, 2 & 3
HEALTH									
622	Hospital			C-i	C-i	C-i	P-i	P-i	P-i
6215	Medical Lab						P	P	P
6211	Medical Office/Outpatient Clinic			C-i	C-i	P	P	P	P
623	Nursing and Personal Care Facility			<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>Residential Treatment Facility</u>							<u>P</u>	

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

20.40.150 Campus uses.

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	CCZ	FCZ	PHZ	SCZ
623	Nursing Facility and Personal Care Facilities	P-m	P-m		P-m
P-m = Permitted Use with approved Master Development Plan					

20.40.280 Residential Care Facilities (RCF) Community residential facilities I and II
 Repealed by Ord. 352.

Residential Care Facilities are permitted in the R-4, R-6, R-8, and R-12 zones with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit and permitted in the R-18, R-24, R-48 and TC-4 zones provided:

1. The number of residents shall be based on bedroom size. Patient bedroom size requirements must comply with WAC 388-97-2440, as amended. In any case, the total number of residents shall not exceed fifteen (15).
2. A RCF must be 1,000 feet from an existing RCF (measured in a straight line from property line to property line).
3. Parking must be located onsite, screened from adjacent residential uses through a solid six-foot high fence or wall, and one parking space for every three patients, plus one space for each staff on duty shall be provided.
4. No more than six parking spaces may be located outside. If more than six parking spaces are required or provided, those spaces above six must be located in an enclosed structure.
5. Signs are limited to Residential sign standards in Table 20.50.540(G).

For the Planning Commission’s reference, WAC 388-97-2440 provides for a square footage analysis of the minimum usable room space a nursing home should ensure for each bed. Staff believes using this standard will reflect the fact that some residential structures are bigger than others so that the total number of residents in any given RCF may be less than the permitted maximum of fifteen (15).

Miscellaneous amendments to change the name “Community Residential Facilities” to “Residential Care Facilities” throughout the Development Code are shown below.

20.40.400 Home Occupation

Note: Daycares, Residential Care Facilities ~~community residential facilities~~, animal keeping, bed and breakfasts, and boarding houses are regulated elsewhere in the Code

Table 20.50.390B – Special Residential Parking Standards

RESIDENTIAL USE	MINIMUM SPACES REQUIRED
Bed and breakfast guesthouse:	1 per guest room, plus 2 per facility

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

Table 20.50.390B – Special Residential Parking Standards

RESIDENTIAL USE	MINIMUM SPACES REQUIRED
<u>Residential Care Facilities-Community residential facilities:</u>	1 per <u>3 2 patients units</u> , plus 1 per FTE <u>employee on duty</u>
Dormitory, including religious:	1 per 2 units
Hotel/motel, including organizational hotel/lodging:	1 per unit
Senior citizen assisted:	1 per 3 dwelling or sleeping units

Table 20.50.540(G) – Sign Dimensions.

A property may use a combination of the four types of signs listed below.

Refer to SMC 20.50.620 for the Aurora Square Community Renewal Area sign regulations.

	All Residential (R) Zones, MUR-35', Campus, PA 3 and TC-4	MUR-45', MUR-70', NB, CB and TC-3 (1)	MB, TC-1 and TC-2
MONUMENT Signs:			
Maximum Area Per Sign Face	4 sq. ft. (home occupation, day care, adult family home, <u>residential care facilities</u> , bed and breakfast) 25 sq. ft. (nonresidential use, residential subdivision or multifamily development) 32 sq. ft. (schools and parks)	50 sq. ft.	100 sq. ft.
Maximum Height	42 inches	6 feet	12 feet
Maximum Number Permitted	1 per street frontage	1 per street frontage	1 per street frontage
		Two per street frontage if the frontage is greater than 250 ft. and each sign is minimally 150 ft. apart from other signs on same property.	
Illumination	Permitted	Permitted	
BUILDING-MOUNTED SIGNS:			
Maximum Sign Area	Same as for monument signs	25 sq. ft. (each tenant) Building Directory 10 sq. ft.	50 sq. ft. (each tenant) Building Directory 10 sq. ft.

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

	All Residential (R) Zones, MUR-35', Campus, PA 3 and TC-4	MUR-45', MUR-70', NB, CB and TC-3 (1)	MB, TC-1 and TC-2
		Building Name Sign 25 sq. ft.	Building Name Sign 25 sq. ft.
Maximum Height	Not to extend above the building parapet, soffit, or eave line of the roof. If perpendicular to building then 9-foot clearance above walkway.		
Number Permitted	1 per street frontage	1 per business per facade facing street frontage or parking lot.	
Illumination	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted

Recommendation – The City currently allows Adult Family Homes in all zones throughout the City with up to a maximum of six residents and two staff per home. Currently, a CRF-I allows the number of residents to be increased by two, up to 10 people, with the approval of a CUP. Staff believes Residential Care Facilities can be appropriate in the residential zones, including the low density zones with a CUP and indexed criteria. RCF uses that are conditioned and meet proposed criteria are intended to be like all other residential uses in these low density zones. Staff recommends amendments proposed in Option 2.

Option 3

This option leaves the Development Code unchanged and will address the topic of residential care facilities with other housing issues in the future. These include Accessory Dwelling Units, Cottage Housing, Tiny Homes, and housing design. Residential Care Facilities is another use that could potentially impact residential neighborhoods and the development of guidelines should be included in a bigger, community-wide planning process. It should be noted that future residential housing issues are not on the citywide work plan and new work items must be placed on the work plan by the City Council.

Recommendation – While Option 3 will analyze a number of issues affecting the single-family neighborhoods, staff does not recommend this option. There is an urgency by the applicant to move forward with their proposed use, staff work has progressed to the point that a reasonable Development Code amendment can be evaluated by the Planning Commission and Council, and the proposed Development Code amendment has been distributed to a wide audience including the Council of Neighborhoods and posted to the City’s webpage so the proposal can be viewed in a community-wide context.

Decision Criteria

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

SMC 20.30.350 states, "An amendment to the Development Code is a mechanism by which the City may bring its land use and development regulations into conformity with the Comprehensive Plan or respond to changing conditions or needs of the City". Development Code amendments may also be necessary to reduce confusion and clarify existing language, respond to regional and local policy changes, update references to other codes, eliminate redundant and inconsistent language, and codify Administrative Orders previously approved by the Director. Regardless of their purpose, all amendments are to implement and be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Planning Commission's role is to provide a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed amendments after holding a Public Hearing. 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 when all of the following are satisfied. The decision criteria in SMC 20.30.350(B) are:

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 Applicant provided responses to the following decision criteria and staff has analyzed each of the criteria below (**Attachment A**).

SMC 20.30.350(1): The amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Applicant's Response:

Since the proposal calls for a Conditional Use Permit, any potential uses that would be contrary to the Comprehensive Plan could be identified and prohibited. However, expanding the opportunity for consideration of operation in the R-4 and R-6 zones to CRF-IIs could enhance the accomplishment of the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Analysis:

The Applicant cites goals and policies that support the proposed Development Code amendment in their application. While some of the goals and policies cited by the Applicant could be interpreted to meet SMC 20.30.350(B)(1) there are a number of goals and policies that may not support the proposal including:

Goal LU V: Enhance the character, quality, and function of existing residential neighborhoods while accommodating anticipated growth.

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

LU15: Reduce impacts to single-family neighborhoods adjacent to mixed-use and commercial land uses with regard to traffic, noise, and glare through design standards and other development criteria.

Goal T V: Protect the livability and safety of neighborhoods from the adverse impacts of the automobile.

H23: Assure that site, landscaping, building, and design regulations create effective transitions between different land uses and densities.

ED3: Encourage and support home-based businesses in the city, provided that signage, parking, storage, and noise levels are compatible with neighborhoods.

Contrary to the Applicant's response, the City cannot restrict a proposed CRF-II facility solely based on the type of CRF-II. There may be some CRF proposals that are inconspicuous and may not be a burden on the residential neighborhoods. In other cases, there may be proposals that negatively impact a single-family neighborhood. Staff is proposing indexed criteria that will lessen the impact of RCFs (renaming the use to Residential Care Facilities accompanied by refined regulations for the proposed use) throughout Shoreline including maximum number of patients, screening, parking, and signage standards.

Staff believes the Applicant's request (Option 1) does not meet SMC 20.30.350(B)(1) but staff proposed Option #2 does meet SMC 20.30.350(B)(1).

SMC 20.30.350(B)(2): The amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.

Applicant's Response:

The Applicant states that the amendment does not automatically allow for any uses that are contrary to the well-being of the neighborhood and it does not allow for a change in the types of activities that can currently be considered for R-4 and R-6 neighborhoods. The amendment does allow for consideration of the operation of a facility with more than ten occupants, but the impact of the change would be fully examined under the CUP process and any detriment to the neighborhood could be specifically determined at the time.

Staff Analysis:

The Applicant's proposed change to the Development Code has the potential to adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare. The potential number of patients that could inhabit a single-family home could adversely affect public health, safety or general welfare. Increased noise, traffic, and parking could impact established single-family neighborhoods. The City does have the opportunity to impose conditions that may decrease the impacts of a proposed

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

CRF but does not have the authority to deny a CRF-II based on the types of services offered.

Staff believes amendments proposed in staff Option #2 will not adversely affect public health, safety, or general welfare. The residential neighborhoods will be protected from overcrowding of residential structures by limiting the amount of patients each RCF may house, parking will be contained onsite, and the residential character of the home will stay intact.

SMC 20.30.350(B)(3); The amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.

Applicant's Response:

The Applicant states that the proposed amendment might allow for better use of some existing structures in the R-4 and R-6 zones that are already being used for more deleterious uses to a neighborhood than a proposed use exercising the CUP process. The amendment does not allow for any new uses without public input and scrutiny.

Staff Analysis:

Residential Care Facilities are not contrary to the best interests of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline with appropriate limitations. As stated in the staff report, as the population of the region ages, residential home care will become more in demand and will provide care options for those who wish to stay in a residential setting.

The R-4 and R-6 zones allow a number of uses that are not traditional single-family in nature. For example, Shoreline allows Adult Family Homes, home-based businesses, Accessory Dwelling Units, schools, churches, and daycares. The CUP process requires public notice and a neighborhood meeting. The neighborhood can comment on the impacts of a proposed project but ultimately the decision lies with the Director of Planning and Community Development. The proposed indexed criteria will mitigate impacts from the Residential Care Facility. Even though this amendment has the potential to add more population to the single-family neighborhoods, staff believes this use should be an option in the R-4 and R-6 zones.

Staff Recommendation

The City should provide the possibility for Residential Care Facilities in all zones appropriate to the scale and impacts of each zone.

6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

Staff recommends either Option 2 - amend the code, or Option 3 - maintain the status quo for further study, as described in this staff report. The Applicant's proposed Option 1, the allowance for a CRF-II in the single-family neighborhoods R-4 and R-6 zoning districts with no residency maximums, has the potential to adversely affect health, safety, and general welfare. However, staff proposed Option 2 is timely and tailored to protect the single-family neighborhoods and yet allow Residential Care Facilities in the residential zones with conditions.

Next Steps

The Development Code amendment schedule is as follows:

June 2018	Council Discussion
July 2018	Council Decision

Attachments

Attachment A – Applicant's Application

Attachment B – Adult Family Homes in Shoreline

Please complete the following: **Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities - Attachment A**

Applicant for Amendment THE ASHLEY HOUSE - KEN MAAZ
Address 18904 BURKE AVE N. City SHORELINE State WA Zip 98133
Phone 206-679-4971 Email KMAAZ@ASHLEYHOUSEKIDS.COM

PLEASE SPECIFY: Shoreline Development Code Chapter 2.40 Section 20.40.120

AMENDMENT PROPOSAL: Please describe your amendment proposal

To allow Residential-II uses to be considered for appropriateness in R-4-R-6 zones through the Conditional Use process.



REASON FOR AMENDMENT: Please describe your amendment proposal

Currently Residential-I facilities are allowed in R-4-R-6 zones through a Conditional Use process. The only difference between Residential-I and Residential-II facilities is the potential number of occupants, Residential-I allows 10 or below and Residential-II allows above 10. Since that is the only difference we would like Residential-II facilities to have the opportunity to be considered in R-4-R-6 zones also. Because the types of inhabitants and their associated impact on the neighborhood can vary widely in both Residential-I and Residential-II facilities, the specific number of inhabitants is less relevant than other actual characteristics of a given program.

A Residential-II facility of one make-up may be far better for a neighborhood than a Residential-I facility of another make-up, yet under the current development code the Residential-II facility cannot be considered.

By allowing Residential-II facilities the opportunity to be considered through the Conditional Use process, no worthwhile and beneficial program will be automatically excluded from a neighborhood and issues that may be of concern such as public safety, traffic, effect on property values, fit with the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood sentiment can be thoroughly examined and if thought to be contrary to the good of the neighborhood, the facility can be denied operation.

This would allow some already existing buildings that might be used for allowable, but deleterious purposes, to be used for more worthwhile and beneficial purposes.

Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities - Attachment A

DECISION CRITERIA EXPLANATION:

Please describe how the amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Since the proposal calls for a Conditional Use process any potential uses that would be contrary to the Comprehensive Plan could be identified and prohibited. However, expanding the opportunity for consideration of operation in R-4-R-6 zones to Residential-II facilities could enhance the accomplishment of the following goals and policies from the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan:

Community Design Element, Goal CD1 – Promote community development and redevelopment that is aesthetically pleasing, functional, and consistent with the City’s vision.

Housing Goals and Policies, Goal HVI – Encourage and support a variety of housing opportunities for those with special needs, specifically older adults and people with disabilities.

Address Special Housing Needs, Policy H25 – Encourage, assist and support social and health service organizations that offer housing programs for targeted populations.

Maintain and Enhance Neighborhood Quality, Policy H21 – Initiate and encourage equitable and inclusive community involvement that fosters civic pride and positive neighborhood image.

Economic Development, Goal EDVI – Support employers and new businesses that create more and better jobs.

Economic Development, Policy ED3 – Encourage and support home-based businesses in the City, provided signage, parking, storage, and noise levels are compatible with neighborhoods.

Economic Development, Policy ED11 – Diversify and expand the City’s job base, with a focus on attracting living wage jobs, to allow people to work and shop in the Community.

The current code states that the “Purpose of R-4 and R-6 zones is to provide for a mix of predominantly single detached dwelling units and other development types, such as accessory dwelling units and community facilities that are compatible with existing development and neighborhood character.” The proposed amendment would not lead to the operation of facilities in R-4-R-6 zones that violate this stated purpose. The amendment would provide an opportunity for specific uses of existing buildings that could further promote the stated purpose.

Please describe how the amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety and general welfare.

The amendment does not automatically allow for any uses that are contrary to the well-being of the neighborhood and it does not allow for a change in the types of activities that can currently be considered for a R-4-R-6 neighborhood. It does allow for consideration of the operation of a facility with more than 10 occupants in R-4-R-6 zones, but the impact of that change would be fully examined in a Conditional Use process and any detriment to the neighborhood could be specifically determined at that time. If the specific use is determined to

2713

170136

RECEIVED
DEC 28 2017
PCD

Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities - Attachment A

undermine public health, safety and general welfare it can be denied. However, it might be determined that the proposed use promotes more safety and neighborhood well-being than an already permitted use.

Please describe how the amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.

As stated above the proposed amendment could enhance several elements of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan. It might also allow for a better use of some existing structures in R-4-R-6 zones with already permitted uses that are more deleterious to a neighborhood than a proposed use exercising the Conditional Use permit process. This amendment does not allow for any new uses of neighborhood buildings without public input and scrutiny. It does allow neighborhoods to have greater say in what facilities are allowed in their midst and it allows them to advocate for the approval of certain Residential-II facilities that they would otherwise not be able to consider as additions to their neighborhoods. The amendment puts more control in the hands of the citizens.

RECEIVED
DEC 28 2017
PCD

Please attach additional sheets if necessary.

Please submit your request to the City of Shoreline, Planning & Community Development.

3/322

170136

Dev. Code Amendment - Residential Care Facilities - Attachment B

contract	FacilityName	LocationAddress	LocationZipCode
Adult Family Home	A LITTLE PIECE OF HEAVEN	17347 DENSMORE AVE NORTH	98133
No Contract	A WATER VIEW ADULT FAMILY HOME	19511 23RD AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	AATMA ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	14526 6TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	ALIANAS HOME CARE	2152 NORTH 193RD ST	98133
No Contract	All About Seniors Three	1435 NW 188TH ST	98177
No Contract	ALL ABOUT SENIORS TWO	19860 15TH AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	ALLIANCE CARE FAMILY HOME INC	17217 11TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	AMBER CARE ADULT FAMILY HOME INC	16239 8TH AVE NE	98155
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam AMEN AFH	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ADULT HOME CARE	20408 WHITMAN AVE N	98133
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam AMEN AFH	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ADULT HOME CARE	734 N 204TH STREET	98133
Adult Family Home	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ADULT HOME CARE	14514 STONE AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	ANCAS AFH	204 NW 195TH ST	98177
No Contract	ANDERSON ADULT FAMILY HOME	17127 15TH AVE NE	98155
No Contract	ANDERSON ADULT FAMILY HOME II	17051 14TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	ANGELINA'S PLACE	1745 NW 193RD STREET	98177
Adult Family Home	Angelina's Place II	14842 Wallingford Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	Applewood Adult Family Home LLC	16621 Stone Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	BCM AFH	18519 STONE AVE N	98133
No Contract	Bella Vita AFH	19538 Burke Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	BEST CARE	15564 8th Ave NE	98155
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam BROADVIEW ADULT FAMILY HOME	BROADVIEW ADULT FAMILY HOME	738 N 203RD ST	98133
Adult Family Home	CALDERON ADULT FAMILY HOME INC	16909 4TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	CEESAYS ADULT CARE FAMILY HOME	15218 12TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	CHARITY AFH 2	18820 8TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Crizhtelle Golden Care Inc	15410 12th Ave NE	98155
Adult Family Home	DIAMOND AFH	18570 ASHWORTH AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	ECHO LAKE ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	2149 N 194TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	ENGUERRAS ADULT HOME CARE	15535 CORLISS AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	EVANS HOME	17629 8TH LANE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Everest Adult Family Home LLC	912 N 196th Ct	98133
Adult Family Home	Evergreen Haven Senior Care	15402 NE 12th Ave	98155
No Contract	Firland Adult Family Home LLC	19214 Firlands Way N	98133
No Contract	FOR SENIORS SAKE	20157 6TH AVE NE	98155

Dev. Code Amendment - Residential Care Facilities - Attachment B

No Contract	FOR SENIORS SAKE INC	19745 10TH AVE NE	98155
No Contract	FOR SENIORS SAKE INC NORTH CITY	19605 10TH AVE NE	98155
No Contract	GARDEN VIEW RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES IN 1011 NW 177TH PL		98177
No Contract	GARDEN VIEW RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY	17539 10TH AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	GENESIS HOMECARE ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	1835 N 200TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	Getch AFH Shoreline	18328 8th Ave NW	98177
Adult Family Home	Gladden Adult Family Home LLC	731 N 204TH ST	98133
No Contract	GOLDEN HILL AFH	16744 ASHWORTH AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	GOOD SHEPHERD HOME INC	200 NW 198TH ST	98177
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home Inc	15503 8TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home Inc	18361 DAYTON PLACE NORTH	98133
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home Inc	15010 LINDEN AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home Inc	754 N 203RD STREET	98133
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home on 8th	18060 8th Ave NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Grace AFH LLC	19831 WALLINGFORD AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	HAPPY FAMILY ADULT FAMILY HOME #2	1228 NE 181ST PLACE	98155
No Contract	Highland A.F.H. LLC	16505 N Park Ave N	98133
No Contract	HILJAY HOME	111 203RD NW	98177
No Contract	HILLWOOD SENIOR CARE AFH 2 LLC	18319 3RD AVENUE NE	98155
No Contract	HILLWOOD SENIOR CARE AFH LLC	19342 FREMONT AVE N	98133
No Contract	Holloway House LLC	18112 Palatine Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	Holy Living Adult Family Home LLC	914 NE 172nd PL	98155
Adult Family Home	HOME AGAIN	18504 2ND AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	HOME SWEET HOME	16538 25TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	INTAL ADULT FAMILY HOME	16304 25TH PL NE	98155
Adult Family Home	JCB ADULT FAMILY HOME	757 N 200TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	JCB II ADULT FAMILY HOME	19613 LINDEN AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	JIRAH HOME CARE	19831 GREENWOOD PL N	98133
Adult Family Home	JOY ADULT FAMILY HOME	15553 27TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Joy Care Adult Family Home LLC	774 N 204TH STREET	98133
Adult Family Home	MAPLE LEAF HOME II	1721 NE 146TH ST	98155
Adult Family Home	MARVI HOME CARE	729 N 203RD ST	98133
No Contract	MILLCREEK AFH III	17734 2ND PL NE	98155
Adult Family Home	MNB ADULT FAMILY HOME	15804 25TH AVE NE	98155

Dev. Code Amendment - Residential Care Facilities - Attachment B

Adult Family Home	MOUNTFOREST VIEW	15028 25TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	NDEN AFH	19819 FREMONT AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	NEW LIFE AT STONE AVE AFH LLC	18824 STONE AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	NEW LIFE HOME CARE	220 NE 175TH ST	98155
No Contract	NICA ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	20002 20TH AVE NW	98177
No Contract	NORTH RIDGE HOUSE	20031 6TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	NORTH RIDGE HOUSE	745 N 180TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	OMNA ADULT FAMILY HOME	17517 19TH CT NE	98155
No Contract	Open Arms AFH Inc	2315 N 194th St	98133
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam Over The Rainbow AFH 2 LLC		16179 MIDVALE AVE N	98133
Specialized Behavior Support, Expanded C OVER THE RAINBOW AFH LLC		16325 N PARK AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	Residence Choice Adult Family Home	17400 17th PI NE	98155
No Contract	RIMAS ADULT FAMILY HOME INC	1812 N 189TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	RIVER OF LIFE HOME CARE	239 NE 178TH ST	98155
Meaningful Home Based Activities, Adult f SAN ANTONIO LTF INC		16747 6TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	SARAUSAD HOMES INC	20203-B 20TH AVENUE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	SARAUSAD HOMES INC.	20203 A 20TH AVENUE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	SHANGRI LA HOME CARE AFH LLC	104 N 177TH STREET	98133
Adult Family Home	SHI'S HOME	16529 8TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	SHORELINE GARDENS SENIOR CARE	1233 NE 168TH ST	98155
Adult Family Home	SOUND VIEW ADULT FAMILY HOME	18025 15TH AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	ST ANTHONY AFH #1	16108 MIDVALE AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	ST ANTHONY AFH II	2200 NW 199th St	98177
Adult Family Home	ST JUDE ADULT FAMILY HOME	1219 NE 152ND ST	98155
Adult Family Home	ST LUKE AFH	19136 8th Ave NW	98177
Adult Family Home	ST MARY'S AFH	19540 7TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	ST MARY'S AFH	339 NE 163RD STREET	98155
Adult Family Home	ST. JOSEPH ADULT FAMILY HOME	1759 NE 148TH ST	98155
Adult Family Home	STELUTA ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	717 N 184TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	SUM'S ADULT FAMILY HOME	17916 FREMONT AVE N	98133
Specialized Behavior Support, Expanded C SUNRISE ADULT FAMILY HOME		1133 N 166TH ST	98133
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam SUNRISE ADULT FAMILY HOME II LLC		19121 3RD AVENUE NW	98177
Meaningful Home Based Activities, Adult f TANYAS ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC		16515 N PARK AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	THE BERGS ADULT FAMILY HOME	310 NE 174TH ST	98155

Dev. Code Amendment - Residential Care Facilities - Attachment B

Adult Family Home	THE GREAT SHEPHERD'S AFH 2	14511 WALLINGFORD AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	THE GREAT SHEPHERDS AFH	1658 N 145TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	THE GREAT SHEPHERDS AFH 1	14519 WALLINGFORD AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	VAN PATTEN AFH	16905 STONE AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	VILLA AFH	15520 30TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Villa Rey Adult Family Home LLC	16748 Corliss Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	WASHINGTON CARE ADULT FAMILY HOME	147 NW 183RD ST	98177