

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

July 19, 2018
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Montero
Vice Chair Mork
Commissioner Davis
Commissioner Lin
Commissioner Maul

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Kendra Dedinsky, City Traffic Engineer

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Malek

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Montero called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by Mr. Szafran the following Commissioners were present: Chair Montero, Vice Chair Mork and Commissioners Lin and Maul. Commissioner Davis arrived at 7:09 p.m. and Commissioners Craft and Malek were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes available for approval.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

**STUDY ITEM: 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT – TRANSPORTATION
ELEMENT T-44**

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran presented the Staff Report, noting that these are citizen-initiated amendments to Transportation Policy T-44, which describes how the City evaluates traffic concurrency and Level of Service (LOS). He described each of the three proposed amendments as follows:

- 1. Add “AM or PM peak” when describing Level of Service (LOS).** This amendment would add “for the peak AM or peak PM” after “LOS D” in the second sentence. It would also add “peak AM and peak PM one-directional” in the last sentence before “volume to capacity.”
- 2. Describe a leg of an intersection.** This proposed amendment would add the following language: “A leg of a signalized arterial intersection refers to that portion of the arterial that is between the signalized intersection and the next nearest intersecting arterial or no-arterial street.” Staff has evaluated this proposal and determined that the methodology appears to be inconsistent with the existing Forecasting and Growth Analysis Methodology.
- 3. Describe an alternative LOS for certain arterial streets.** The language proposed by the applicant appears to be inconsistent with existing methodology. When the City did traffic modeling in 2011 for the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), the two arterial streets described in the amendment (Dayton Avenue N from N 175th to N 185th and 15th Avenue NE from N 150th Street to N 175th Street) were not exceeding the Volume to Capacity (V/C) ratio. Therefore, staff does not consider the streets to be grandfathered as described.

Mr. Szafran summarized that staff is recommending denial of the applicant’s proposed amendments to Policy T-44 as outlined in Attachment B of the Staff Report.

Chair Montero asked if the applicant submitted documentation to support the proposed amendments, and Mr. Szafran answered that the applications for each of the amendments were attached to the Staff Report. Vice Chair Mork asked if the applicant shared his rationale for the proposed amendments with staff, and Mr. Szafran answered no. He explained that in reading the application (Attachment B), the applicant believes the proposed amendments would provide clarification. However, the Traffic Engineer does not agree with the applicant’s rationale.

Chair Montero summarized that that Amendment 3 would nullify the grandfathering and add another amendment for Dayton Avenue N and 15th Avenue NE. Mr. Szafran clarified that the two streets were always described in Policy T-44, and the applicant is proposing to reorganize the last section of the policy.

Public Comments

There was no public comment.

STUDY ITEM: 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT – POINT WELLS SUBAREA PLAN UPDATE

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran presented the Staff Report for proposed amendments to update the Point Wells Subarea Plan, which are citizen-initiated. The applicant believes the plan should be updated given the many changing conditions at Point Wells over the past eight years. Mr. Szafran reviewed that the Point Wells Subarea Plan was adopted by the City Council in 2010 as a component of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The subarea plan articulates the City’s concerns, interests and aspirations regarding urban service delivery, governance, traffic and impacts on adjacent neighborhoods and infrastructure in Shoreline. He explained that, generally, the proposed updates are related to acreages and mapping, access, views and traffic. He described the proposed amendments and the Commission discussed each one as follows:

1. Staff is proposing that the subarea be renamed from Subarea Plan 2 – Point Wells to Point Wells Subarea Plan. When the plan was adopted in 2010, the City had three planned areas. Since that time, the planning areas have been changed or deleted, and the City no longer attaches numbers to the subarea titles.
2. Some of the maps would be amended to update acreages throughout the plan. The maps would also be updated to recognize that the upper bluff area was recently annexed into the Town of Woodway. The language in the plan that describes the upper bluff area is no longer needed and should be deleted. Staff supports this amendment.

Chair Montero asked for clarification about the map changes, and Mr. Szafran advised that the acreage details that are currently shown on the map for each platted parcel within the subarea would be deleted and replaced with a combined acreage number. Chair Montero asked if the current property owner could sell the platted parcels individually. Mr. Szafran answered that he would assume so.

3. The applicant is proposing that the 1st paragraph in the “Geographic and Historical Context” Section be amended to replace “100” with “50.” In addition, the last sentence would be deleted. Staff supports this amendment. Since Woodway has annexed the upper bluff area, the unincorporated area should not be 50 acres, not 100 acres. As a result of the annexation, the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad no longer bisects the unincorporated portion, so the last sentence can be eliminated.
4. The language relative to access would be updated to read, “*Although there is potential easterly access to Point Wells through the Town of Woodway connecting to 116th Avenue W, presently Point Wells is connected to the regional road network only via Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road in the City of Shoreline. Therefore, future re-development of Point Wells would be most efficiently, effectively and equitably provided by the City of Shoreline and its public safety partners, the Shoreline Fire Department and Shoreline Police Department.*” Staff supports this amendment as it recognizes there is no longer a need to refer to a “lowland portion” because the “upland portion” is no longer part of the unincorporated island.

5. The language under Figure 1 would be modified to read, *“The only vehicular access to Point Wells is via Richmond Beach Road and the regional road network via the City of Shoreline. However, there is potential easterly access through the Town of Woodway connecting to 116th Avenue W.”* Staff recommends that, in addition to deleting the 1st sentence in the paragraph, Figure 2 and its associated language should all be deleted as there is no longer a need to identify the upland area versus the lowland area. The plan should also recognize that a second access road is likely to be required by Snohomish County.
6. Concerning views, the amendment would identify the public view corridor in Figure 2 and Policy PW-5 would be updated to read, *“New structures in the NW subarea should rise no higher than elevation 150 or be no taller than 90 feet, whichever is less.”* Staff supports this proposed amendment, which recognizes the 90-foot building height limit contained in the County’s Planned Community Business zoning regulations. However, the Commission should recognize that in certain areas in the lowlands it might be better to have taller buildings with less footprint if they are clustered away from the view corridor.

Chair Montero asked if the upland area is developable, and Mr. Szafran responded that there is currently an application for a 36-lot subdivision. Chair Montero asked about the view corridor and height restrictions associated with the upland area. Mr. Szafran answered that he does not have that information. Chair Montero asked if 90-foot tall buildings on the lower portion would impact views from the upland area, and Mr. Szafran answered no, noting that the upland area is much higher.

Vice Chair Mork asked if staff believes this amendment would be helpful. Mr. Szafran answered that staff is not opposed to the amendment. Director Markle said it doesn’t ultimately matter if the property is all within Snohomish County’s jurisdiction. But the idea of the tradeoff is that if density of a certain high volume is going to be permitted, it needs to be out of the view corridor and in a location on the site that does not impact the City. If a greater density is not allowed, staff supports the idea of limiting building height to 90 feet or no higher than elevation 150. She further explained that if the regulations stay as they are, a significant amount of density would be allowed, and the City suspects that once all the studies have been completed, some areas might be found unsuitable for development. This will further limit the footprint. Rather than allowing tall buildings throughout the site, it might be better to have taller buildings in the northwest corridor to allow for shorter buildings towards the City’s view corridor. The amendment may not have a negative impact on the City unless there is a need to cluster height away from its view corridor. Mr. Szafran pointed out that Policy PW-6 limits structures in the SE subarea, which is the City’s view corridor, to six stories.

Commissioner Lin asked if the City has the ability to place height restrictions on development within the public view corridor. Mr. Szafran said he is not aware of any City-imposed view regulations. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor agreed that there are no view covenants in Shoreline, with the exception of private covenants in Innis Arden. If the City is successful in annexing Point Wells, the view corridor would be artificially put over that portion of Point Wells

to keep the buildings within the corridor lower. However, the City does not have any ability to influence Snohomish County to do the same.

Vice Chair Mork said she supports allowing the most flexibility possible for development at Point Wells, but she appreciates that development within the view corridor could impact surrounding properties, but that would not be the case for development in the northwest portion of the subarea. Director Markle agreed that the northwest portion is not part of the City's view corridor, and she does not believe development in this location would impact property owners on the bluff unless it exceeds a certain elevation. This amendment and others seem to indicate that if you go over 200 elevation and go up 90 or 120 feet, you will begin to impact the view from the upland portion. The proposed amendment will limit the height of buildings in the northwest portion, which is potentially advantageous to efforts to preserve views. Vice Chair Mork summarized that if the City wants the most flexibility but also try to protect views, staff would recommend approval of the amendment. Director Markle concurred.

Chair Montero observed that the amendment could complicate the process of annexing Point Wells via an owner initiative if Snohomish County's code is more flexible. The amendment might slow down the annexation process rather than encourage it.

7. An additional sentence would be added to the section titled, "Snohomish County's designation of Point Wells as an Urban Center." The new sentence would read, "*Despite the City's opposition, in 2009 Snohomish County rezoned Point Wells as an Urban Center, and in 2010 adopted an Urban Center Development Code that applies to all Urban Centers in Snohomish County.*" The new sentence confirms that the area was, in fact, designated as an Urban Center in the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan. However, in light of the Hearing Examiner's June 29th decision to deny the building permit application, the Point Wells site is zoned Planned Community Business and the future land use is Urban Village. Staff recommends that this section remain as is.

Commissioner Maul questioned if it would be appropriate for the Point Wells Subarea Plan to identify the zoning the City wants for the property. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor answered that the Comprehensive Plan only identifies land-use designations, and the zoning is contained in the Development Code. The Point Wells Subarea Plan could identify the appropriate land use designations, and the applicable zoning would be attached via development regulations. She reminded the Commission that the City does not currently have jurisdiction over the area, so it cannot assign a land-use designation at this time. However, the plan could identify the land-use designation the City believes is appropriate for its vision of the site.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that the City doesn't have any control over it and when Point Wells is annexed unless the land owner requests it. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor agreed that is the case. Currently, the property is under single-ownership and the City does not have any authority to initiate annexation. Annexation depends on residents, which there are none, or the owner self-initiating an annexation proposal.

Commissioner Maul concurred with staff's recommendation. He did not believe it would be appropriate to list Snohomish County's land uses and zones in the Subarea Plan. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

8. The existing paragraph in the "Designation of a Future Service and Annexation Area at Point Wells" would be replaced with a new paragraph that was taken from the "Geographic and Historical Context" section. The 2nd paragraph would no longer be needed since Woodway has annexed the upland portion. Staff supports this proposed amendment.
9. The applicant is proposing that the 2nd paragraph under Policy PW-2 be changed by adding the following language at the end, "*and that generated traffic after mitigation does not exceed adopted city-wide level of service standards and does not exceed the traffic limit for Richmond Beach Drive that is specified in this subarea plan.*" Staff believes the proposed language is an overreach and is not necessarily what the City anticipates into the future. It would further restrict traffic on this roadway more heavily than other comparable roadways within the City. Staff is recommending denial of this amendment. However, if the Commission wants to amend Policy PW-2, staff recommends that it be changed to read, "*and that any transportation level of service failures, in accordance with Shoreline Municipal Code, are mitigated to maintain the adopted standard.*"
10. The last sentence in the paragraph under Policy PW-4 would be amended by deleting the last sentence to recognize that the slope will see some tree removal to accommodate recently approved development.
11. The 6th sentence in the 2nd paragraph under Policy PW-10 would be changed to read, "*The City's traffic study completed in 2009, assuming a 4-lane Richmond Beach Road, shows that if more than 8,250 vehicles trips a day enter the City's road network from Point Wells, it would result in a level of service "F" or worse at a number of City intersections.* In addition, the following language would be added at the end of the 2nd paragraph to "read, "*The City's Transportation Improvement Plan has scheduled Richmond Beach Road from 24th Ave NW to Dayton Ave N to be rechanneled from 4 lanes to 3 lanes in 2018. The rechannelization will reduce the capacity of this road segment so that current excess capacity is about 4,000 vehicle trips per day. If more than this number of vehicles enter Richmond Beach Road from Points Wells, it will result in a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ration of over .90 on several City road segments and a level of service "F" or worse at a number of City intersections. This would be an unacceptable impact incapable of being mitigated with Richmond Beach Road remaining at three lanes.*"

Mr. Szafran said staff does not support this proposed amendment because previous traffic studies did not consider the amount of traffic that a 3-lane configuration of Richmond Beach Road could handle. Staff does not recommend that the specific number of daily vehicle trips be included in the amended language, as background volumes will change over time and the daily trips are not what the City uses for concurrency. Staff is recommending alternative language that would read, "*In 2018, the City rechannelized the Richmond Beach Road corridor from 24th Avenue NW to Dayton Avenue N from four (4) lanes to three (3) lanes. This rechannelization further reduced existing capacity along the corridor. Any changes proposed to land use within the subarea should*

be carefully studied to ensure that the trips generated do not exceed the adopted volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio standard of 0.90.”

Commissioner Lin asked about the advantage of using V/C ratio. Ms. Dedinsky explained that V/C is a LOS standard that responds to whatever the condition is at the time that it is measured. If you set a specific limit at this point in time, it will not be representative in the future as background volumes change. Setting any limit to the trips coming out of the site is not going to take into account future changes on and to the roadway. The V/C is the tool used to measure the feel of the roadway as opposed to establishing a set limit of trips coming from the site, which could be completely irrelevant based on the number of trips that are added or subtracted from the system in the future.

12. Policy PW-12 would be amended by striking the entire last sentence. At this time, the City does not have LOS standard based on daily trips, and it is not consistent with the citywide standards. Staff does not support this proposed amendment and recommends the City consider deleting the entire policy to be consistent with citywide standards.
13. A new Policy PW-13 would further limit the City’s adopted LOS standard for Richmond Beach Road by saying that no segment could exceed 0.90 V/C. City code says that one segment may exceed the 0.90 V/C as long as the intersection meets LOS. Staff does not support limiting Richmond Beach Road beyond what the rest of the City is limited to from a concurrency perspective.
14. This amendment would delete the last sentence in the 1st paragraph in the “Interjurisdictional Coordination” section. With the likelihood of a second access road through Woodway, this sentence is no longer accurate. Vice Chair Mork asked if the words “and Edmonds” should also be included at the end of the 1st sentence, and Mr. Szafran agreed to consider this and report back.
15. Existing Policy PW-13 would be amended to delete the last two sentences, which talks about the City working with Woodway and Snohomish County to address future environmental impacts associated with development at Point Wells. Staff believes this joint effort could be helpful in the future and recommends leaving the language as is.

Mr. Szafran summarized that staff is recommending approval of a majority of the applicant’s proposed amendments with some minor modifications proposed by staff.

Commissioner Maul asked about the goal of Comprehensive Plan amendments for property that is outside of the City’s jurisdiction. He observed that nothing in the Point Wells Subarea Plan is binding. Director Markle explained that the subarea plan is the start to the City’s vision to annex the property in the future and shows the City’s intent. Its current designation is a future service and annexation area, and the subarea plan sets the stage for future planning for annexation. Commissioner Davis commented that the property owner could decide at any point to seek annexation into Shoreline, and the subarea plan allows the City to be ready if that happens.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no Director's Report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Chair Mork reported that the subcommittee that was formed to review the Commission's bylaws have decided to wait until fall to start its work.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran advised that the August 2nd meeting will include a discussion about Green Belt Commercial Development Code Regulations.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

William Montero
Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission