

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

October 18, 2018
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Montero
Vice Chair Mork
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Davis
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Malek

Staff Present

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

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Lin

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Montero 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 Montero, Vice Chair Mork, and Commissioners Craft, Davis, Maul and Malek. Commissioner Lin was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of September 20, 2018 and October 4, 2018 were approved as submitted.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING: POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF DEEP GREEN INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Staff Presentation

Ms. Redinger reviewed that on August 2nd, the Commission discussed the City Council's original request to consider expanding the green building mandate that currently exists in the Mixed-Use Residential (MUR) zones, which requires projects to achieve Built Green 4-Star certification. On September 6th, the Commission discussed expanding the Deep Green Incentive Program (DGIP) instead of the mandate. Following the September 6th meeting, staff engaged in further conversations with representatives from the Passive House Institute US (PHIUS) and learned that the appropriate name for the certification to fulfill the mandate in MUR zoning is PHIUS+. Staff also learned that the organization offers a net zero program called PHIUS+ Source Zero, which is equivalent to the International Living Future Institute's (ILFI) Zero Energy Certification that is currently eligible under Tier 3 if it is paired with a Salmon Safe Certification. Staff's current recommendation includes not only adding PHIUS+ to Tier 4 as a way to fulfill the mandate in MUR, but also adding PHIUS+ Source Zero with Salmon Safe as an option to fulfill Tier 3 in the DGIP.

Ms. Redinger recalled that on September 6th, the Commission discussed whether or not parking reductions for the DGIP should be cumulative with other available reductions, including proximity to transit on Aurora Avenue North and the light rail stations. At that time, Vice Chair Mork also suggested making the parking reductions for affordable housing be cumulative.

Ms. Redinger reviewed the proposed changes to Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) 20.50.400 as follows:

- No change is being proposed to SMC 20.50.400(A), which currently allows up to a 25% parking reduction for a combination of the following: on-street parking, shared parking agreement, parking management plan, residential parking zone, high-capacity transit stop within ¼ mile, pedestrian public access easement, traffic calming or diverting facilities, retention of 20% of significant trees in MUR-70', or replacement of all significant trees removed in MUR-70'.
- SMC 20.50.400(B) refers to parking reductions for the DGIP. Currently, Tier 1 development would be eligible for up to a 50% parking reduction, Tier 2 up to 35% and Tier 3 up to 20%. Staff is proposing a maximum parking reduction for Tier 4 of 5%.
- No change is being proposed to SMC 20.50.400(E), which allows parking reductions of up to 50% for the portion of a residential development providing low-income housing units that are affordable to those making 60% Area Median Income (AMI) or less.
- SMC 20.50.400(F) allows a parking reduction of 25% for multifamily development within ¼ mile of a light rail station. Staff is recommending that "B and E" be deleted. This would allow deep green buildings in light rail station subareas to combine parking reductions from the DGIP with those for proximity to transit and deeper affordability.
- SMC 20.50.400(G) states that parking reductions for affordable housing or the DGIP may not be combined with parking reductions in Subsection A. Staff recommends this subsection be deleted.

To illustrate the potential ramifications of adopting the proposed changes, Ms. Redinger shared how a theoretical baseline development would be impacted. In the 100-unit multifamily building, 75 units would be studios and 1-bedroom (.75 parking stalls per unit) and 25 units would be 2-bedroom (1.5 parking stalls per unit). With no parking reductions taken, the project would require 94 parking stalls. Four would be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) stalls and the overall parking reductions would not change this requirement.

1. If it was a 4-Star project in the Mixed Business (MB) zone within ¼ mile of a RapidRide stop on Aurora Avenue North and included 20% of the units affordable to 70% AMI, a total of 68 parking stalls would be required. In addition to capturing a 5% reduction through the DGIP, the project could capture an additional 25% reduction for proximity to high-capacity transit and meeting at least one other criteria in Subsection A. The project would not be eligible for the affordable housing reduction, which requires units affordable at 60% AMI, but it would be able to take advantage of the City's Tax Exemption Program.
2. If it was an Emerald Star project in the MB zone within ¼ mile of a RapidRide stop on Aurora Avenue North and included 20% of the units affordable to 60% AMI, a total of 42 parking stalls would be required. In addition to capturing the 35% reduction for Tier 2 of the DGIP, the project could capture an additional 25% reduction for proximity to high-capacity transit and meeting at least one other criteria in Subsection A. It could also capture a 50% reduction for the units that are affordable at 60% AMI.
3. If it was a 4-Star project located in the MUR-45' zone within ¼ mile of a light rail station and included 20% of the units affordable to 70% AMI, a total of 71 parking stalls would be required. The project would capture a 25% reduction for proximity to the light-rail station, but the other requirements would be mandatory.
4. If it was an Emerald Star project located in the MUR-45' zone within ¼ mile of a light rail station and included 20% of units affordable to 60% AMI, a total of 42 parking spaces would be required. The project would capture a 35% reduction for Tier 2 of the DGIP, as well as a 25% reduction for proximity to the light rail station. It could also capture a 50% reduction for the units that are affordable at 60% AMI. If the Commission were to make the criteria under Subsection A eligible for an additional 25% reduction, the parking requirement would be reduced to 32 stalls. Staff is not recommending allowing the parking to be reduced that drastically.
5. If it were an Emerald Star project in the MB zone within ¼ mile of a RapidRide stop on Aurora Avenue North and included 100% of the units affordable to 60% AMI, a total of 24 parking stalls would be required. Although this would be a drastic reduction, staff believes it would be worthwhile to create a path for significant parking reductions for deep green projects that are within close proximity to transit and have 100% of the units as affordable.

Ms. Redinger explained that when the original DGIP was adopted, there was an interest in trying to make all programs within each tier as comparable as possible. One of the primary differences between the Built Green and International Living Future Institute (ILFI) programs is Built Green uses energy and water

modeling for 4- and 5-Star certifications and the ILFI requires a performance period and analyzes actual use before awarding any certification. Built Green staff has recently offered to perform additional post-occupancy analysis for 5-Star projects applying through the DGIP to make the programs more comparable. However, staff is concerned that as the program is expanded citywide and the enrollment of Built Green projects continues to increase, Built Green will not have the capacity to continue to do this extra level of analysis. She noted that PHIUS also does not do post-occupancy performance evaluations and is concerned about having additional requirements for just Shoreline that are above and beyond their protocol. Staff recommends striking SMC 20.50.630(F)(7)(b) from the code language and relying on the modeling procedures currently used by Built Green and PHIUS, which have been found to be reliable at predicting performance.

Ms. Redinger reviewed that the DGIP has been in place since April of 2017, but the City has yet to receive a project application through that program. However, the mandate in the station areas appears to be working, as the City has received 151 project applications so far in 2018.

Ms. Redinger summarized that, following the Commission's recommendation, the City Council will conduct a study session on the proposed amendments on November 26th and potentially adopt the changes as Ordinance No. 839 on December 10th.

Vice Chair Mork referred to the proposed changes to SMC 20.50.400(F) and asked why Subsection A was specifically called out instead of making it the Director's discretion, as well. She referred to Scenario 4, noting that if projects were eligible for an additional parking reduction under the criteria in Subsection A, the Director would have the discretion of deciding whether to allow this additional reduction or not. Ms. Redinger answered that it is important to keep the expectations relatively close to what the City will actually offer. She agreed that the Commission could recommend allowing the reduction in Subsection A to be combined with other reductions, but it is not likely the Director would grant only 32 parking stalls for a 100-unit building. While the City is working to develop more connected, walkable communities, it will still take a while to get there. Staff felt that allowing or even setting the expectation of a 66% parking reduction might be too much at this time.

Vice Chair Mork commented that situations are different in different areas of the City, and she would be very comfortable allowing the Director to make the decision. The current situation may change over time, and the City may find that fewer parking stalls are needed. Allowing the Director to have discretion would enable the City to adapt as changes occur.

Vice Chair Mork asked if the City would still have access to the information if SMC 20.50.630(F)(7)(b) were eliminated. Ms. Redinger said that, currently, owners are required to submit utility information to Built Green so they can analyze it and show it to the Director. If the requirement is eliminated, the City could make this request, but it would not be a code requirement. Vice Chair Mork asked if there is a way to include a requirement that the owner provide the information to the City upon request. She noted that this information could be important if the City were to conduct a special research project at some point in the future. Perhaps the owners could sign something that allows the City to access this information from the utility company. Ms. Redinger said one of staff's main directives has been to not create more work for anyone (certification agencies, third-party verifiers, and City staff). Eliminating SMC 20.50.630(F)(7)(b) would be taking a step back from what the City was requiring Built Green to do outside

of its protocol. She commented that requiring households to turn in utility data for a 5-year period is not the most efficient way to get to how much of a difference it is making towards reducing the carbon footprint. A better approach would be to use a standard modifier of Built Green 4-star must be 20% more efficient than a comparable household. The City can compare Seattle City Light data against this multiplier to capture how efficient the energy system is.

Commissioner Malek commented that the sophistication of technology is growing quickly. For example, radio frequency is now used to calculate energy use and the information is being sent to the “cloud.” People can access the information via their smartphones or agencies have the ability to accurately identify what a person is spending, losing or gaining. If the City wants to do something broad scale at some point in the future, the data could be collected per neighborhood. He cautioned that once data is gathered, the City would be responsible for storing and analyzing it. That might be more than the City wants to do at this point. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor agreed that the City would be required to retain the information and make it available for public disclosure.

Chair Montero asked how the City would measure its goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 25% by 2020. Ms. Redinger answered that the City obtains data from service providers to calculate the City’s carbon footprint every three or four years.

Commissioner Davis commented that Scenario 3 would be achievable based on the proposed change that would allow the parking reduction for affordable housing to be combined with the parking reductions identified in Subsection A. Ms. Redinger agreed that the scenario assumes that the parking reductions would be cumulative. She explained that the MUR zones already require 4-Star Built Green and 70% AMI, and allowing the incentives to be layered may encourage developers to reach a little deeper for affordability. For the most part, staff feels it is acceptable to allow cumulative reductions because each one represents more affordability and a greener development. As proposed, a developer in the MUR zone could combine the parking reduction allowed by Subsection A with the parking reductions allowed for green building. However, the high-capacity transit incentive cannot be used to satisfy the requirements of Subsection A since it is a mandated requirement in the zone.

Public Testimony

There was no public testimony.

Commission Deliberation and Recommendation

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO EXPAND AND AMEND THE DEEP GREEN INCENTIVE PROGRAM AS OUTLINED IN ATTACHMENT A OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Craft asked if the Commission is comfortable with allowing a 100-unit apartment building with less than 50% parking. The Commissioners indicated support based on the criteria proposed by staff. Vice Chair Mork asked if the Commissioners would support allowing all parking reductions to be

combined and then letting the Director make the final decision. Most Commissioners indicated they would not support that change.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

There were no Commissioner reports or announcements.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Cohen advised that the November 1st agenda will include a public hearing on the 2018 Comprehensive Plan amendments. Director Markle advised that the Shoreline Master Program update will also be presented to the Commission on December 6th. It was decided that the subcommittee assigned to review the Commission's bylaws would postpone its discussion until early 2019. Ms. Redinger announced three 185th Corridor Project Drop-In Storefront Studio events: October 20th from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at the Spartan Recreation Center, October 23rd from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at the Spartan Recreation Center, and October 25th from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.



William Montero
Chair, Planning Commission



Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission