

## Memorandum

**DATE:** July 2, 2019

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Nathan Daum, Economic Development Manager

**RE:** Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services/Tree Board Comments  
Regarding Merlone Geier Partners Development Agreement for  
Shoreline Place (former Sears property)

---

---

### Board Meeting Summary:

At its June 27 regular meeting, the PRCS/Tree Board provided comments for the Shoreline Planning Commission to consider as it reviews the proposed Development Agreement with Merlone Geier Partners for the redevelopment of the Sears property within the Shoreline Place Community Renewal Area (CRA). The board took no formal action. In attendance were eight members of the board. Four members provided comments which are summarized below.

Generally, the Board members were supportive of the proposal and positive about its contribution to Shoreline.

### PRCS Board Member Comments:

1. *The public space proposed is necessary for the success of the planned retail and residential uses; Park Impact Fee (PIF) Credits are too high or not appropriate at all.*

Staff comment: The creation of public space was a major feature of the City's vision when it created the CRA. Merlone Geier Partners has stated that it is incorporating extensive public space into its designs in response to the City's CRA vision, not market demand, and that retail would be better served by direct placement on rights-of-way, rather than set back behind public space. As a result, they are proposing 2.75- 3.47 acres of public space, well in excess of the 0.56 acres that would be required by code. The PIF Credit makes this possible. Other redevelopments underway in the city, including the CRA properties owned by Trammel

## Shoreline Place DA - Att. G - PRCS/Tree Board Memo

Crow Residential and Washington State Department of Transportation, include no additional public space beyond what is required by code.

2. Comparing the proposal to Seattle's University Village, some board members felt that such an environment geared towards creating desirable conditions for commercial activity, would not be appropriate as criteria for Park Impact Fee Credits.

Staff comment: University Village is a wholly-owned private shopping center. It was not developed within a CRA or regulated by a Development Agreement. It does, however, provide an example of the level of quality and track record of the designers of the public space at Shoreline Place. However, the walkways and plazas at University Village total approximately 0.75 acres, or 3% of the 24-acre site. This compares to up to 3.47 acres, or 20%, proposed by Merlone Geier on its 17-acre site.

3. The requirements for the public spaces to qualify for PIF credit are insufficient.

Staff comment: The areas that would qualify for PIF credits do have specific park amenity requirements to be included in the public space. Each component will include at least the minimum number of design elements required by the Supplemental Site Design Guidelines, although the developer may propose as many of the design elements as may be feasible to contribute to the sense of place and overall success of the project.

4. Why would the parking lot for the "Community Open Space" be considered for inclusion in the PIF Credit calculation?

Staff comment: To ensure the "Open Space System" is available to the community residing outside of the development, the City of Shoreline required the parking lot be made available to guests of the public space and signed accordingly.

5. There is a need to preserve solar access to "Community Open Space" if some of adjacent property redevelops, or a need to rethink that location in light of the lack of control of property to the south owned by a different entity.

Staff comment: The success of the public space is important to both the City and the Developer. In addition to requirements to comply with City development controls for light and air, there are private contractual agreements between the various property owners at Shoreline Place. Such private agreements are a common practice for multiple-owner shopping centers across the country and may be an option for the property owners to work together to ensure the public open spaces are protected from future overshadowing.

6. How will requests to cordon off public plazas for outdoor dining or other private business use be handled (for spaces counted towards proposed PIF credits)?

## Shoreline Place DA - Att. G - PRCS/Tree Board Memo

Staff comment: Exhibit I Open Space Operations and Maintenance Plan (O & M Plan) and Rules Regulations covers this to some degree, however, staff agrees there is opportunity for refinement in this area of the agreement.

7. Concern about the lack of setbacks and potential 'urban canyon' effect of buildings along the public streets.

Staff comment: This is a component of the CRA zoning which is not currently before the Planning Commission for review.