



# PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, November 7, 2019  
7:00 p.m.

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

Estimated Time

- |   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>1. CALL TO ORDER</b>                           | 7:00 |
| <b>2. ROLL CALL</b>                               | 7:01 |
| <b>3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA</b>                      | 7:02 |
| <b>4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>                     | 7:03 |
| a. <a href="#">October 3, 2019 Draft Minutes</a>  |      |
| b. <a href="#">October 17, 2019 Draft Minutes</a> |      |

## **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.*

- |  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT</b>   | 7:05 |
| <b>6. STUDY ITEMS:</b>   |      |
| a. <a href="#">Vision 2050 Presentation – Puget Sound Regional Council</a> | 7:10 |
| <b>7. DIRECTOR’S REPORT</b>  | 8:00 |
| <b>8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS</b>  | 8:15 |
| <b>9. NEW BUSINESS</b>   | 8:16 |
| <b>10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES &amp;<br/>    COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS</b> | 8:17 |
| <b>11. AGENDA FOR November 21, 2019</b>                                    | 8:18 |
| <b>12. ADJOURNMENT</b>   | 8:20 |

*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.*

**DRAFT**  
**CITY OF SHORELINE**

**SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING MEETING**

October 3, 2019  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

---

**Commissioners Present**

Chair Montero  
Vice Chair Mork  
Commissioner Davis  
Commissioner Lin  
Commissioner Malek

**Staff Present**

Nora Gierloff, Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development  
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Catie Lee, Associate Planner  
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

**Commissioners Absent**

Commissioner Craft  
Commissioner Maul

**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 Davis, Lin and Malek. Commissioners Craft and Maul were absent.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of September 5, 2019 were approved as presented.

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Joseph Irons, Shoreline**, reported that just two days ago, the City issued a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Determination of Nonsignificance for the 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendments. The determination was late, and he asked that the Commission not penalize the applicants of the amendments

by delaying the public hearing. He said he and his wife are unavailable on the new hearing dates of October 17<sup>th</sup> or November 7<sup>th</sup>. They arranged their schedule to be present and fully involved in the process, as the amendment affects them personally, as well as the lives of their employees, many of whom are Shoreline residents. He recalled that, on August 9<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Szafran identified October 3<sup>rd</sup> as the date of the public hearing and advised that applicants would have 10 minutes to present. He asked that he and his wife have an opportunity to present their arguments in support of the proposed amendment at the public hearing that they actually paid for. He stressed that it is imperative that he and his wife attend the public hearing and requested that the public hearing be moved to a date they can present at, even if it requires moving the amendment to the 2020 Docket.

Mr. Irons commented that the City seems to be sending the message that it doesn't support small businesses. His proposed amendment would actually support small business, and the City and Planning Commission should take a stance of support since it directly aligns with the City Council's Goal 1, Points 2 through 5. Contrary to what a few opponents alleged, the City led him to believe his business was operating legally and conforming all these years. They have jumped through every hoop, and having the goalpost moved now is unfair. They don't want the application to result in a procedural error, but they want an opportunity to present the facts, with their attorney present. He said his office is mixed use, with residential use on top of commercial use. The City does not support that, yet they have allowed many existing buildings in the North City Business District to be replaced with large apartment buildings with little green space, little parking, and no commercial on the ground floor. He suggested that the City reevaluate its position. He said he intends to submit a much larger packet, including a number of support letters and comments they have received to date.

**Melissa Irons, Shoreline**, said that, as business owners, she and her husband feel they have been misled by the City staff. She referred to Customer Response Memorandum (CRM) 55276 and reviewed that, on May 14, 2014, someone contacted the City to report: *"There is a home business at 1510 NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street, with three commercial trucks and 11 vehicles parked in the neighborhood that belong to employees or customers. There is a sign at the business that reserves two parking places for customers. This is an R-8 zone. Do they have a variance to have this type of business?"* On July 8, 2014, Randy Olan, City of Shoreline, stated in the CRM that he, *"Spoke with a customer (complainant), explaining that the only issue we were enforcing at the time was parking. The customer confirmed it was much better, and I told her to call me directly if there's changes. I also told her that, since the business has been there since 2008 and was next to other commercial uses, we are not enforcing zoning at this time. But if the site continues to be an issue, we've been told we would proceed with enforcement action."* She also referred to an email from Laurie Jennings dated July 23, 2014 (CRM 1800729), which reads: *"They recently submitted a permit application for a reroof of their property. When the fire department was reviewing the permit, they asked whether or not it should be treated as a commercial space in regards to fire suppression. This is what brought their still present violation to our attention."* She pointed out that there are no words of violation in the May 2014 or July 2014 reports.

Ms. Irons explained that Iron's Brothers Construction and their family is cohesive. Wherever they operate, they will take their values and community efforts and continue to make a positive impact. The company is a vital employer in the City. They were asked to complete the application process by the City of Shoreline less than one year ago. They have done so without any resistance, having met all timelines and committed to paying all financial obligations. This is a very large burden for them, and rejecting the

application would not solve the situation. The application has created animosity between the business community and residential community. The Commission's role, in representing the City, is to create synergy between both and achieve the best for all.

**PUBLIC HEARING: TOWNHOUSE DESIGN STANDARDS CODE UPDATE**

Ms. Lee reviewed that staff conducted research earlier in the year, looking at the zoning code of 22 jurisdictions in the Pacific Northwest to determine which ones had design standards specific to the townhouse building type. From January to June, staff held nine meetings with internal and external stakeholders. An online visual preference survey was conducted in April, and 534 responses were received. A public workshop was held on August 1<sup>st</sup>, with 10 community members participating and providing feedback on the proposed code. The Commission conducted a study session on August 1<sup>st</sup>, where a number of concerns were raised. On September 5<sup>th</sup>, staff presented a number of options for addressing the concerns raised at the August 1<sup>st</sup> public workshop and Commission meeting. Tonight's meeting is a public hearing on the proposed code update.

Ms. Lee explained that the City is experiencing increasing demand for the townhouse housing style since the adoption of the Mixed Use Residential (MUR) 35' and 45' zoning in the 185<sup>th</sup> and 145<sup>th</sup> Station areas in 2015 and 2016. The City's current design standards for townhouses are better suited for apartment buildings. While the increase in new townhouses constructed helps to expand housing choice within the City, it is important that the developments be appropriately designed to ensure they are functional and yield quality townhouse developments that add value to the community. She reviewed that the proposed Townhouse Standards include:

- Additional definitions for site and building design features (balcony, fenestration, entry, street wall, etc.), which are terms used in the proposed regulations.
- Requirements to enhance how townhomes look from the street by requiring a percentage of all units to face the street, minimizing the visual impact of on-site paving, and adding landscaping to facades.
- More thorough requirements for solid waste collection.
- Requirements for outdoor space and landscaping. Currently, apartment development in any of the zones requires landscaping along the perimeter of the property, but there is no such regulation for townhouses.

Ms. Lee summarized that all of the updates, as directed by the Planning Commission at the September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, have been incorporated into the draft standards attached to the Staff Report (Attachment A). As a result of ongoing staff discussions, some additional changes were made. Most are minor clarifications, but two are more notable:

- The September 5<sup>th</sup> draft said that pedestrian access could be right next to vehicular access, but it had to be raised or otherwise separated by a building or landscaping. Because having a 20-foot access drive with a 4-foot walkway next to it would result in a lot of hardscape, staff is proposing to remove the word "raised" so that the pedestrian access has to either be separated by landscaping or located on the other side of the access drive, separated by a building.

- As proposed on September 5<sup>th</sup>, developments with 10 or more units would have to meet private street standards. The private street standards in the Engineering Development Manual require a minimum 20-foot access drive and 5-foot sidewalk next to it that has to be raised and no landscaping would be required in between. Staff is now proposing to change the language so that both single family attached and mixed single family attached developments would have to meet the multifamily access type, which means they would only have to have a 20-foot-wide access drive, and the pedestrian access would have to be separated with landscaping or be on the other side of the building away from the vehicle access.

Ms. Lee recalled that, at the September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Commission raised the issue of fire sprinkling for townhouses. She explained that the International Fire Code requires fire sprinklers on all buildings over 4,800 square feet, and it may even be required on buildings under that threshold based on fire flow and hydrant distance. The City has had a Fire Impact Fee since 2018, and the 2019 rate is \$2,187. If a developer voluntarily installs sprinklers, the fee can be reduced to \$1,530 (30% less). According to the Fire Department staff, fire sprinkler systems cost about \$1.35 per square feet to install. If you come in just under the 4,800 threshold, installing the fire sprinkler would cost approximately \$6,478.

Ms. Lee said that if the Commission formulates a regulation following the public hearing, the next step would be a City Council study session on November 25<sup>th</sup>. Potential adoption is scheduled for December 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Peter Bocek, Seattle**, said he is an architect based in Seattle. His firm currently has four clients who are developing projects in the City of Shoreline, for a total of about 150 units. The projects are in various stages of planning/design/permitting now. Approximately 80 of these units will be townhouse projects, and most are in the MUR-35' zone on mid-block single parcels. He noted that he previously submitted comments for the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Bocek applauded the Commission and Planning staff. From an architect's standpoint, there aren't a lot of design standards for townhomes, and there should be. He is happy to see that changes are being proposed. However, he is concerned about potential impacts. If the standards are adopted as currently proposed, the density will decrease. In addition, the time the development community will take to build out housing in the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones will increase and costs will go up. It will require the assembly of lots to create viable developments. Lastly, the proposed amendments would change the nature of the developers who are doing the work now. For example, three of his four Shoreline clients are small, local developers who have been doing this type of work for a long time. He voiced concern that, if the standards are adopted as proposed, developers would be limited to fewer units, and projects may no longer make sense. The smaller developers will exit, and the regional and national developers will build Shoreline's housing.

Mr. Bocek referred to the proposed requirement that 40% of a development's units must face the street, which would be difficult to make work. This would be especially true for single parcels, where the other requirements would result in a decrease in density. He commented that there may be some single lots that, because of their size and dimension, it may not be possible to achieve the required minimum density of 12 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Bocek also referred to the proposed turnaround requirement for access driveways that are more than 150 feet long measured from the curb line. He voiced concern that this requirement would eliminate at least two units. He noted that the other comments he provided in his written submittal are generally dimensional suggestions that are intended to provide flexibility. For example, the idea of requiring weather protection is good, but the size is bigger than it needs to be.

**Tam Dang, Mukilteo**, said he represents the vast majority of homeowners in Shoreline, particularly those in the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones. He said he has owned his 8,000-square-foot property (60' wide by 130' deep) in the MUR-45' zone since 1997 and it is currently developed with a 1,000-square-foot bungalow. He voiced concern that the proposed standards (i.e. 30% frontage and 20-foot driveway) are too rigid and will make redeveloping his property at its highest and best use financially unfeasible. Instead, the proposed standards will result in large developers assembling properties to develop large apartment complexes. He also voiced concern about the proposed requirement that projects include at least four units.

Mr. Dang observed that most of the current homeowners in the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones aren't doing any improvements at all. They are hoping a large investor will purchase their properties, and there is no incentive for them to do anything. He suggested it will take at least a decade for things to turn around, and he hopes the Commission reconsiders the proposed standards to give some flexibility to current property owners, architects and developers.

The Commissioners deliberated and took action on the proposed amendments outlined in Attachment A as follows:

- **SMC 20.20 – Definitions, SMC 20.30.410 – Preliminary Subdivision Review Procedures and Criteria, and SMC 20.50.020(1) – Dimension and Density Table for Residential Zones**

**VICE CHAIR MORK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO SMC 20.20 (DEFINITIONS), SMC 20.30.410 (PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION REVIEW PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA) AND SMC 20.50.020(1) (DIMENSION AND DENSITY TABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL ZONES) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**SMC 20.50.040 – Setbacks – Designation and Measurement**

Ms. Lee summarized that the only changes in this section are to clarify that balconies are allowed to project 5 feet into the required setback and that eaves on single family attached and mixed single family attached developments may encroach up to 18 inches into a required setback.

Commissioner Malek asked if “fireplace structures” refers to the bump outs for fireplaces on the exterior of buildings, and Ms. Lee answered affirmatively. Commissioner Malek noted that, as proposed, only two fireplace bump outs would be allowed per façade. Ms. Lee clarified that the limit of two would only apply to fireplace structures that project into a setback.

Vice Chair Mork summarized that, as proposed, only two bay windows and/or fireplaces per façade could project into a required setback. Ms. Lee commented that the requirement would primarily apply on the front setback of townhouse developments. The side and rear setbacks are typically 5 feet, which doesn't allow these types of structures to encroach. Vice Chair Mork asked how the provision would be applied to a zero-lot-line situation. Ms. Lee answered that nothing would be allowed to project into the right-of-way. Commissioner Davis added that the building would have to be setback, and then any number of projections would be allowed as long as they fall within the lot line boundaries.

Vice Chair Mork asked how the provision would apply to side setbacks. Ms. Lee explained that most of the time, the side and rear setbacks will be 5 feet, and the City allows very few things to project into these areas. For the most part, the provision will apply to lots in MUR zones where there is a 10-foot front setback. The provision would also apply to MUR-zoned properties located next to an R-6 zone, where projects of three units or more will require a 15-foot rear setback.

Vice Chair Mork asked staff to explain its rationale for the provision, and Ms. Lee answered that it would allow more flexibility. She explained that the provision is already in the code, and the proposed change simply clarifies that balconies are another type of structure that should be allowed to project into the setback. Commissioner Davis said her understanding is that the provision discourages developers from developing buildings within the setbacks. Setbacks are for the purpose of creating a buffer between neighboring properties and sidewalks.

**CHAIR MALEK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO SMC 20.50.040 (SETBACKS – DESIGNATION AND MEASUREMENT) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER DAVIS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Subchapter 3 – Single Family Attached Residential Design**

Commissioner Malek observed that it is clear that leaving the design standards up to developers is inadequate, and the finished products have not set the stage for better, more attractive housing stock that has a community feel. However, he found the two options offered by staff at the September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting to be distasteful. To his thinking, leaving the code so stringent and requiring investors to purchase more than one lot to accomplish an attractive and fully-functioning townhouse project disenfranchises the current owners who pursued them with the understanding they could build under a different design code. He said he has been approached by members of the community, including some builders, who have voiced concern about the disenfranchisement of interior lot holders. For example, what happens if a property owner is not ready to move and sell his/her property, but the people on either side are? He agreed that the issue requires further study to come up with creative solutions that will result in a more positive outcome. However, he is concerned about continuing with the limited design standards until the City completes its Missing Middle Analysis next year and can offer better solutions. He suggested they discuss creative solutions that might offer a compromise and result in a more positive outcome rather than a continuation of the type of development that diminishes the overall housing stock and makes purchasing some of the adjacent lots less desirable. The standards need to allow for development to move forward and properties to be sold in real time without burdening property owners by requiring them to wait.

Vice Chair Mork recalled that staff presented three options for addressing concerns related to the requirement that at least 40% of the units within a development to be oriented towards the street (**SMC 20.50.160(C)**). Ms. Lee reviewed that **Option 1** was to keep the original 40% language, but add an exception that on lots 60 feet wide or less, only 30% of the units would have to be located within the front property line in a 25-foot distance. **Option 2** was to rewrite the provision entirely to move away from a percentage requirement and simply state that for buildings where there is not an access drive for vehicles, the rest of the lot frontage has to be filled with buildings. **Option 3** was to keep the original 40% requirement.

Vice Chair Mork agreed that what they have now is not good enough, and the goal is to figure out a compromise that provides flexibility. She said she would support allowing the Director discretion to alter the requirement on a case-by-case basis and come up with a different solution. Commissioner Malek said they need to bridge the gap between what they have now, which is unacceptable, and what they want to get to, which they haven't yet found. He said it seems appropriate to give the Director autonomy to deliberate on interior lots to come up with sensible solutions. However, they should avoid creating an "exception" burden by providing at least some framework by which she can base her decision. He said he would support Option 1.

Ms. Lee explained that, per Option 2, development on a single, midblock would likely end up as perpendicular-oriented buildings. However, the other standards that are proposed in the amendments would make the buildings look more interesting, with entryways facing out to the street. Developers who are able to assemble lots will have more flexibility to orient several of the front doors towards the street. She summarized that Option 2 is intended to provide some flexibility for single, midblock lots.

Ms. Lee explained that the Missing Middle Analysis that is scheduled for next year will contemplate ways to increase density in single family zones beyond just single-family homes (accessory dwelling units, cottage-style development, triplexes, etc.) The study will not focus on townhouses in the MUR zones.

Ms. Lee acknowledged that the 40% requirement (Option 3) could lead to a number of outcomes, some of which were addressed in the public comments. You could end up with developments with fewer units (less density) and skinnier units, and it would encourage lot assemblage. She presented three drawings to illustrate how the provision could be applied on a variety of lot sizes.

Commissioner Davis said it appears that most of the concern is related to lots that are 60 feet wide, where the 40% requirement (Option 3) would reduce the number of units from three to two. Three units would be possible if the requirement were reduced to 30% (Option 1). The 40% requirement would not impact the number of units that could be built on a 70-foot-wide lot. She said it doesn't seem reasonable to force a 60-foot-wide lot to develop with just two units, leaving a large space in the back that is undevelopable. On the other hand, she wants to prevent the development of side-facing townhouses. She recommended Option 1, but change the exception to apply to lots that are less than 70 feet wide.

Commissioner Lin asked if there is any scenario where a 60-foot-wide lot could develop with skinny townhouses and still fit three units on the site using the 40% requirement. Ms. Lee answered that they would have to be really skinny to get two units up front and one in the back.



Ms. Lee pointed out that the scenario provided for Option 1 is for detached single family homes, which are not allowed in the MUR-45' zone. The exception would only apply in the MUR-35' zone and other zones that allow single family detached and single family attached development. An applicant in the MUR-45' zone would have to apply for administrative design review for a departure from the standard, and the end result might be similar to the scenario provided for Option 2.

Commissioner Malek voiced concern that the 40% requirement is substantial, given that it would significantly impact density. He said he is not happy with the type of development that has occurred thus far, and he likes the idea of a design standards. However, he suggested that they use a phased approach, starting with standards related to design aesthetics (landscaping at the perimeter, garden walls, activating the streetscape with glazing and entryways, etc.) as an interim step (Phase 1). The more exaggerated changes could be held off until Phases 2 and 3.

Vice Chair Mork commented that, if the Commission adopts a phased approach, developers will likely build five buildings in a row, with only the front building facing the street. Ms. Gierloff pointed out that five units could only be accommodated on lots that are 70 feet wide and greater. Four units might be possible on a 60-foot-wide lot. Commissioner Malek commented that reducing the number of units that can be built on a property from five to four or from four to three is unfair, especially in a declining market where people have been purchasing properties at a premium over the past three years and have made plans based on a higher density. The City gave them the impression that the greater density would be allowed based on the MUR zoning. However, he is not in favor of letting townhouse development go forward unchecked. He suggested they could remedy that with Option 2 for MUR-35' along with the same perimeter landscaping requirements that apply in the higher densities. Additional standards could be considered as part of Phases 2 and 3.

Commissioner Lin asked if it is possible to adopt language to limit the possibility of single lots developing with a building orientation that is perpendicular to the frontage. Commissioner Davis said she would support language that prevents side-oriented buildings facing the street. Even with fenestration on the side, side-facing buildings are not pedestrian friendly and do not result in walkable street frontages.

Commissioner Davis summarized that rewriting Option 1 would have to include a provision that prevents sideways buildings along the street front, which appears to be feasible on a 60-foot-wide lot using a narrow townhouse design. Ms. Lee agreed that would work for the MUR-35' zone. However, applying Option 1 in the MUR-45' zone would result in fewer units or assembled lots because the MUR-45' zone doesn't allow detached single-family units.

Commissioner Malek agreed that side facing buildings are not the most attractive. However, the MUR-45' zone is intended for higher density, and the City should make a good-faith effort towards achieving that. If all a developer can do in the MUR-45' zone is turn the buildings sideways, it should be allowed on an interim basis while the City figures out a better solution as part of Phase 2 or Phase 3. He recommended that Phase 1 include some aesthetic design standards to improve the appearance of townhouse development without becoming too heavy handed. The idea of compensating for less density by building units that are more luxurious is infeasible. It also is inconsistent with the City's goal of increasing density within a half mile walkshed of the light rail stations.

Vice Chair Mork asked if the maximum density could be created on narrow lots in the MUR-45' zone via accessory dwelling units. Ms. Lee responded that the City allows one accessory dwelling unit on every lot in the City, and they are not subject to density standards. Vice Chair Mork noted that an accessory dwelling unit requires that a property owner must live on the site. She asked if it would be possible to construct two 4-story buildings in the MUR-45' zone and then rent out half of each of the buildings, resulting in essentially four residential units. Ms. Lee said that a stacked development is called an "apartment" and would be allowed as long as there was enough space to accommodate the required parking.

Commissioner Davis asked if the language could be adjusted to allow a single-family unit to be constructed at the front of a narrow lot in the MUR-45' zone. Ms. Lee said the use table would have to be changed to allow single family detached development.

Commissioner Malek suggested the Commission recommend a phased approach that runs simultaneously with the adopted phased approach for MUR zoning. Phase 1 could include Option 2 for **SMC 20.50.160(C)**, with additional landscaping requirements as called out in Chapter 7 of the Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC). That would mean that all of the existing permits and all stakeholders who own property can build at least an improved version of what they have seen thus far and still maintain their density, which is critical for them to be solvent. Phase 2 of the MUR zoning will be implemented in 2021, which means the Commission and staff would have an entire year to work on additional design standards concurrent with the work that will be done related to housing options. Additional design standards could also be implemented as part of Phase 3 of the MUR zoning, which is scheduled to occur in 2033.

Vice Chair Mork voiced concern that the properties included in Phase 1 of the MUR zoning would be developed different than the properties included in Phases 2 and 3. She said she appreciates Commissioner Malek's concern for property owners who want to redevelop now, but they must also be concerned for homeowners who live in the area. Commissioner Malek pointed out that redevelopment is already occurring, and some of the recent projects are subpar and discourages redevelopment around them. He suggested that, as they continue to develop language for improved design, perhaps they could offer some incentive for developers to incorporate the improved design standards early.

Vice Chair Mork asked if there is a way to adopt Option 2 and incentivize Option 1. Commissioner Malek suggested the inducement should come after the fact. They should send a clear and unfettered message to the community, and it should be Option 2. He would love to see something better to address sideways building, but he cannot think of how to do that now.

Commissioner Davis agreed that a phased approach is an interesting thought, but a lot of townhouse development has happened in the past year, and she anticipates that there will substantially more moving forward. The City is not happy with the development that has occurred so far. Rather than focusing on building neighborhoods, developers are focusing on getting the maximum density out of each lot to make money. She said she feels a responsibility to the community, particularly the surrounding established neighborhoods, to recommend design guidelines that require change now. The Development Code should be written in a way that creates a stronger fabric from the beginning rather than feeling pressure from property owners who want to redevelop now based on the current code. She voiced concern that postponing the adoption of design guidelines will result in more poor townhouse development.

Vice Chair Mork suggested a compromise that would adopt Option 1 for lots in the MUR-35' zone, with an exception for lots that are less than 70 feet wide, and Option 2 for lots in the MUR-45' zone. Commissioner Malek agreed this would be a better compromise, but he is still concerned that Option 1 would result in a loss of one unit (about \$600,000). He disagreed that developers would be able to raise the price of the three units because they will be more attractive being less dense. While that does work in certain circumstances, he doesn't believe that will be the case in the MUR zones. The idea is also inconsistent with the City's design philosophy, which is to get the most density possible near the station areas.

Commissioner Malek agreed that additional design guidelines are needed to address issues that were not anticipated during Phase 1 of the MUR zoning. He is also concerned about the large number of townhouses that are currently being developed. However, he believes that Option 2 for both MUR-35' and MUR-45' would be the best approach for the time being, with a recommendation that the issue be revisited in preparation for implementation of Phase 2 of the MUR zoning. He explained that Option 2 would avoid injury and/or damage to existing property owners. Any other option would result in property owners inundating the City with legitimate complaints.

Commissioner Davis said she supports Option 1, with modified language for lots less than 70 feet wide, for the MUR-35' zones. This would allow a 60-foot-wide lot to meet the density requirement and accommodate three units. Further, she recommended Option 2 for the MUR-45' zone.

**COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SUBCHAPTER 3 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. VICE CHAIR MORK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO REPLACE THE LANGUAGE IN SMC 20.50.160(C) WITH THE LANGUAGE CONTAINED IN OPTION 2 OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2019 STAFF REPORT. THE LANGUAGE WOULD READ, "*BUILDINGS SHALL BE LOCATED TO CREATE A 'STREET WALL' WHICH ENHANCES THE STREETScape AND OVERALL PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE. EXCEPT FOR VEHICULAR ACCESS THAT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT MANUAL AND THE DEVELOPMENT CODE, BUILDINGS SHALL FILL THE LOT FRONTAGE. ALL UNITS WITH FRONTAGE SHALL BE ORIENTED TO THE PUBLIC RIGHT(S)-OF-WAY.*" THE MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.**

**COMMISSIONER DAVIS MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO CHANGE SMC 20.50.160(C) TO RETAIN THE EXISTING LANGUAGE FOR ALL APPLICABLE ZONES EXCEPT MUR-45', BUT INCLUDE A 30% EXCEPTION FOR LOTS UP TO 70 FEET WIDE. SHE FURTHER MOVED TO AMEND SMC 20.50.160(C) TO ADOPT OPTION 2 FOR THE MUR-45' ZONE. VICE CHAIR MORK SECONDED THE MOTION TO AMEND.**

Commissioner Malek once again voiced concern, noting that the proposed change would apply to a variety of other zones that are designed to be high density. While they don't have a perfect solution for design aesthetics yet, a lot of stakeholders will be facing an economic catastrophe if the amendments are adopted

as proposed. While reducing potential density by one or two lots may seem inconsequential, it represents a substantial loss for some property owners. The entire MUR area is under redevelopment and the Commission's obligation is to the longer-term community. They need to develop design standards that are functional and allow for the higher densities that are anticipated within the half mile walkshed of the stations. The proposed change would not accomplish this goal. He felt that, given time, the Commission could come up with a better solution.

Vice Chair Mork pointed out that the design standards could be updated in the future if the Commission comes up with better solutions. Ms. Lee agreed that the code could be amended at any time and any of the standards could be replaced. She observed that there are hard policy decisions to be made, and there are no perfect solutions.

Ms. Gierloff recalled that the City devoted a good portion of the year to discussing townhouse standards. If the Commission doesn't feel they have it right yet, maybe they aren't ready to move forward. However, she doesn't see the City doing the same amount of effort and outreach next year when there are a lot of other projects on that also have deadlines and need to move forward.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION RELATIVE TO SMC 20.50.160(C) WAS APPROVED 4-1, WITH CHAIR MONTERO, VICE CHAIR MORK AND COMMISSIONERS DAVIS AND LIN VOTING IN FAVOR AND COMMISSIONER MALEK VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

Vice Chair Mork noted that the Commission has heard from architects who have spent time writing detailed comments. She asked what sections of the proposed changes their specific comments were related to. Mr. Szafran advised that the Commission received a comment about **SMC 20.50.160.(D)(2)**, which would require a turnaround facility on lots with dead-end access drives that are 150 feet or more long. Chair Montero said another comment was regarding **SMC 20.50.160(B)(1)**, which requires that each unit must have a covered entry or porch with weather protection with a minimum width of 6 feet and a minimum depth of 4 feet.

Vice Chair Mork recalled that Mr. Bocek has requested that the minimum width of covered entries and porches (**SMC 20.50.160.(D)(2)**), be reduced to 4 feet and the minimum depth to 3 feet. Ms. Lee recalled that the Commission discussed this provision on September 5<sup>th</sup> and indicated general support for the language as proposed. Commissioner Davis recalled that the Commission discussed that a 6-foot width would be wide enough for two people to stand side-by-side, and reducing the width requirement to 4 feet would only accommodate 1 person. She acknowledged that a 4-foot width is more common in townhouse development, but there may be some drawbacks that are worth considering.

Commissioner Malek commented that the design standards must be future and forward thinking, recognizing that development trends will change. He doesn't like to see elements that are abbreviated and appear as half-hearted gestures. But as long as elements do not detract from other housing stock, he supports allowing developers to build more abbreviated units that sell. He said he would support reducing the size requirements for covered entries and porches. Commissioner Davis said she would also support the reduction, which would still result in useable space.

**CHAIR MALEK MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO CHANGE SMC 20.50.170(B)(1) TO READ, “EACH UNIT SHALL HAVE A COVERED ENTRY OR PORCH WITH WEATHER PROTECTION AT LEAST 20 SQUARE FEET WITH A MINIMUM WIDTH OF FOUR (4) FEET AND A MINIMUM DEPTH OF THREE (3) FEET.” VICE CHAIR MORK SECONDED THE MOTION TO AMEND, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Ms. Lee referred to **SMC 20.50.160.(D)(2)** and explained that, for lots that are 150 feet deep or greater, it is important to provide space for emergency and delivery vehicles to turn around. However, Mr. Bocek pointed out that the requirement could result in a loss of one or two units. Vice Chair Mork asked how many properties the provision would apply to, and Ms. Lee said there are a few, but it is not the average lot.

Ms. Lee said the actual dimensions of the required turnaround facility are currently being drawn up by the Public Works Department, but it is accurate that a unit would need to be eliminated to meet the requirement. She advised that a technical drawing, with actual dimensions, will be adopted into the Engineering Development Manual when it is amended in March of 2020, and the draft language refers to the Engineering Development Manual for the dimensional requirements. Chair Montero suggested that rather than establishing a 150-foot threshold, perhaps the provision could refer to the Engineering Development Manual. Ms. Lee responded that the 150-foot threshold was identified by the Fire Department as the appropriate threshold, and Ms. Gierloff emphasized that 150 feet is very standard for fire department requirements across all jurisdictions.

Vice Chair Mork observed that the requirement would only apply to a small percentage of lots. Therefore, she did not feel the change would be warranted or necessary. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

**THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED, WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**Subchapter 4 – Commercial and Multifamily Zone Design**

Ms. Lee explained that Subchapter 3 used to include multifamily zone design. As proposed, multifamily projects would be reviewed under Subchapter 4.

**VICE CHAIR MORK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD SUBCHAPTER 4 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Vice Chair Mork asked if the City received any public comments regarding the proposed amendments to Subchapter 4, and Ms. Lee answered no.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Subchapter 7 -- Landscaping**

Commissioner Malek recalled his earlier suggestion that the perimeter landscaping that is required in the higher density zones (**SMC 20.50.490(B)**) also be applied to the MUR-35' zone. However, the suggestion was made with the understanding that **SMC 20.50.160(C)** would be amended to apply Option 2 to both the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones, which would enable developers to obtain the greater density. Because the Commission made a different decision, his earlier suggestion no longer applies.

Commissioner Lin asked how the landscaping requirement would differ between a townhouse development of four units and a 4-unit multifamily development on the same size lots in the MUR-45' zone. Ms. Lee said multifamily development is required to use Type I landscaping when adjacent to a single-family zone and Type II when adjacent to a multifamily zone. The requirement would be the same for single family attached development.

**COMMISSIONER LIN MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD SUBCHAPTER 7 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED. VICE CHAIR MORK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chair Montero closed the public hearing.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Ms. Gierloff called the Commission's attention to the flyer that was recently put out regarding a discussion in Kenmore on the "missing middle housing," that the Commission may be interested in attending.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Commissioner Malek reported that the draft Interlocal Agreement between the Town of Woodway and the City of Shoreline for the Point Wells Project would put both jurisdictions on the same negotiating platform in hopes of a stronger position when working with the developer, BSRE, in the future. The utility piece will be wrapped up in the broader discussion of the specifics of the Interlocal Agreement.

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Szafran reviewed that a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan amendments is scheduled for October 17<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

---

William Montero  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Carla Hoekzema  
Clerk, Planning Commission

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**  
**CITY OF SHORELINE**

**SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING MEETING**

October 17, 2019  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

---

**Commissioners Present**

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

**Staff Present**

Nora Gierloff, Planning Manager  
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney  
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

**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, Lin, Malek and Maul.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as amended

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no general public comments.

**PUBLIC HEARING: 2019 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS**

Chair Montero reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the hearing. He pointed out that the hearing would be continued to November 21, 2019.



Mr. Szafran explained that the State Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to generally once a year. The City Council set the 2019 Docket on June 3<sup>rd</sup>, with the three amendments listed in the Staff Report. He reviewed each of the amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 1** is a privately-initiated amendment that seeks to change the land use designation and zoning of two parcels located at 1510 and 1517 NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Mixed Use (MU-2) and concurrently rezone the properties from Residential (R-8) to Community Business (CB). He referred to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, which shows the subject parcels outlined in red, with a MU-2 designation to the west and a Low Density Residential (LDR) designation to the east. He also displayed the zoning map, which shows the subject parcels outlined in red and currently zoned R-8, with CB zoning to the west and R-6 zoning to the east. He pointed out that the R-8 zone allows for a mix of single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, townhomes and community facilities. It also allows such uses as daycares, churches, conference centers, schools and fire stations, with approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

As demonstrated by Attachment D in the Staff Report, there are many parcels of R-6 and R-8 zoning that are adjacent to CB and Mixed Business (MB) zones. He said staff has reviewed the applicant's responses and analyzed the request to change the land use and zoning, and a summary of the findings were included in the Staff Report. The Staff Report also lists the pros and cons of the proposed amendment. Pros include retain and expand the existing business zone, provide a mix of residential and commercial activity and bring a nonconforming building into compliance. The cons include accommodation of an intense commercial use; the potential for greater building height up to 60 feet; no maximum density requirement; increased noise; increased traffic from employees, customers and delivery trucks; spillover parking; outdoor lighting; and lack of landscape buffer between commercial and single-family uses. When considering the amendments, the Commission can take action on the parcels together or separately.

- **Amendment 2** is also a privately-initiated amendment to change Natural Environment Goal V to set local goals to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in support of the Paris Climate Accord threshold to limit global warming to less than 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. Staff has proposed a change to rephrase the language to make it clearer that GHG emissions, themselves, would not be limited to the number of degrees, but that reducing local GHG emissions is the most effective contributor to the attempt to limit the levels of global warming.

The applicant's proposed language reads, "*Protect clean air and the climate for present and future generations by limiting greenhouse gas emissions to 1.5°C of global warming above pre-industrial levels, and promotion of efficient and effective solutions for transportation, clean industries and development.*"

Staff's proposed language reads, "*Protect clean air and the climate for present and future generations through significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, to support Paris Climate Accord targets of limiting global warming to less than 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. Local reduction targets will also promote efficient and effective solutions for transportation, clean industries, and development.*"

If adopted, the amendment would require substantial changes in the energy we use and the transportation modes we choose. It will necessitate adjustments in the land use, housing, economic development and utilities section of the Comprehensive Plan in the future, as well as updating the City's Climate Action Plan, Greenhouse Gas Inventory, and the Carbon Wedge Analysis. These are all on the City staff's work plan in the near future.

- **Amendment 3** is related to Amendment 1 and would amend Land Use Policy LU2 to allow professional offices in the MDR land use designation. The proposed language would add "professional offices" as one of the uses that may be allowed in the MDR land use category. If the amendment is implemented, staff would bring back a Development Code amendment to add "professional offices" as a conditional use in the R-8 and R-12 zones. The pros and cons of the amendment are listed in the Staff Report. The pros include encouraging more economic activity throughout the City and allowing a lower-impact use to occur within single-family residential neighborhoods. The cons include office uses replacing single-family development. The City already allows home-based businesses under certain conditions, but some professional offices may not be compatible with the existing neighborhood. Generally, there is additional traffic, parking and intensity from businesses that are located in neighborhoods.

Mr. Szafran summarized that the Staff Report recommends denial of Amendments 1 and 3 and approval of Amendment 2. The public hearing will be continued to November 21<sup>st</sup> for additional public testimony, with tentative City Council dates of December 2<sup>nd</sup> for discussion and December 9<sup>th</sup> for adoption.

**Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline**, said she was present to voice opposition to Amendments 1 and 3. To highlight one point made in the Staff Report, she said the current R-8 zoning serves as a buffer between the community business zone along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and the R-6 homes to the east. As also stated in the report, the City does not have that many areas zoned as R-8. She said it is important for the City, overall, to have residential properties of various lot sizes. In the past, the Commission has stated the value of having a mix of residential types, and retaining the R-8 zoning for these two properties will align with that value. She expressed her belief that the current zoning offers more value to the City than converting the properties to CB. She said she also appreciates small businesses in the community. Although not related to the topic at hand, she hopes that, in the future, the Commission will consider making properties zoned as CB be required to have businesses occupy the ground floor. She said there are two apartment complexes currently being built in the North City Business District, and both properties are zoned CB. She said it is important to encourage commerce in Shoreline by requiring the apartment building owners to house businesses on the ground floor. With more businesses on properties already zoned as CB, there will be no need to alter the current residential zones.

**Lee Keim, Shoreline**, said she was present to speak in favor of Amendment 2, which would update Natural Environment Goal V to support the goal of the United Nations International Panel for Climate Change (IPCC). It would limit global warming to 1.5°C. It was due to her frustration with inaction on the Federal level and failure of the State's Carbon Tax Initiative last fall that she submitted Amendment 2. She explained that, for years, cities have been laboratories for taking action on climate change. More than half of the world's population lives in cities and cities are responsible for 70% of the carbon emissions in the energy sector. Amendment 2 is her opportunity to inspire Shoreline to join other cities across the nation, confronting global warming. She observed that the clock is ticking on the opportunity to address

the climate crisis. The IPCC has issued three reports required under the Paris Climate Accords in the last year, warning of the rapid changes and future consequences to the earth's land, water and human habitation if the atmosphere is allowed to warm beyond 1.5°C. They say that global GHG emissions must peak in the next decade and quickly decline thereafter or the world may face economic and financial crisis due to melting glaciers and polar ice, rising sea levels, extreme storms, drought, flooding and fires that will hamper food production and water supply. The most vulnerable populations and economies will be the hardest hit.

Ms. Keim explained that the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to indicate how a community envisions its future and set forth strategies for achieving that vision. It is the Planning Commission's responsibility to review and approve improvements of the Comprehensive Plan and provide guidance and direction for Shoreline's future growth. The Staff report suggests that Amendment 2 meets the Shoreline Municipal Code requirement and is recommended for approval. The Staff Report correctly identifies that adopting Amendment 2 would require reanalysis and updates of the City's 2013 Climate Action Plan, 2016 GHG Emission Inventory, and the 2015 Carbon Wedge Analysis. It will take continued political will and citizen support to meet these challenges. Many technologies already exist that will get the City on its way to a renewable energy future and create good paying jobs in a new economy. For example, biofuel plants in Oregon and Washington are creating renewable diesel fuel, and zero emission cars, busses and commercial vehicles are being developed. Large solar and wind power generation already exists in the State and many others. A company in Portland has developed the first of its kind renewable wave energy device that will be tested in Hawaii and brings hope of tapping a great potential of marine energy. So called small things, like replacing standard heating and cooling units in residential homes with high-efficiency electric heat pumps, increasing insulation, switching to LED lighting, can all help the City reduce its carbon footprint.

Ms. Keim summarized that, by approving Amendment 2, the Commission will show the citizens of Shoreline that they acknowledge the assessments and warnings of the world's climate scientists and that they understand significant policy changes are urgently needed. She is happy to add her voice to others of this generation who understand that it is our task to create a livable future for those who come after.

**Marlin Gabbert, Shoreline**, said he is a resident of the North City Neighborhood and was present to speak in favor of Amendments 1 and 3. He expressed his belief that there needs to be more depth to the commercial area so they don't end up with a strip zone and that is why he supports a rezone of the properties to CB. From a planning point of view, a CB zone would be easier to site a building, provide parking and still have enough buffer to protect the single-family residential zones. He said he doesn't believe the current R-6 zoning does anything positive for the property. Each lot is about 7,500 square feet and can only accommodate one unit. The existing apartment building has been used for a long time, and there have been many visits by City officials and others. There needs to be a reasonable compromise to allow the Irons Brothers to continue their business. He said he has read the letter that the applicant's attorney submitted, and agrees with every one of the points. Again, he said he supports Amendments 1 and 3 and the rezone of the Irons Brothers property and urged the Commission to move in a favorable direction.

**Mark Rettman, Save Shoreline Neighborhoods**, said he was present to speak on behalf of over 230 concerned neighbors, citizens and voters who are part of the Save Shoreline Neighborhoods Group opposing the land use re-designation and rezone at 1510 and 1517 NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street (Amendments 1 and

3). He provided a map showing the distribution of the citizens opposing the amendments, noting that they all live in the immediate area. He said the signatures were collected within just a few hours of community outreach in the area and almost 100% of the residents contacted opposed the rezone. He said he doesn't need 10 minutes to reiterate 10 months of facts, environmental impacts, problems, and opposing comments that have been submitted to the City already. If the Commission has further questions, he asked that they review all of the opposing comments that have been submitted thus far or reach out to the Save Shoreline Neighborhoods group for further discussion.

Mr. Rettman noted that the Staff Report only provides comments from the applicant and supporters and none from those who oppose the two amendments. He commented this does not provide a fair, transparent and equal representation of the comments on Amendments 1 and 3. However, some of the opposing comments are on the website for tonight's meeting. He asked that the Commission deny Amendments 1 and 3 for the following reasons:

- It sets a bad precedent to reward violators by allowing them to change the rules (rezone) instead of abiding by existing rules.
- Irons Brothers willfully caused the problems by not following existing Shoreline code. It's not the City's or neighbors' problem or fault.
- It sets a bad precedent to allow businesses to expand into residential neighborhoods.
- Spot zoning is not the way to add more business areas in the city. It should be done as part of a large planning effort.
- It would permanently change the use of the properties to any use in the future, not just a construction office and yard. It would be a long-term permanent change that would accommodate any allowable business in the future.
- It would permanently bring business impacts into the neighborhood including traffic, parking, noise, alarms, privacy/cameras, light and glare, dust, more impactful development standards and noise limits, and other environmental and social justice impacts.
- It's not fair to businesses that operate legally and have all the costs associated with operating legally. We fully support local businesses that operate legally, and favor should not be given to those that do not operate legally.
- Amendment 3 would cause more business and financial impacts in residential neighborhoods and citywide.
- It's not fair to the residential neighborhoods and all the kids, families, elderly, minorities, disabled, and residents that live in this area that will be permanently exposed to the permanent impacts that this permanent change will cause.

Mr. Rettman said it not about whether or not the Irons Brothers is a good company. This is strictly about whether or not it is appropriate to rezone two residential lots to CB to fix code violations that the violators caused themselves and if the rezone is appropriate based on the Comprehensive Plan criteria, rezone criteria, City regulations, Growth Management Act and other acceptable common planning practices. He asked the Commissioners to maintain their previous positions that were voiced at the two prior meetings on the topic. He urged them to listen to the overwhelming majority of Shoreline citizens and accept the staff's recommendation of denial for Amendment 1 and 3 and save Shoreline neighborhoods.

**Kristi Rettmann, Shoreline**, said she lives next door to the 1517 NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street property. She is also a member of the Save Shoreline Neighborhoods Group and is opposed to Amendments 1 and 3. The fact that Irons Brothers is a small community business is not the issue here. The issue is and always has been legal in nature. The Irons Brothers have operated at 1510 NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street since 2008, completely out of compliance with the land use requirements of the Shoreline Municipal Code. They would have you believe they are being forced out of Shoreline by the City and opponents to the rezone. This is not a fact. Many other small businesses in Shoreline abide by the code and are not asking for a special rezone. Based on public record, Irons Brothers knew back in 2014 that they were out of compliance. Instead of moving to an already commercial business lot, they deliberately purchased another residential lot across the street (1517) in 2018 and expanded their business further into the neighborhood. She said she finds it very odd that a construction company would not understand how to check appropriate uses on the lot they are working on since their business would regularly have to do that for code and compliance issues at any other parcel they are working on. It feels like Irons Brothers wants special treatment simply because they have been around for a while and do nice things in the community. While she appreciates that, a lot of other people do nice things in the community and have so for decades. That doesn't mean they can be above the law when it suits them.

Ms. Rettman said she has heard people talk about previous uses at 1517, and she would say those neighbors never bothered them and they live right next door. More importantly, though, past use is not a justification to get a pass to continue to disregard current land use and zoning codes. If the rezone is approved, this would send a message that you can violate code for years and ask for forgiveness later. It would tell the citizens of Shoreline they can violate the code and simply pay for a rezone to meet their needs. Approval of the rezone would send the message that the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code are simply words without merit. Approval of Amendments 1 and 3 would hold the needs of a single business over the needs of the entire neighborhood that they are asking to expand upon. She said she hopes the City will be on the side of what is right and what is just. She strongly encouraged the Commissioners to stick with staff's recommendation, which was made after months of careful study, and deny Amendments 1 and 3.

Vice Chair Mork clarified that the purpose of Amendment 2 is to cause certain things to be done, and it appears that the City is already planning on doing these things. She asked if the amendment would simply reaffirm the City's position without necessarily incurring additional research costs. Mr. Szafran answered affirmatively. It also provides more justification and support for updating the plans before the major update of the City's Comprehensive Plan in 2023. Vice Chair Mork expressed her belief that Amendment 2 is really important, as the City is trying to make a difference and needs to know where it currently stands.

Chair Montero continued the public hearing to November 21<sup>st</sup>.

Commissioner Craft asked if staff would be asked to present the Staff Report again at the public hearing. He also asked if the hearing would remain open for public testimony. Chair Montero answered that the hearing would remain open for public testimony, and Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor advised that staff would provide a summary of the proposed amendments for the benefit of those who are not in attendance at the October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Vice Chair Mork said it appears the concerns are all about Amendments 1 and 3. She asked if the Commission could take action on Amendment 2 now. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor

explained that the public hearing was advertised for the total docket, so the Commission must wait until the next public hearing to take action on all three amendments at the same time.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Ms. Gierloff provided a brief report on development that is currently taking place in Shoreline, noting there is a lot of townhouse activity. She advised that one developer was going to build 88 townhouses but ended up purchasing 19 of the 20 lots in a single block to do 287 apartments with a central parking garage instead. The townhouse permits are still active, but the applicant has started the process to change the proposal. Vice Chair Craft asked if the applicant would be asking for any type of relief as part of the change, and Ms. Gierloff said the applicant plans to do an ADR but no other zoning changes.

Chair Montero asked for more information about the Washington State Department of Transportation Project, and Ms. Gierloff said it involves remodeling the existing building, including the garage and storage building.

Ms. Gierloff reported that the developers of the Vale Project have purchased an additional parcel and are looking at doing another apartment building using the Deep Green Incentive Program. There is a project mid-block on NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street, where the applicant presented two different scenarios at the pre-application meeting. One was a code-compliant 5 over 2 concept, and the other would take advantage of the potential height increase to 140 feet in the MUR-70' zone. They are looking at how the different incentives and requirements would work under the two scenarios.

Vice Chair Mork asked how staff has been impacted by the influx of development applications. Ms. Gierloff said the Planning and Community Development staff are busy. Review times are steady, and they are meeting their goals, but they would love them to be shorter. A new senior planner will come on board soon, but he won't be doing much of the current planning work. Mr. Szafran said the City takes advantage of consultants if they get too backed up.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

#### **Findings of Fact for Townhouse Design Standard Code Amendments**

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor said that, consistent with the new process of having recommendation letters going to the City Council after the Commission makes its recommendations, she sent an email to the Commissioners earlier in the day that contained a formal cover letter to the City Council, as well as Findings of Fact that support the Commission's recommendation for the Townhouse Design Standard Amendments. She reviewed that the Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendments as outlined in the Staff Report with the following modifications:

- The Commission recommended to change SMC 20.50.160(C) to retain the existing language for all applicable zones except MUR-45', but include a 30% exception for lots up to 70 feet wide. They further recommended to amend SMC 20.60.160(C) to adopt Option 2 for the MUR-45' zone.

- The Commission recommended to change SMC 20.50.170(B)(1) to require each unit to have a covered entry or porch with weather protection at least 20 square feet with a minimum width of 4 feet and a minimum depth of 3 feet.

She recalled that the Commission's recommendations at the last meeting outlined concepts, and the documents she prepared contain actual code language to implement the concepts. She invited them to review the documents and provide feedback. She said the intent is to forward the entire package to the City Council.

While Finding of Fact #2 accurately describes the Commission's final recommendation, Vice Chair Mork pointed out that none of the Commissioners were satisfied it was a great solution. It was intended to be a compromise solution for the time being. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor emphasized that the Findings of Fact #2 reflects what the Commission voted on, and only Commissioner Malek voted in opposition. Vice Chair Mork agreed that the finding is factually correct, but from her perspective, she thought they gave clear direction for staff to come up with a better alternative. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor agreed that the Commission talked about the need for better options, but it seemed to be more futuristic. Vice Chair Mork questioned if it would be appropriate for the City Council to know that the Commission does not believe the amendment represents a perfect solution. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor suggested a statement could be added to the cover letter. Mr. Szafran commented that the Commission's concerns will be noted in the Staff Report that is prepared for the City Council, and they will also be reflected in the Commission Meeting Minutes. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor added that the Commission could specifically ask that a recommendation letter to the City Council contain additional information to clarify their recommendations.

### **Update on Point Wells**

Commissioner Malek suggested that Commissioners watch the video recording of the September 23<sup>rd</sup> City Council Meeting where the City's Attorney, Margaret King, provided an update on Point Wells. She reported that the Town of Woodway and the City of Shoreline have entered into an Interlocal Agreement that addresses a lot of details related to traffic studies, traffic levels, etc. It is a good start, as having a common platform will strengthen both their negotiating positions. He reminded them that the developer, BSRE, has until December 18<sup>th</sup> to comply with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements and make a decision relative to building locations.

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor said both councils authorized the Interlocal Agreement, which includes a number of steps that both jurisdictions need to take. It doesn't preclude the developer from moving the application forward in Snohomish County. Right now, the application is in court, and BSRE hasn't reactivated its applications with Snohomish County. They asked the court to stay the December 18<sup>th</sup> deadline, but the City of Shoreline objected and the court agreed not to extend the deadline.

Chair Montero asked if development at Point Wells would impact the Ronald Wastewater District. Vice Chair Mork answered that the wastewater from Point Wells is in the Ronald Waste District's system and is addressed in the Interlocal Agreement. The issue was also discussed at the September 23<sup>rd</sup> update to the City Council. Her understanding is that the City has decided there is no specific date for the assumption. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor said the City had planned on moving on the

assumption in 2020, but a recent ruling by the Court of Appeals regarding the Snohomish County portion of the Ronald Wastewater District was not in the City’s favor. The City already has authority to assume the portion of the district within King County, but Snohomish County has denied the request twice. The Olympic View Water and Sewer District has also voiced opposition. The Ronald Wastewater District filed a petition before the Washington Supreme Court requesting a review to reverse the Court of Appeals decision, and they are awaiting a decision. Vice Chair Mork summarized that the fundamental issue is that Snohomish County believes the assets the rate payers of the Ronald Wastewater District bought and paid for should be turned over to the Olympic View Water and Sewer District and the Ronald Wastewater District and/or the City of Shoreline need to figure out how to do the separation and pay for the assets. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor clarified that they are not really arguing over assets. Lift Station 13 will continue to be owned by the Ronald Wastewater District, and the Olympic View Water and Sewer District is claiming no title to it. Olympic View is more interested in everything else that would happen there since Lift Station 13 currently serves about 60 homes in the City of Shoreline. The City owns the land it sits on and needs to keep it operating to the benefit of those residents.

**NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no committee reports or Commissioner announcements.

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Szafran advised that the November 7<sup>th</sup> agenda will include a presentation by the Puget Sound Regional Council on Vision 2050.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned 7:55 p.m.

---

William Montero  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Carla Hoekzema  
Clerk, Planning Commission





## Memorandum

**DATE:** November 7, 2019

**TO:** City of Shoreline Planning Commission

**FROM:** Nora Gierloff, Planning Manager, AICP  
Steven Szafran, Senior Planner, AICP

**RE:** Puget Sound Regional Council VISION 2050

### **Regional Planning Framework**

Staff from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) will make a presentation to the Planning Commission about the VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy at the November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. This is the Puget Sound region's long-range plan drafted by PSRC. Vision 2050 provides a guide for sustaining a healthy environment, thriving communities, and a strong economy. It includes a strategy for how and where the central Puget Sound region can grow to a forecast of 5.8 million people and 3.4 million jobs by the year 2050. Over the next 30 years, the region is forecasted to grow by 1.8 million additional people and 1.2 million new jobs. The City has participated in the regional effort to develop this strategy and has submitted Shoreline specific comments, see Attachment A.

The City has also begun updating our 2012 Comprehensive Plan by reviewing and participating in the completion of the following projects:

**Urban Growth Capacity Study** – This is the new name for the report formerly known as Buildable Lands. The UGCS is underway and will wrap-up mid-2020. The UGCS provides cities and county feedback on accommodating targeted growth in our planned land use patterns. The UGCS answers several questions including:

1. Is development occurring at planned urban densities?
2. How is growth tracking to adopted targets and land use assumptions?
3. Is there adequate land capacity available for anticipated growth in jurisdictions and the UGA?

The UGCS will require staff to evaluate if growth targets are being met, if densities are being achieved, and whether there is enough capacity for the jobs and housing targets. This requires staff to compile data from issued single-family, multifamily, mixed-use, and commercial

permits. Also, staff will evaluate available land for growth to accommodate revised growth targets from King County.

**Growth Targets** – Through the update of the King County Countywide Planning Policies, the County will be allocating growth targets between the 39 cities in King County. The targets originate from PSRC in Vision 2050 and it is King County’s responsibility to distribute those numbers of jobs and housing among the jurisdictions. The City will be responsible for identifying areas with the capacity to accommodate that growth.

**King County Countywide Planning Policies** – The CPPs are currently being revised and will be adopted by 2021. The update of the CPPs will include three new initiatives; the 4:1 program (20% of an owner’s land into the UGA and 80% protected as open space), Urban Growth Capacity Study, and regional affordable housing. It will be staff’s responsibility to review and comment on King County’s proposed CPPs and review the City’s Comprehensive Plan to ensure compliance with the updated CPPs.

**Office of Financial Management Forecasts** – OFM will be updating population forecasts starting in the end of 2021 to mid-2022. Staff will review the forecasts and comment appropriately.

**2023 Comprehensive Plan Update** – The City is required to update the Comprehensive Plan by June 2023. The updated Plan must incorporate the vision and policies of the beforementioned plans of the PSRC, OFM, and King County. The update is scheduled to begin in 2021 with scoping and public participation. Staff will be responsible for review of Vision 2050, Urban Growth Capacity Study, OFM Forecasts, Growth Targets, and King County’s CPPs to ensure the City’s Plan is following the goals and policies of those regional plans.

**Attachment A:** September 3, 2019 Comment Letter to PSRC



SHORELINE  
CITY COUNCIL

Will Hall  
Mayor

Doris McConnell  
Deputy Mayor

Susan Chang

Keith A. McGlashan

Chris Roberts

Betsy Robertson

Keith Scully

September 3, 2019

Erika Harris, SEPA Official  
Puget Sound Regional Council  
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104

Via Email: [VISION2050@psrc.org](mailto:VISION2050@psrc.org)

RE: DRAFT VISION 2050 Comment

To Erika Harris:

The City of Shoreline (“Shoreline”) would like to take this opportunity to convey to PSRC our initial comments in response to Puget Sound Regional Council’s DRAFT VISION 2050. We appreciate the amount of work that has gone into first preparing the SEIS, then the draft vision, and the opportunity for the public to provide input on the vision for the next 30 years on how and where the central Puget Sound region should grow.

VISION 2050 is a shared strategy for how and where the central Puget Sound region can grow to a forecast of 5.8 million people and 3.4 million jobs by the year 2050. Over the next 30 years, the region is forecasted to grow by 1.8 million additional people and 1.2 million new jobs.

The Regional Growth Strategy of VISION 2050 considers how the region can distribute the forecasted growth, primarily within the designated urban growth area, and support development near high-capacity transit in the region. The strategy is a description of a preferred pattern of urban growth that has been designed to minimize environmental impacts, support economic prosperity, advance social equity, promote affordable housing choices, improve mobility, and make efficient use of new and existing infrastructure. VISION 2050 envisions a future where the region:

- Maintains stable urban growth areas.
- Focuses the great majority of new population and employment within urban growth areas.
- Maintains a variety of community types, densities, and sizes.
- Achieves a better balance of jobs and housing across the region.
- Within urban growth areas, focuses growth in cities.
- Within cities, creates and supports centers to serve as concentrations of



jobs, housing, services, and other activities.

- Builds transit-oriented development around existing and planned infrastructure.
- Uses existing infrastructure and new investments efficiently.

The City of Shoreline has taken steps to prepare for the influx of people and jobs over the next 30 years including:

- Planning for two new light-rail stations;
- Allowing a range of housing types and densities within walking distance of high-capacity rail and bus transit;
- Requiring green building construction within our light-rail station areas;
- Requiring affordable housing in our light-rail station areas;
- Creating and implementing a Sustainability Strategy;
- Becoming the first Salmon-Safe certified city in Washington State;
- Creating and implementing a Climate Action Plan;
- Updating the Surface Water Master Plan and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan,
- Creating the Town Center Subarea and the Community Renewal Area at Shoreline Place to create opportunities for live, work, and gathering; and
- Transportation plans and projects that prioritize multi-modal transportation options throughout the city.

After initial review of the draft VISION 2050, the goals and policies of VISION 2050 align with those of the City's Comprehensive Plan, Subarea Plans, Transportation Plan, and development regulations.

VISION 2050 calls for cities and counties to support the building of more diverse housing types, especially near transit, services, and jobs, to ensure all residents can live in thriving urban places. Shoreline supports this by adopting Mixed-Use Residential zones that allow multiple housing types with no prescribed density limits.

VISION 2050 also calls for more housing affordable to low- and very low-income households and Shoreline has required affordability at 70% AMI for rental units in the station areas.

VISION 2050 works to substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions in support of state, regional and local emissions reduction goals and Shoreline has adopted a Sustainability Strategy, Climate Action Plan, set greenhouse gas reduction emission targets, and became Salmon Safe certified that will eventually reduce carbon emissions, provide cleaner surface water, and generally provide a cleaner environment for the residents of Shoreline.

VISION 2050 strives to accommodate growth in urban areas, focused in designated centers and near transit stations, to create healthy, equitable, vibrant communities well - served by infrastructure and services



The following analysis shows how the City of Shoreline’s adopted plans, policies, and development regulations are in line with the Draft VISION 2050.

**Regional Growth Strategy Policies**

*MPP-RGS-7 Attract 65% of the region’s residential and 75% of the region’s employment growth to high capacity transit station areas to realize the multiple public benefits of compact growth around high-capacity transit investments. As jurisdictions plan for growth targets, focus development near high-capacity transit to achieve the regional goal.*

The City adopted the 185<sup>th</sup> Street and 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plans to address land use and transportation needs around the future light-rail stations. The plans are intended to attract a vibrant mix of land uses that offer housing choice, jobs, businesses that serve the neighborhoods, social and recreational opportunities, and community services. The City Council took the bold steps to designate roughly 472 acres around both stations for a mix of townhomes, rowhomes, apartments, office, retail, and community uses that will support Sound Transit’s ridership goals and the City’s commitment to a sustainable future locally and regionally.

**Environment Policies**

*MPP-En-5 Locate development in a manner that minimizes impacts to natural features. Promote the use of innovative environmentally sensitive development practices, including design, materials, construction, and on-going maintenance.*

*MPP-En-6 Use the best information available at all levels of planning, especially scientific information, when establishing and implementing environmental standards established by any level of government.*

*MPP-En-16 Preserve and enhance habitat to support healthy wildlife and accelerate the recovery of salmon, orca, and other threatened and endangered species. (Salmon Safe Certification)*

The City last updated the Critical Areas Ordinance in 2015 and addresses the suitability for development in and near wetlands, steep slopes, streams, shorelines, and wildlife habitat. On Earth Day 2019, the City became the first Salmon-Safe Certified City in Washington State to further reduce pollutants and pesticide use, improve erosion control, conserve water, and install rain gardens and other “green infrastructure” to keep stormwater runoff clean.

**Climate Change Policies**

*MPP-CC-1 Advance state, regional, and local actions that substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions in support of state, regional, and local emissions reduction goals, including targets adopted by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.*



*MPP-CC-2 Reduce building energy use through green building and retrofit of existing buildings.*

The City adopted the Climate Action Plan in September 2013 to place a priority on sustainable land use and building practices, resilience of our natural systems, and reducing the City's carbon footprint. The city requires mandatory green building in the City's two light-rail station areas and has adopted a Deep Green Incentive Program to encourage the construction of green building throughout the City.

### **Development Patterns Policies**

*MPP-DP-1 Develop high-quality, compact urban communities throughout the region's urban growth area that impart a sense of place, preserve local character, provide for mixed uses and choices in housing types, and encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.*

*MPP-DP-3 Enhance existing neighborhoods to provide a high degree of connectivity in the street network to accommodate walking, bicycling, and transit use, and enough public spaces.*

*MPP-DP-16 Promote cooperation and coordination among transportation providers, local government, and developers to ensure that joint- and mixed-use developments are designed to promote and improve physical, mental, and social health and reduce the impacts of climate change on the natural and built environments.*

*MPP-DP-21 Plan for densities that maximize benefits of transit investments in high-capacity transit station areas that are expected to attract significant new population or employment growth.*

The region's existing and planned transit system connects central places throughout the region, providing people access to housing and jobs, and affordable transportation choices. In many cases, transit options connect dense, vibrant urban places that are planned to accommodate more growth. As the transit network expands, suburban communities will also have access to more mobility options, and an opportunity to transform from auto-oriented areas with separated land uses to compact, mixed-use, and walkable neighborhoods.

VISION 2050 encourages focusing growth in these areas and conducting station area planning to maximize benefits. The Aurora Corridor through Shoreline is home to King County Metro's E-Line. The area adjacent to Aurora is designated Mixed-Use and zoned Mixed-Business and Town Center. The Mixed-Business and Town Center 1, 2, and 3 zones are the City's most intense zoning that allows a mix of dense housing and employment centers that can support a wide range of jobs.

The Draft VISION 2050 states that the region's population and employment growth should occur within a quarter to a half-mile from current and planned high-capacity transit station areas, including light rail, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, ferries, and streetcar is consistent with Shoreline's



Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies. Specifically, Land Use Goals and Policies LU11 through LU17 which encourage the development of walkable places with architectural interest that integrate a wide variety of dense walkable communities, retail, office, and service uses.

### **Housing Policies**

*MPP-H-1 Plan for housing supply, forms, and densities to meet the region's current and projected needs consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.*

*MPP-H-2 Provide a range of housing types and choices to meet the housing needs of all income levels and demographic groups within the region.*

*MPP-H-3 Achieve and sustain – through preservation, rehabilitation, and new development – a sufficient supply of housing to meet the needs of low-income, moderate-income, middle-income, and special needs individuals and households that is equitably and rationally distributed throughout the region.*

The City has addressed housing through the Comprehensive Plan and a comprehensive housing strategy that increases affordability and choice within the local housing stock in order to accommodate the needs of a diverse population. The construction of two light rail stations will provide opportunities for increased residential densities within a ½ mile of each station. Since the approval of the light-rail station subarea plans, the city has experienced a noticeable uptick in the amount of single-family attached and townhome units coming to market. In addition, all the housing built within the light-rail station subareas must be built to Built-Green or equivalent standards. The City's housing goals and policies include:

Goal H I: Provide sufficient development capacity to accommodate the 20-year growth forecast and promote other goals, such as creating demand for transit and local businesses through increased residential density along arterials; and improved infrastructure, like sidewalks and stormwater treatment, through redevelopment.

Goal H II: Encourage development of an appropriate mix of housing choices through innovative land use and well-crafted regulations.

Goal H III: Preserve and develop housing throughout the city that addresses the needs of all economic segments of the community, including underserved populations, such as households making less than 30% of Area Median Income.

### **Economy Policies**

*MPP-EC-1 Support economic development activities that help to recruit, retain, expand, or diversify the region's businesses, targeted towards businesses that provide living-wage jobs.*

*MPP-EC-7 Foster a supportive environment for business startups, small businesses, locally owned and women- and minority-owned businesses to help them continue to prosper.*



*MPP-EC-10 Ensure that the region has a high-quality education system that is accessible to all of the region's residents.*

The city has taken steps to support economic development activity that includes creating places for people to shop, live, and gather.

Four specific areas possess the potential to dramatically strengthen the economic vitality of Shoreline. These City-Shaping Areas shall be the focus of concerted Placemaking Projects designed to trigger large-scale redevelopment and growth.

- Strengthen Shoreline's Signature Boulevard – leveraging the city's \$140 million Aurora Corridor Project by facilitating constant investment along its six miles of improved frontage.
- Catalyze Shoreline Place – encouraging intensive private redevelopment of the former Sears center into an exemplary lifestyle destination.
- Ignite Station Area Growth – parlaying the extraordinary public investment that will bring light rail service to Shoreline's two rezoned station areas.

Additional commercial nodes can influence the economic vitality of the surrounding neighborhoods. Placemaking Projects in these Neighborhood Commercial Centers shall seek to create identity, encourage walkability, expand housing options, and provide needed goods and services.

- Shoreline Town Center.
- Echo Lake at Aurora & N 192<sup>nd</sup>.
- North City Business District.
- Four Corners at NW Richmond Beach Rd.
- Downtown Ridgecrest.
- Ballinger Commercial Center.

### **Transportation Policies**

*MPP-T-7 Coordinate state, regional, and local planning efforts for transportation through the Puget Sound Regional Council to develop and operate a highly efficient, multimodal system that supports the Regional Growth Strategy.*

*MPP-T-8 Strategically expand capacity and increase efficiency of the transportation system to move goods, services, and people consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy. Focus on investments that produce the greatest net benefits to people and minimize the environmental impacts of transportation.*

*MPP-T-15 Prioritize investments in transportation facilities and services in the urban growth area that support compact, pedestrian- and transit-oriented densities and development.*





*MPP-T-16 Improve local street patterns – including their design and how they are used – for walking, bicycling, and transit use to enhance communities, connectivity, and physical activity.*

*MPP-T-17 Promote and incorporate bicycle and pedestrian travel as important modes of transportation by providing facilities and reliable connections.*

*MPP-T-18 Promote coordination among transportation providers and local governments to ensure that joint- and mixed-use developments are designed in a way that improves overall mobility and accessibility to and within such development.*

The City updated the Transportation master Plan in 2011 which coordinates transportation improvements with land uses and plans for what is needed to respond to growth. The City's Public Works Department took an approach that designs a system for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists. To implement this approach the City has developed:

- Goals, policies, and implementation strategies that identify how to improve and expand Shoreline's transportation system.
- Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit System Plans that show complete systems for mobility throughout the City.
- Prioritized projects for funding including bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic safety and operations projects.
- Projects needed to accommodate growth over the next twenty years.
- Updated street classifications that match the existing use of the street with the appropriate classification.
- A funding strategy to pay for the identified improvements.
- An updated concurrency standard that ensures adequate transportation facilities will be in place as growth occurs.

In addition, the City is currently working on the following projects that promote walkability, bicycling, and aesthetic improvements to encourage safe connections through higher density, mixed-use development, especially near future light-rail service:

- 145th Street Corridor Study
- 148th Street Non-Motorized Bridge
- 175th Street Corridor Improvements
- 185th Street Multimodal Corridor Strategy (pre-design study)
- Bicycle Plan
- Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program (NTSP)
- Sidewalk Prioritization Plan
- Street Light Program
- Streetlight Master Plan
- Trail Along the Rail Feasibility Study



**Public Services Policies**

*MPP-PS-3 Time and phase services and facilities to guide growth and development in a manner that supports the Regional Growth Strategy.*

*MPP-PS-13 Promote the use of renewable energy resources to meet the region's energy needs.*

Public services are essential to the day-to-day operation of the region, helping make communities safe, healthy, prosperous, and resilient. As the region grows, public services will need to continue to adjust and evolve to meet the region's changing needs. Shoreline has adopted goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan that align with the proposed Public Services Policies including:

Goal CF I: Provide adequate public facilities that address past deficiencies and anticipate the needs of growth through acceptable levels of service, prudent use of fiscal resources, and realistic timelincs.

CF15: Through site selection and design, seek opportunities to minimize the impact of capital facilities on the environment, and whenever possible, include enhancements to the natural environment.

CF26: Plan accordingly so that capital facility improvements needed to meet established level of service standards can be provided by the City or the responsible service providers.

New or expanded public services and infrastructure are needed to support new development. At the same time, existing infrastructure requires ongoing maintenance and upgrading. Using more efficient designs and technologies can curb some of the need for new infrastructure. A commitment to sustainable infrastructure ensures the least possible strain on the region's resources and the environment, while contributing to healthy and prosperous communities.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft VISION 2050.

Rachael E. Markle  
Rachael Markle, AICP, Director  
City of Shoreline Planning & Community Development

9-3-19  
Date