

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

November 19, 2009  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

---

### Commissioners Present

Chair Wagner  
Vice Chair Perkowski  
Commissioner Behrens  
Commissioner Broili  
Commissioner Hall  
Commissioner Kaje  
Commissioner Kuboi  
Commissioner Piro (arrived at 7:14 p.m.)

### Staff Present

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services  
Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services  
Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, Planning & Development Services  
Kirk McKinley, Transportation Services Manager  
Rich Meredith, Traffic Engineer  
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

### Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Pyle

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hall called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:09 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Hall, Vice Chair Wagner and Commissioners Behrens, Broili, Kaje, Kuboi and Perkowski. Commissioner Piro arrived at 7:14 p.m. and Commissioner Pyle was absent.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Commission added "election of a new Commission chair" as an additional item on the agenda. The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

### ELECTION OF COMMISSION CHAIR

In light of his recent election to the City Council, Chair Hall advised that he would resign as Commission Chair effectively immediately, but he would continue to serve on the Commission for the remainder of the year. He said it has been a tremendous honor and privilege to serve on the Planning Commission over the past six years. He has learned a lot and appreciates the support and respect that

each of the Commissioners have offered, as well as the support and respect offered by the public to the Commission. He reminded the Commission that, in the past, the vice chair of the Commission has assumed the role of chair. Vice Chair Wagner indicated she would accept the chair position. She pointed out that the Commission must elect a new vice chair to serve until the Commission's annual election at their first meeting in April. At that time, both the chair and vice chair positions would be up for election. She briefly reviewed the process for nominating Commissioners for the role of vice chair and then opened the floor for nominations.

**COMMISSIONER KUBOI NOMINATED COMMISSIONER PERKOWSKI FOR VICE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, AND COMMISSIONER BROILI NOMINATED COMMISSIONER PIRO. COMMISSIONER BEHRENS NOMINATED COMMISSIONER KAJE. THE MAJORITY OF THE COMMISSIONERS VOTED TO ELECT COMMISSIONER PERKOWSKI AS THE NEW VICE CHAIR OF THE COMMISSION.**

### **DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

Mr. Tovar announced that the City Council would be meeting for the first time in the City Council Chamber of the new City Hall on December 7<sup>th</sup>. The parking facility is still under construction, and they are not sure it will be useable by that date, but it should be completed in time for the Commission's first meeting in January. The Commission's December meetings will be in the Shoreline Conference Center.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of November 5, 2009 were approved as amended.

Chair Wagner recognized the presence of City Councilmembers Eggen and McGlashan.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Laethan Wene, Shoreline**, said he hopes Councilmember Elect Hall will make the effort as a City Councilmember to listen to the people with disabilities and acknowledge what they have to say.

**Dennis Lee, Shoreline**, requested that the public comment periods for the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan and the Point Wells Subarea Plan and Zoning be split so that public comments could directly follow the staff and Planning Commission's discussion of each item. The Commission concurred that would be appropriate.

### **STAFF REPORTS**

#### **Study Session: Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan**

Mr. Cohn reviewed that the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed less than two years ago, and members of the group are available to present their report and recommendation to the Commission. He announced that a public hearing on the draft proposal has been

set for early 2010. In the interim, the public could direct their comments to the Planning Commission in writing.

**Dick Nicholson, Chair of the Ridgecrest Neighborhood Association and Vice Chair of the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea CAC**, advised that he has been a member of the committee since its inception. It has been a great process, and he has learned a lot about his neighborhood. He stated that the Growth Management Act (GMA) mandates the City go through subarea planning processes, which are quite worthwhile for neighborhoods and the community. He recalled that when the City's first comprehensive zoning map was adopted by ordinance (292) on January 7, 2002, several segments were designated as special study areas, the Briarcrest Neighborhood and the southern part of the Ridgecrest Neighborhood (Paramount). Other areas have been included in the study area subsequent to the special designation. He explained that the purpose of the CAC is to work with staff to develop a long-term vision for the subarea that identifies infrastructure priorities, implements appropriate zoning if different than the current zoning, and informs development of code modifications.

Mr. Nicholson said that, for the most part, the two neighborhoods were developed after World War II as part of King County. Because the lots were quite large, the predominant type of development was single-family residential. There are some commercial areas along the major arterials, and each of the neighborhoods has some multi-family zoning. Over the years, the neighborhoods have developed a community spirit and have grown. He pointed out that Lake City Way, 145<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 155<sup>th</sup> are major arterials that bisect the neighborhoods, and they offer transit and other amenities to the community. He briefly reviewed the CAC's subarea plan process as follows:

- Staff toured the neighborhoods with a group of residents in early 2008 to discuss the issues and characteristics the residents considered important.
- An open house was held on March 19, 2008, and the community was invited to attend and discuss a subarea plan process and smart growth principles and to provide their input on concerns and goals for the area. A second community open house was held on May 20, 2008.
- Twenty-three citizens submitted applications for the CAC, and 16 individuals were appointed on June 16, 2008. They now have 13 active members. The members live within the study areas, with the exception of a few who are representing neighborhood associations and/or commissions. There is a considerable amount of diversity of interest and focus amongst the members.
- The CAC held their first meeting on July 15, 2008 where they decided to develop the subarea plan using the same categories of the Comprehensive Plan. They invited experts, including City employees, to several meetings to provide knowledge to benefit the process.
- The CAC began to formulate their recommendations by identifying neighborhood characteristics and the inventory of existing amenities and issues. They created goal and policy recommendations for each categorical element.
- The CAC made a presentation on April 6, 2009 to inform the City Council about the progress achieved to date, and they held an open house on June 16, 2009 to solicit feedback from the community.
- After considering responses and incorporating suggestions from the City Council and residents of the neighborhoods, the CAC came to agreement on the report document and then focused on their most challenging task of finalizing the zoning map.

- After numerous meetings, the CAC approved the plan and zoning map that is currently before the Planning Commission on November 17, 2009.

**Arthur Peach, Director of the Briarcrest Neighborhood Association and Chair of the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea CAC**, said it was a privilege to work with such a diversity of developers, renters and property owners. Their expertise varied and created an array of viewpoints, which helped the CAC attain its goal of creating a document and map through a democratic process to advise the City Council on development. He expressed his belief that the project could not have had any better representation. He noted that, as with any committee, diversity will bring up a multitude of discussions including the following:

- **Third places** (such as a coffee house) should be created in order to provide opportunities for residents of the community to strike up conversations with their neighbor while conducting business.
- **What impacts would come from the density needed to sustain business and how would the impacts alter the neighborhood character and the values set by the committee?** To find an answer, the CAC followed some work done by the Planning Commission on Mixed Use Zoning (MUZ) designation, and they found this concept could create options for the future and maintain or create more jobs. The theory of job creation began with the intention to bring in a flow of commuters against the typical traffic congestion along Lake City Way and 145<sup>th</sup>. The roadway was the focal point of many discussions, and the CAC looked towards a solution to coincide with the roads and not dwell on their problems.
- **What housing choices were the best fit for the neighborhood?** The CAC sought more choices and made recommendations to increase transportation options in the future, including trail and park accessibility. Recommendations for code changes to maintain neighborhood character were also included in the document. The intent is to maintain current housing stock and help meld the technology of today with that of tomorrow.
- **How would the current infrastructure handle the growth that would occur with increased density?** The questions the CAC asked the City staff seemed to offset the fears of overcapacity. Many recommendations were approved by the CAC such as Land Use Policy 1, which states “Establish policies and zoning to provide appropriate transitions between existing and proposed development and to similar land uses to minimize conflicts relating to solar access, noise, and scale, etc.”

Mr. Peach summarized that through rigorous discussions and an ever spinning web of scenarios, the CAC voted that the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan would allow an increase in density to create sustainable business and be capable of supporting future populations for the next 20 years. He advised that the process was long, and the group did their best they could. He thanked the City staff for helping the CAC along the way.

Ms. Redinger explained that at the beginning of the process, the CAC identified goals, purposes, quality of life values, and an inventory of the neighborhoods’ physical, social and environmental characteristics (see Appendix A of the Report). The CAC also created a list of assumptions to identify common ground and where there were divergent opinions from the outset. Lastly, they created policy recommendations to implement the goals, which will eventually be condensed and adopted as part of the City’s

Comprehensive Plan. She reminded the Commission that the CAC used the categories already identified in the Comprehensive Plan, with the exception of capital facilities and utilities which they did not address. Based on direction from the Sustainability Strategy and other City documents, they felt it was also important to include a natural environment category, which is not currently in the City's Comprehensive Plan. She reviewed categories as follows:

- **Land Use.** *To promote smart growth, enhancement of local businesses and amenities, connectivity and transition between uses, and compatibility between potential development and the established residential character of the neighborhood.* Ms. Redinger explained that having previously identified issues currently or potentially affecting the subarea, the CAC was able to differentiate between those whose solution could be supported by additional growth and development and those that could negatively impact the residential quality of life as a consequence of such growth and development.

Ms. Redinger further explained that neighborhood goals of increasing transit service, developing sidewalks and trails, encouraging sustainable development and affordable components, and establishing retail businesses and “third places” could all be positive benefits of increased density. However, concerns over increased population included impacts to traffic, parking, natural environment, stormwater drainage and the high water table, as well as loss of privacy, peace and neighborhood identity.

Ms. Redinger advised that in order to maximize their opportunities and minimize the negative impacts, the CAC came up with goals and policy recommendations. She particularly noted the following:

- Goal 2 would encourage mixed use along transit and commercial corridors.
  - Policy 1 would establish policies in zoning to provide appropriate transitions between existing and proposed development and dissimilar land uses. The CAC talked about both transition zoning such as step downs from areas of higher intensity to the single-family core of the neighborhood, and transition elements such as step backs, setbacks, buffers, etc.
  - Policy 5 would require the City to consider establishing a neighborhood business zone that would be restricted to non-residential uses or some other solution to the problem of retail development being overlooked when residential development on the site yields more profit.
  - Policy 8 would require that the quality of life for current residents of the subarea be considered in decision-making processes that involve new development in the community, even though decisions must also take into account overall land use goals and the economic needs of the City as a whole.
- **Housing.** *To promote housing diversity, affordability and adaptability while respecting and maintaining the identified single-family character of the neighborhoods.* Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that Recommendation 2 under “Housing Choice and Neighborhood Character Strategies” in the Comprehensive Housing Strategy advises to “test changes in the Comprehensive Plan and/or development regulations designed to encourage housing choice through pilot projects in select and limited sites or on a broader scale as a result of a defined neighborhood subarea planning

and design process.” She explained that since adoption of the strategy, the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea CAC is the first to be able to recommend where and how new or revisited housing styles and code changes may be implemented as pilot projects. She noted the CAC spent some time talking about “megahouses” and reached the conclusion that it is better to look at this issue as part of a city-wide process.

Ms. Redinger said the CAC also talked about appropriate infill, and a visual preference survey was conducted. She referred to Pages 10 and 11 of the report, which include pictures of accessory dwelling units and cottage style housing, as well as some multi-family development design features that they liked in the survey. She referred to the housing goals and policies that are identified in the proposed plan and particularly highlighted the following:

- Goal 1 would recognize and continue the area’s history of providing affordable yet diverse housing to a variety of residents across the income spectrum.
  - Goal 4 would increase the housing stock that attracts new families by appealing to a diversity of buyers’ interests including energy efficiency, multi-family/multi-generational/single-family housing options, and the ability to adapt to a family’s changing needs.
  - Policy 1 would require the City review existing policies and City code on accessory dwelling units and home businesses to promote low-impact density.
  - Policy 1 would create incentives to remodel and retrofit the current stock of single-family homes.
  - Policy 4 encourages “green” building through incentives, fees and/or tax policies.
  - Policy 7 involves removing obstacles to adult family homes in residential zoning districts.
- **Transportation. *To promote connectivity, safety, alternative transportation and walkability throughout the subarea’s roadways and trail systems.*** Ms. Redinger said the CAC invited the City’s planners and traffic engineers to discuss the logistics of the road network inside the subarea, as well as the surrounding 145<sup>th</sup> and Lake City Way. Initially, there was a lot of enthusiasm to try and address issues related to 145<sup>th</sup>. However, because the east-bound lanes of 145<sup>th</sup> are in Seattle, the west-bound lanes are in unincorporated King County, and Shoreline’s city limits begin at the northern edge of the right-of-way, the CAC scaled back their ambitions about improvements on the roadway to facilitate better pedestrian access, etc.

Ms. Redinger said the CAC also wanted to promote increased public transit, especially with King County Metro. However, because Metro’s funding comes primarily from sales tax revenue, the existing economic situation has caused a significant budget shortfall. It is hoped that in the future, budget increases would dictate the ebb and flow of transit service. The CAC chose to focus goals and recommendations on improvements to traffic safety, road treatments, and pedestrian and bicycle networks within the City’s jurisdictions. She referred to the proposed transportation goals and policies and particularly highlighted the following:

- Goal 1 is to encourage “walkable” and “bikeable” neighborhoods and intra-area connections through incorporation of pedestrian and bicycle corridors.

- Policy 5 is to encourage the City to work with Seattle, King County, Sound Transit and WSDOT to undertake a corridor study on 145<sup>th</sup> that would result in a plan for the corridor to improve safety, efficiency and modality for all users. The policy states that the plan should include adjacent neighborhoods in the process, and should have a proposed funding strategy for implementation.
- **Parks, Recreation and Open Space.** *To preserve, protect and promote creation of public spaces that balance needs for human recreation, animal habitat and natural vegetative growth.* Ms. Redinger said the CAC understands that the Parks Board governs initial decision-making and approves scheduled updates to the Parks Master Plan, and a Parks Plan CAC is currently being formed to create its own recommendations for the “trail” component of the plan. Therefore, the CAC’s recommendations would be forwarded to those tasked with Park Plan updates. She referred to the proposed parks, recreation and open space goals and policies and highlighted the following:
  - Goal 2 is to encourage development of sidewalks, footpaths, green streets, and signage on existing walkways near trail areas.
  - Goal 3 is to use incentives to encourage development of more open and green space.
  - Policy 1 indicates that as the population increases, the City should establish target metrics for parks space per capita and ensure that parks development and funding keep pace with residential development.
  - Policy 2 states that for large-scale development, a standard should be established for a proportional area of open space created or green space preserved.
- **Economic Development.** *To promote development of businesses that serve needs of local residents, add to vibrancy and socially-oriented identity of neighborhoods and provide jobs.* Ms. Redinger advised that the City’s Economic Development Manager spoke to the CAC, and they incorporated his suggestions into their proposed goals and policies. She referred to the housing goals and policies that are identified in the proposed plan and particularly highlighted the following:
  - Goal 1 is to encourage the creation of community gathering places and nodes (indoor and outdoor) for gathering and social interaction.
  - Goal 2 is to revitalize the local economy by encouraging new business that is beneficial to the community in terms of services, entertainment and employment.
  - Policy 1 calls for encouraging home-based business within the parameters of the residential zoning to encourage employment without adverse impact to neighborhood character.
- **Community Design.** *To encourage well-planned design of systems and appropriate transitions between different uses so that positive impacts of growth are realized and negative impacts may be minimized.* Ms. Redinger explained that over the next 20 years, the CAC envisioned hubs of retail activity where neighbors could gather, leaving their cars in their driveways in favor of walking or biking for errands. They imaged green corridors for wildlife as well-managed habitat for native species of flora and fauna. They wish to maintain their reputation of supporting a diverse population base and providing some of the City’s most affordable housing options. They believe that concentrating on elements of design and articulating standards was an effective method of achieving

their goals. She referred to the proposed community design goals and policies and highlighted the following:

- Goal 3 calls for encouraging planning of local “hubs” for provision of services and gathering places.
  - Policy 1 recommends establishing rules and incentives that ensure developments are planned in ways that are consistent with the community’s vision of three-pronged sustainability (economic, environmental, and social equity).
  - Policy 2 recommends establishing density and zoning regulations and design review processes that are flexible enough to allow for creativity in design but restrictive enough to ensure protection of the community, especially the immediately adjacent neighbors.
- **Natural Environment.** *To provide a healthy and flourishing natural environment for the benefit of both human and wildlife residents, utilizing innovative technology and conservation measures.*  
Ms. Redinger reviewed the following natural environment goals and policies:

- Goal 1 is to create incentives to encourage the use of innovative methods of protecting natural resources such as solar power for lighting outside space, green stormwater conveyance systems, and new recycling options.
- Goal 3 states that when redeveloping a site, the City should encourage the incorporation of measures that improve or complement the community’s natural assets such as its tree canopy, surface water elements, wildlife habitat, and open space.
- Goal 5 urges the City to support the creation of contiguous ecosystems through a designation of “green corridors” as a public/private partnership.
- Goal 9 calls for more accurate mapping of the groundwater system and the locations of covered streams in Ridgecrest and Briarcrest to allow a better understanding of the hydrology of the area and its wetland characteristics.
- Policy 2 calls for retaining and establishing new trees, open spaces and green belts.

Ms. Redinger said that once the CAC felt comfortable with the draft goal and policy recommendations, they moved on to discussing the zoning map, which was the more contentious issue. The initial discussion focused on what percentage of the growth management target for the City would be the subarea’s share. Since the subarea comprises 3% of the City’s total land mass, 3% of the target would be 150 households. The CAC understood the targets are fluid and would probably change and that the subarea would not necessarily be expected to absorb that percentage of growth. The numbers were used as a conceptual framework.

Ms. Redinger advised that the CAC reviewed the MUZ regulations the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council that were later adopted. Their initial concept was more of a mixture of uses rather than mixed-uses in one building. They discussed ways to encourage commercial development and considered the following zoning options:

- MU1 would have had a zoning cap of 12 units per acre and a 35-foot height limit. This would have allowed live/work opportunities, but not large scale residential development.

- MU2 caps density at 48 units per acre and a 35-foot height limit.
- MU3 is basically the same as the recently adopted MUZ zone and provides a full-scale of options based on increasing amenities, affordability, green building, open space, public art, etc.

Ms. Redinger said the CAC was very cognizant of the fact that the subarea plan was meant for the next 20 years. They recognized that many things would change in that time period. By 2029 there will likely be a light-rail stop near 145<sup>th</sup> and Interstate 5, and new automotive technology may have transformed the feeling, design and perhaps even the necessity of cars. They understand that successive generations may have different preferences for building and neighborhood design and amenities, new technologies may spur new industry, and the job base and commercial districts will likely grow and evolve. She summarized that while contemplating how to incorporate the uncertainties into the long-range vision for the subarea, the CAC also focused on the aspects of the neighborhood they want to preserve such as the single-family character, friendly atmosphere and natural amenities. The goal of the CAC was to attempt to control inevitable change and use it to gain amenities and improvements they seek but keep it from negatively affecting the quality of life they treasure and the character of the neighborhoods that they call home.

Mr. Cohn explained that while the CAC has recommended the proposed goals and policies and zoning map, the Planning Commission would be responsible for making a recommendation regarding implementing the zoning map via a legislative rezone process. He referred the Commission to the current Comprehensive Plan map and noted that the majority of the subject properties are identified as special study areas with no specific land use designation. However, there is a specific land use designation of mixed use for the property located at the corner of 145<sup>th</sup> and Lake City Way. There is also an area across from the Fircrest site that is designated in the Comprehensive Plan as mixed used. He provided a zoning map to illustrate the proposed zoning. He advised that using the new MU2 and MU3 zones, the CAC has specifically defined how the transition should occur from the more intense uses on 15<sup>th</sup>, 145<sup>th</sup> and Lake City Way to the less intense uses. He reviewed several maps to specifically illustrate how the transitions would work. He emphasized that no new commercial zones are recommended. The current commercial zones are used as the base, and the plan identifies specifically what the intensity in each of the commercial zones should be.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that this is the first neighborhood plan to be created in the City of Shoreline and is a good example of how urban planning and design should start at the neighborhood level. It is a great document, and he hopes they plan to keep it evolutionary so it can continue to grow and improve.

Commissioner Behrens thanked the participants on the CAC for their efforts, which shows the spirit that makes Shoreline a good City. He said the proposed plan speaks volumes to the participants' character.

Commissioner Kaje pointed out that the City may also go through a similar subarea planning process for other parts of the City. He asked Mr. Peach and Mr. Nicholson to provide input about what worked well and what could be improved. Mr. Nicholson said he believes the process was good, but he suggested it could be condensed so they don't lose volunteers along the way. Mr. Peach expressed his belief that allowing community involvement in the process is very important and empowers the citizens.

Commissioner Kaje pointed out that the complex issues on 145<sup>th</sup> will play an important role in defining the potential the area can have. He asked what kind of reaction or response the CAC received from the City Council about when the City would start to deal with issues related to 145<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Peach answered that the jurisdictional issues on 145<sup>th</sup>, as well as the current economic climate, make it difficult to start conversations about potential improvements at this time. He expressed his hope that all jurisdictions would carefully consider the issues in the near future in conjunction with the proposed new light-rail station that is proposed just north of 145<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Nicholson said the CAC had an extensive discussion about 145<sup>th</sup> (setbacks, curb cuts, inadequacy of transit, safety issues, etc.). However, their ability to address the issues is limited by the fact that it is a multi-jurisdictional state route. He noted the CAC felt there is currently inadequate east/west transit and they would like to see improvement in the future, but they acknowledged the City's limitations to dictate how the route should be improved.

Commissioner Piro asked if the CAC would have a role in creating a process for implementing and monitoring the plan. Ms. Redinger said the CAC was asked to provide clear direction in the form of policy recommendations, but not to get into specific code language. Once the plan is in its final form, the Planning Commission would consider specific code language to implement the goals and policies. She referred to Appendix C of the draft proposal, which outlines the process identified in the Sustainability Strategy for implementing goals and policies, setting baselines, and tracking progress based on household proximity to parks, bus stops and commercial districts. She referred to the chart on Page 33 of the draft report, which identifies a baseline measurement for each of these areas. When the baseline measurements are considered again within the context of the sustainability strategy, the City can zero in on the neighborhood and see which direction they are headed. Otherwise, it is a matter of waiting for the economy to recover and see if the development opportunities envisioned in the plan become a reality.

Commissioner Piro said the proposed plan is an impressive piece of work. It is good to see they are looking at not only coming up with a nice plan, but how to make sure it is successful and helps form and shape the community in the future.

Chair Wagner recommended the Commission specifically reach out to the members of the CAC when they move forward with the next phase of implementing the subarea plan in 2010. Ms. Redinger agreed that the members should be invited to participate in the remainder of the process. Commissioner Hall said it will be important for the Commission to gain an understanding of how the committee tried to balance the issues that were controversial. He said he recognizes how much effort was required by the participants to complete their task.

Commissioner Kuboi requested clarification about the term "social equity," which was used in the report. Bill Bear said the actual term is social capital, and it was developed in part by Robert Putnam in his book, "Bowling Alone," which talked about the general decline of connection and trust in community. What we have today are people who live next to each other, but don't know their neighbors' names. The consequences of this can be anything from increased crime to more problems with health, to a decrease in the economy. When there is a lack of trust in the community, people don't invest in each other or in the public process. The CAC wants to make sure the neighborhoods in the subarea would not follow the social theory that the closer people are physically the further apart they are

socially. This will take some work, and concepts such as “third places” must be part of how a community adds density without causing harm.

The Commission emphasized that this meeting is a study session and not a public hearing. Mr. Tovar said members of the CAC are present to present information related to the minority report that was prepared by some members of the group. He suggested that this feedback should be considered part of the CAC’s presentation rather than public comment. He urged the Commission to limit comments from other members of the public in light of their full agenda. He explained that while a study session is a public meeting, a public hearing is advertised and citizens are specifically invited to share their input. He noted a public hearing on the proposed subarea plan proposal is scheduled for January. The primary purpose of the study session is to explain the CAC’s recommendation and allow the Commission an opportunity to ask questions.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Dennis Lee, Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea CAC Member**, referred to the minority report, which represents the viewpoint of five of the CAC members. He explained that there was consensus throughout the process of creating goals and policies for the subarea. However, some members of the group believe the zoning map was done piecemeal and is not consistent with the goals and policies outlined in the CAC’s report. He explained that the group of CAC members who did not recommend approval of the zoning map would present their viewpoint to the public and solicit feedback from their neighbors regarding possible alternatives.

Mr. Lee expressed concern that once a commercial property is developed as residential, it will not likely ever go back to a commercial use. While the current popular meaning of mixed-use development is an apartment or condominium development with retail uses on the ground floor, there is a range of businesses that do not fit into that model. Space for these businesses needs to be preserved for the next 20 years, and the intent of the proposed MU1 zone was to concentrate the increased density into a specific area and leave the rest of the area for commercial development that creates jobs. The minority group is concerned that when the City goes through their Comprehensive Plan review process they will focus their discussions on density rather than job growth, which is also important.

**Bill Bear, Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea CAC Member**, observed that before he was appointed to serve on the CAC, he would have characterized himself as a person who was opposed to density on general principles. However, throughout the course of his work on the CAC, he changed his mind to understand that density can work if it is planned and done right. He thinks of the City as a living organism that has to have all the components necessary for life. Every time a living organism gets out of balance, they typically call it a disease or cancer. He said he was initially impressed and enthused about the draft plan, but it seems that the plan was thrown out when the zoning map was created. He expressed his belief that the proposed zoning map shows more housing units than the neighborhood could handle. He noted that 500 additional units would be allowed at the corner of Lake City Way, 132<sup>nd</sup> and 149<sup>th</sup>. If the subarea plan is to be a model for other parts of the City, they must do better than a 7 to 5 approval. They need a higher rate of consensus.

Commissioner Behrens asked how Mr. Bear's group came up with the number of 500 additional units for the property that is located at the corner of Lake City Way, 132<sup>nd</sup> and 149<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Bear explained that the zoning map was actually approved without having final numbers. However, the assumption is that if every property developed to the maximum level possible in the MU3 zone, it would result in approximately 500 additional units. Ms. Redinger said the CAC asked for the potential number of additional households that would result under maximum build out of the proposed zoning, and staff came up with three numbers they felt were important: the number of current households on the ground, the number of households that would be on the ground if the current zoning was built, and the number of households that could be on the ground if the proposed zoning was built out. The big jump is between the number of houses on the ground now and the number of houses that could be on the ground if the current zoning was built out, and there was another jump to what it could be if it was built out under the proposed zoning. When gauging the portion of what might be developed out of the potential high end number, staff looked at North City where the plan called for 20 years of growth at the capacity for 900 additional units, but only 100 of the units have been built over the past 10 years. There is no way to tell what the actual number would be, but some members of the CAC are concerned about the potential number of additional units that would be allowed if every lot were redeveloped at its maximum density.

Commissioner Broili said he sees the process as just the beginning of an evolutionary, adaptive process, and the work has just begun. He suggested the next phase will be refinement and further work on the zoning map, itself, so it becomes a document that more members of the CAC can support.

### **Study Session: Point Wells Subarea Plan and Zoning**

Commissioner Hall advised that the City of Shoreline has filed an appeal with the Growth Management Hearings Board against Snohomish County. He said that because he is an employee of Snohomish County, he would continue to recuse himself from the deliberations on the Point Wells Subarea Plan and Pre-Annexation Zoning proposal. He left the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. McKinley advised that he and Mr. Meredith were present to provide a brief traffic analysis associated with the Point Wells Subarea Plan and answer the Commission's questions. He advised that the Mr. Meredith did a thorough review of the work that was performed for Snohomish County's Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) related to Point Wells to see how the proposed land use designation would impact the Richmond Beach corridor, as well as the entire western portion of the City. He emphasized that staff was very interested in determining at what point the traffic coming from Point Wells would cause mitigation, congestion and safety problems that would be very difficult to overcome.

Mr. McKinley said that in his traffic analysis, Mr. Meredith reviewed capacity, safety and collision data, and noted gaps in the pedestrian system along the corridor to come up with a list of mitigation projects as a starting point. In addition to this preliminary list of mitigations, staff is recommending the developer be required to do a more in-depth and detailed traffic analysis and pay for and work with staff and the public to complete a corridor study that would consider the different options and how the traffic, safety and capacity issues could be mitigated.

Mr. Meredith referred to memos he provided to the Commission that were included in the City's response to Snohomish County's SEIS. He explained that he reviewed the traffic model that was used in the County's SEIS and changed some of the assumptions about the dispersion rate of traffic leaving Point Wells and arriving at Aurora Avenue North, which is the major north/south connector. The County's SEIS indicated that most of the traffic would disperse before it got to Aurora Avenue North, but the City's goal would be to manage the traffic as much as possible to keep it on major arterials such as Aurora Avenue North, which is where most of the City's capacity improvements are being constructed. The County's SEIS also showed a higher percentage of traffic going north instead of south; but if the Point Wells development has a lot of residential units, more of the jobs are likely to occur to the south and east.

Mr. Meredith explained that a lot of assumptions and variables go into figuring out how many trips a development can generate, and a mix of residential, commercial and retail has been proposed for the subject property. Instead of trying to explicitly define development scenarios, staff analyzed the impacts of a certain number of trips generated by the development in the PM peak hours. He felt it would be more efficient to place a cap on the number of trips the site could generate, and let the developer figure out the appropriate mix of residential and commercial uses. He noted there would be quite a difference in how the traffic moves in and out of the site morning and afternoon, but the impacts seem to be greater to the system during the afternoon. Therefore, they focused their study on afternoon trips. When a corridor study and a more detailed model are done, they will also need to include the AM peak hour trips.

Mr. Meredith said the Commission asked why staff used the average daily traffic instead of the level of service. He referred to the charts and noted that staff looked at both. The peak hour volumes were used to model the different scenarios, but all of the comparisons show what the level of service would be at the intersection as a whole and on the approach at each leg of the intersection. Chair Wagner said she raised this question because it appeared the staff had made some assumptions that if you send too many cars through, some of the intersections would fail. She asked if the assumptions included mitigation efforts. Mr. Meredith responded that some of the proposed mitigation is rolled into the model. For example, the model assumes that Aurora Avenue North was built out and that new traffic signals had been installed. He explained that as he developed each scenario, he dispersed all of the traffic at the intersections and optimized all of the traffic signal timings. He cautioned that, with some work, the operation at some of the intersections could be improved. The model was provided as a starting point for comparison purposes.

Mr. Meredith said a Commissioner questioned why the study stopped at Aurora Avenue North. He explained that the SEIS from Snohomish County stopped at Aurora Avenue North. However, with a little more work, the corridor study could be extended to Meridian Avenue, and some of the City's other studies have explored traffic diversion around Meridian and Fremont Avenues. Commissioner Piro said his understanding is the corridor would be 175<sup>th</sup> and Interstate 5 to Point Wells, and he would be interested in seeing what is happening throughout the entire area. He agreed the Commission should extend the study to the east to include Meridian Avenue.

Commissioner Behrens asked if the study reflects the traffic model that would occur due to the light rail station that has been proposed at 185<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Meredith answered that it did not. He explained that the timing was not conducive to including the station into the model. He agreed it should be included in the more detailed corridor study because it could have a dramatic impact on the traffic on 185<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Kaje observed that the intersection at 185<sup>th</sup> and Linden Avenue seems to improve in its level of service in nearly all of the scenarios. He asked if this is assuming full implementation of the Aurora Corridor Project plus additional mitigation. Mr. Meredith advised that this intersection was problematic in the model. The model shows that it is operating at a fairly high level of service, but sometimes models do not accurately reflect the traffic backups from adjacent signals. This intersection is closely tied into Aurora Avenue North, which made it hard to optimize and coordinate it with Aurora Avenue North and Fremont Avenue. He summarized that this issue needs to be worked out with a more detailed model. As more traffic comes through the corridor, it will become more difficult to coordinate the signals in this area.

Commissioner Behrens asked if the traffic model took into account the specific impacts associated with the summer season when visitors are coming to and from the new park that is proposed at Point Wells along the waterfront. Mr. Meredith said the model only considered the typical PM peak hour movements. Commissioner Behrens observed that if they are going to build an attractive new park in the area, it would likely draw a significant number of visitors, and the model should take this into account. Mr. Meredith agreed this could be included in the model by determining the appropriate number of cars within a given hour. He agreed there might be some congestion on nice days in the summer. This is an issue they should keep in mind as the site develops, but the model did not consider special events.

To answer to the Commission's previous question, Mr. Meredith said two projects are identified in the current Capital Improvement Plan: the corridor study and improvements at the intersection of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Richmond Beach Road. While both of the projects are unfunded at the moment, the intersection at 3<sup>rd</sup> is a high-collision rate intersection, and the City has a definite desire to make improvements there.

Mr. McKinley advised that Sound Transit's original Sound Move Program that was approved by voters in 1996 and 1997 identified three potential commuter rail station locations from Point Wells to Salt Water Park and an environmental analysis was done for each of the three locations. The City Council was invited to weigh in on the issue, and they voted to eliminate Saltwater Park and retained the other two as potential station locations. These two stations are still included in Sound Transit's plans, but they are not funded as part of the 20-year plan. Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) has responded that their property is off limits.

Commissioner Broili asked Mr. Meredith to clarify the definition for the term "built out." He observed that each generation has a different view of what "built out" is. As populations grown, the City's definition of "built out" will change, as well. Mr. Meredith said when he used the term "built out" he was talking from a traffic standpoint about the widening of Aurora Avenue North. Construction for the second mile is starting in January and will be closely followed by the third mile. He explained that it is difficult to get funding to add lanes and capacity to roadways since most of the funding goes to multi-

modal projects. As he looks to the future, he does not see the City being able to widen Aurora Avenue North more than what they have already planned.

Commissioner Broili agreed that Aurora Avenue North will probably be built out in terms of present day thoughts about traffic, but it is important to keep in mind that this will change in the future. Future plans should be as flexible as possible so the City can meet new demands as they arise. Mr. McKinley said the staff's goal in transportation planning is to provide for every type of user and to look to the future so they are not reliant on a single method of getting around. Even though the fuel types for powering single vehicles may change, he said he believes they will still have single vehicles and they will still need the space to move them. One aspect of the Aurora Corridor Project is to offer transit a competitive advantage over people in single cars. There is an exclusive lane for buses, and they can manipulate the signals to keep their speed and reliability up. The more the City can do to increase other modes of transportation, the further they can stretch their limited resources (roads).

Commissioner Piro asked staff to explain how the worst case scenario would impact the City's concurrency ordinance. He observed that there are a variety of ways to address concurrency issues. They can choose to make the necessary adjustments to live with the lower level of service, make investments to improve the level of service, or revisit their land-use assumptions. He recognized it can be challenging to deal with concurrency in an inter-jurisdictional capacity, particularly when revisiting the land use assumptions. He questioned how development of Point Wells to its full capacity would impact the City's potential for development opportunities elsewhere. Mr. Meredith reminded the Commission that the City is in the process of updating their Transportation Master Plan, and how they measure their concurrency will be one of the chief topics. Whatever they decide about how concurrency will be measured and treated will feed back into whatever the City does for Point Wells. He summarized that staff is trying to make the concurrency issue more clear not only for Point Wells, but for development elsewhere in Shoreline. Commissioner Piro said it would be helpful for staff to provide examples of other development in the City that have triggered a concurrency situation. Mr. Meredith said the concurrency issue has come up with some master plan proposals, and staff could provide some examples at a future meeting.

Commissioner Kaje asked staff to provide information regarding the incremental difference in peak PM traffic between what currently exists and what would occur as a result of the most intense development scenario for Point Wells. He said it would be helpful to have the actual 2007 base numbers. He observed that the differences would vary depending on the intersection. For example, near the beach there could be a huge proportional impact on a specific intersection and closer to Aurora Avenue North there is already a very large area that is funneling through the intersection. Mr. Meredith said he would try to put together a chart to identify the base volumes. He said he believes there are about 50 cars during the peak PM hour on Richmond Beach Drive, so adding 550 trips would result in a significant increase. A maximum build out could result in up to 825 PM peak hour trips.

Vice Chair Perkowski asked about the assumptions related to train traffic interference. Mr. Meredith said the assumption is there would be no delays caused by trains. He said the model assumes today's conditions, with some of the mitigation they talked about and the Aurora Avenue North improvements. The roadway does not cross the train tracks at this time. Mr. McKinley pointed out that there is a bridge

over the tracks at Point Wells, and the assumption is that the Point Wells developer would provide whatever access over the tracks is necessary.

Commissioner Behrens said average citizens are interested in knowing how long they could get stuck at an intersection. When the current vehicle trips are compared to what is projected, it is important to identify the expected delay. Mr. Meredith noted the analysis also identifies how the travel times within the corridor would change.

Commissioner Piro said it would be valuable to have a more descriptive analysis of the character of the corridor from 175<sup>th</sup> and Interstate 5 to Point Wells so it could be compared to other areas within the region. He asked staff to share examples to compare the proposed type of evolving high-intensity development with other places around the region that may be significantly far removed from a major transportation network. He said he would be particularly interested in the length of the other corridors and their proximity to transit service.

Commissioner Broili observed that the corridor from Point Wells to Aurora Avenue North is already a developing area. As the population and traffic continues to grow, businesses are going to continue to grow, as well. The character of the whole corridor will change rather dramatically in specific places. He said he would like staff to address this growth in their analysis. He observed there are other examples of similar causeways going down to beach areas off of main thoroughfares that could be used as examples of how they have developed over time. This may give some idea of what the future holds.

Commissioner Broili disagreed with staff's assumption that the train would not likely stop at Point Wells. He expressed his belief that as traffic and population continues to grow, there will be an opportunity for the train to serve a north/south corridor that will take some of the pressure off of Aurora Avenue North and Interstate 5. He cautioned not to eliminate a stop at Point Wells as a possibility in the future. Mr. Meredith agreed there would probably be a train station at Point Wells at some point. However, there are no plans for the train stop within the timeframe of the model. Again, Commissioner Broili said it is important to keep this stop in mind as they plan for Point Wells.

Mr. Tovar referred to written comments staff received from the Commission since their last discussion about Point Wells. He said staff is working to gather the additional information requested by the Commission, which would be included in the Commission's December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting packet. He cautioned that some of the questions the Commissioners have raised are longer-range and won't be answered within the next month. Instead, they will be addressed as part of the citywide Transportation Master Plan update.

Commissioner Kaje reminded staff that they indicated they would answer some of the Commission's questions at the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. He specifically requested staff feedback for the following questions:

- **Question 17.** Do they need flow control when discharging into receiving water? Mr. Tovar answered that they do not.

- **Question 18.** Have infrastructure issues such as sewer and water been reviewed in terms of existing capacity? Mr. Tovar said he does not have a detailed answer for this question. Intuitively, the answer is yes, capacity is there. However, he would like to be able to cite language from the County's SEIS to support this answer.
- **Question 20.** Could the contaminated soils be transported from the site by barge or would it have to be carted out by train or by trucks through the City of Shoreline. Mr. Tovar said staff could ask the State for clarification, but it is highly unlikely that transporting by barge would be permitted. He said he is not optimistic that BNSF would grant permission to remove the contaminated soil by rail, either. He said this specific issue would be addressed at the time a permit is reviewed, and staff does not currently have an answer for how much would have to be removed and how much could be treated on site. Chair Wagner observed that there are numerous regulations for dealing with contaminated soil.
- **Question 4.** Questions were raised about Site and Development Standard C regarding minimum separation of tall buildings. Staff indicated they would prepare a graphic to illustrate the concept further. Mr. Tovar advised that Chair Wagner prepared a graphic that would be included in the Commission's next packet.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Les Nelson, Shoreline**, said he hasn't heard much about the issue of water supply. He noted he has worked for Seattle Public Utilities in water supply for the past 30 years. He explained that, typically, lowland areas are served by pressure reducing stations. Once a pressure reducing station has been installed, not only is the pressure reduced, but the flow is restricted. He questioned how the City would get adequate fire flow to serve the anticipated development of the Point Wells site. He recalled previous planning efforts in the City that eventually failed because there was not enough water pressure to serve the area. Mr. Nelson said the November 19<sup>th</sup> edition of the *Daily Journal of Commerce* contains an article regarding retail spaces. Mr. Tovar said that before the Commission's December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, staff would seek written communication from Seattle Public Utilities and the Olympic View Water District to address Mr. Nelson's concerns related to adequate water pressure to serve Point Wells.

Commissioner Behrens questioned what impacts staff foresees to the Ronald Wastewater System if the proposed project goes forward. He also questioned who would be responsible for paying for the additional wastewater service that would be required to accommodate the development. Mr. Tovar agreed to seek written communication from the Ronald Wastewater District before the December 3<sup>rd</sup> public hearing, as well. Commissioner Behrens observed that it is difficult to know what the water and sewer supply demand will be until they know the type of development that will be constructed. Mr. Tovar agreed and said that when seeking feedback from the providers, staff would use the information in the SEIS that estimates the approximate maximum number of units to determine the anticipated demand for both water and sewer.

Chair Wagner advised that a public hearing on the Point Wells Subarea Plan and Zoning has been scheduled for December 3<sup>rd</sup>. She encouraged the Commissioners to forward their additional questions to staff as soon as possible. It was noted that the packet may be delayed because of the upcoming holiday weekend.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Tovar announced that the City filed a petition for review with the Growth Management Hearings Board against Snohomish County's designation of Point Wells as an Urban Center. The Town of Woodway and the Richmond Beach Community Association also filed a petition for review against the same action. All three petitions would be considered at a preliminary pre-hearing conference on December 7<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m. at the Shoreline Fire Department Training Station Headquarters on Aurora Avenue North. It will be a public meeting, but not a public hearing. The only people who will be talking to the Growth Hearings Board will be the Attorneys representing the three appellants, the County and the property owner (Paramount). The topic of discussion at the pre-hearing conference will be the issues that are to be briefed, argued and decided, as well as a schedule for moving forward. Another issue that could come up at or prior to the pre-hearing will be a joint stipulation by all the parties for a settlement extension of up to six months to give the parties an opportunity to negotiate some resolution short of requiring a decision by the Hearings Board. If the extension is approved, the court could issue a stay on all the proceedings for a specific period of time.

Mr. Tovar said one of the values of the proposed subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning is to figure out what the policies and regulations should be from the perspective of the City of Shoreline. This has been done at the direction of the City Council, and it may or may not have direct application. If the property is annexed into the City of Shoreline at some point in the future, the adopted plans and regulations would apply. In the meantime, the subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning would be the basis for future discussions with all parties about what it might take to settle the litigation. The proposal will identify those things the City of Shoreline believes are important to include in future development requirements for Point Wells, even if it is developed as part of Snohomish County.

Mr. Tovar recalled that at a previous meeting, the Commission discussed how *CURRENTS* could be used to increase the profile of the Planning Commission and their work program. They expressed a desire to provide early notification to the public as to what issues the Commission will be working on. In response to the letter the Commission sent to the City Manager, Mr. Tovar announced that the first quarterly announcement from the Planning Commission would be published in the January edition of *CURRENTS*. Staff would forward a draft of the proposed article to the Commission for comments and suggestions before it is sent forward for publication.

Chair Wagner inquired if the article would include information about upcoming Commission vacancies. Mr. Tovar said announcements are not typically published until a vacancy has occurred. He noted that one vacancy would occur in January, and at least two more in March. Staff suggests it would be better to advertise all of the positions at the same time for an unspecified number of vacancies. The announcement could go out in January and the recruitment process could start shortly thereafter.

Chair Wagner inquired when the Commission would meet jointly with the Parks Board to discuss the tree regulations. Mr. Cohn said the joint meeting has not yet been scheduled. He advised that staff wanted to work more on the tree code prior to the joint meeting.

It was noted that the regular meeting of December 17<sup>th</sup> was cancelled.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business scheduled on the agenda.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

No new business was scheduled on the agenda.

## **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Commissioner Broili reported the he and Commissioner Pyle attended the American Planning Association Conference. He said he was encouraged that much of the conference focused on green building, sustainable design, triple bottom line, etc. He was also encouraged to see that this was the prime focus of all of the state and local municipalities. He said Michael Shadow, a Seattle-based speech coach, spoke about how to communicate with the public and each other to put forward ideas and support propositions. Because the Commission could use some improvement in that area, he suggested they invite him to speak to them about how they can reach out to their constituency in a more productive way.

## **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Cohn announced that a public hearing for the Point Wells Subarea Plan and Pre-Annexation Zoning has been scheduled for December 3<sup>rd</sup>.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

---

Michelle Linders Wagner  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith  
Clerk, Planning Commission