

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
(Via Zoom)

January 20, 2022
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present

Chair Pam Sager
Commissioner Janelle Callahan
Commissioner Andy Galuska
Commissioner Mei-shiou Lin
Commissioner Jack Malek¹

Staff Present

Rachel Markle, Planning Director
Andrew Bauer, Planning Manager
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Julius Rwamashongye (excused)

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Ms. Hoekzema called the roll.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 6, 2022 Planning Commission meeting were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Rebecca Jones, previous resident of Shoreline, encouraged the Planning Commission in its role in revising the Tree Code and commented on current environmental issues. She noted the Pacific

¹ Commissioner Malek arrived at approximately 7:04 p.m.

Northwest is part of a carbon sink and spoke to the importance of preserving large, established trees so this can continue.

STUDY ITEM: MUR70' Development Code Amendments

Planning Manager Bauer made the PowerPoint presentation following up on the Planning Commission's direction at a prior meeting for staff to look into further parking reductions and options for increased height and development agreement thresholds.

Parking

The proposed amendments would allow up to a maximum of 50% parking reduction in the MUR70' zone for developments of 100+ dwelling units or a minimum 10,000 square feet of commercial with a condition that a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan be prepared and provided by the applicant. TDM examples may include things like bikeshare/carshare, free or reduced cost transit passes, enhanced bike facilities, wayfinding, and communications on non-vehicle trip options. A list of TDM strategies would be maintained by the Director and should advance city goals and be updated regularly to respond to trends. Mr. Bauer reviewed a hypothetical comparison of parking requirements for nearby jurisdictions.

Summary of Parking Alternatives:

1. Reduction up to 50% with TDM
2. Reduction more than 25%, less than 50% TDM
3. No reductions beyond existing (25%)

Height Allowances

Mr. Bauer reviewed a table summarizing existing and proposed height allowances in the MUR70' zone. The proposed base would be 80' (not to exceed 7 stories) with various height allowance incentives when significant trees are retained.

Development Agreement

A development agreement is required to achieve the maximum height. It is a legislative decision made by the City Council and includes a Planning Commission hearing and recommendation. This can add a significant amount of time and uncertainty to the process. Existing and proposed development agreement requirements were reviewed.

- Proposed requirements retain the 20% affordable units at 60% AMI (Area Median Income) and would be required on heights over 90'.
- The LEED Gold requirement would be removed and replaced with a requirement to be Built Green 4-Star or better.
- The requirement for 90% of parking to be in the structure is proposed to be removed with design standards addressing surface parking.

- The proposed requirements would remove the requirement for developers to purchase TDR (Transfer of Development Right) credits with a caveat that it may be brought back into the requirements in the future.
- The requirement to provide park space dedication to accommodate residents would be revised to require that publicly accessible park, plaza, or open space would be provided.
- The requirement to require combined heat and power infrastructure or district energy is proposed to be removed as it is unlikely to be provided.
- The requirement that 40,000 square feet of commercial space be provided would be revised to 10,000 square feet and that it be moved to be one of two potential requirements to achieve the 100' step.
- The requirement that 30% of ground floor area for neighborhood amenities is proposed to be moved to be one of two potential requirements to achieve the 100' step.
- The requirement that 2% of construction valuation be paid to fund parks is proposed to be revised to require that 1% be provided for art or placemaking amenities.
- Off-site frontage improvements to connect development to transit, commercial uses, etc. would be expanded to include utility infrastructure and other amenities such as wayfinding, transit enhancements, etc.

To achieve 100' Building Height: 20% of units would need to be affordable at 60% AMI and one of the following: 10,000 square feet of commercial space or 30% ground floor devoted to neighborhood amenities (nonprofit office space, eating and drinking establishments, or other space available for community functions).

To achieve 140' Building Height: This would require all the requirements to achieve 100' plus the following: include park, plaza, or open space; 1% to art or placemaking amenities; and subarea improvements (utilities, off site frontage, wayfinding, transit stop enhancements, etc.).

Summary of Height and Development Agreement Alternatives:

1. Increase base height to 80', establish 100' without development agreement and 140' with development agreement
2. Increase base to 80', 10+ stories require development agreement with revised requirements
3. Increase base to 80', all other heights and development agreements remain as-is

Commission Discussion:

Parking Requirements

Commissioner Malek spoke to the importance of parking reductions but expressed concern about consequences of under parking – having parking requirements that are too low. Planning Manager Bauer explained that the developer/property owner will have to monitor their parking levels with the TDM plans. He acknowledged that parking will always be a moving target, but the City has been collecting regular on-street parking data ahead of the station's opening. Commissioner Malek brought up The Emerald development in Seattle whose goal was to provide no parking at all and instead provide car sharing. Eventually they ended up buying surplus parking from adjacent buildings. He spoke in support

of having the lower parking requirements but expressed some caution and a desire to keep studying this issue.

Commissioner Lin concurred with Commissioner Malek's concern for balance. She asked for some clarification about the comparison with other cities. Mr. Bauer responded.

Commissioner Callahan commended staff for their work on these reductions. She asked about the possibility of allowing a greater reduction of 60% or 65% if there is car sharing on site.

Commissioner Lin also thanked staff for their great work. She asked about the process of updating the TDM in the future. Mr. Bauer explained that each TDM would be unique as it would be specific to the development. A preferred list of TDM strategies is something that would be compiled and kept current by staff; it would not need to go through a code amendment process.

Chair Sager commented that people who know they can get by with no car or with car sharing would gravitate toward these types of places. She spoke in support of the reductions up to 50% with the TDM.

There was unanimous support to consider Parking Alternative 1: Reduction up to 50% with TDM.

Height and Development Agreement Alternatives

Commissioner Callahan asked for examples of existing building heights in Shoreline. Mr. Bauer discussed some examples of building heights. Commissioner Callahan expressed an interest in visuals at a future meeting.

Commissioner Lin asked for clarification about how the proposed development agreement amendments would "close the financial gap" as referenced by FCS Group. Mr. Bauer broadly reviewed the consultant's findings as outlined in their analysis of how to make high rise construction more financially feasible in Shoreline.

Commissioner Malek recalled discussion surrounding reducing or eliminating some of the impact fees, especially traffic impact fees. He suggested that they might want to discuss this again as a way to mitigate that financial gap. He noted that Mountlake Terrace, which is a smaller jurisdiction, has a standard of 12 stories. He commented that the height is what is needed to get density into the area without destroying the suburban aspect. He spoke in support of allowing the higher heights. He commented on cross-laminated timber (CLT) as a new material which could also help bridge the gap. He doesn't agree with developer agreements and thinks they stand in the way of progress. It is an unnecessary step and adds to the amount of time it takes to get permitted. This is a huge cost for developers. He recommended establishing the code for the height they want in the areas they want and allowing developers to follow it. This provides certainty for the builders. As a benefit the higher heights will help to preserve trees and the suburban areas.

Commissioner Galuska suggested requiring "retail" instead of "commercial" as one of the conditions for the higher heights. He also recommended being more specific with the language around affordability to encourage lower cost larger units for family housing. Mr. Bauer agreed and clarified that the AMI would

be adjusted for family size and unit mix. Commissioner Galuska spoke in support of having 80' as the base. He doesn't know if they would see anything higher than that anyway. He commented that CLT should be allowed under current development code.

Commissioner Callahan asked for clarification about the purpose of a development agreement. Mr. Bauer explained it would provide a way for a developer to get to 140' via a list of additional requirements and, sometimes, public benefits and a phased timeline. Commissioner Malek commented he is not completely opposed to development agreements, especially for commercial developments, but for more dense housing he thinks it can be built into the code and eliminate the delay in time that development agreements take. Because of the times we are in everyone is short-staffed and everything takes longer anyway. He thinks they can compete with other townships by streamlining the process and building Shoreline's values into the code. Regarding trees, he thinks Shoreline has one of the most robust tree canopies in the state. If they want to protect it, they need to put density somewhere; it makes sense to do high density near high frequency transit. He thinks they should go to 14 stories as a base height in those high-density areas.

Commissioner Lin asked if there is a way they can do something like a development agreement without having to go through the lengthy process of going through the Planning Commission and City Council. Mr. Bauer explained that Alternative 1 is a hybrid of that idea. If desired, they could also look at an alternative which allows higher heights and doesn't require any development agreements if the developer meets other requirements.

Chair Sager agreed that it would be nice if they didn't have to do a development agreement and just had what they want spelled out clearly in the code. This would speed up the process and be an incentive in itself. She suggested an Alternative 4 of increasing the base to 80' and allowing up to 140' with other requirements (with no development agreement).

Commissioner Callahan asked about developer agreement requirements in the surrounding cities.

Mr. Bauer summarized staff would provide:

- More information around height – especially visuals or reference points for comparison
- A height comparison with other cities and whether a developer agreement or other process is required
- Feedback from stakeholders on having more height with less process

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor commented they are still waiting on a Pt. Wells decision.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Staff reviewed the agenda for the next meeting which is scheduled for February 3.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Pam Sager
Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission