

**AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING**



Thursday, September 29, 2011
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber
17500 Midvale Ave N.

	<u>Estimated Time</u>
<u>DINNER MEETING</u>	
1. CALL TO ORDER	6:00 p.m.
<u>REGULAR MEETING</u>	
1. CALL TO ORDER	7:00 p.m.
2. ROLL CALL	7:01 p.m.
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	7:02 p.m.
4. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS	7:03 p.m.
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7:08 p.m.
a. September 1 Regular Meeting	
6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	7:10 p.m.
<i>During the General Public Comment period, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not of a quasi-judicial nature or specifically scheduled later on the agenda. Each member of the public may comment for up to two minutes. However, the General Public Comment period will generally be limited to twenty minutes. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Speakers are asked to come to the front of the room to have their comments recorded and must clearly state their first and last name, and city of residence.</i>	
7. STAFF REPORTS	7:15 p.m.
a. Study Session: Comprehensive Plan Update - Transportation Element and Development Code Amendments	
8. PUBLIC COMMENT	9:30 p.m.
9. DIRECTOR'S REPORT	9:40 p.m.
10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	9:44 p.m.
11. NEW BUSINESS	9:45 p.m.
a. Review Planning Commission Transmittals for October 10 City Council Meeting	
12. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	9:55 p.m.
13. AGENDA FOR October 6	9:58 p.m.
14. ADJOURNMENT	10:00 p.m.

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. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 801-2236.

WHO WE ARE

The Shoreline Planning Commission is a 7-member volunteer advisory body to the City Council. The purpose of the Planning Commission is to provide guidance and direction for Shoreline's future growth through continued review and improvement to the City's Comprehensive Plan, Development Code, shoreline management, environmental protection and related land use documents. The Planning Commission members are appointed by the City Council and serve a four year term.

WHAT IS HAPPENING TONIGHT

Planning Commission meetings may have several items on the agenda. The items may be study sessions or public hearings.

Study Sessions

Study sessions provide an opportunity for the Commissioners to learn about particular items and to have informal discussion with staff prior to holding a public hearing. The Commission schedules time on its agenda to hear from the public; however, the Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. The public is encouraged to provide written comment to the Commission; however, since Commissioners are volunteers and may not have time to check email every day, if written comments are not included in the agenda packet and are offered during a study session, they may not have time to read them until after the meeting.

Public Hearing

The main purpose of a public hearing is for the Commission to obtain public testimony. There are two types of public hearings, legislative and quasi-judicial. Legislative hearings are on matters of policy that affect a wide range of citizens or perhaps the entire jurisdiction and quasi-judicial hearings are on matters affecting the legal rights of specific, private parties in a contested setting. The hearing procedures are listed on the agenda. Public testimony will happen after the staff presentation. Individuals will be required to sign up if they wish to testify and will be called upon to speak generally in the order in which they have signed. Each person will be allowed 2 minutes to speak. In addition, attendees may want to provide written testimony to the Commission. Speakers may hand the Clerk their written materials prior to speaking and they will be distributed. For those not speaking, written materials should be handed to the Clerk prior to the meeting. The Clerk will stamp written materials with an exhibit number so it can be referred to during the meeting. Spoken comments and written materials presented at public hearings become part of the record.

CONTACTING THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Written comments can be emailed to plancom@shorelinewa.gov or mailed to Shoreline Planning Commission, 17500 Midvale Avenue N, Shoreline WA 98133.

www.shorelinewa.gov/plancom

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

September 1, 2011
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Wagner
Vice Chair Perkowski
Commissioner Behrens
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner Esselman
Commissioner Kaje
Commissioner Moss

Staff Present

Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, Planning & Development Services
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Perkowski called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. She recognized the presence of Mayor McGlashan and Councilmember Eggen.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Wagner, Vice Chair Perkowski and Commissioners Behrens, Broili, Esselman, Kaje and Moss.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Cohn did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of August 18, 2011 were approved as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING ON SOUTHEAST SHORELINE SUBAREA LEGISLATIVE REZONE

Chair Wagner reviewed the rules and procedures for legislative public hearings and then opened the public hearing.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation

Ms. Redinger reviewed that the Planning Commission has held five discussions regarding implementation of the Southeast Shoreline Subarea Plan since it was adopted by the City Council in May of 2010. She reminded the Commission that they last discussed the issue on March 17th, at which time they directed staff to implement the subarea plan in two phases:

- **Phase 1** -- Legislatively rezone portions of the subarea to conform to the vision of the adopted subarea plan.
- **Phase 2** -- Work with the Commission to develop new Development Code regulations to implement other portions of the plan.

Ms. Redinger recalled that the Commission's recommendation for Comprehensive Plan designations for the Southeast Shoreline Subarea Plan closely mirrors the recommendation of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), and the City Council adopted the Commission's recommendation in May of 2010. Zoning designations are the focus of tonight's public hearing. She reminded the Commission that the subarea plan contains a lot of discussion and policy recommendations about creating incentives for business development, mixed-use, walkability, and other urban amenities. She displayed the current zoning map, which does not provide a lot of logical transitions. She also displayed the proposed zoning map, which provides gentler and more logical transitions between the commercial uses and the single-family neighborhoods to the north and west.

Ms. Redinger noted that most of the area around 15th Avenue was designated in the Comprehensive Plan as mixed-use, and the current zoning is Neighborhood Business with less transition between the commercial and single-family uses. As per the Commission's March 17th discussion, the area is proposed to be zoned as Community Business to be more consistent. As part of Phase 2, the Commission will review the Development Code standards for Community Business. She recalled that the CAC made numerous recommendations and the Commission has had significant discussion about what the appropriate transition should be (height, density, incentives for green building and affordability, mixed-use, etc.)

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that the adjacent neighborhoods were concerned about traffic and the impact of a significant increase in the number of dwelling units. She explained that staff reviewed the Shoreline Traffic Analysis Zones (SAZ), which were done as part of the Transportation

Master Plan Update. The areas were broken into small sections that are assumed to have similar traffic patterns. Staff analyzed the areas by SAZ to identify the existing housing units, the potential for new housing units based on the current zoning, the potential for new housing units based on the proposed zoning, and the likely number of housing units that would be built over the next 20 years. She displayed a chart that identified the estimated numbers for each of the smaller sections within the subarea.

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that the subject of tonight's hearing is the proposed zoning. While staff can answer questions about the potential Development Code amendments, the discussion should focus on issues related to the rezone. She advised that the Commission may decide to recommend future implementation of the policies in the subarea plan such as different housing styles and allowing small-scale commercial/office uses in residential zones. Another option is to address these topics as part of the Comprehensive Plan analysis or update. She reminded the Commission that these topics are important to property owners within the subarea. Ms. Redinger also recalled that on March 17th, the Commission discussed that it may be appropriate to consider the potential of applying at least some of the Development Code amendments identified in Phase 2 citywide, perhaps starting with pilot programs.

Mr. Cohn recalled that the bulk of the Commission's previous discussion has been related to the portion of the subarea located near Bothell Way and Northeast 145th Street. He noted that two written comments were received related to this area, and transition is of particular concern. The proposal in the Staff Report outlines staff's recommendation for transition, but the two comment letters suggest other alternatives.

Questions by the Commission to Staff

Commissioner Moss noted there are two different proposals contained in John Davis' Briarcrest Zoning Proposal (Exhibit 9). Mr. Cohn suggested Commissioner Moss ask Mr. Davis to clarify his proposal during the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Commissioner Behrens said he submitted a question to staff regarding the potential of requiring a setback along Northeast 145th Street. Staff responded that when the 145th Street Corridor Study is finished, the Public Works and Planning & Community Development staff will make some recommendations for appropriate setbacks along Northeast 145th Street. He recalled that this issue was of particular concern to the people who live in this area of the City.

Commissioner Behrens noted that, as proposed, the area along Bothell Way and 32nd Avenue Northeast would be zoned Community Business. He observed that the current zoning has commercial uses along Bothell Way, but on 32nd Avenue Northeast, there is a mixture of residential. As proposed, the residential zoning would be replaced with the Community Business designation. He said he understands the need to make the entire block work as a unit. However, the proposal would place commercial zoning on lots that are only accessible from 32nd Avenue Northeast. He pointed out that in other subarea plans, the Commercial Business zoning designation has been located along arterial streets. It is important to place commercial uses on roads that can adequately handle traffic and allow for access. He questioned the viability of zoning the properties on 32nd Avenue Northeast for business uses because the

lots are not visible from Bothell Way or Northeast 145th Street. He also expressed concern about how a large business could impact 32nd Avenue Northeast, particularly traffic that accesses 32nd Avenue Northeast from Bothell Way via Northeast 145th Street.

Mr. Cohn said the City's Economic Development Manager has recommended Commercial Business zoning along 32nd Avenue Northeast. The goal is to aggregate lots so that development can span both lots, with the main access and visibility coming from Bothell Way. He agreed that egress is a difficult issue. The Traffic Engineer has stated the roadways can handle the additional traffic. Commissioner Behrens said he understands the need to aggregate lots to accommodate a substantial-sized development. However, he questioned how the City can force aggregation to occur. Ms. Redinger said there are reasons why this particular area has not redeveloped, and staff does not anticipate developers will scramble to put together a development proposal based on the current Community Business standards. She reminded the Commission that they would review and likely amend the Community Business standards as part of Phase 2 of the subarea implementation, which will involve a substantial community involvement process. If a development proposal is submitted in the meantime, the developer would be required to complete a traffic analysis and mitigate the impacts. The idea is that mixed-use development on 32nd Avenue Northeast would serve the neighborhood rather than draw a substantial amount of traffic from Bothell Way. Commissioner Behrens emphasized that he is not opposed to Community Business development along Bothell Way. However, none of the central lots that face 32nd Avenue Northeast are large. Therefore, aggregation is the only way they can be developed as Community Business.

Public Testimony

Diana Herbst, Shoreline, said she purchased a home in a single-family neighborhood on 30th Avenue Northeast. She expressed concern that, as currently proposed, 30th Avenue Northeast will experience the most traffic impact because it has a traffic control at the intersection of Northeast 145th Street. It is already nearly impossible to turn onto Northeast 145th Street from any of the other neighborhood streets. Traffic associated with new development would make the problem even worse. She observed that because her property would remain single-family zoning, she would be unable to sell it to a commercial developer. On the other hand, she will be subject to significantly more traffic in front of her home. She asked that the Commission address this concern before they forward a recommendation to the City Council. Perhaps they could add traffic lights at some of the other intersections along Northeast 145th Street so that the homes along her street are protected.

Ms. Herbst said a representative from the City's Public Works Department recently visited a neighbor's house and informed him that his property is impacted by underground streams along 30th Avenue Northeast. However, when she mentioned these underground streams at a previous public hearing, a Planning & Community Development staff person explained that the drainage was related to surface water runoff. Ms. Herbst expressed concern that the City staff cannot agree about the origin of the water. She summarized that she wants to ensure her neighborhood is protected.

John Davis, Lynnwood, said he is a stakeholder in Shoreline. He referred to the written comments he submitted previously (Exhibit #9). He said he supports the proposed zoning, which he believes is a step in the right direction. In his last letter he suggested they could use smaller, more frequent zoning steps

to accomplish a better transition. For example, the proposed zoning would not result in a worse situation for the property owners along 30th Avenue Northeast if the zoning was smoothed out just a little more behind the long row of R-18 and R-24 zoning along the east side. Mr. Davis applauded the Planning Commission for working hard on this difficult issue. He also commended the Planning and Community Development staff for being good listeners and remaining objective throughout the entire process. The process has been contentious, and they have done a good job working with all interested parties. He summarized that he supports their work wholeheartedly. However, he once again suggested that the City be bold enough to make the transition a little smoother. This would be to the entire community's long-term benefit.

Chair Wagner asked Mr. Davis to clarify the differences between the two proposals he submitted for alternative zoning (Exhibit #9). Mr. Davis said the maps he submitted both reflect options for creating a smoother transition. He recommended zoning the majority of the properties between Northeast 147th Street and Northeast 149th Street as R-18, except those between 30th Avenue Northeast and 31st Avenue Northeast that front along Northeast 149th Street. He felt this would protect the single-family properties to the north by providing a smooth transition from R-48 to R-24 to R-18, to R-12.

Mr. Davis said he moved out of one of his properties within the subarea this past weekend, and it was auctioned for sale last Friday because of the credit crunch and partially because of the interesting, but unnecessarily long process to create the subarea and appropriate zoning. A property owner located across the street indicated he would have supported his proposal 100% if he had known about it. They are hopeful they can obtain a slightly higher zoning designation even on the north side of Northeast 149th Street. One property owner at the corner of Northeast 149th Street and 30th Avenue Northeast informed the CAC that he preferred a zoning upgrade, as well. He summarized that the single-family property owners on the north side of Northeast 149th Street are not unanimous in their desire to remain R-6. A smooth transition can work in the best interest of everyone.

Final Questions by the Commission

Chair Wagner asked staff to respond to concerns raised regarding surface water. Ms. Redinger reviewed that there has been extensive discussion about surface water in and near the subarea. She clarified that Jill Mosqueda, Development Review Engineer, deals specifically with the stormwater code, and she has discussed this issue several times at community meetings both prior and after the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan was adopted. Ms. Mosqueda agreed there are water issues in the neighborhood. However, staff believes the issues are not related to the water table. Instead, infiltration is a problem because the entire area was developed without stormwater standards. She summarized that the root cause of the water problems is the significant amount of pavement in the area that funnels stormwater to certain properties. When these properties become saturated the structures experience flooding. Ms. Redinger acknowledged that the City does not have the resources to complete a hydrology study for the entire subarea. However, developers would be required to complete an analysis as part of any development proposal. Each development would be required to capture stormwater on site. She said staff has talked to the neighbors about how redevelopment could improve the stormwater runoff issues piece-by-piece, along with larger capital stormwater improvement projects.

Mr. Cohn noted the elevation gain from 30th Avenue Northeast to the west. Stormwater runoff from uphill properties flows to properties along 30th Avenue Northeast. The proposal focuses on redevelopment along Bothell Way and 32nd Avenue Northeast, which would not have an impact on 30th Avenue Northeast. The properties along 30th Avenue Northeast are located in an entirely different drainage basin that flows towards Lake Forest Park. He summarized that any new development would be required to meet the new and better stormwater standards, so less water would be released into the earth than what currently occurs.

Commissioner Esselman asked staff to speak about Mr. Davis' ideas for transition zoning. She particularly noted the middle properties on either side of 31st Avenue Northeast. Ms. Redinger reviewed that the CAC talked a lot about smooth transitions and creating L-shaped patterns. This concept made it into the text and policies of the subarea plan. However, some compromises were made before the plan was actually approved by the CAC. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the properties at the intersection of 31st Avenue Northeast and Northeast 147th Street as Medium-Density Residential, which can be zoned no higher than R-12. She reminded the Commission that zoning must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designations, unless there has been a subarea plan study. Staff felt that some of the transitions discussed by the CAC were not necessarily represented in the zoning map approved by the CAC. There has also been criticism that the zoning map did not match the transition standards, particularly the L-shaped patterns that were part of the CAC's discussion. She said the Commission could recommend Mr. Davis' plan to the City Council. However, they would have to invoke the exemption that they felt the subarea plan policies called strongly for the area to achieve a high-density residential zoning. Another option would be to amend the Comprehensive Plan Map at some point in the future.

Commissioner Kaje said he appreciated Mr. Davis' efforts to provide graphic illustrations of his proposal. He cautioned against trying to make the zoning too fine tuned when, in reality, they are talking about the difference between a duplex and a triplex. He questioned if these uses would be considered dramatically different if they are developed on identically-sized lots that are located next to each other, but one is zoned R-12 and the other R-18. The building form and other site standards would not be substantially different. He referred to the strip of properties above Northeast 147th Street between 30th Avenue Northeast and 31st Avenue Northeast and noted that the lots along 30th Avenue Northeast are smaller than those on 31st Avenue Northeast. He suggested that each of the lots along 30th Avenue Northeast would accommodate a maximum of two units regardless of whether they are zoned R-12 or R-18. He summarized that because the differences are so small, he is not sure it is worthwhile to further tweak the zoning as recommended by Mr. Davis.

Commissioner Kaje referred to Ms. Herbst's concern about potential traffic impacts on 30th Avenue Northeast given that this is the only intersection along Northeast 145th Street with a traffic signal. He observed that a traffic study would be required as part of any substantial redevelopment proposal, and he expects additional traffic controls would be required. He asked staff to describe the City's process for addressing potential traffic impacts. Mr. Cohn shared that the State has appropriated money to do a 145th Street study to identify how traffic should work and who should be responsible for the roadway. Staff is currently discussing this issue with the City of Seattle. While the outcome is yet unclear, staff hopes King County will allow them to take over the County portion and the City of Seattle will see the

wisdom of doing the same. Resolving this issue will help when deciding whether or not more lights can be placed on Northeast 145th Street. He pointed out that the main portion of the traffic will come from the southeast corner of the subarea (Bothell Way). It is staff's hope and expectation that the Commission will discuss access and egress issues when they review potential changes to the Community Business zone. Currently, the Community Business zone does not restrict access on neighborhood streets.

Commissioner Behrens referred to the intersection at 31st Avenue Northeast and Northeast 147th Street, where there is a deadhead in the middle of the street that prevents access through the intersection. He asked how this intersection would be handled in the future and what impact it would have on the traffic migrating onto 30th Avenue Northeast. Ms. Redinger said there have been numerous discussions amongst the CAC and the traffic engineers regarding this intersection and there was a conflicting set of opinions. One group advocated for protecting the neighborhood by limiting east/west access. Another group advocated increasing east/west access. The intersection referred to by Commissioner Behrens was part of a private property that was to be dedicated to the City. However, the property was sold and another house was developed behind. This property is now ineligible for dedication because the rear property would become landlocked. She acknowledged that the right-of-way could be opened to through traffic, or it could be left the way it is to prevent east/west access. At the request of Commissioner Behrens, Mr. Cohn confirmed that the traffic study assumed that Northeast 147th Street would not be a through street and that traffic could only move east/west on Northeast 145th Street and Northeast 149th Street. Ms. Redinger cautioned that it does not mean that Northeast 147th Street cannot become a through street at some point in the future as conditions change. Commissioner Behrens asked if future decisions about Northeast 145th Street would also play a role in whether or not Northeast 147th Street becomes a through street. Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively. She summarized that staff knows that traffic is very important to the people in the neighborhood, and they will pay careful attention to the 145th Street Corridor Study as it progresses.

Deliberations

COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE PROPOSED ZONING MAP (EXHIBIT 3) FOR THE SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOODS AS DRAFTED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER MOSS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Kaje reviewed the rezone criteria the Commission must consider when reviewing rezone applications as follows:

1. *The rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.* Commissioner Kaje said the Commission would look closely at the recently approved Southeast Shoreline Subarea Plan, which is part of the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Redinger said the proposed zoning changes were tailored to be consistent with the subarea plan and the accompanying map adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan in May of 2010.

2. *The rezone will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.* Ms. Redinger explained that redevelopment under the proposed zoning would trigger stormwater, street frontage (sidewalk), and other improvements, which would benefit public health, safety and welfare.
3. *The rezone is warranted in order to achieve consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.* Again, Ms. Redinger advised that there are a number of parcels that need to be rezoned in order to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designations that were adopted as part of the subarea plan. Additional rezones are proposed in order to be consistent with the policy recommendations in the subarea plan.
4. *The rezone will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity of the subject rezone.* Ms. Redinger advised that the rezone is intended to encourage redevelopment that is beneficial to the neighborhood. Standards contained in the Development Code will protect the existing neighborhood character and quality of life for residents as redevelopment occurs.
5. *The rezone has merit and value for the community.* Ms. Redinger explained that the rezone is based on recommendations from the Citizens Advisory Committee, and the intent was to increase development options for neighborhood businesses to provide jobs and services, as well as provide clear zoning transition between different uses.

Commissioner Kaje suggested that because the subarea plan was crafted with a lot of effort by a citizen's group, the Commission must meet a fairly high burden when considering Criteria 1 and 3 beyond just saying the zoning proposal was crafted to be consistent with the subarea plan. Instead, he suggested they revisit the subarea plan. He observed that not all of concepts in the subarea plan can be implemented via zoning. Some are more appropriate for citywide implementation, and others can be implemented via the transportation and/or parks master plan, etc. He noted there are numerous recommendations about incentives, but in his review of the subarea plan he did not get the sense that the CAC was talking about zoning and upzoning as an incentive. There is a lot of language about protecting neighborhoods, solar access, etc. He summarized that incentives need to be achieved some other way.

Chair Wagner noted that the Commission has had previous discussions that redevelopment would actually improve the stormwater situation, and she appreciates the clarification provided by staff about the difference between stormwater and underground streams. The Commission is aware that drainage is a significant problem, but she felt the proposal would not create additional negative impacts.

Ms. Redinger cautioned that when meeting with the CAC, staff tried not to get into the details of Development Code language. The CAC's role was to create a vision for the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea, and it is the responsibility of the staff, Planning Commission and the City Council to implement the vision. She reminded the Commission that at one of the community meetings staff spent a lot of time detailing how the recommendations could be implemented. Because the subarea plan is part of the Comprehensive Plan, it will filter into functional master plans such as surface water, transportation, etc. and then into capital budgets and annual work plans.

Commissioner Kaje said he reviewed the subarea plan to identify the various recommendations that have a nexus with zoning. He suggested the Commission focus on these recommendations to determine if the proposal is consistent with the subarea plan. The Commission agreed that would be an appropriate approach.

Commissioner Kaje referred to Natural Environment Policy Recommendation NE12 (Page 3 of the Plan), which calls for using green buffers to build height ratio between different land uses, especially where transition zoning is not possible. He reminded the Commission that this concept was implemented in a portion of the Town Center Subarea. A certain vegetation buffer was linked to the fact that there would be a fairly high adjacent use. While he does not have an answer at this time, he asked if the Commission feels there are places in the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea where the proposed zoning transition may not be adequate to meet NE12. He specifically referred to a property, which is located west of 15th Avenue Northeast and north of Northeast 145th Street. This property is proposed to be zoned Community Business, and it is located next to R-6 zoning. Commissioner Kaje noted that many of the properties west of 15th Avenue Northeast are identified for Community Business zoning yet they abut single-family residential. He asked if there are other provisions in the Development Code that would implement NE12. Ms. Redinger advised that NE12 could be implemented via the Development Code language when they articulate the standards for transition in Community Business zones.

Commissioner Moss asked if the current zoning requires transition. Ms. Redinger answered that the design standards address transition, but they could be more stringent and more detailed. She noted that staff does not anticipate a significant number of development proposals before the Community Business zoning standards have been updated to address issues such as transition. Mr. Cohn advised that Community Business zoning standards do address the issue of transition by calling for a 35-foot maximum building height when Community Business abuts single-family.

Commissioner Kaje suggested that in their recommendation to the City Council, the Commission could ask the City Council to make amendments to the Community Business zoning provisions a high priority for the staff and Commission. The proposal would expand the use of the Community Business zone; and in several cases, it would be located next to single-family zoning.

Commissioner Moss recalled that there were three parcels near 15th Avenue Northeast where the recommended designation was not finalized. Staff explained its rationale for the proposed designation and that the property owners had been contacted but did not respond to the City's letters and phone calls. Mr. Cohn emphasized that the zoning change would not make the uses on the two parcels non-conforming.

Commissioner Kaje referred to Land Use Policy Recommendation LU4 (Page 4 of the Subarea Plan), which calls for establishing policies and zoning to provide appropriate transitions between existing and proposed development and dissimilar land uses to minimize conflicts relating to solar access, noise, scale, etc. He expressed his belief that this recommendation has been met by the proposed step down zoning, particularly in the southeast corner. However, he acknowledged that the Community Business standards need to be revised in the future to refine the transition requirements. He also expressed his belief that LU5 (Page 4 of the Subarea Plan), which calls for placing the highest-density housing (mixed

use) on transit lines or in already established commercial zones, has been adequately addressed by the proposal.

Commissioner Kaje referred to LU7 (Page 4 of the Subarea Plan), which calls for 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. He reminded the Commission that they discussed this recommendation and decided against a business-only zone. He asked if that is still their position. Chair Wagner suggested that this issue would be best addressed through a Development Code regulation. She asked if the current Community Business zone has a ground floor commercial requirement. Mr. Cohn answered that there is currently no ground floor commercial requirement in the Community Business zone and single-use buildings are allowed. He agreed the Commission discussed the issue previously, but they did not provide any specific direction to staff. Ms. Redinger said staff has not been presented with any evidence to support the assumption that property owners would not develop commercial or office uses because of the profitability of residential uses. She agreed this issue could be addressed in greater detail when the Development Code standards are reviewed in the future. Commissioner Kaje pointed out that the Mixed-Use Zone requires that the ground floor be developed to at least be amenable to commercial uses. He asked if the Commission felt the same provision should be applied to the Community Business Zone.

Commissioner Behrens observed that the Commission has discussed a lot of potential changes to the Community Business zone, but if the proposed zoning is approved, it would be implemented based on the current standards. He expressed concern that until the Community Business Zone has been amended, a developer could build a structure under the existing requirements that would not provide a proper transition. It would not be a benefit to the people in the neighborhood to have uncontrolled, large-scale community business development next to single-family houses.

Ms. Redinger recalled that staff previously provided graphics to illustrate the differences in the height allowed in the various zones. For example, residential zones are limited to 35-feet in height, as are Commercial Business zones that are located next to Single-Family Residential zones. She summarized her belief that the proposed zoning would not open the floodgates of development, but she understands Commissioner Behren's concern. She explained that the process has taken a long time, and several property owners within the subarea have been vested in the process from the beginning. Again, she emphasized that most of the recommendations found in the Subarea Plan will be implemented via the Development Code rather than zoning. The Commission determined that updating the Development Code would involve a long process in order to address the many recommendations found in the Subarea Plan. Therefore, they agreed to move forward with the rezone proposal first to give some assurance to the property owners, particularly the residential property owners.

Ms. Redinger advised that the commercial property owners are now paying attention to the process. They have indicated they would like to advocate for greater height and more density at some point in the future, so it is unlikely the commercial properties will develop under the current Community Business zoning standards. The commercial property owners want more certainty as to what can potentially be developed before spending a lot of money and time to create development proposals. Staff is not recommending the Commission postpone their decision on the rezone proposal until they have worked

through all of the details to update the Community Business zone. Instead, the Commission could recommend the City Council place the Development Code update on the work program as a priority project.

Commissioner Kaje referenced Housing Policy Recommendation H2 (Page 5 of the Subarea Plan), which calls for new housing development that is added in the center of established neighborhoods of the subarea being consistent with the neighborhood character. It states that lot size to structure ratios and the scale of buildings is important. He noted there are numerous small lots, particularly in the southeast corner of the subarea. While it is possible to aggregate the lots, normal single-family lots will be rezoned to a higher residential density. He acknowledged that the proposed rezone could produce undesirable outcomes, but the same thing could happen in other neighborhoods throughout the City. He said he does not believe the issue can be addressed through zoning, but the issue of lot size to structure ratio was correctly called out by the CAC as something that needs to be addressed at some point in the future. Ms. Redinger said staff has discussed this issue in their preparations to update the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element. They foresee a potential bundle of Development Code amendments related just to housing to implement the City's adopted housing strategy citywide.

Commissioner Kaje referred to Economic Development Policy Recommendation ED3, which calls for increasing small-scale economic development that employs local people and complements residential character. He also referred to ED10, which calls for modifying commercial zoning regulations to require that mixed-use buildings be designed to accommodate ground level commercial uses along arterial street frontages. He suggested that the modification called out in ED10 would implement ED3. He suggested they recommend to the City Council that the concept of ground floor commercial space should be one of the first things considered when the Community Business zone is updated. Otherwise, they could end up with strictly residential development in areas where they had hoped to stimulate business. Ms. Redinger suggested that allowing home-based business uses on properties that are already developed as single-family residential would be another way to encourage small businesses.

Vice Chair Perkowski referred to Rezone Criteria 3 and asked staff to highlight where additional rezones are proposed in order to be consistent with the policy recommendations in the subarea plan. Ms. Redinger used a map to identify some of the inconsistencies. She noted that while some of the proposed zoning changes are not necessary to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, they are needed to realize policy recommendations related to transition, attracting amenities, making the properties more marketable, etc.

Chair Wagner referred to the concerns raised by Commissioner Behrens regarding access to the properties located on the east side of 32nd Avenue Northeast. She expressed her belief that staff's explanation clarified the concern. She reminded the Commission of their previously discussed desire to have the lots redeveloped, and pooling the properties would result in a benefit. She said she is opposed to changing the zoning to match the zoning proposed for the west side. Ms. Redinger recalled that tools were created for the Town Center Subarea to implement the "protect and connect theory" where commercial abuts residential. It is also possible to create effective standards for the Community Business zone, perhaps borrowing some standards from the Town Center.

Commissioner Broili agreed that the properties on the east side of 32nd Avenue Northeast should be rezoned to Community Business as proposed. It is important to keep in mind that nothing will change overnight. The subarea plan is long-term, and it is appropriate for the City to plan for the properties to be consolidated into larger units for redevelopment so that Commissioner Behren's concerns do not come to pass. Ms. Redinger pointed out that larger developments are more likely to hit a threshold that will trigger a greater traffic analysis and mitigation. Commissioner Esselman added that rezoning the properties on the east side of 32nd Avenue Northeast to Community Business as proposed would also allow for commercial uses that serve the people living in the area. She said she also supports the rezone as proposed by staff.

Commissioner Behrens asked the staff and Commission to show him of another Community Business zone that exists on a non-arterial street. He suggested it is very unlikely that a developer would build a large-scale business where it cannot be seen and there is no available traffic pattern to serve the site. Chair Wagner responded that if the lots are consolidated and developed, then access could come from Bothell Way rather than 32nd Avenue Northeast. Commissioner Behrens cautioned that the City cannot require a property owner on Bothell Way to allow access through their property to another business located on an adjacent street. He recalled he previously proposed utilizing a Planned Area concept to address specific ingress/egress issues. This approach would have allowed them to figure out how to use the properties at a higher density. The Commission didn't choose this approach; and as proposed, access to these properties would have to come from Northeast 149th Street and 32nd Avenue Northeast. They cannot require property owners on Bothell Way to allow access to come through their properties. Even if they could, the properties would not be visible from Northeast 145th Street or Bothell Way.

Commissioner Behrens said that if the City allows Community Business development to occur on 32nd Avenue Northeast, the traffic access is going to funnel back into the residential neighborhoods via Northeast 149th Street and 30th Avenue Northeast. He felt this would be in conflict with Rezone Criteria 2 and 4. He does not see how the benefits of development at the level allowed by the Community Business zone would outweigh the detriment to the neighborhood. He said he is not suggesting they not allow commercial development along 32nd Avenue Northeast, but the commercial application should be more appropriate for the adjacent neighborhood such as R-48. The Community Business zoning designation opens the potential for very large developments on these properties, and the traffic impacts to the neighborhood would be great.

Commissioner Broili said he sees no reason why anyone on Bothell Way would have to allow access through their properties to the properties on 32nd Avenue Northeast. These properties can be accessed via 32nd Avenue Northeast. He said the properties on 32nd Avenue Northeast will not likely redevelop for many years because they are not visibly accessible from Bothell Way. As these properties go undeveloped, the property owners on Bothell Way may choose to purchase them to make larger properties that expand from Bothell Way all the way to 32nd Avenue Northeast. The consolidated lots would accommodate larger developments. He said he does not agree with the logic that traffic would disperse itself into the neighborhood via Northeast 147th Street or Northeast 149th Street. If he were going up 32nd Avenue Northeast, he more than likely would turn right to access Bothell Way.

Commissioner Kaje pointed out that a Community Business zoning designation would not prevent these property owners from developing something that is economically viable, such as R-48, if aggregation is not an option. He further pointed out that there is a development on Linden Avenue with multi-family housing on top and retail uses below. Linden Avenue is not an arterial street, yet the businesses appear to function appropriately. He agreed that the development on the east side of 32nd Avenue Northeast may look very different than the development that occurs on Bothell Way, but he does not see this as negative. The Community Business designation would allow the properties to be developed as purely residential.

Commissioner Behrens pointed out that 32nd Avenue Northeast is only accessible from Northeast 145th Street if you are heading in a westbound direction. Northeast 149th Street is only accessible from one direction on Bothell Way. It is not possible to turn left from 32nd Avenue Northeast onto Northeast 145th Street. It is very difficult to turn right, as well. Therefore, traffic on 32nd Avenue Northeast would have to go to Northeast 149th Street, across the back of the neighborhood, to exit off of 30th Avenue Northeast and reenter Northeast 145th Street. Cars trying to access Bothell Way from Northeast 149th Street can only turn right onto Bothell Way. He summarized there is no good access to the properties on 32nd Avenue Northeast except through the single-family neighborhoods.

Commissioner Moss said that having watched the path of least resistance of people walking and driving, she agreed with Commissioner Behrens that it will be difficult for people who want to go to Bothell Way. They may very well need to go down to 30th Avenue Northeast. The flip side is if they are going westbound, they can either go the short direction and not get stopped at that intersection where it is hard to get out or into the turn lane and circle around instead. People figure that out, and they are only talking about back tracking one to one-half blocks. The property owners could develop the properties as R-48 under the current zoning, but changing the zoning to R-48 would not allow for aggregation of the parcels. An R-48 designation could stymie redevelopment in the entire area.

Commissioner Moss referred to two small parcels that are proposed to be zoned Neighborhood Business at the far northern portion of the subarea at 15th Avenue Northeast and North 155th Street. Mr. Cohn said they are currently zoned, Neighborhood Business, as well. Commissioner Moss noted that other Neighborhood Business zones within the subarea were changed to Community Business. Mr. Cohn pointed out that these properties are bordered on two sides by single-family residential zoning. In addition, the properties are not a large enough to accommodate any type of large development.

Vote by the Commission to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification

THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE PROPOSED ZONING MAP (EXHIBIT 3) FOR THE SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOODS AS DRAFTED BY STAFF WAS APPROVED 6-1, WITH COMMISSIONER BEHRENS VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

Closure of Public Hearing

Chair Wagner closed the public hearing.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Cohn did not have any items to report to the Commission.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Commissioner Kaje reminded the Commission of their earlier discussion that it would be appropriate to send a strong message to the City Council that updating the Community Business zone code language to address the issue of transition should be a priority. A discussion about the concept of stimulating commercial uses in the Community Business zone should also be a priority. He said he likes the ground floor requirement contained in the Mixed Use zone, and it would make sense to apply the same concept to the Community Business zone. He felt it would be appropriate to require buildings in the Community Business zone to be constructed to the appropriate standards to accommodate commercial uses on the ground floor. He clarified that he is not proposing that non-commercial uses be precluded from the ground floor.

The Commission agreed to forward a recommendation to the City Council that they place the following items on the Commission's work program as priorities:

- A review of the Community Business zone transitions. The review should not only consider design transition, but traffic and transportation, particularly for commercial business zones that are adjacent to single-family residential zones.
- A review of the ground floor commercial building standards as they relate to design and to storefront transparency.

Commissioner Behrens asked how the City could require a developer to convert ground floor residential units to commercial space if the demand changes. Mr. Cohn said this could be part of the discussion. He explained that commercial space can often be rented for two to three times the amount charged for residential space. Developers will likely make the change as soon as the market can support it. Chair Wagner suggested the Commission postpone additional discussion regarding this issue until they receive direction from the City Council to move forward.

Commissioner Broili suggested that storefront transparency can be addressed as a design issue. Buildings can be designed to allow more privacy, but at the same time, the space can be converted to a more open commercial use. Mr. Cohn recalled that the Commission has previously discussed the concept of requiring a certain percentage of transparent windows on ground floor commercial space, and this type of requirement would make it more difficult for developers to other types of uses. Chair Wagner suggested that staff provide pictures to illustrate the concept in various situations.

Commissioner Esselman suggested the issue of floor area ratio should also be a priority to address citywide.

Commissioner Kaje described King County's incentive program, which uses a concept called the Public Benefit Rating System. The program provides a menu of options for developers to offer public

amenities that are beyond those required by the code in exchange for a tax benefit. For example, a developer could earn points for protecting a riparian area, allowing public access, providing additional open space, preserving a stream corridor, preserving more trees than required, preserving buildings, etc. The program could be customized for each property. He suggested staff research whether the concept has been used in any urban settings. Rather than offering numerous incentive programs, all incentive opportunities could be administered under one umbrella program. Commissioner Broili agreed he would like to explore this option further. He noted that Seattle's Green Factor Program is similar to the program described by Commissioner Kaje. He suggested the City could build off of Seattle's program.

NEW BUSINESS

No new business was scheduled on the agenda.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Kaje announced that between 150 and 200 people attended the outdoor movie night at Aldercrest last weekend. Two bands played before the movie, and there were a variety of elected officials present. He summarized that it was a fun neighborhood event.

Mr. Cohn announced that from 10:00 a.m. to Noon on September 9th, the Transportation Choices Coalition and the Futurewise will provide a presentation at the Shoreline library about Transportation Oriented Development. If Commissioners are unable to attend, a book is also available for their review.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission that their training session is scheduled for September 15th.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 P.M.

Michelle Linders Wagner
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

TIME STAMP
September 1, 2011

CALL TO ORDER: 00:10

ROLL CALL: 00:17

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: 00:35

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS: 00:42

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 00:45

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 02:05

**LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING ON SOUTHEAST SHORELINE SUBAREA
LEGISLATIVE REZONE: 02:25**

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation: 04:08

Questions by the Commission to Staff and Applicant: 13:22

Public Testimony: 25:05

Final Questions by Commission: 33:46

Deliberations: 53:16

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 1:53:00

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: 1:53:10

NEW BUSINESS: 2:06:18

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENT: 2:06:20

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA: 2:08:35

DRAFT



Memorandum

DATE: September 29, 2011

TO: Shoreline Planning Commission

FROM: Kirk McKinley, Transportation Services Manager
Alicia McIntire, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Comprehensive Plan Update – Transportation Element
Development Code amendments

I. Introduction

The City Public Works Department has led an effort over the past two years in developing a draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP), which is the long range vision for the City's transportation system. Public Works staff has regularly updated the Planning Commission during the TMP's development. While it was originally thought that the TMP would be a policy document that would help set the framework for update of the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, it was recently determined by the City's legal department that the TMP, Comprehensive Plan and Development Code must all be internally consistent in order for them to be effective and implementable.

In light of this determination, the Planning and Community Development and Public Works Department are requesting Planning Commission review of an updated Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan and associated Development Code amendments to implement this updated element. The draft updated element has been derived from the Goals and Policies included in the draft TMP. Over the next few meetings, the Planning Commission is scheduled to discuss and make a recommendation regarding an updated Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments needed for its implementation.

II. Discussion

Attachment A is the draft Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. In accordance with Council direction to reduce the size of the City's Comprehensive Plan, the element consists of an introductory statement and the goals and policies. The goals and policies establish the framework and objectives for the City's transportation system and guide its development and management. The background information and technical

analysis about the City's transportation system is contained in the TMP, which is referenced in the introductory statement, as well as several of the policies. Staff is recommending no changes to the existing Comprehensive Plan goals, only renumbering to match the format of the TMP. Staff is recommending 53 policies, some of which are existing, that address the following topics:

- Sustainability and Quality of Life
- Bicycle System
- Pedestrian System
- Transit System
- Master Street Plan
- Concurrency and Level of Service
- Transportation Improvements
- Funding

The draft Transportation Element includes reference notations indicating whether a recommended policy is existing or new. Please note that some of the policies have been modified a bit since the distribution of the TMP. The discussion will be based upon the language in the attachment. Policy 40 (shaded in gray) is currently undergoing revision. Staff will provide revised language with the October 6 packet, along with additional text addressing mandatory Growth Management Act elements for the Transportation Element.

A detailed description of each topic can be found in the July 21, 2011 Planning Commission staff report. Supporting documentation for development of the policies can be found in the draft TMP provided earlier this month.

Attachment C lists the existing Transportation Goals and Policies in the Comprehensive Plan.

Attachment B identifies the development code amendments needed for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Most of these amendments are "clean up" items that identify specific items to reference (such as the street classification map) or provide clarity to review processes. Notations are included that explain or clarify the need for the change. The language associated with Amendment #1 will be modified to coincide with the changes made to Policy 40 in the draft Transportation Element and will be provided with the October 6 packet.

The most significant change is to the City's transportation Level of Service (LOS) standards. The recommended development code amendment is consistent with the recommended policy for the Comprehensive Plan. The following charts summarize the characteristics of LOS standards and provide examples of intersections in Shoreline and their existing LOS.

Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards and Characteristics

Level of Service	Roadway Segments V/C Ratio	Signalized Intersections Avg. Delay (sec/veh)	General Description
A	≤ 0.60	≤ 10	Free Flow
B	> 0.60 - 0.70	> 10 - 20	Stable Flow (slight delay)
C	> 0.70 - 0.80	> 20 - 35	Stable Flow (acceptable delay)
D	> 0.80 - 0.90	> 35- 55	Approaching unstable flow (speeds somewhat reduced, more vehicles stop and may wait through more than one signal cycle before proceeding)
E	> 0.90 - 1.0	> 55- 80	Unstable Flow (speeds reduced and highly variable, queues occur, many vehicles have to wait through more than one signal cycle before proceeding)
F	> 1.0	> 80	Forced Flow (jammed conditions, long queues occur that do not clear, most vehicles wait through more than one signal cycle before proceeding)

Examples of Current LOS in Shoreline for Comparison Purposes

Level of Service	Roadway Segments in Shoreline	Signalized Intersections in Shoreline
A	Northbound 5 th Ave NE: 145-185 in the p.m. peak	N 196 th St & 15 th Ave NE in the p.m. peak
B	Eastbound 175 th Ave N: Meridian-I-5 in the p.m. peak	Richmond Beach Rd & 3 rd Ave NW in the p.m. peak
C	Northbound Meridian Ave N: 155-200 in the p.m. peak	Richmond Beach Rd & 8 th Ave NW in the p.m. peak
D	Southbound Meridian Ave N: 175-185 in the a.m. peak	N 185 th St & Meridian Ave N in the p.m. peak
E	Northbound 15 th Ave NE: 152-153 (transition for 4 to 3 lanes) in the p.m. peak	N 145 th St & Greenwood Ave N in the p.m. peak
F	None currently	N 145 th St & I-5 Northbound Ramp/5 th Ave NE in the p.m. peak

Currently, the City has adopted LOS E for signalized intersections on arterials as the acceptable standard. The draft policy language and associated development code amendments recommend that the City adopt LOS D for all signalized intersections on arterials, with additional volume to capacity standards for Principal and Minor arterials. With these standards, the City will accept intersections that operate at LOS D or better and will help balance levels of congestion, the cost of added capacity, and the need to minimize diversion of traffic onto neighborhood streets.

Randy Young, the consultant assisting the City with updating the concurrency regulations, will be in attendance at the October 6 Planning Commission meeting to answer questions regarding LOS and concurrency. Please see the July 21 staff report and the TMP for additional information about concurrency.

In conjunction with the amendments to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, the Transportation Level of Service and Transportation Capital Funding Recommendations in the supporting analysis for the Capital Facilities element will need to be amended. This will provide for consistency within the Comprehensive Plan. The staff recommended changes to the Capital Facilities element will be included in the October 6 packet.

III. Recommendation

No formal action is requested at this time. This report is for update purposes only. The schedule for completion of the amendment process is outlined below.

IV. Next Steps

At the September 29 meeting, staff will discuss the proposed revisions to the Transportation Element and provide background about the proposed changes. If there is enough time, staff will introduce the proposed Development Code amendments that are necessary to implement the proposed policies.

The Planning Commission is scheduled to continue discussion of the Comprehensive Plan and/or development code amendments on October 6. The Commission will be using the information from this packet in the October 6 continued discussion.

A public hearing is tentatively scheduled for October 27. That evening, if time allows, the Planning Commission may finalize their recommendation to Council. If needed, additional meetings could be scheduled for November 3 and 17.

If you have questions or ideas that you would like staff to address at the study session, please email, plancom@shorelinewa.gov and amcintire@shorelinewa.gov.

Attachment A: Draft Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element

Attachment B: Draft Development Code amendments

Attachment C: Existing Comprehensive Plan Transportation Goals and Policies

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT**INTRODUCTION**

The Transportation Element will guide the development and funding of a transportation network that provides mobility for residents and employees within the City of Shoreline in a way that preserves citizens' quality of life. The City's transportation system will be multi-modal transportation, with an emphasis on moving people and a "Complete Streets" approach where the system accommodates all users. Because of Shoreline's location between the City of Seattle and Snohomish County, as well as the multiple entities that influence transportation in Shoreline, such as the Washington State Department of Transportation and transit agencies, the City should work to coordinate transportation improvements with neighboring jurisdictions and transit providers.

The Transportation Element establishes policies on how to prioritize Shoreline's transportation system improvements and how to identify the City's strategic interests in regional investments, adjacent transportation facilities and funding alternatives. The transportation policies are designed to guide the actions of public agencies, such as the City, as well as private decisions related to individual developments. The Transportation Element also provides the foundation for development regulations contained in the Shoreline Development Code and Engineering Development Guide.

The City's transportation system supports development of the land uses envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan and helps to shape the form of development within Shoreline's mixed-use, commercial and residential neighborhoods. To further that purpose, the City has adopted a Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The TMP is the City's long-range blueprint for travel and mobility in Shoreline. The TMP provides guidance for public and private sector decisions on local and regional transportation investments, including short-, mid-, and long-range transportation and related land-use activities. In this way, the City can assess the relative importance of projects and schedule their planning, engineering and construction as growth takes place and the need for the facilities and improvements is warranted. It also establishes a prioritization of the projects to be included in future capital improvement programs.

The TMP is a long range plan, with policies, programs and projects that will be implemented over the next 20 years. As the City's transportation needs change over time, the TMP will be updated and adopted as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

GOALS

Goal T I: Provide safe and friendly streets for Shoreline citizens. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T I)*

Goal T II: Work with transportation providers to develop a safe, efficient and effective multimodal transportation system to address overall mobility and accessibility. Maximize the people carrying capacity of the surface transportation system. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T II)*

Goal T III: Protect the livability and safety of residential neighborhoods from the adverse impacts of the automobile. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T VI)*

Goal T IV: Encourage alternative modes of transportation to reduce the number of automobiles on the road. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T VII)*

Goal T V: Maintain the transportation infrastructure so that it is safe and functional. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T XI)*

Goal T VI: Develop a transportation system that enhances the delivery and transport of goods and services. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T VIII)*

Goal T VII: Coordinate the implementation and development of Shoreline's transportation system with its neighbors and regional partners. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T X)*

Goal T VIII: Develop a bicycle system that is connective and safe and encourages bicycling as a viable alternative method of transportation. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T V)*

Goal T IX: Provide a pedestrian system that is safe, connects to destinations, accesses transit and is accessible by all. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T IV)*

Goal TX: Support increased transit coverage and service that connects local and regional destinations to improve mobility options for all Shoreline residents. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T III)*

Goal XI: Secure reliable and fair funding to ensure continuous maintenance and improvement of the transportation system. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Goal T IX)*

POLICIES

Sustainability and Quality of Life

Policy T1: Make safety the first priority of citywide transportation planning and traffic management. Place a higher priority on pedestrian, bicycle and automobile safety over vehicle capacity improvements at intersections. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy T1 - modified)*

Policy T2: Reduce the impact of the City's transportation system on the environment through the use of technology, expanded transit use and nonmotorized transportation options. *(New Recommended Policy)*

Policy T3: Use engineering, enforcement and educational tools to improve traffic safety on City roadways. *(Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy T2)*

Policy T4: Communicate and involve residents and businesses in the development and implementation of transportation projects. *(New Recommended Policy)*

Policy T5: Support and promote opportunities and programs so that residents have options to travel throughout Shoreline and the region using modes other than single occupancy vehicles. *(New Recommended Policy)*

Policy T6: Implement the City's Commute Trip Reduction Plan. *(New Recommended Policy)*

Policy T7: In accordance with Complete Streets practices and guidelines, new or rebuilt streets shall address, as much as practical, the use of the right-of-way by all users and consider the unique aspects of Shoreline's transportation network. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T8: Develop a comprehensive detailed street lighting and outdoor master lighting plan to guide ongoing public and private street lighting efforts. (***Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy T8***)

Policy T9: Comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements for all transportation projects. Integrate stormwater management into transportation projects. Use Low Impact Development techniques or green street elements except when determined to be unfeasible. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T10: Develop a regular maintenance program and schedule for all components of the transportation infrastructure. Maintenance schedules should be based on safety/imminent danger and on preservation of resources. (***Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy T18 – modified***)

Policy T11: Direct service and delivery trucks and other freight transportation to appropriate streets so that they can move through Shoreline efficiently. (***Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy T55 – modified***)

Policy T12: Implement a strategy for regional coordination that includes the following activities:

- Identify important transportation improvements in Shoreline that involve other agencies. These may include improvements that will help keep traffic on I-5 and off of Shoreline streets, such as changes to on-ramp metering and construction of a southbound collector-distributor lane from NE 205th Street to NE 145th Street.
- Remain involved in federal, state, regional and county budget and appropriations processes.
- Participate in regional and county planning processes that will affect the City's strategic interests.
- Form strategic alliances with potential partners, such as adjacent jurisdictions or like-minded agencies.
- Develop legislative agendas and meet with federal and state representatives who can help fund key projects.
- Develop regional legislative agenda and meet with area representatives (elected officials and staff) to the Puget Sound Regional Council, Sound Transit and King County Council.
- Develop partnerships with the local business community to advocate at the federal, state and regional level for common interests. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Bicycle System

Policy T13: Implement the Bicycle System Plan included in the City's Transportation Master Plan. Develop a program to construct and maintain bicycle facilities that are safe, connect to destinations, access transit and are accessible by all. Use short-term improvements, such as signage and markings, to identify routes when large capital improvements will not be constructed for several years. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T14: Develop standards for the creation of bicycle facilities. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T15: Develop a sustainable funding program to cover the costs to implement the City's Bicycle System Plan included in the City's Transportation Master Plan. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T16: Develop a public outreach program to inform residents of the options for bicycling in the City and educate residents about bicycle safety and the health benefits of bicycling. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Pedestrian System

Policy T17: Implement the Pedestrian System Plan included in the City's Transportation Master Plan through a combination of public and private investments. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T18: Prioritize construction of sidewalks, walkways and trails that are safe, connect to destinations, access transit and are accessible by all. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T19: Design crossings that are appropriately located and provide safety and convenience for pedestrians. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T20: Develop a funding program to share the cost and efforts needed to construct sidewalks, walkways and trails identified as part of the City's Pedestrian System Plan included in the City's Transportation Master Plan. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T21: Develop flexible sidewalk standards to fit a range of locations, needs and costs. (***Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy T30***)

Policy T22: Develop a public outreach program to inform residents of the options for walking in the City and educate residents about pedestrian safety and the health benefits of walking. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Transit System

Policy T23: Make transit a more convenient, appealing and viable option for all trips through implementation of the Shoreline Transit Plans included in the City's Transportation Master Plan. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T24: Monitor transit service and advocate the City be well served and transit quality, passenger comfort and safety are maintained at the desired level for Shoreline residents. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T25: Encourage development in appropriate areas that is supportive of transit. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T26: Encourage transit providers to expand service on existing transit routes in accordance with adopted transit agency service guidelines. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T27: Work with Metro Transit to implement RapidRide Bus Rapid Transit service on the Aurora Avenue N corridor and operate it as a convenient and appealing option for riders in Shoreline and those that want to come to Shoreline. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T28: Work with transit agencies to improve east-west service across the City of Shoreline and service from Shoreline to the University of Washington. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T29: Strengthen Aurora Avenue N as a high usage transit corridor that encourages cross-county, seamless service. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T30: Work with Sound Transit, the Shoreline School District, the Washington State Department of Transportation, Metro Transit and Shoreline neighborhoods to develop the final light rail alignment and station area plans for the areas surrounding the future Link light rail stations. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T31: Work with Metro Transit to develop a plan to orient bus service to serve the light rail station at Northgate coinciding with the opening of service at Northgate. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T32: Support and encourage the development of additional High Capacity Transit service in Shoreline. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T33: Continue to install and support the installation of transit supportive infrastructure. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T34: Work with Metro Transit and Community Transit to develop a bus service plan that connects residents to light rail stations, High Capacity Transit corridors, such as Bus Rapid Transit on Aurora Avenue N, and park-and-ride lots throughout the City. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T35: Implement traffic mitigation measures at light rail station areas. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T36: Monitor transit service, transportation patterns and land use around the light rail stations. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Master Street Plan

Policy T37: Design City transportation facilities with the primary purpose of moving people via multiple modes, including automobiles, freight trucks, transit, bicycles and walking, with vehicle parking identified as a secondary use. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T38: Implement the standards outlined in the Master Street Plan for development of the City's roadways. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T39: Frontage improvements shall support the adjacent land uses and fit the character of the areas in which they are located. (***Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy T16 – modified***)

Concurrency and Level of Service

Policy T40: Adopt a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.90 or lower for Principal Arterials or Minor Arterials, excluding the following areas where:

- Widening the roadway cross-section is not feasible, due to significant topographic constraints.

- Interjurisdictional coordination is required to mitigate congestion.
- Rechannelization and safety improvements result in acceptable levels of increased congestion in light of the improved operational safety of the roadway.
- The V/C ratio on one leg of an intersection is greater than 0.90 but the intersection operates at Level of Service (LOS) D or better.

Adopt LOS D at the signalized intersections on arterials within the City as the level of service standard for evaluating planning level concurrency and reviewing traffic impacts of developments, excluding the Highways of Statewide Significance (I-5 and Aurora Avenue N). Intersections that operate worse than LOS D will not meet the City's established concurrency threshold. The level of service shall be calculated with the delay method described in the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual 2010 or its updated versions.

These Level of Service standards apply throughout the City unless an alternative Level of Service standard is identified in a Shoreline Comprehensive Plan Subarea Plan. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T41: The following levels of service are the desired frequency of transit service in the City of Shoreline. Headways on all-day service routes should be no less than thirty minutes, including weekends and evenings (strive for twenty-minute or less headways during the day on these routes); headways on peak-only routes should be no more than twenty minutes (strive for fifteen-minute or less headways on these routes). (***New Recommended Policy***)

Transportation Improvements

Policy T42: Projects should be scheduled, designed and constructed with the following criteria taken into consideration:

- Service and greatest benefit to as many people as possible.
- Ability to be flexible and respond to a variety of needs and changes.
- Coordination with other City projects to minimize costs and disruptions.
- Ability to partner with private development and other agencies and leverage funding from outside sources.
- Flexibility in the implementation of projects when funding sources or opportunities arise. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T43: Consider and coordinate the construction of new capital projects with upgrades or projects needed by utility providers operating in the City. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T44: Pursue corridor studies on key corridors to determine improvements that address safety, capacity and mobility and support adjacent land uses. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T45: Expand the City's pedestrian network. Prioritize projects shown on the Pedestrian System Plan included in the City's Transportation Master Plan, using the following criteria:

- Can be combined with other capital projects or leverage other funding
- Proximity to a school or park.
- Located on an arterial.
- Connects to an existing walkway or the Interurban Trail.
- Located in an activity center, such as Town Center or North City, or connects to Aurora Avenue N.
- Connects to transit.

- Links major destinations such as neighborhood businesses, high-density housing, schools and recreation facilities. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T46: Prioritize projects that complete the City's bicycle networks, as shown on the Bicycle System Plan included in the City's Transportation Master Plan, using the following criteria:

- Connects to the Interurban Trail.
- Completes a portion of the routes connecting the Interurban and Burke Gilman Trails.
- Provides access to bus rapid transit or light rail.
- Connects to existing facilities.
- Connects to high-density housing, commercial areas or public facilities.
- Connects to a regional route or existing or planned facilities in a neighboring jurisdiction.
- Links to a school or park.
- Can be combined with other capital projects or leverage other funding. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T47: Coordinate with the Washington State Department of Transportation to evaluate and design improvements to the interchange at NE 175th Street and I-5. Develop a funding strategy for construction. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Funding

Policy T48: Aggressively seek grant opportunities to implement the City's Transportation Master Plan and work to ensure that Shoreline receives regional and federal funding for its high priority projects. (***Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy 59 – modified***)

Policy T49: Support efforts at the state and federal level to increase funding for the transportation system. (***Existing Comprehensive Plan Policy 61***)

Policy T50: Identify and secure funding sources for transportation projects. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T51: Develop and implement a City-wide transportation impact fee program to fund growth related transportation improvements and, when necessary, use the State Environmental Policy Act to provide traffic mitigation for localized development project impacts. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T52: Enhance neighborhood safety and livability by funding neighborhood safety programs. (***New Recommended Policy***)

Policy T53: Provide funding for maintenance, preservation and safety. (***New Recommended Policy***)

This page intentionally blank

AMENDMENT #1 SMC 20.60.140

This change would modify the development code to bring it into compliance with the recommended Level of Service for Shoreline.

SMC 20.60.140 Adequate streets.

The intent of this subchapter is to ensure that public streets maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) as new development occurs. ~~The level of service standard that the City has selected is a LOS E Standard at signalized intersections on arterial streets, which is the basis for measuring concurrency.~~

A. Level of Service. The level of service standard that the City has selected is a LOS D standard at signalized intersections on arterial streets and a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.90 or lower for Principal Arterials or Minor Arterials, excluding the following areas where:

1. Widening the roadway cross-section is not feasible, due to significant topographic constraints.
2. Interjurisdictional coordination is required to mitigate congestion.
3. Rechannelization and safety improvements result in acceptable levels of increased congestion in light of the improved operational safety of the roadway.
4. The V/C ratio on one leg of an intersection is greater than 0.90 but the intersection operates at LOS D or better.

B. Concurrency. Development that causes roadways to operate below the level of service identified in 20.60.140(A) will not meet the City's established concurrency threshold. These Level of Service standards apply throughout the City unless an alternative Level of Service for particular streets has been adopted in the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.

A.C. Development Proposal Requirements. All new proposals for development that would generate 20 or more new trips during the p.m. peak hour must submit a traffic study at the time of application. The estimate of the number of trips for a development shall be consistent with the most recent edition of the Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Traffic Engineers. The traffic study shall include at a minimum:

1. An analysis of origin/destination trip distribution proposed;
2. The identification of any intersection that would receive the addition of 20 or more trips during the p.m. peak hour; and
3. An analysis demonstrating how impacted intersections could accommodate the additional trips and maintain the LOS standard.

BD. Development Approval Conditions. A development proposal that will have a direct traffic impact on a roadway or intersection that exceeds the adopted LOS standards shall not be approved unless:

1. The applicant agrees to fund improvements needed to attain the LOS standard;
2. The applicant achieves the LOS standard by phasing the project or using transportation demand management (TDM) techniques to reduce the number of peak hour trips generated by the project;

3. The roadway or intersection has already been improved to its ultimate roadway section and the applicant agrees to use TDM incentives and/or phase the development proposal as determined by the City of Shoreline.

AMENDMENT #2 SMC 20.70.010 and .020

These sections would be recodified as SMC 12.10.100 and .110, respectively.

20.70.010 Purpose.

~~The purpose of this chapter is to establish engineering regulations and standards to implement the Comprehensive Plan and provide a general framework for relating the standards and other requirements of this Code to development.~~

20.70.020 Engineering Development Guide.

~~Pursuant to SMC [20.10.050](#), the Director is authorized to prepare and administer an “Engineering Development Guide.” The Engineering Development Guide includes processes, design and construction criteria, inspection requirements, standard plans, and technical standards for engineering design related to development. The specifications shall include, but are not limited to:~~

- ~~A. Street widths, curve radii, alignments, street layout, street grades;~~
- ~~B. Intersection design, sight distance and clearance, driveway location;~~
- ~~C. Block size, sidewalk placement and standards, length of cul de sacs, usage of hammerhead turnarounds;~~
- ~~D. Streetscape specifications (trees, landscaping, benches, other amenities);~~
- ~~E. Surface water and stormwater specifications;~~
- ~~F. Traffic control and safety markings, signs, signals, street lights, turn lanes and other devices be installed or funded; and~~
- ~~G. Other improvements within rights-of-way~~

AMENDMENT #3 SMC 20.70.120 and .130

SMC 20.70.120 ~~General~~ Dedication of right-of-way

- A. Dedication shall occur at the time of recording for subdivisions, and prior to permit issuance for development projects.
- B. Dedications may be required in the following situations:
 1. When it can be demonstrated that the dedications of land or easements within the proposed development or plat are necessary as a direct result of the proposed development or plat to which the dedication of land or easement is to apply;
 2. To accommodate motorized and nonmotorized transportation, landscaping, utilities, surface water drainage, street lighting, traffic control devices, and buffer requirements as required in Subchapter 4, Required Improvements, and Subchapter 5, Utility Standards;
 3. Prior to the acceptance of a private street, private stormwater drainage system or other facility for maintenance;

4. When the development project abuts an existing substandard public street and additional right-of-way is necessary to incorporate future frontage improvements as set forth in the Transportation Master Plan and the Engineering Development Guide for public safety; or
5. Right-of-way is needed for the extension of existing public street improvements necessary for public safety.

C. The city may accept dedication and assume maintenance responsibility of a private street only if the following conditions are met:

1. All necessary upgrades to the street to meet City standards have been completed;
2. All necessary easements and dedications entitling the City to properly maintain the streets and allow public access have been conveyed and accepted by the City;
3. The Director has determined that maintenance of the facility will contribute to protecting or improving the health, safety, and welfare of the community served by the private road; and

SMC 20.70.130 Dedication of right-of-way.

- ~~A. The Director may grant some reduction in the minimum right-of-way requirement where it can be demonstrated that sufficient area has been provided for all frontage improvements.~~
- ~~B. The City may accept dedication and assume maintenance responsibility of a private street only if the following conditions are met:~~
- ~~1. All necessary upgrades to the street to meet City standards have been completed;~~
 - ~~2. All necessary easements and dedications entitling the City to properly maintain the street have been conveyed to the City;~~
 - ~~3. The Director has determined that maintenance of the facility will contribute to protecting or improving the health, safety, and welfare of the community served by the private road; and~~
 - ~~4. The City has accepted maintenance responsibility in writing.~~

SMC 20.70.220 Street classification.

~~Streets and rights of way are classified in the Transportation Master Plan Street Classification Map (Fig.A)~~

SMC 20.70.320 Frontage improvements

~~Frontage improvements required for subdivisions pursuant to Chapter 58.17 RCW and Chapter 20.30 SMC, Subchapter 7, and to mitigate identified impacts, shall be provided and installed pursuant to standards set forth in the Transportation Master Plan Street Classification Map (Fig. A), the Master Street Plan contained in Appendix D of the Transportation Master Plan and the Engineering Development Guide for the specific street which is substandard pursuant to this section. When required, frontage improvements shall be~~

installed as described in the ~~Transportation Master Plan and the Engineering Development Guide for the specific street classification and street segment~~

- A. Standard frontage improvements consist of curb, gutter, sidewalk, amenity zone and landscaping, drainage improvements, and pavement overlay to one-half of each right-of-way abutting a property as defined for the specific street classification. Additional improvements may be required to ensure safe movement of traffic, including pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and nonmotorized vehicles. The improvements can include transit bus shelters, bus pullouts, utility undergrounding, street lighting, signage, and channelization.
- B. Frontage improvements are required for:
 - 1. All new multifamily, nonresidential, and mixed-use construction;
 - 2. Remodeling or additions to multifamily, nonresidential, and mixed-use buildings or conversions to these uses that increase floor area by 20 percent or greater, as long as the original building footprint is a minimum of 4,000 square feet, or any alterations or repairs which exceed 50 percent of the value of the previously existing structure;
 - 3. Subdivisions.

Exception:

i. Subdivisions, short plats, and binding site plans where all of the lots are fully developed.

C. Exemptions to some or all of these requirements may be allowed if the street will be improved as a whole through a Local Improvement District (LID) or Capital Improvement Project scheduled to be completed within five years of permit issuance. In such a case, a contribution may be made and calculated based on the improvements that would be required of the development. Contributed funds shall be directed to the City's capital project fund and shall be used for the capital project and offset future assessments on the property resulting from an LID. An LID "no-protest" commitment shall also be recorded. Adequate interim levels of improvements for public safety shall be required.

D. Required improvements shall be installed by the applicant prior to final approval or occupancy.

E. For subdivisions the improvements shall be completed prior to final plat approval or post a bond or other surety as provided for in SMC [20.30.440](#)

Transportation Element Goals & Policies

Introduction

The Transportation Element will guide the development and funding of a transportation network that provides mobility for residents and employees within the City of Shoreline in a way that preserves citizens' quality of life. The City's transportation system will be designed around safe and friendly streets that can accommodate pedestrians and bicycles as well as automobiles and buses. Because of Shoreline's location between the City of Seattle and Snohomish County, the City should also pursue a strategic plan to coordinate transportation improvements with neighboring jurisdictions and transit providers. The Transportation Element establishes policies on how to prioritize the City's transportation system improvements and how to identify the City's strategic interests in regional investments, adjacent transportation facilities and funding alternatives.

Transportation Goals

- Goal T I:** Provide safe and friendly streets for Shoreline citizens.
- Goal T II:** Work with transportation providers to develop a safe, efficient and effective multimodal transportation system to address overall mobility and accessibility. Maximize the people carrying capacity of the surface transportation system.
- Goal T III:** Support increased transit coverage and service that connects local and regional destinations to improve mobility options for all Shoreline residents.
- Goal T IV:** Provide a pedestrian system that is safe, connects to destinations, accesses transit, and is accessible by all.
- Goal T V:** Develop a bicycle system that is connective and safe and encourages bicycling as a viable alternative method of transportation
- Goal T VI:** Protect the livability and safety of residential neighborhoods from the adverse impacts of the automobile.
- Goal T VII:** Encourage alternative modes of transportation to reduce the number of automobiles on the road.
- Goal T VIII:** Develop a transportation system that enhances the delivery and transport of goods and services
- Goal T IX:** Secure reliable and fair funding to ensure continuous maintenance and improvement of the transportation system.

Goal T X: Coordinate the implementation and development of Shoreline’s transportation system with our neighbors and regional partners.

Goal TXI: Maintain the transportation infrastructure so that it is safe and functional.

Transportation Policies

Safe and Friendly Streets

- T1:** Make safety the first priority of citywide transportation planning and traffic management. Place a higher priority on pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile safety over vehicle capacity improvements at intersections.
- T2:** Use engineering, enforcement, and educational tools to improve traffic safety on City roadways.
- T3:** Monitor traffic accidents, citizen input/complaints, traffic violations, and traffic growth to identify and prioritize locations for safety improvements.
- T4:** Develop a detailed traffic and pedestrian safety plan for arterials, collector arterials and high potential hazard locations.
- T5:** Develop a safe roadway system as a high priority. Examples of methods to improve safety include:
- center left turn lanes,
 - median islands,
 - turn prohibitions,
 - signals, illumination,
 - access management, and
 - other traffic engineering techniques.
- T6:** Evaluate and field test installation of devices that increase safety of pedestrian crossings such as flags, in-pavement lights, pedestrian signals, and raised, colored and/or textured crosswalks.
- T7:** Designate “Green Streets” on select arterials and neighborhood collectors that connect schools, parks, neighborhood centers and other key destinations. Compile design standards for each “Green Street” type.
- T8:** Develop a comprehensive detailed street lighting and outdoor master lighting plan to guide ongoing public and private street lighting efforts.
- T9:** Minimize curb cuts (driveways) on arterial streets by combining driveways through the development review process and in implementing capital projects.

Multi-Modal Transportation System

- T10:** Implement the Transportation Master Plan that integrates “Green Streets”, bicycle routes, curb ramps, major sidewalk routes, street classification, bus routes and

transit access, street lighting and roadside storm drainage improvements. Promote adequate capacity on the roadways and intersections to provide access to homes and businesses.

- T11:** Coordinate transportation infrastructure design and placement to serve multiple public functions when possible, i.e. integrate storm water management, parks development and transportation facility design.
- T12:** Implement a coordinated signal system that is efficient and which is flexible depending on the demand or time of day, and responsive to all types of users.
- T13:** Adopt LOS E at the signalized intersections on the arterials within the City as the level of service standards for evaluating planning level concurrency and reviewing traffic impacts of developments, excluding the Highways of Statewide Significance (Aurora Avenue N and Ballinger Way NE). The level of service shall be calculated with the delay method described in the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual 2000 or its updated versions.
- T14:** The City of Shoreline shall pursue the development of a multi-modal measure for Level of Service that takes into account not only vehicular travel and delay, but transit service and other modes of travel.
- T15:** Assure that vehicular and non-motorized transportation systems are appropriately sized and designed to serve the surrounding land uses and to minimize the negative impacts of growth.
- T16:** Design transportation improvements to support the city's land use goals and fit the character of the areas through which they pass.
- T17:** Utilize the Arterial Classification Map as a guide in balancing street function with land uses. Minimize through traffic on local streets.
- T18:** Develop a regular maintenance schedule for all components of the transportation infrastructure. Develop maintenance schedules based on safety/imminent danger, and on preservation of resources.
- T19:** Inventory and inspect the transportation infrastructure.
- T20:** Establish a pavement management system.
- T21:** Upgrade our signal system to that it is responsive, fully interconnected, and moves people efficiently and safely.

Local and Regional Public Transit

- T22:** Develop a detailed transit plan in coordination with transit providers to identify level of service targets, facilities and implementation measures to increase Shoreline residents' and students' transit ridership.

- T23:** Work with transit service providers to provide safe, lighted, and weather protected passenger waiting areas at stops with high ridership, transfer points, Park and Ride, and park and pool lots.
- T24:** Work with all transit providers to support “seamless” service into Shoreline across the county lines and through to major destinations.
- T25:** Work with Sound Transit to study the development of a low impact commuter rail stop in the Richmond Beach/Point Wells area. The Richmond Beach residents shall be involved in the decision making process as far as location, design, and access to the service.

Pedestrian System

- T26:** Provide adequate, predictable, and dedicated funding to construct pedestrian projects.
- T27:** Place high priority on sidewalk projects that abut or provide connections to schools, parks, transit, shopping, or large places of employment.
- T28:** Reinforce neighborhood character and abutting land uses when developing and designing the pedestrian system.
- T29:** Provide sidewalks on arterial streets and neighborhood collectors.
- T30:** Develop flexible sidewalk standards to fit a range of locations, needs and costs.
- T31:** Work with the School District to determine and construct high priority safe school walk routes. The City should partner with the School District to achieve these goals.
- T32:** Coordinate sidewalk design and construction with adjacent jurisdictions where sidewalks cross the City boundaries.
- T33:** Provide pedestrian signalization at signalized intersections, and install midblock crossings if safety warrants can be met. Consider over- and under-crossings where feasible and convenient for users. Use audio and visual pedestrian aids where useful.
- T34:** Implement the City’s curb ramp program to install wheelchair ramps at all curbed intersections.
- T35:** Require all commercial, multi-family and residential short-plat and long-plat developments to provide for sidewalks or separated all weather trails, or payment in lieu of sidewalks.
- T36:** Develop an off-street trail system that serves a recreational and transportation function. Preserve rights-of-way for future non-motorized trail connections, and utilize utility easements for trails when feasible.

Bicycle System

- T37:** Reinforce neighborhood character and abutting land uses when developing and designing the bicycle system.
- T38:** Work with the bicycle community to develop bicycle routes connecting schools, recreational and commuter destinations, including transit linkages. Aggressively pursue construction of the Interurban Trail as the spine of the City's bicycle system.
- T39:** Work with neighboring jurisdictions and other agencies to ensure that Shoreline's bicycle routes/corridors and designs are compatible and connect with one another.
- T40:** Work with Lake Forest Park to develop a bicycle linkage to the Burke-Gilman trail.
- T41:** Work with the School District to determine and encourage safe bike routes to schools. The City should partner with the School District to achieve these goals.
- T42:** Accommodate bicycles in future roadway or intersection improvement projects.
- T43:** Require new commercial developments to provide convenient bicycle parking facilities for employees and visitors/customers. Encourage merchants to install bike parking facilities.
- T44:** Reduce barriers to bicycle travel and reduce bicycle safety problems.

Neighborhood Protection

- T45:** Work with neighborhood residents to reduce speeds and cut-through traffic on non-arterial streets with education, enforcement, traffic calming, signing, or other techniques. Design new residential streets to discourage cut-through traffic while maintaining the connectivity of the transportation system.
- T46:** Streamline the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program process and improve opportunities for public input.
- T47:** Monitor traffic growth on collector arterials and neighborhood collectors and take measures to keep volumes within reasonable limits.

Transportation Demand Management

- T48:** Work with major employers, developers, schools, and conference facilities to provide incentives to employees, tenants, students, and visitors to utilize alternatives other than the single occupant vehicle.
- T49:** Support educational programs for children and residents that communicate transportation costs, safety, and travel choices.
- T50:** Support state and federal tax policies that promote transit and ridesharing.

Transportation Element – Goals & Policies

- T51:** Develop parking system management and regulations to support alternatives to the single occupant vehicle
- T52:** Analyze alternatives by which employers and/or developers not subject to the Commute Trip Reduction Act can encourage their employees and tenants to pursue alternative transportation choices.
- T53:** Work with Shoreline Community College and King County Metro to reduce employee and student use of single occupant vehicles and promote transit and carpooling.

Freight Mobility System

- T54:** Incorporate new strategies, as they are developed, into Shoreline’s TDM programs that promote or provide alternatives to driving alone.
- T55:** Ensure that service and delivery trucks, and other freight transportation can move with minimal delay on appropriate streets and rail systems in our city as shown on the truck route map.
- T56:** Minimize the disruption of arterial traffic flow by developing time-limited loading zones in commercial areas and regulating areas that don’t have loading zones. Develop a plan for business access streets to provide freight loading zones on less-heavily traveled roadways.
- T57:** Discourage truck traffic through residential neighborhoods during typical sleeping hours.
- T58:** Work with developers/property owners along the Aurora Avenue North corridor and in North City to plan business access streets as a part of redevelopment.

Funding

- T59:** Aggressively seek grant opportunities to implement the adopted Transportation Element to ensure that Shoreline receives its fair share of regional and federal funding. Pursue grant opportunities for joint project needs with adjacent jurisdictions.
- T60:** Analyze and if feasible implement a City-wide development impact fee program which will include transportation system improvements, and where feasible, use SEPA to provide traffic mitigation for system-wide impacts.
- T61:** Support efforts at the state and federal level to increase funding for the transportation system.
- T62:** Allocate resources in the City’s Transportation Improvement Program and Capital Improvement Program according to the project prioritization matrices.
- T63:** Balance project costs against reasonably expected revenue sources for the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The TMP shall be updated bi-annually to reflect changes in revenue availability and revisions to the project list.

- T64:** Pursue one of the following actions in the event that the City is unable to fund the transportation capital improvements needed to maintain adopted transportation level of service standards:
- Phase development which is consistent with the Land Use Plan until such time that adequate resources can be identified to provide adequate transportation improvements;
 - Reassess the Land Use policies and regulations to reduce the travel demand placed on the system to the degree necessary to meet adopted transportation service standards; or
 - Reassess the City’s adopted transportation level of service standards to reflect levels that can be maintained, based on known financial resources.

Regional Coordination

- T65:** Advocate the City’s strategic interest in high capacity transit, local and express bus service and other transit technologies. Work with local and regional agencies to obtain a fair share of transit service and facilities.
- T66:** Develop short-, medium- and long-range priorities and implementation strategies for improvements to the state highway system within and adjacent to the City of Shoreline. Advocate for added access to and connections on to I-5 through the City of Shoreline.
- T67:** Develop interlocal agreements with neighboring jurisdictions for development impact mitigation, for coordination of joint projects, and management of pass-through traffic. Consider annexing the sections of NE 145th and NE 205th Streets that are adjacent to the City. Work with adjacent jurisdictions and stakeholders to jointly study the 145th, 205th and Bothell Way NE corridors to develop level of service standards as part of a plan and funding strategy for future improvements.
- T68:** Work with neighboring jurisdictions to reduce air quality impacts and manage storm water runoff from the transportation system.
- T69:** Pursue methods of reducing the impact on Richmond Beach Drive at the King/Snohomish County line (e.g. closing) if the Point Wells property is not annexed by the City of Shoreline. Consider the extension of 205th only as potential mitigation for future development of Point Wells.

