

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Continued Deliberation on Proposed Ridgecrest Planned Area 2 Legislative Rezone
DEPARTMENT:	Planning and Development Services
PRESENTED BY:	Joseph W. Tovar, FAICP, Director

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

The City Council continues their discussion and deliberation on the recommended new planned area legislative rezone for the Ridgecrest commercial area. At the January 14 Council meeting, staff presented the Planning Commission recommendation. The City Council continued discussing this item on January 28 and February 19. The Council continues their discussion February 25 for review of the attached Policy Options Matrix and direction to staff for amendments to the proposed rezone. Staff will post the proposed amendments on the City's website prior to Monday, March 3, to provide an opportunity for the public to review and comment. The Council intends to take final action on the proposal at its March 3 Business meeting.

Staff has reviewed all the proposed amendments and they are within the scope of the original rezone proposal, with the exception of one amendment which was proposed by Councilmember Eggen: R-24 zoning for 100 feet adjacent to single-family zones, 2:1 setback above 35 feet. If the Council wishes to consider this amendment staff recommends that it be remanded to the Planning Commission for review since this option was not in the original scope.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council finish deliberation on this matter at its February 25 meeting and direct staff to prepare amendments to be included in the zoning ordinance that will be considered on March 3.

Approved By:

City Manager 

City Attorney 

ATTACHMENT A

Policy Options Matrix

A. BUILDING SIZE AND DESIGN/TRANSITION ISSUES

Proposal	Proposed by	Pros and Cons	Staff recommendation	Possible motion
1. Adopt Planning Commission recommendation	Hansen and McGlashan	Pro- reflects unanimous recommendation of the Planning Commission Con- would forego opportunities for further refinements essentially consistent with the proposal reviewed by the Planning Commission.	The Planning Commission recommendation balanced a concern for project viability with need for mitigations and amenities. Staff believes further amendments are appropriate so long as they lessen impacts and/or increase amenities without imposing unreasonable costs.	
2. R-24 zoning for 100 feet adjacent to single-family zones, 2:1 stepback above 35 feet	Eggen	Pro- would create smaller building bulk and unit count in PLA 2A zone Con- R-24 zoning would eliminate use rights and unit count rights of existing NB zoning. A “rezone” to R-24 would require new notice and hearing.	Not recommended. It is more important to focus on height and mass rather than unit count. Suggest option 5 below.	Remand to the Planning Commission for review; this option was not in the original scope.
3. Maximum of 5 stories	Scott	Pro- would eliminate mass of sixth floor. Con- unless FAR was also lowered, could result in more bulk on fifth floor. Likely to render unviable a mixed use project with 20% moderate income, three star Built Green, and amenities such as public plaza, etc.	Not recommended. Staff believes that stepbacks in option 5 below would create the visual perception of 5 stories.	Direct staff to bring back language that would have....
4. 6 stories with 2:1 stepbacks above 35 ft from south and west sides	Ryu and Way	Pro- would lessen building mass along south and west sides. Con- Reduces economic viability of project to achieve relatively small impact when compared to hybrid option below.	Not recommended.	Direct staff to bring back language that would have....

5. Hybrid option: 6 stories with an additional 10 ft stepback above 35', then 1:1 stepbacks to 6 stories	Staff	Pro- would lessen perceived building mass of sixth floor almost as well as option 3 without seriously impact project viability. See sketchup and section views for comparison.	Recommended. This option reduces perceived bulk from south almost as much as Option 4, but with far less impact on project viability.	Direct staff to bring back language that would have....
6. Restrict unit size to a minimum of 600 square feet	Eggen	Comparable market, Lake City has studios/small one-bedroom of 450 ft., larger one-bedroom units of 550-600 sq. ft. and two-bedroom units from 700-800 sq. ft. Units rent for \$2/sq. ft so a 600 sq. ft unit would rent for \$1200/month. Customers for these units: divorced who want to stay in neighborhood, "sunbirds" who have a 2 nd home elsewhere, and children who grow up in area.	Not recommended. This option would needlessly eliminate housing choice and marginalize project viability.	Direct staff to bring back language that would...

B. AMENITIES AND SITE DESIGN ISSUES

Proposal	Proposed by	Pros and Cons	Staff recommendation	Possible motion
7. 5 th Ave NE and NE 165 th Plaza <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create public space on corner Soften building mass by the corner 	Ryu, Scott, and Way	Pro- Reduces apparent mass of building at prominent corner and creates visual interest and pedestrian vitality at intersection. Con- adds cost and reduces building floor area at the corner of PLA 2A.	Recommended. Staff believes these are reasonable ways to mitigate building bulk, create visual interest and pedestrian activity. To be included and detailed in administrative design guidelines to be adopted by the Department	Direct staff to draft code language that would require creation of design guidelines dealing with these aspects of building corner treatment
8. Public plaza should include covered portion	Ryu		Recommended. Include in administrative design guidelines to be written by	Direct staff to bring back language that would add a

			staff	requirement for staff creation of design guidelines dealing with public plaza
9. Require a public viewing area or terrace treatment on 6 th floor	Way	Pro- Provide public access to views Con - Security issues for the owner and residents who live there and potential risk of liability for owner and make the project less viable	Not recommended. Staff could find no examples of such an exaction in mixed use project. Cost would marginalize project viability.	Direct staff to bring back language that would add a requirement
10. Add new language for sustainability including: provision of bike racks, bus passes, using native, non-invasive plants	Way		Recommended. Staff believes these concepts can be easily added in the sustainability section of code language.	Direct staff to bring back language that would add requirements to...
11. Design guidelines that encourage "cut-ins" on west side for emergency vehicle access	Ryu	Fire Marshal has told staff that this would be unnecessary; that they would require sprinklers and they would fight a fire using vehicles in the street, not on the property	Not recommended. Emergency responders have said such cut-ins would serve no public safety purpose.	Direct staff to bring back language that would add a requirement
12. Add requirement to make indoor meeting space available for rent to non-profit organizations	Staff	Pro- space of non-profit organizations would contribute to "third place" energy to complement retail uses and open-air public plaza. Con- Limits profitability of rents for retail on the ground floor	Recommended. Uses such as police storefront office, and meeting or office space for community or after hours school program would benefit both project and community at large.	Direct staff to bring back language that would add a requirement to..
13. Add requirement to limit maximum percentage of non-retail use in storefronts facing 5 th Avenue NE	Staff	Pro: Promote to retail and commercial use Con: May result in empty storefronts if units cannot be rented.		Direct staff to bring back language that would add a requirement to..

C. PARKING ISSUES

Proposal	Proposed by	Pros and Cons	Staff recommendation	Possible motion
14. Owner should provide bus passes	Staff	Pro: Would re-enforce the self-selection of new residents who would be more likely to use transit. Con: Adds costs and conditions to operating practices instead of physical improvements are difficult to enforce	Recommended. Building owner should be required to provide 50% of the units with METRO bus passes for 2 years	Direct staff to bring back language to that effect.
15. Require 95% of required parking be on-site with the balance provided off-site	Eggen	Pro: Some people would not have to walk to get to their car. Reduces likelihood of neighborhood parking impacts Con: Limits owners' flexibility in how he manages parking, reducing project viability.	Not recommended. Instead, staff recommends adding a building permit condition stating <u>that if tenant on street parking exceeds X% owner will be required to provide additional parking consistent with the development code or restrict building occupancy to the extent necessary or reduce the excess on street parking..</u>	Direct staff to bring back language to add a parking enforcement regulation as suggested.
16. Modify parking standards	Staff	Standards to be more rigorous than PC recommendation, but slightly less than current standards—in combination with Flexcar and bus passes, will support sustainability goal	Recommended. Staff recommends: 1.0 for studio 1.3 for one-bedroom 1.6 for two-bedroom	Direct staff to bring back language that would add new parking requirements as suggested.
17. Place time limits on 5 th Avenue on-street parking	Staff	Would ensure turnover of spaces near retail businesses	Recommended. Staff suggests that this be included as part of the neighborhood parking plan.	Direct staff to...
18. Tandem parking for long-term parking	Staff		Recommended. Staff suggests the addition of enforcement	Direct staff to...

and tying rent to parking stalls			clause noted in #15 above.	
----------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------	--

D. INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUES AND OTHER IDEAS

Proposal	Proposed by	Pros and Cons	Staff recommendation	Possible motion
Infrastructure				
19. Add impact fee to fund intersection improvements including corner treatment	Ryu	Pro: Would create synergy among corners in creating a “people place” Con: Impact fee must be tied to an overall impact fee program which the City has not undertaken. State law would only allow a fee that is proportional to a project’s impact, not other future project’s impacts	Not recommended. Instead, the City should seek funds through grants etc to develop intersection/corners design and pay for improvements as part of an economic development strategy	Direct staff to include “searching for funding sources” in recommendation below to develop plan for intersection improvements
Other				
20. Direct staff to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a neighborhood parking plan • Develop plan for 165th/5th Ave NE ROW and intersection improvements • Discuss with Crest owner how to maintain Crest as a viable community asset • Encourage police substation to move to new development. 	Way		Recommended. The staff supports this direction. These will be added as direction to the CMO and staff; separate and distinct from adoption of the zoning ordinance.	Direct staff to take these actions concurrent with the adoption of the zoning ordinance.