

**Part Eleven – 197-11-960**

**SEPA Rules**

**TO BE COMPLETED  
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR  
AGENCY USE ONLY**

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity that might be needed.  
As development occurs, the extent of utility upgrade will be assessed and analyzed by utility providers.

**c. SIGNATURE**

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number: (     ) \_\_\_\_\_ Date Submitted \_\_\_\_\_

**This page left intentionally blank**

**Part Eleven – 197-11-960**

**SEPA Rules**

**TO BE COMPLETED  
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR  
AGENCY USE ONLY**

**D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS  
(DO NOT USE THIS SHEET FOR PROJECT ACTIONS)**

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent of the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water/emissions to air/production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Because the area is mostly built-out, substantial increases in discharges and/or emissions are not anticipated. All development must comply with adopted rules and regulations to mitigate these impacts.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Current regulations address these concerns. In addition, recently adopted stormwater regulations, and proposed tree retention regulations provide better protection against run-off pollution and loss of tree canopy.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Most of the habitat in the subarea is located in 3 City parks adjacent to the subarea, which would not be detrimentally affected by additional development.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

None

The Subarea Plan contains a number of recommendations regarding creation of green corridors and backyard habitats.

**Part Eleven – 197-11-960**

**SEPA Rules**

**TO BE COMPLETED  
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR  
AGENCY USE ONLY**

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?  
Additional housing and cars may mean increased electricity, water, resource and fuel needs.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

The Subarea Plan calls for sustainable development on a number of different levels. The intention is to create a walkable/bikable community with access to transit, more compact forms of housing, green building, and economic development to provide goods and services in closer proximity to residences.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?  
No sensitive areas or those designated for governmental protection are contained within the boundaries of the subarea. There are several adjacent parks, but the potential increased density would not stress their capacity for service.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

Aforementioned stormwater, lot coverage and tree regulations, as well as Critical Areas Ordinance, Parks Master Plan, and sustainable development techniques would protect resources and mitigate impacts.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?  
The subarea is not adjacent to any shorelines and no new land uses are proposed. The Subarea Plan promotes augmentation of existing housing stock and business development.

Existing problems with stormwater drainage and resultant pollution of water bodies have been documented and are a source of concern for the neighborhoods.

**Part Eleven - 197-11-960**

**SEPA Rules**

**TO BE COMPLETED  
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR  
AGENCY USE ONLY**

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

Land use techniques to mitigate impacts of increased density include traffic calming measures, setbacks, stepbacks and other design standards and buffering techniques.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Greater density could increase demand on transportation, public services and utilities.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demands(s) are:

The Subarea Plan calls for sustainable development on a number of different levels. The intention is to create a walkable/bikable community with access to transit, more compact forms of housing, green building, and economic development to provide goods and services in closer proximity to residences.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

No conflicts have been identified.

Transportation Master Plan will include traffic modeling for growth scenarios and delineate appropriate mitigation. Subarea Plan calls for interjurisdictional corridor study for SR523 and proposed light rail with mitigation and funding.



## Planning and Development Services

17500 Midvale Avenue N., Shoreline, WA 98133-4921  
(206) 801-2500 ♦ Fax (206) 546-8761

**SEPA THRESHOLD DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE (DNS)****Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan****PROJECT INFORMATION**

**DATE OF ISSUANCE:** January 28, 2010

**PROJECT NAME/DESCRIPTION:** Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan, which contains policy and zoning recommendations from a Citizen's Advisory Committee.

**APPLICANT:** City of Shoreline Planning Department

**PROPERTY OWNER:** NA

**APPLICATION FILE NUMBER:** 301619

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Portions of the Ridgecrest and Briarcrest neighborhoods

**PARCEL NUMBER:** NA

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:** NA

**CURRENT ZONING:** NA

**ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS:** Environmental Checklist

**SEPA THRESHOLD DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE (DNS)**

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued in accordance with WAC 197-11-340. The City of Shoreline has determined that the proposal will not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of the submitted SEPA Environmental Checklist and other information on file at the City of Shoreline. This information is available for public review upon request at no charge.

**PUBLIC COMMENT AND APPEAL INFORMATION**

There is no administrative appeal available for this decision. The SEPA Threshold Determination may be appealed with the decision on the underlying action to superior court. If there is not a statutory time limit in filing a judicial appeal, the appeal must be filed within 21 calendar days following the issuance of this decision on the underlying decision in accordance with State law.

Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner  
City of Shoreline, Planning & Development Services

Date

These Minutes Approved  
April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

March 4, 2010  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

### Commissioners Present

Chair Wagner  
Vice Chair Perkowski  
Commissioner Behrens  
Commissioner Broili  
Commissioner Kaje  
Commissioner Kuboi  
Commissioner Piro

### Staff Present

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

### Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Pyle

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wagner called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:08 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

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

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

### DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Tovar announced that the City Council adopted an ordinance to reduce the size of the Planning Commission from nine to seven members effective April 1<sup>st</sup>. In addition, a subcommittee of four Councilmembers conducted interviews for the three Planning Commission seats that will begin new terms on April 1<sup>st</sup>. They unanimously recommended three candidates for the City Council to approve at their regular meeting of March 8<sup>th</sup>. Chair Wagner is up for reappointment, and the other two candidates for appointment (Donna Moss and Cynthia Esselman) are in the audience. The new members would not be officially sworn in until April. However, because it is unlikely the Commission would complete their

work on the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan tonight and the issue would be carried over to April, staff felt it was wise for them to observe and take notes at the meeting.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of February 4, 2010 were approved as presented.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Laethan Wene, Shoreline**, voiced opposition to the proposal to no longer televise the public comment portion of City Council Meetings on public television. He expressed his belief that it is important that comments are televised.

### **LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING ON SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOODS SUBAREA PLAN (Continued from February 4<sup>th</sup>)**

Chair Wagner reviewed the rules and procedures and opened the public hearing. She reminded the audience that the public comment period would be limited to comments related to new information provided since the February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. She referred to the Desk Packet (Exhibit 17), which contains written correspondence the Commission received that was not part of the March 4 Meeting Packet published on February 25<sup>th</sup>. She said the Commissioners had an opportunity to review the new items prior to the meeting. The desk packet included the following items:

- An email from Commissioner Pyle dated March 2, 2010.
- A matrix that was prepared by staff.
- An email from Sigrid Strom dated March 4, 2010.

Commissioner Piro noted that although he was not present at the February 4<sup>th</sup> hearing, he listened to the recording and reviewed all of the written materials that have been presented and is prepared to fully participate in the continued hearing.

### **Staff Overview and Presentation**

Mr. Tovar explained that a subarea plan is a geographic subset of a comprehensive plan. State law allows local jurisdictions to have subarea plans, but it does not require them. The Growth Management Act (GMA) defines comprehensive plans as “generalized, coordinated land use policy statements.” He noted that it is important to focus on the words “generalized” and “coordinated.” The past presumption that the City’s Comprehensive Plan must contain a tremendous amount of detail and that the implementing zoning had to correspond and be consistent is false. Comprehensive plans and subarea plans can be more generalized than development regulations. They are intended to be policy statements and not regulations. However, every plan is implemented through regulations such as zoning ordinances.



Mr. Tovar explained that the Comprehensive Plan (including the subarea plan) is subject to the goals and requirements of GMA regarding public notice, public participation, etc. Countywide policies are also created to allocate targets to the cities within the County, and Shoreline now has a citywide target. He emphasized that there is no GMA or countywide allocation to a subarea plan; it is up to the City to decide how much of its growth it wishes to allocate to a particular subarea. Some opinions were offered at previous meetings that there is a one-to-one requirement in the GMA between numbers of households and numbers of jobs, but that is not the case. There is no requirement that the City's ratio of housing to jobs must be mirrored in every subarea plan. He summarized that the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan can have whatever ratio of jobs to housing the City Council ultimately decides is an appropriate level of balance. The same would be true for the Town Center Subarea Plan. However, both plans must be consistent with the City's overall plan and targets.

Mr. Tovar clarified that the issue currently before the Commission is related to the Comprehensive Plan and not the development regulations and/or permits. While there has been a fair amount of discussion about zoning in the record and the CAC spent time talking about various zoning scenarios, the issue currently before the Commission is the staff drafted subarea plan. The proposal includes both text and a land use map (not a zoning map). He reminded the Commission that they are not being asked to make a recommendation about the zoning map at this time. Instead, they should focus their recommendation on what they think the subarea plan should look like. The Commission can start with the draft subarea plan as a starting point and then make appropriate revisions based on testimony, deliberations, citations to other facts in the record and other parts of the Comprehensive Plan, etc. They must work with the information that is in the record as it helps support their conclusions regarding the subarea plan.

Mr. Tovar advised that the CAC's report and the minority report (included in the record) are documents the Commission can refer to. While they can either agree or disagree with all or portions of them, the Commission is not being asked to make alterations to these documents. They are intended to represent the product of the groups' work.

Mr. Tovar explained that because zoning must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, whatever zoning is adopted for the subarea must be consistent. The CAC was not charged with preparing a zoning map. However, because the City's Comprehensive Plan designations are not as finely broken down as they might be, there was some discomfort about how generalized the land use designations should be. The CAC found it useful to talk about zoning for illustrative purposes as per their recommended subarea plan. The issue currently before the Commission is the subarea plan, and there was widespread agreement amongst the CAC about the subarea plan, itself. However, there is obviously some disagreement about the zoning, as reflected in the minority report. This issue should be addressed at some point in the future, but not now.

Mr. Tovar reviewed that the CAC conducted 33 meetings over a 1½ year period. They spent an extensive amount of time with staff and the community. He noted that Commissioner Pyle actually served on the CAC for a while and has some history and perspective about the process. Staff believes the process was balanced and allowed the members to express opinions.

Mr. Tovar observed that with any legislative action before the Commission, they will receive both subjective (opinions, beliefs, values, preferences) and objective input (facts, empirical evidence, learned discipline). He noted there are no qualifications associated with subjective input. While subjective comments may be valid, the Commission must recognize they are different in nature than objective input. He said it is appropriate for people to ask clarifying questions about the objective input provided by engineers, planners, etc. However, it would be wise for the Commission to recognize when an assertion or conclusion is made about a technical matter from someone who does not have subject matter expertise. He clarified that he is not saying that people who are not experts in the field have no right to express an opinion, do research and present it, or question an expert. But when someone makes an assertion of fact, unless they can point to some evidence, the input should be weighed differently than an expert witness.

Mr. Tovar advised that, inevitably, the Commission will have to deal with zoning. While there is no specific zoning proposal before the Commission at this time, the subarea plan would be implemented through zoning. He suggested that after the Commission makes a final recommendation on the subarea plan, they can deal with zoning in several ways:

- Recommend the City Council direct staff to prepare a legislative rezone to implement all or parts of the subarea plan. The rezone proposal would be brought back to the Commission for a new public process.
- Recommend the City Council adopt the subarea plan and allow individual property owners to apply for quasi-judicial rezones. The City would respond to each request as it is submitted, using the adopted subarea plan for guidance.
- Recommend the City Council direct staff to prepare a legislative rezone for those things they believe are timely and appropriate for the City to deal with upfront in a larger context and then wait for people to apply for quasi-judicial rezones on a site-specific basis for the remaining items.
- Recommend the City Council direct staff to prepare a planned area zone, which would be a legislative process using direction from the adopted subarea plan. It would be possible to create a zone that would only to apply to a specific part of the subarea.

Mr. Tovar referred to the map that was prepared to illustrate the CAC's recommendation for the southeast corner of the proposed subarea. He summarized that there was not widespread disagreement about the location for transition areas, but there was some contention about the densities and use mixes that should be allowed within the areas of transition. He said he does not believe there is enough detailed information for the Commission to resolve this issue now. However, staff expects at least one more public hearing regarding the subarea plan proposal. He suggested the Commission could direct staff to prepare a few land-use alternatives for future consideration, including the alternative embodied in the minority report. Staff could also prepare land-use alternatives for the area along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast. This would enable the Commission to identify how much specificity the subarea plan should include.

Again, Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission and public that at the end of the public hearing, the Planning Commission would not be making a recommendation regarding zoning. Their current charge

is to make a recommendation regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment, with the understanding that zoning would be addressed at some point in the future.

Commissioner Kaje recalled Mr. Tovar's earlier clarification that the subarea plan would become a geographic subset of the Comprehensive Plan, which leads him to the assumption that the subarea plan would provide a greater level of specificity. For example, he questioned if it would be appropriate to express in a subarea plan some fairly important but general statements about a particular street and how it would function and interface with the neighborhood. Mr. Tovar said the purpose of his definition was to make the point that comprehensive plans are not regulations. Development regulations address detailed standards such as setbacks, bulk, etc. Some comprehensive plans that have been adopted within the State are very detailed and are close to becoming regulations, and others are more generalized and conceptual. The Commission has leeway to go either direction. For example, they could provide more specificity and talk about street segments and/or identify the maximum number of units that should be allowed in a particular area. However, taking this approach creates an obligation for the City to implement consistent zoning. In the past, the Comprehensive Plan has been vague as it relates to the mixed-use and multi-family zones, and it would be helpful for the Commission to narrow down the range for density.

Commissioner Kaje observed that while they have received recommendations from the public about specific capital projects, it is important to keep in mind that they are not currently being asked to make a recommendation regarding the Capital Facilities Plan. Mr. Tovar said the Commission could make some recommendations in the narrative of the subarea plan about needs or projects the City should investigate as part of its overall Capital Facilities Plan update. He explained the proposal does not include a lot of discussion about large capital projects, but there is some language about walkways and the desire to have a better pedestrian network, which is appropriate for the subarea plan. He pointed out that Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street is not within the City's jurisdictions, so they cannot do a capital project in this location. However, it would be appropriate for the subarea plan to indicate the City should pursue inter-jurisdictional coordination for a capital project on Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Redinger added that some of the recommendations in the subarea plan could filter into capital improvements via master plans (surface water, transportation, parks, etc.)

Chair Wagner asked if the Commission could recommend a policy statement that the Surface Water Master Plan should address concerns they have heard from the public related to drainage in the subarea. Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that the Comprehensive Plan is aspirational and represents what the Commission would like to see. He said the subarea plan could include a statement that the City should consider and/or investigate potential capital projects such as walkways, stormwater runoff, etc.

Mr. Cohn referred the Commission to the matrix that was included in their desk packet. He explained that the purpose of the matrix is to identify the issues and questions, review the CAC's recommendations and potential options, and invite the Commission to share their vision. In addition, the Commission could identify additional concepts or options they would like staff to explore. He reviewed each of the Questions/Issues as follows:

1. What is the Commission's vision for redevelopment of commercial areas at Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street/Bothell Way and Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street/15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast? Does the Commission want to encourage a variety of housing choices?
2. What is the best way to handle transition between taller and more intense uses and single-family areas?
3. Is a design review process appropriate in commercial areas?
4. Should Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and other pilot housing styles and policies be "tried out" in the subarea?
5. Is there a need for additional policy guidance on how to deal with inter-jurisdictional issues on Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street?
6. Does the Commission want to provide added direction on implementation of the Comprehensive Plan?

### **Questions by the Commission**

None of the Commissioners had questions during this portion of the hearing.

### **Public Testimony on New Information**

**Sarah Kaye, Shoreline**, said she lives in the Briarcrest Neighborhood, which is located just north of the subarea. She expressed concern about a subarea planning process that does not deal with zoning at the same time. The time for the community to voice their concerns about zoning is during the subarea planning process. Once the plan has been adopted, the zoning would be changed to be consistent regardless of whether the proposal adheres to the goals and ideals stated by the surrounding neighborhoods. She said she likes the idea of a commercial plaza in the very southeast commercial area, and she would like the City to keep the process open.

Commissioner Piro referred to the options Mr. Tovar noted earlier to address issues related to zoning. He asked Ms. Kaye if either of these options would alleviate her concerns. Ms. Kaye said there are pros and cons of each option. She said she would like the goals and ideals, as stated in the Comprehensive Plan, to take precedence over specific zoning. For example, there is nothing in the Development Code that would prevent a town house project that would block the direct sunlight into her house. She noted that Land Use Policy 4 is related to solar access, but it is not formalized. She would like solar access to have some weight when the City reviews specific project proposals.

**Arthur Peach, Shoreline**, said he served as chair for the Southeast Neighborhoods CAC from March 2009 through November 2009. He explained that the CAC asked staff to provide development numbers as part of their decision process, and the zoning map was used as a visioning tool to create a comprehensive plan map. At the end of the process, the CAC came up with 700 units that could be accommodated as per the proposed subarea plan. However, the Staff Report implies there would be 900 units. While this may have little influence on future development, it is important to keep in mind that the CAC proposed 700 units. He advised that at the CAC's first appearance before the City Council, Councilmember Scott asked them to address and give a number to the density they were willing to absorb in the neighborhood. Through discussion and voting, the CAC decided on 700 units, not 900 or

150. He asked the Commission to use the correct information as they analyze the proposal and make a recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Peach suggested that moratoriums are an appropriate approach for future subarea planning processes. This would insure that applications for development are consistent with the vision set forth by residents and do not disrupt the final outcome of the subarea plan. He said he is proud of all the hard work put forth by the CAC members. He thanked all of the neighbors and staff for their work, as well. Commissioner Kaje asked Mr. Peach to clarify his comments regarding moratoriums. Mr. Peach said that if a developer proposes a project before the CAC finishes their process, the proposal may change the vision the CAC is working towards. He recommended that no development applications should be accepted during the subarea planning process. Mr. Peach submitted his comments and they were entered into the record as Exhibit #18.

**Dennis Lee, Shoreline**, recalled that the Commission raised a question about drainage at the February 4<sup>th</sup> hearing. While staff provided an answer, the public was not allowed to respond. He commented that at the public meetings related to the subarea plan the CAC invited people to put dots on a map to identify the areas where drainage is an issue, yet he cannot find this map as part of the record. While he is not an expert on drainage issues, he can lift the water meter covers and observe the water levels, and he considers this information to be scientific and informative. He said every time the issue of Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street was raised, the CAC spent a considerable amount of time discussing the concerns. They concluded that they would not make any recommendations for this street because it is not within the City's jurisdiction. He noted that the average setback on Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street is quite large, except for the new construction, and there could be problems if buildings are constructed right up to the sidewalk. Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street is a particular concern because the telephone poles are all scarred from mirrors hitting them, and the sidewalk is right next to the poles. He summarized that it will not be easy to improve the situation unless there are setbacks on at least one side.

Commissioner Behrens reported that the Commissioners were provided a copy of the map that Mr. Lee referenced.

**Janet Way, Shoreline**, said she was present to represent the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group. She said that while she does not have any advanced degrees, she has expertise as a citizen activist and observer in the neighborhood for the last 20 years, particularly related to watersheds. She also has expertise as a former elected official. She reminded the Commission that the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group has presented several documents, ideas, a SEPA comment letter, and policy proposals. Each one of the policy proposals were intended to address points the group does not believe are adequately covered by the proposed plan such as electric vehicle plug ins as part of the parking infrastructure (T-13), community gardens (CD-14), and floor area ratios in housing (H-9). She asked that the Commission consider adopting the policy proposals put forth by the group.

Ms. Way suggested the planned area concept would be an excellent proposal to work towards for some of the denser areas. She suggested they become zero impact zones and demonstration areas that could generate new development and excitement and more community involvement. She suggested that for such a project, the City could adopt the Cascade Regional Building Council's Cascadia Principles.

Ms. Way expressed concern that the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Threshold Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) that was contained in the Staff Report indicates that existing drainage or traffic problems would be addressed on a piecemeal basis with each new development. She pointed out that there are already significant drainage problems in the two watersheds within the area due to undetained and damaging stormwater. It is not acceptable for the City to avoid addressing these issues, and a significant adverse impact would result. She encouraged the Commission to find a way to address these problems through capital project or master plan proposals. In addition, she asked that the Commission address transportation solutions as part of the plan. She said she is glad the plan includes the goal of working towards solutions with neighboring jurisdictions (T-11), but she felt the language should be stronger. The discussion should also include planning for a possible light rail station. She referred to a map she submitted on behalf of the group, as well as some court rulings and related articles that she believes are very significant. She emphasized that now is the time to address the issues and concerns. Addressing issues piecemeal has not worked in the past, and that is why Puget Sound is now in trouble. Ms. Way submitted her comments and they were entered into the record as Exhibit #19.

**Bettelinn Brown, Shoreline**, said she lives in the Briarcrest Neighborhood. She thanked Mr. Tovar for the helpful information he provided to educate the citizens. She said that she is in a position to educate the residents of the Briarcrest Neighborhood through their newsletter, and it is important for her to be able to represent the issues in a more accurate and less subjective manner. She expressed concern that the Department of Transportation (DOT) has made changes that have had significant impacts on the neighborhood without soliciting their input. She noted that the CAC did a lot of research to address traffic flow issues. The cooperation, integration and inclusion of the neighborhood in the public process is important.

Ms. Brown said she was present to represent the Sisters of the Carmelite Order who have a monastery located in the Briarcrest Neighborhood. They have asked her to speak on their behalf because they are cloistered and do not speak in public. She provided a color-coded map of the area and a list of all the property owners between Bothell Way and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast. She said it is important that everyone is on the same page (the staff, Commission, and neighborhood association). She also provided a booklet published by the Carmelite Sisters. These documents were entered into the record as Exhibit #20.

**Bill Bear, Shoreline**, said he was one of the people who submitted the minority report. He said the purpose of his comments is to address the unintended consequences of the zoning, planning and thinking that has taken place thus far. He expressed concern that the proposed changes would drive up the price of land and people would no longer be able to afford to live in the neighborhood. He noted that the CAC's report indicates a desire for more affordable housing, more businesses, living wage jobs, etc. If the end result creates a situation where the price of land is too high, existing businesses will move out and new businesses will not come in. He pointed out that the property between 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast and Bothell Way is largely owned by one person, and a planned area could provide the possibility of utilizing parking space by residential development in the evening and on weekends and by businesses during the weekdays. He said this concept was successfully used in Rockville, Maryland, where they have two stories of residential above retail space. All the parking is located under the library that is a block and a half away. It would also be possible to do a planned area with a community development

corporation so that all of the citizen angst could be remediated if they are involved in the process and are part owners in the community corporation.

**Sigrid Strom, Shoreline**, said she lives in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood. She clarified that those who signed the minority report are not against density. Their concerns have to do with the zoning map and what they see as a lack of correlation between the map and the plan. She agreed there was a lot of consensus on most of the goals and policies found in the report. However, difficulty arose when the discussion was diverted to the zoning map. She pointed out that the map Mr. Tovar displayed was the zoning map, not the land-use map. She clarified that the CAC was tasked with creating a land-use map for the subarea, but they never voted on the land-use map. They actually voted on the zoning map. She cautioned Mr. Tovar that some members of the CAC do have expertise. She said she is willing to recognize the expertise of people who work for the City, but the City should recognize that many citizens have a lot of expertise in related areas.

Commissioner Piro asked Ms. Strom to offer her perspective on the options presented by Mr. Tovar for addressing zoning issues. Ms. Strom said she does not have a lot of expertise in this area, but she would not be in favor of the case-by-case basis. She would prefer a more broad and comprehensive rezone. She said she is concerned about implementing any type of zoning before the development guidelines and controls are in place to ensure that the actual zoning corresponds with the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Piro summarized that Ms. Strom would be in favor of a three-step approach: adoption of the subarea plan, adoption of development guidelines, and then adoption of the appropriate zoning.

#### **Final Questions by the Commission**

None of the Commissioners had additional questions during this portion of the hearing.

#### **Deliberations**

Mr. Cohn referred to the matrix that was prepared by staff to guide the discussion. He recalled that the CAC recommendation was to encourage appropriate development to provide additional housing (choice) as well as a place for businesses that can provide goods and services to the neighborhood. He asked the Commission to share their thoughts on the CAC's vision and identify additional concepts they would like to add to the vision.

Vice Chair Perkowski asked staff to clarify the intended outcome of tonight's deliberations. Mr. Cohn said staff would like the Commission to review the CAC's recommendations and identify additional options they want to consider. Staff would prepare some optional proposals for the Commission and public to review and comment on at a later date. Commissioner Piro said staff is seeking feedback about whether or not the CAC's recommendations are adequately addressed in the draft subarea plan. They should also identify issues that need attention at a later point in time, but would not be addressed as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Kaje recalled that at the last meeting he asked Mr. Peach if the CAC had considered a specific vision for the southeast corner, especially the block fronting Bothell Way. The summary of the

CAC's vision provided in the matrix was based on Mr. Peach's response, but there is no specific language in the text related to this vision. Mr. Cohn added that the summary was also based on the CAC's 18-month discussion. Ms. Redinger pointed out that the summary in the matrix was based on the following policies found in the CAC's report:

- H-6 – Review existing policies on accessory dwelling units.
- H-7 – Adopt regulations for cottage style housing.
- H-10 – Encourage partnerships to create affordable housing.
- ED-1 – Encourage the creation of community gathering.
- ED-2 – Revitalize the local economy by encouraging new business that is beneficial to the community in terms of services, entertainment and employment.
- ED-3 – Increase small-scale economic development (retail, office, service.)
- ED-7 – Encourage community groups to define specific types of commercial, retail and professional business.
- ED-8 – Encourage home businesses.
- Ed-12 – Modify commercial zoning to require that mixed-use buildings be designed to accommodate commercial uses along arterial street frontages.
- CD-3 – Encourage planning of local hubs for provision of services and gathering places.
- CD-9 – Use medium to low-density multi-family units as transitional areas from high-density residential or commercial properties to single-family homes.
- CD-12 – Establish rules and incentives that ensure actions occur in a manner that is consistent with the community's vision while still promoting and providing incentives for redevelopment.

Commissioner Behrens said he was impressed with how well the subarea plan was written. He observed that while the members of the CAC are in general agreement as to what they want to see in their neighborhood, there is some disagreement about how to implement the policies and goals identified in the plan. It appears that most of the controversy is associated with the southeast corner. The planned area concept would allow a process for addressing all of the issues and concerns to the satisfaction of all parties. They should keep the CAC's vision in mind (functional businesses, additional housing, community gathering place, etc.) as they move forward. If they use a piecemeal approach and allow each property owner to propose a rezone, the end result will not likely be what the community envisions. They need to create zoning and development opportunities that result in the types of businesses the CAC talked about as appropriate for the neighborhood. Ms. Redinger noted that because much of the southeast corner is under single ownership, it would be very important to obtain feedback from the property owners as part of any future planned area discussion.

Commissioner Kaje said it would be very useful to provide guidance to the City Council that the planned area concept is one option that could be explored in the future for redevelopment of the portion of the southeast corner that is currently under single-ownership if it comes up. However, at this time, he is not comfortable saying that all or part of the area should be designated as a planned area. Commissioner Behrens agreed the Commission should recommend that the planned area option be considered and pursued, if possible. However, he recognized this would not be the only option for the property.



Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that they could forward the subarea plan to the City Council with a recommendation that it not become effective until the implementing zoning is in place. This would allow the Commission time to consider the planned area option as one zoning tool to implement the goals and policies in the CAC's Report and address other zoning issues before the subarea plan becomes effective.

Ms. Redinger said the CAC never talked about the planned area concept as a zoning tool. Mr. Tovar explained that the planned area concept is a development regulation tool that consists of writing a zoning designation that is unique and appropriate for application to a discrete part of the City. It would provide an opportunity to use the substantive recommendations and concerns embodied in the CAC's report as the direction to write code for that particular zone. Chair Wagner summarized that the current zoning regulations require setbacks between lot lines, etc., which could potentially discourage someone from developing a slightly larger building with a smaller footprint that is set away from the solar access, etc. A planned area would allow for creative development choices for a particular area. Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that the subarea plan is intended to be aspirational and should describe what the City wants to achieve in as much detail as possible, understanding that the actual zoning tools would come after, based on direction provided in the narrative of the subarea plan.

Commissioner Behrens asked if it would be inappropriate for the subarea plan to include a statement that the planned area concept should be considered for a portion of the subarea. Mr. Tovar said it would be appropriate to identify the concept as something that should be explored. However, they should not limit the property to this one zoning option. The language should provide enough flexibility and detail to implement the policy statements.

Commissioner Kuboi explained that not including a specific policy related to the planned area concept would not preclude staff from considering the option in the future. No implementation tool would be explicitly precluded by anything that is in the draft subarea plan. He suggested the Commission not spend a lot of time talking about zoning issues now. These decisions will be addressed by staff and stakeholders who are working on projects in the future. He recalled the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan and reminded the Commission that the more specificity they put into the subarea plan, the more opportunity there will be for individuals to disagree. If the language maintains a comfortable general level that everyone can agree on, they can move the document forward for adoption as quickly as possible.

Commissioner Broili said he sees the subarea plan as a vision for the future, and should not discuss the specific details related to its implementation. These decisions would be made at a later date. The CAC's report has defined where they want to go, and he is ready to accept the report because it gives good, general direction. It will provide a starting point on which future zoning and other decisions can be based. Commissioner Kuboi concurred.

**COMMISSIONER BROILI MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOODS SUBAREA PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE MAP AS PROPOSED BY STAFF IN EXHIBIT #1, WITH ADDITIONAL COMMISSION AMENDMENTS. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Piro said he believes the current proposal represents basic agreement, and many of the points of dispute are related to future discussions. However, he would support a phased approach that allows the Commission to address zoning and development regulation issues before the subarea plan becomes effective.

Commissioner Kuboi observed that the CAC and staff spent a lot of time and effort to come up with a well-considered product. He cautioned against spending too much time tinkering and second guessing, allegedly under the guise of improving the document. He expressed concern that future CAC's could become discouraged from spending a significant amount of time creating a document for self-acclaimed experts to tinker with. Chair Wagner pointed out that Commissioner Pyle had the same sentiment, and she agreed. However, there are some editorial issues that should be addressed before the document is forwarded to the City Council.

Commissioner Kaje observed that many of the policy statements are, by nature, more fitting as potential citywide policy statements. They do not fit well into the limitations of a subarea plan. Mr. Cohn said that, in his experience, some policies found in subarea plans are eventually adopted into comprehensive plans as citywide policies. Subarea plans can be used as pilot areas for trying new ideas.

Commissioner Kaje referred to PR4, which says, "*As the population increases, establish target metrics for park space per capita and ensure that parks development and funding keep pace with development.*" While he agrees with the sentiment contained in this policy, he suggested this policy statement should apply citywide rather than on a neighborhood basis. Mr. Tovar agreed that if someone were to read this policy statement, they would think they were looking at a citywide policy document. He suggested the Commission consider removing this policy from the subarea plan and place it in their parking lot of items to move forward to the City Council as separate recommendations. He agreed that, as currently drafted, this policy statement is not a good fit for the subarea plan.

Commissioner Broili said he would support moving the policy out of the subarea plan, but he does not want to place it in a parking lot of issues that get postponed as time goes by. As has been pointed out numerous times, the City is way behind the curve on parks. He would like to forward a recommendation to the City Council as soon as possible. Mr. Cohn suggested that the Commission's forwarding letter to the City Council could identify policies that they believe are good ideas, but not necessarily appropriate on a subarea basis. They could ask the City Council to consider making them citywide policies. He reminded the Commission that they would have an audience with the City Council at the joint meeting on April 12<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Piro suggested the policy remain in the subarea plan, but perhaps it could be contextualized for the subarea. They could also include a recommendation to the City Council that it is an issue of citywide importance that needs attention. Commissioner Kaje said there may be some policies that should be pulled from the subarea plan, but with a very strong statement for the City Council to address it on a citywide basis. It may be possible to bring other policies into the context of the subarea plan with minor edits.

**COMMISSIONER BEHRENS MOVED THE COMMISSION ADD AN ADDITIONAL POLICY LU11 TO READ: “CONSIDER ENCOURAGING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GATEWAY PROJECT AT NORTHEAST 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND BOTHELL WAY THAT UTILIZES A PLANNED AREA CONCEPT.”**

Commissioner Behrens pointed out that this property is the southeast gateway into the City of Shoreline. Vice Chair Perkowski asked if Commissioner Behrens would be in favor of further defining the area referenced in the motion. Commissioner Behrens said he was specifically referring to the area that has been defined as the mixed-use zone that abuts Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street and Bothell Way. Commissioner Kuboi asked Commissioner Behrens to describe the functional purpose of the gateway besides signage. He noted that if you go north on Bothell Way from this location you will be out of the City in a short time. The idea of a gateway in this location would be odd because it skirts the City in both directions. Commissioner Behrens pointed out it is a major arterial intersections that handles the largest volume of traffic coming into the City. Commissioner Kuboi asked if Commissioner Behrens was thinking of a sign to identify the entrance to the City or a signature development that would require a significant investment by the developer. Commissioner Behrens said his concept of a gateway project would include development, but could also include signage. He said he would like to see the area developed. Commissioner Piro pointed out that, historically, the City has used the term “gateway” for some sort of entrance treatment. However, Commissioner Behrens is talking about a district planning project. Commissioner Kuboi noted that the term “gateway” has also been used in a larger context with the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan.

**COMMISSIONER KAJE SECONDED THE MOTION FOR PURPOSES OF DISCUSSION.**

Commissioner Kaje suggested the motion be amended to remove the gateway project terminology and get at the idea that they want to flesh out the vision expressed in the subarea plan the mixed-use polygon shaped property in the southeast corner of the subarea.

Commissioner Broili said he would not support the motion on the floor. Again, he pointed out that zoning issues can be addressed after the subarea plan has been adopted. While he does not disagree with the concept the motion puts forward, he does not believe it is the appropriate way to deal with it.

**COMMISSIONER BEHRENS WITHDREW HIS MOTION.**

**COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO AMEND POLICY H4 TO READ: “INCREASE HOUSING STOCK THAT ATTRACTS NEW FAMILIES RESIDENTS BY APPEALING TO A DIVERSITY OF BUYERS’ AND RENTERS’ INTERESTS, INCLUDING:**

- **ENERGY EFFICIENCY**
- **PARKING OPTIONS**
- **DENSITY/SIZE/FAR**
- **PRIVATE/SHARED OUTDOOR OPEN SPACE**
- **AFFORDABLE/QUALITY/SUSTAINABLE BUILDING MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES**

- **MULTI-FAMILY/MULTI-GENERATIONAL/SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING OPTIONS**
- **ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS**
- ~~**BALANCE RENTAL AND OWNERSHIP OPTIONS**~~
- **ADAPTABILITY**

**COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Kaje said he is unclear about what “*balance rental and ownership options*” means. However, he values the goal that they are not trying to craft the subarea for buyers only. Capturing buyers and renters who are potentially interested in diverse housing options is certainly what the City’s Housing Strategies supports. The changes he suggested are more consistent with the Housing Strategy already in place and also capture the intent of the subarea plan proposal. Commissioner Piro concurred with Commissioner Kaje’s observations.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**COMMISSIONER BEHRENS MOVED TO AMEND H9 TO READ: “CONSIDER ADDING LANGUAGE TO THE DEVELOPMENT CODE TO ENCOURAGE RIGHT-SIZED HOUSING.”**  
**COMMISSIONER KAJE SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Broili said he has a problem with either term. At what point does a house become a megahouse or right-sized house. While he does not disagree with the concept, the language must better define the terms. Commissioner Behrens observed that “megahouse” can mean a lot of different things. Commissioner Kaje suggested that perhaps this policy would be more appropriate as a citywide policy. Ms. Redinger pointed out that the CAC Report defines the term “megahouse” as a structure that is out of proportion to the size of the lot on which it is built or the scale of housing in the existing neighborhood.” Commissioner Kaje noted that the Commission also received written correspondence about how to define megahouses based on the floor to area ratio. Commissioner Broili agreed with Commissioner Kaje that this policy should be addressed as a citywide issue.

**COMMISSIONER BEHRENS AMENDED HIS MOTION TO DELETE POLICY H9 (“CONSIDER ADDING LANGUAGE TO THE DEVELOPMENT CODE TO RESTRICT DEVELOPMENT OF “MEGAHOUSES.”) AND NOTE THAT IT IS AN ISSUE THE CITY COUNCIL SHOULD ADDRESS CITYWIDE. COMMISSIONER KAJE ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT.**

Chair Wagner reminded the Commission that she, Commissioner Kuboi, Commissioner Kaje, and Commissioner Behrens participated on the Housing Strategy CAC, where they struggled with the issue of “megahouses,” as well. She agreed that this is a bigger issue than this one subarea.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Behrens noted that the Commission discussed Policy H11 at the last hearing, and they agreed there was no clear idea about what the obstacles were. Commissioner Kaje pointed out that there

are different permitting requirements for group homes, depending on the size and the zone in which the use is located. However, he is still not sure about the intent of the CAC recommendation because there are different obstacles depending on how the area is zoned. Ms. Redinger said this policy was specifically intended to allow an increase in impervious surfaces for accommodating Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Generally, the policies encourage smaller footprints and slightly taller heights for stormwater issues. However, the tradeoff for accessibility is a more spread out footprint. Commissioner Broili cautioned that the City does not need to give up permeability to accommodate the ADA requirements. Ms. Redinger said stormwater regulations no longer distinguish between permeable and impermeable materials. It does not matter if a ramp is built out of pervious concrete or a structure has a green roof, it is still considered hardscape.

Commissioner Kaje cautioned that if this is a unique development code concern, it should be dealt with as an exception in the Development Code. Mr. Tovar agreed the policy could be removed from the subarea plan and the issue could be addressed as a code amendment. He reminded the Commission that they would be reviewing their work program on April 12<sup>th</sup> at their joint meeting with the City Council. Many of these issues could be captured as part of items that are already on the Commission's work program.

**COMMISSIONER BEHRENS MOVED THE COMMISSION DELETE POLICY H11 (REMOVE OBSTACLES OF ADULT FAMILY HOMES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS) AND NOTED THAT IT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED AS A DEVELOPMENT CODE FIX. COMMISSIONER KAJE SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Behrens commented that if they can't make the language functional and clear, then the policy does not belong in the subarea plan. Commissioner Kaje said he understands and appreciates the intent of Policy H11, but he felt the issue should be dealt with citywide via the development code. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Piro referred to Exhibit 16 (proposals from the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group), and suggested the Commission consider these proposals as they review the subarea plan and the City's Comprehensive Plan in general. He noted that some of the proposals are not necessarily subarea specific. He particularly asked staff to react to the group's proposed Policy T12 (*"Consider improving connections to cross-park corridor at Paramount Park Natural Area for pedestrian and bike transportation options"*). He asked if this option was discussed by the CAC. Ms. Redinger questioned the definition of the term "cross-park corridor." It is not something that was talked about specifically by the CAC. Commissioner Piro said his understanding of the proposed policy is that there should be connections within the park to the City's bicycle/pedestrian network. Chair Wagner noted the City's Comprehensive Plan already includes language to address connectivity. Commissioner Piro said he would not be against calling out the need for connections and improvements in the subarea plan, as well. Commissioner Broili said there is an existing path that crosses from east to west about mid park. Ms. Redinger said Ms. Way just clarified that the map shows an outline of the road where Northeast 148<sup>th</sup> Street would go through Paramount Park.

Commissioner Kaje recalled from the recent walk through of the area that there is an existing, muddy path through the area. His interpretation of the proposed policy is that this path should be improved. Commissioners Piro and Broili both agreed and indicated they would support the policy. Ms. Redinger questioned if this policy would be more appropriately placed in the Transportation and/or the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan. She noted that the project would have to be identified in one of the two master plans in order to receive funding through the Capital Improvement Program. Commissioner Kaje said he understands the funding issue, but this type of local perspective, knowledge and recommendation is appropriate to include in the subarea plan with the understanding that the project would have to be adopted into a master plan before it could be implemented.

Ms. Redinger referred to PR7 in the proposed subarea plan, which reads, *"Upgrade the path over Little's Creek in Paramount Open Space to provide a more permanent solution to the extremely muddy condition during wet weather. The path is a primary connection between the east and west sides of the Ridgecrest neighborhood."* The Commission agreed that PR7 adequately addresses the issue, so there would be no need to add the group's proposed T12.

**COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO AMEND POLICY T5 TO READ: *"IMPLEMENT TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES ON LOCAL STREETS BETWEEN NORTHEAST 145<sup>TH</sup> AND NORTHEAST 150<sup>TH</sup> STREETS, AS WELL AS OTHER LOCAL ROADWAYS TO IMPROVE SAFETY AND REDUCE CUT-THROUGH TRAFFIC."* COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Behrens questioned if this motion would include all of the streets in the subarea that are between Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> and Northeast 150<sup>th</sup> Streets, or would there be a limit on the east/west designation, as well. Commissioner Kaje reminded the Commission that the intent of the subarea plan is to provide policy guidance. When implementing the plan, the City would identify the cut-through and safety issues and prioritize the traffic calming measures. Nothing about the proposed policy would require the City to provide traffic calming measures everywhere within the subarea. Ms. Redinger pointed out that the neighborhood and traffic engineers met together to create a traffic calming plan, which identifies where the improvements should go, the time frame, and budget. She suggested the traffic engineers might not support Policy T5 as currently written.

Commissioner Broili said he would assume there are issues the CAC was trying to address with Policy T5. Mr. Cohn said the CAC's concern was cut-through traffic in the southeast corner of the subarea. Commissioner Kaje said he did not realize the policy was intended to be limited to a specific area, and he would not support an amendment that limits the measures to specific streets. He said the purpose of his amendment was to react to the fact that traffic calming devices would not be appropriate on all streets within the subarea. He said he would prefer to act on the motion that is on the table. An additional motion could be made later to modify the policy further.

Commissioner Behrens asked if it would be possible to word the policy to recommend the calming devices that are identified in the existing traffic report. Mr. Tovar suggested the motion could be amended to say "priority local streets." The Commission agreed that would be appropriate.

**COMMISSIONER KAJE AMENDED HIS MOTION TO CHANGE POLICY T5 TO READ: "IMPLEMENT TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES ON PRIORITY LOCAL STREETS BETWEEN NORTHEAST 145<sup>TH</sup> AND NORTHEAST 150<sup>TH</sup> STREETS, AS WELL AS OTHER LOCAL ROADWAYS TO IMPROVE SAFETY AND REDUCE CUT-THROUGH TRAFFIC." COMMISSIONER PIRO AGREED TO THE AMENDMENT.**

Commissioner Behrens asked if it would be appropriate to delete "between Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> and Northeast 150<sup>th</sup> Streets." Mr. Cohn noted that the traffic study covered much of the Briarcrest Area, which extends to the north of Northeast 150<sup>th</sup> Street. Commissioner Piro pointed out that last part of the policy refers to all other local roadways within in the subarea.

**THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0-1, WITH COMMISSIONER BEHRENS ABSTAINING.**

Commissioner Behrens said he is not opposed to the concept contained in T5, but he does not believe the language is specific enough.

**CHAIR WAGNER MOVED TO AMEND POLICY PR1 TO READ: "SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF A TRAIL/DESIGNATED PATHWAY CONNECTING THE INTERURBAN TRAIL AND THE BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL WITH PARAMOUNT PARK (UPPER AND LOWER), HAMLIN PARK, SOUTH WOODS PARK, AND JACKSON PARK, AND TO THE BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL." COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Chair Wagner pointed out that the proposed amendment would clarify and enhance the intent of the policy. She noted that the amendment was discussed earlier by the Commission and was also a point of discussion during a previous public hearing.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO DELETE POLICY PR4 ("AS THE POPULATION INCREASES, ESTABLISH TARGET METRICS FOR PARK SPACE PER CAPITA AND ENSURE THAT PARKS DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDING KEEP PACE WITH DEVELOPMENT") AND REFER IT TO THE PARKS DEPARTMENT FOR THE PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Kaje said he has done the math for the City's current park acreage in and near various neighborhoods and found the area is not "park poor" relative to other neighborhoods but the City as the whole lags behind others of its size. He felt the issue should be addressed on a citywide basis. Commissioner Piro concurred. A citywide policy would address the park needs for the Southeast Neighborhoods, as well as all other neighborhoods in the City.

Vice Chair Perkowski said he expressed a concern about Policy PR4 at the previous hearing for similar reasons as those expressed by Commissioners Kaje and Piro. In addition, the language is too vague and is not clear that it is asking for more parks per capita than what currently exists. Commissioner Piro

suggested that when this policy is eventually transmitted to the City Council, they should make it clear that the intent of the policy is to identify existing deficits and increase park space in those areas.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Piro referred to the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group's proposal (Exhibit 16) to add a new Policy ED13 to read, *"Support development of opportunities through innovative and creative technologies by permitting business uses for research and development, design and environmental concepts to provide potential sites for family wage "green jobs."* He said that while he does not disagree with the intent of the policy, he felt it would be more appropriate to make it a citywide policy at some point in the future.

**COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO DELETE POLICY ED4 ("INCREASE ACCESS TO LOCALLY-MADE PRODUCTS AND LOCALLY-GROWN FOODS.") AND NOTE THAT IT IS AN ISSUE THE CITY COUNCIL SHOULD ADDRESS CITYWIDE. COMMISSIONER BROILI SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Kaje said the intent of this policy should not apply to just the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea. It should be a more general citywide policy.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Piro referenced Policy ED4 (*"Inventory and promote the SE Subarea resources and opportunities, such as redevelopment at Shorecrest, Public Health Labs, Fircrest, etc."*) of the proposed subarea plan. He suggested that for good form, there should never be a policy that uses the word "etc." The Commission agreed that "etc." should be removed from the policy.

**COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO DELETE POLICY ED6 ("IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANDATES OF THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT AND THE PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDED STANDARDS, BE ATTENTIVE TO CONCURRENCY REQUIREMENTS REGARDING JOB CREATION RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT.") AND NOTE THAT IT IS AN ISSUE THE CITY COUNCIL SHOULD ADDRESS CITYWIDE. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Again, Commissioner Kaje felt this policy would be more appropriate as a citywide policy in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Tovar and Commissioner Piro pointed out that being attentive to concurrency requirements regarding job creation relative to development is not a requirement of the Growth Management Act or the Puget Sound Regional Council's recommended standards.

Commissioner Behrens observed that almost all of the Economic Development Policy recommendations should probably be applied citywide. Commissioner Piro noted that some of the policies have a special focus for the subarea. Commissioner Kaje agreed that many could have applicability elsewhere, but his assumption is that many were selected to be applied specifically to the subarea. For example, Policy ED9 (*"Attract neighborhood businesses with support from the Economic Development Advisory*



*Committee that could be sustained by the community.”)* is asking for businesses into the subarea. The CAC also believes that it is appropriate to encourage Policy ED8 (*“Encourage home-based business within the parameters of the residential zoning to bolster employment without adverse impact to neighborhood character.”*) for this particular subsection. He felt these policies were appropriate to leave in the subarea plan. Ms. Miranda reminded the Commission that the policies would translate into development code at some point. Some of the policies could be adopted as pilot regulations for the subarea.

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Piro referred to the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group’s recommendation to add a new Policy CD14 to read, *“Work with community groups, neighborhoods and outside experts to promote “community gardens” for production of food and recreation.”* He recalled the earlier discussion that generalized language about food production might be more appropriate as a citywide policy. However, this proposed policy could have particular application in the subarea. He asked if the idea of community gardens was discussed by the CAC. Ms. Redinger answered that she felt the CAC would be comfortable adding the policy.

**COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED TO ADD NEW POLICY CD14 TO READ: “WORK WITH COMMUNITY GROUPS, NEIGHBORHOODS AND OUTSIDE EXPERTS TO PROMOTE “COMMUNITY GARDENS” FOR PRODUCTION OF FOOD AND RECREATION.” COMMISSIONER BROILI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED TO LOCATE THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT SECTION AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOODS SUBAREA PLAN. COMMISSIONER BROILI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Broili referred to Policy NE9 (*“More accurately map the groundwater system and the locations of covered streams in Ridgecrest to allow a better understanding of the hydrology of the area and its wetland characteristics.”*) and expressed his belief that it is important to have a complete understanding of the hydrology of any given area, including both the natural hydrology and the infrastructure. Commissioner Piro asked staff to provide clarification about the problems Policy NE9 is intended to address. He also questioned if the problems are unique to the Southeast Neighborhoods. Ms. Redinger said the City does not have extensive groundwater mapping of any neighborhoods in the City, but University of Washington students are working on this project. She said staff talked a lot with the City’s Environmental Services Surface Water Manager about the existing groundwater systems, but she does not have the technical expertise to answer where the data gaps are and what information is available.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that Little’s Creek is one of the few creeks in the City, and it flows through the subarea. He recalled that concern has been raised previously regarding the existing stormwater and flooding issues. He felt it would be appropriate to discuss whether this policy should

remain in the subarea plan or become a citywide policy at some point in the future. Mr. Tovar said it would be appropriate to include the policy in the subarea plan because it would not over commit what the City can actually do and it provides a statement of intent.

Commissioner Piro suggested the policy be changed to read, *"Develop the technical resources for better understanding the groundwater system."* The issue is more than just creating a map, but also creating understanding of the analysis of the system.

Commissioner Behrens recalled that Commissioner Broili earlier raised an issue about the existing groundwater problems in the area. He suggested the policy be worded to expressly address stormwater issues through capital improvements. He recommended the language be changed to read, *"Identify current problems with surface water management and recommend capital improvement projects to address them."* Commissioner Piro said he likes the idea of there being an outcome as a result of the policy. It is important to develop resources for better understanding and to correct the problems. However, recommending capital improvement projects might be too specific. Instead, it might be appropriate to recommend actions and measures to address existing problems. Mr. Tovar agreed "actions and measures" would be more inclusive.

Ms. Redinger pointed out that the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group's recommendation for Policy NE9 also includes the Briarcrest Neighborhood as well as Ridgecrest. Commissioner Kaje recommended that the "Ridgecrest" be replaced with "the subarea." He said he did not believe the policy was intended to apply to just Ridgecrest. The remainder of the Commission concurred. They also identified additional changes to make the language more clear.

**COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED TO AMEND POLICY NE9 TO READ: "DEVELOP TECHNICAL RESOURCES FOR BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF OVERALL HYDROLOGY, MORE ACCURATELY MAP THE GROUNDWATER SYSTEM AND THE INCLUDING THE LOCATIONS OF COVERED STREAMS IN RIDGECREST THE SUBAREA, AND RECOMMEND ACTIONS AND MEASURES TO ADDRESS EXISTING STORMWATER DRAINAGE PROBLEMS TO ALLOW A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE HYDROLOGY OF THE AREA AND ITS WETLAND CHARACTERISTICS." COMMISSIONER BROILI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Kaje asked staff to explain the relationship or overlap between Policies NE5 (*"Support creation of contiguous ecosystems through a designation of "green corridor," as a public/private partnership."*) and NE14 (*"Designate the area between Seattle's Jackson Park and Hamlin Park as a potential "green corridor" to provide a contiguous ecosystem for wildlife."*) Both talk about green corridors. He recalled the Commission received an email that pointed out that Policy NE5 was not meant to specifically reference Jackson and Hamlin Parks. Instead, it was intended to provide an explanation of the contiguous belt. Ms. Redinger said the CAC's overall recommendation was to look at opportunities to create more green corridors and habitat systems. She suggested the two policies could be merged.

Commissioner Broili observed that Policy NE4 (*"Link green open spaces within subarea and then link them to those outside subarea to create trails."*) and Policy NE5 are more human oriented. Policy NE14 is more related to wildlife corridors. Commissioner Piro offered that "ecosystem" would include wildlife habitat. Commissioner Broili suggested the language should make it clear that habitat should be considered as part of the policy. Commissioner Kaje referred to Ms. Strom's comment that the specific green corridor being recommended would link Jackson Park to Paramount Park and east to Hamlin Park. The idea is that all three should be linked. Mr. Cohn agreed that was the CAC's intent.

**COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO MERGE POLICIES NE14 AND NE5 TO READ: "SUPPORT CREATION OF CONTIGUOUS ECOSYSTEMS, WITH ATTENTION TO WILDLIFE HABITAT, THROUGH DESIGNATION OF A "GREEN CORRIDOR," AS A PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP, INCLUDING THE AREA BETWEEN SEATTLE'S JACKSON PARK, PARAMOUNT PARK AND HAMLIN PARK." COMMISSIONER BROILI SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Vice Chari Perkowski suggested the word "designation" be replaced with "development." Designation would mean the City could just declare it as a green corridor, but development would imply that that it would require some additional work to create a contiguous ecosystem. Chair Wagner recalled that the Commission also had some discussion about how the concept should be designated on the Comprehensive Plan Map and what the implications would be.

**COMMISSIONERS KAJE AND BROILI ACCEPTED THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LANGUAGE TO READ, "SUPPORT CREATION OF CONTIGUOUS ECOSYSTEMS, WITH ATTENTION TO WILDLIFE HABITAT, THROUGH DEVELOPMENT OF A "GREEN CORRIDOR," AS A PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP, INCLUDING THE AREA BETWEEN SEATTLE'S JACKSON PARK, PARAMOUNT PARK AND HAMLIN PARK." THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Kaje said he supports the goal of making greater use of volunteer organizations for habitat restoration (Policy NE10), but he suggested the policy could be applicable citywide. He would also be comfortable maintaining the policy as part of the subarea plan, but the language should be changed to correctly identify the Department of Fish and Wildlife. Commissioner Piro asked staff to share whether Policy NE10 was intended to promote backyard habitat in the neighborhood. Ms. Redinger said there are a number of ways in which volunteers would be helpful. On a citywide basis, staff is trying to determine how to better utilize volunteers. The main issue is not the shortage of volunteers, but only a portion of one staff person's time is dedicated to volunteer coordination. Commissioner Piro suggested the policy could focus more on advancing programs for backyard habitat in the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea, as well as neighborhood volunteers for habitat restoration. Otherwise, he agreed with Commissioner Kaje that the policy should be deleted and considered in the future as a citywide policy. Ms. Redinger pointed out that Policy NE7 (*"Create incentives to encourage enhancement and restoration of wildlife habitat on both public and private property through existing programs such as the backyard wildlife habitat stewardship certification program."*) addresses the issue of backyard habitat restoration.

**COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO DELETE POLICY NE10 ("MAKE GREATER USE OF VOLUNTEERS FOR HABITAT RESTORATION BY USING PROGRAMS ALREADY IN PLACE THROUGH ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCIES SUCH AS THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES.") AND NOTE THAT IT IS AN ISSUE THE CITY COUNCIL SHOULD ADDRESS CITYWIDE. COMMISSION PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Note: Commissioner Broili had stepped out of the room at the time of voting.)**

**COMMISSIONER KAJE MOVED TO AMEND POLICY NE11 TO READ: "AS PART OF THE PROCESS OF REVISING THE CITY'S TREE CODE, CREATE INCENTIVE TO PLAN ALL REMODEL AND NEW DEVELOPMENT AROUND SUBSTANTIAL TREES AND GROVES OF TREES TO PRESERVE TREE CANOPY." COMMISSIONER BEHRENS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Chair Wagner questioned whether or not Policy NE11 would be more appropriate as a citywide policy. Commissioner Kaje noted that the CAC specifically called for this policy, so it would be appropriate to keep it as part of the subarea plan. Commissioner Piro suggested that the policy could remain in the subarea plan, but it could also be considered as a citywide policy at some point in the future. Vice Chair Perkowski asked if the clause "*as part of the process of revising the City's tree code,*" would limit the policy to the City's tree code revisions.

**COMMISSIONER PIRO OFFERED A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO CHANGE POLICY NE 11 TO READ: "CREATE INCENTIVE TO PLAN ALL REMODEL AND NEW DEVELOPMENT AROUND SUBSTANTIAL TREES AND GROVES OF TREES TO PRESERVE TREE CANOPY," AND NOTE THAT THE ISSUE IS SOMETHING THE CITY COUNCIL SHOULD ADDRESS CITYWIDE, AS WELL. COMMISSIONERS KAJE AND BEHRENS AGREED TO ACCEPT THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. THE MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Commission noted the lateness of the hour and questioned if they would be able to complete their review of the proposed land use map or if it would be appropriate to continue their deliberations to a future date. Chair Wagner pointed out that most of the public comments were related to the CAC's proposed zoning map, and not the actual land use map.

Commissioner Behrens asked Mr. Peach if there was significant agreement amongst the CAC regarding the proposed land use map, or were most of the contentious issues related to the zoning map. Mr. Peach said the zoning map was used to create the vision in the CAC's report. They actually layered the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map colors over the zoning map. Ms. Redinger added that there is agreement between the minority report and majority report maps in that both of the areas are mixed use. The difference is in the specifics of the zoning. Perhaps the subarea area plan language could be amended to include any of the zoning identified in the minority and majority reports as appropriate for the areas identified as mixed use on the land use map. She emphasized there is not a dispute about whether or not the area should be mixed use; the issue is related to the level of intensity.

Mr. Peach referred to the intersection at 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street, and noted that the CAC's zoning map identifies a transition from heavier to lighter density, but the transition is not illustrated on the proposed land use map. The zoning map was intended to grasp the CAC's vision, but the land use designation can mean anything from R-48 to R-18.

Chair Wagner requested clarification from staff about whether the designations on the proposed land use map are consistent with the current Comprehensive Plan designations. She also asked if they were intending to propose additional language. Mr. Cohn said that if the Commission wants the maps to be more granular in nature, they should provide additional direction to staff. If that is the case, they would not likely finish their deliberations regarding the land use map tonight.

COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF THE LAND USE MAP. COMMISSIONER BROILI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Piro said he is very satisfied with the explanations provided by staff and Mr. Peach that most of the discrepancies are related to the zoning map and not the land use map. Given the more generalized nature of the Comprehensive Plan Map and that it allows for additional detail and refinement to take place as part of future development regulations and zoning, the proposed land use map adequately represents the intent of the CAC's report, as well as the policies outlined in the proposed subarea plan. Commissioner Broili agreed with Commissioner Piro that there is additional work to be done, but it can happen later as part of development code and zoning work. The proposed land use map accurately reflects the CAC's intent.

Commissioner Kaje asked Mr. Tovar to remind the Commission of their earlier discussion about the potential park expansion at the south end of the Paramount Park Open Space. Mr. Tovar said that the proposed land use map identifies this property as "park." However, he reminded the Commission that the City has already received an application (Plateau at Jackson) for a final plat for this particular piece of property, and it is extremely likely the property will be developed as single-family homes. If this does not happen, the best way to express the City's interest in ultimately acquiring a portion or all of the property as a park might be to show a broken green line around it, but leave the existing underlying designation (low-density residential) intact. The Comprehensive Plan could also provide narrative to describe the City's long-term interest in potentially acquiring the property. He emphasized that the City does not have the ability to obtain public land merely by identifying it in the Comprehensive Plan as such.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that the City still has control over the right-of-way to provide some connectivity to Jackson Park. Mr. Tovar said that, assuming that the Plateau at Jackson is built, there may be some opportunity with the rights-of-way on either side of the development to create the type of connectivity discussed in the subarea plan. Commissioner Broili reminded the Commission that Little's Creek is located immediately to the west of the property.

Commissioner Piro recalled that when the Commission reviewed the application for the Plateau at Jackson Project, they clearly saw the benefits associated with acquiring the property for a public use, but that was not an option for the Commission to consider at the time. They discussed doing what they

could to encourage the siting of the subdivision to take into account the ecological connection, as well as providing opportunities for some physical trail connections. He emphasized that designating the property as "park" in the Comprehensive Plan would not make the subdivision go away. Mr. Tovar agreed the property owner has a vested right to develop the plat as approved. The purpose of showing the property as a potential park is to allow the City the option of purchasing one or more of the lots if the vested application is never exercised. The fact that there will likely be a plat recorded and lots developed does not mean it would be fruitless to show the property as a potential park.

The Commission agreed it would be appropriate to identify the property with a broken green line around it, but leave the existing underlying designation (low-density residential) intact. Narrative should be added to the Comprehensive Plan to describe the City's long-term interest in potentially acquiring the property. They emphasized that Policy NE5 (*"Support creation of contiguous ecosystems, with attention to habitat, through designation of a "green corridor," as a public/private partnership, including the area between Seattle's Jackson Park, Paramount Park and Hamlin Park."*) also addresses the issue.

**COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO CHANGE THE LAND USE MAP LEGEND FOR THE "PARK EXPANSION" DESIGNATION AS WELL AS LIST THE UNDERLYING ZONING FOR PARCELS UNDER THIS DESIGNATION, AND TO ADD TEXT TO THE SUBAREA PLAN UNDER THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT SECTION TO READ: "THE CITY HAS AN INTEREST IN ACQUIRING LANDS ADJACENT TO PARAMOUNT PARK OPEN SPACE." COMMISSIONER BROILI ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Piro recalled that the Commission started their deliberations with the idea that they would work on the document, but it would come back for additional discussion at a later date. This would have allowed an opportunity for the public to comment on the adjustments that were made. If the Commission votes on a final recommendation now, any additional refinement and discussion would take place at the City Council level.

#### **Vote by Commission to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification**

**THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOODS SUBAREA PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE MAP AS PROPOSED BY STAFF IN EXHIBIT #1, AND AMENDED BY THE COMMISSION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **Closure of Public Hearing**

The public hearing was closed at 10:57 p.m.

#### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Tovar announced that the City Council would hold a retreat on March 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> to review the ten Council Goals that were previously adopted. He noted that Goal 1 is to implement the adopted

Community Vision by updating the Comprehensive Plan and key development regulations in partnership with residents, neighborhoods and businesses. The goal contains the following items:

- Adopt the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan - just completed by the Commission.
- Appoint new residential density incentive regulations for the RB zone (now MUZ) - already completed by the Commission.
- Update the tree regulations - coming before the Commission in the near future.
- Complete Town Center Plan - coming before the Commission in the near future.
- Complete Draft Urban Design Capital Facilities and Park Elements of the Park Plan - coming before the Commission in the near future.

Mr. Tovar advised that the agenda for Commission's April 12<sup>th</sup> joint meeting with the City Council would include a discussion regarding Goal 1. Any updates that are made at the retreat would be reviewed with the Commission at that time. The Commission's upcoming work program would also be discussed. The Commission would have an opportunity to report on their progress over the past several months. He suggested the Commissioners share their thoughts with staff about specific items they would like to discuss with the City Council. Staff would summarize the submitted ideas. He noted that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission would meet with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor to discuss the meeting agenda prior to April 12<sup>th</sup>.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business scheduled on the agenda.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Amendment to Planning Commission Bylaws**

This item was tabled until a future agenda.

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

Commissioner Piro reported that the February issue of the Puget Sound Regional Council's newsletter contained an article about the City of Shoreline's groundbreaking for the second mile of the Aurora Project. He provided copies of the newsletter to each of the Commissioners. He said there was a lot of excitement amongst the staff to showcase the project.

Commissioner Piro announced that he was invited to be part of a delegation (12 people) that visited heads of major Christian religious communions in Europe. They met with the Archbishop of Canterbury in London, the Ecumenical Patriarch of the Orthodox Churches in Istanbul, the Pope in Rome and finished in Geneva where they met with the General Secretaries of the World Council of Churches, the Lutheran World Federation and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches. It was a phenomenal trip, and they were treated graciously.

### **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission that the March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting will start at 6:00 p.m. There are several items on the agenda, including continuation of the public hearing for the CRISTA Master Development Plan. The Commission would also discuss the joint meeting with the City Council and review the Draft Town Center Vision Statement. He agreed to contact the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission to discuss the order of the agenda to make sure they can get through all the items.

Mr. Cohn explained that if the Commission decides to continue the CRISTA Master Development Plan hearing beyond March 18<sup>th</sup>, they could make that announcement at the end of the hearing. The hearing could be continued to March 25<sup>th</sup>, if necessary.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 P.M.

---

Michelle Linders Wagner  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith  
Clerk, Planning Commission