

Jack Malek

-206-498-2189/20224 23<sup>rd</sup> Pl NW, Shoreline, WA 98177

1062

Jmalek@Windermere.com

**From:** Scott [scottb@fourfoldarchitecture.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 03, 2009 4:22 PM  
**To:** Jack Malek  
**Cc:** jtovar@shorelinewa.gov  
**Subject:** Q/C's for Planning Staff

Hi Jack -

Thanks for your call last night and sorry I was out and missed it. Below are my points on the PW subarea plan and zoning for your use. Mind you, I did a skim on the minutes from the study sessions, but can't be sure whether some of these points were not covered in preceding planning commissioners comments. At any rate, I guess it can't hurt to say it again. I am copying Joe with this note as he and I spoke about the permitting issue below, and I wanted him to have a copy of my text.

- In an general sense, I believe the Plan and Zoning documents have the intent that was expressed through public comment and the charrette. However, I believe some of that plan mapping indicates relatively arbitrary distinctions that should be tested (massaged) through a complete, multi-stage, design review process. Here are some specific comments regarding the Subarea Plan:
  - The Plan calls for three subareas (SE, SW, and NW), and distinguishes them in the regulations. SE makes the most sense, as it is segregated from the rest of the lowland parcel by the tracks. However the line distinguishing NW and SW does not reflect a clear geographic distinction, save for some finding of more environmentally sensitive soils in the SW parcel. So why draw the line and use it to distinguish the heights of buildings? As another example, I do agree that a park should be located in this parcel if the site is built out, but that choice should be based on the overall master plan for the site as proposed by the developer, taking into account other options, according to a comprehensive design process.
  - PW-4 in the Plan indicates that the SE sub-area will have buildings no higher than 6 stories, whereas an area in NW sub-area immediately north may have towers up to 200 ft. I don't mind seeing the distinction, but I want to know why. It makes more sense in this case to envision a different use on this parcel as is alluded in reference to the SW sub-area (open space). If the only reason limiting the height of buildings in the SE sub-area is a few SF homes immediately east, it makes more sense to include it in the view corridor and limit buildings to 35 feet or completely. Incidentally, wouldn't this sub-area feature large in any pedestrian connection to Woodway?
  - PW-5 calls for slender towers with view corridors. Elsewhere in the zoning it is stipulated that there must be 100 ft. separation between towers. I am not sure either of these matters as much as the street grid underneath. In other words, these regulations make more sense as part of a general design review guideline document, including modeling studies the city has conducted, give it to the developer, and use this tool for real design review once the project proposal is available. Otherwise, the design forest (a comprehensive master plan) will run risk of getting lost for the trees (well intentioned specific regulations).
  - PW-6 calls for a Richmond Beach Rd. view corridor - I agree with the concept, but do not understand the parameters of the map. How will this be implemented; are we to assume that the lines reflected by the "arrow" graphic are going to be surveyed and applied by easement, done? Shouldn't this view corridor be referential to the specifics of the land form, built landmarks, or something other than arbitrary lines on a map?
- Miscellaneous Zoning Comments:
  - 20.92.040A. Applicability. Permitting by Administrative Design Review and Site Development Permit doesn't cut it in my opinion relative to scale of the site, magnitude of impacts, and the intent to create a landmark in terms of environmentally sensitive design. My issue is not so much with the lack of public input, which is very limited with an ADR process, as I am advocate for formal design review, and others have already put energy

2062

into this point as I understand. That said, there should be a required public hearing, and I think it is most effective to have such in front of the Planning Commission. More importantly in my opinion, is the need to have a comprehensive review of the entire site employing something similar to a Master Development Permit review, as is required now in COS only for a campus (eg: Krista). Without this, the developer may phase the project over years of changing staff, and there may be little chance for a comprehensive, and from a green perspective, holistic design for this "island" as the planning documents wisely express it to be. To make a point, the code asks for a "Master Sign Plan" but not a Master Development Plan??

- o This last one is word-smithing, and was probably addressed previously, but what the hey? 20.92.070B. Maximum Floor Plate. I think the wording is confused. Here is what I think they want it to mean:
  1. Max floor plate for buildings >65 ft in height is 10,000 SF.
  2. " " " 65 ft > 35 ft is 30,000 SF.
  3. " " " <35 ft is unlimited.

Ok, that's what I got. Good luck tonight Jack and thanks for being there.

Peace,  
Scott

**Scott Becker**  
**f o u r f o l d ARCHITECTURE, PLLC**

c: 206.533.9112  
e: scottb@fourfoldarchitecture.com  
[www.fourfoldarchitecture.com](http://www.fourfoldarchitecture.com)