

Subarea Plan Potential Amendments

#	Source	Possible Amendment:
1	RP	Add new <u>“Policy PW-1A: The Vision for Point Wells is an environmentally sustainable mixed-use community that is a model of environmental restoration, low-impact and climate-friendly sustainable development practices, and which has provided extensive public access to the Puget Sound with a variety of trails, parks, public and semi-public spaces.”</u>
2	RP	Clarify the intent of the Transportation Implementation Plan by modifying Policy PW-7 as follows: <u>“Policy PW-7 To enable appropriate traffic mitigation of future development at Point Wells, the developer should fund the preparation of a Transportation Corridor Study as the first phase of a Transportation Implementation Plan, under the direction of the City, with the input and participation of Woodway, Edmonds, Snohomish County and WSDOT. The Study and Transportation Implementation Plan should identify, engineer, and provide schematic design and costs for intersection, roadway, walkway and other public improvements needed to maintain or improve vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian safety and flow on all road segments and intersections between SR 104 and N. 175th Street, with particular attention focused on Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road.”</u>
3	RP	Consider revising paragraph 1 of the section (see page 6 of the draft plan) to clarify that the '09 analysis is "background information." (The reference to Snohomish County zoning may cease to be relevant if the area is annexed to the City, so that discussion should be secondary in the subarea plan. “A traffic and safety analysis performed by the City in the summer of 2009 evaluated the nature and magnitude of impacts likely to accrue from the development of Point Wells as an “Urban Center” under Snohomish County zoning, as well as development scenarios assuming lesser orders of magnitude. <u>This background information provided a basis for the City to conclude</u> The City concluded that, prior to the approval of any specific development project at Point Wells, the applicant for any development permit at Point Wells should fund, and the City oversee, the preparation of a detailed Transportation Corridor Study.”
4	RP	In paragraph 2, consider language that speaks to evaluating "and expanding" bicycle and pedestrian "mobility" as well as "safety." Add a discussion of transit in this paragraph. Again in paragraph 2, in the final sentence, consider adding the term "multimodal" following "innovative" - so that the sentence reads "innovative and multimodal strategies and investments." Amend Paragraph 2 as follows: <u>“The Transportation Corridor Study and Implementation Plan should encompass all of Richmond Beach Drive</u>

		and Richmond Beach Road, and all their intersections with public roads, from NW 205 th Street to State Route 99, and include an evaluation of projected impacts on vehicular flow and levels of service at every intersection and road segment in the corridor. The Study should also evaluate <u>and expand</u> bicycle and pedestrian safety <u>and mobility</u> as impacted by the projected annual daily and peak hour traffic, and identify appropriate “context sensitive design” treatments for every intersection, road segment, block face, crosswalk and walkway in the study area. In addition to conventional engineering design, the Study should evaluate the value and feasibility of innovative <u>and multimodal</u> strategies and improvements such as road diets, complete streets, one way couplets, roundabouts, and traffic calming devices.”
5	RP	<p>Add additional language after paragraph 2 (page 7 of the draft plan) by inserting the following paragraph:</p> <p><u>“A Transportation Implementation Plan - a corridor study would be a step in the development of such a plan. The scope of the transportation plan should include a multimodal approach to mobility and accessibility to and from Point Wells, as well as detailed planning for investments and services to improve multimodal travel for adjacent communities between Point Wells and and I-5. This could well include an integrated approach to accessing Point Wells, the Richmond Beach neighborhood, and Richmond Highlands with the Bus Rapid Transit system along Aurora Avenue, the I-5 corridor itself - focusing on the interchanges at N. 205th and N. 175th, as well as the Sound Transit light rail stations serving Shoreline.</u></p> <p><u>While the analysis of vehicle flows is appropriate as part of the study, the solutions should provide alternatives to vehicle travel to and from Point Wells - as well as more transportation choices for the Richmond Beach neighborhood and adjacent communities than current exist today.”</u></p>
5	RP	<p>Expand the language in the first sentence of PW-7 to also address as an outcome: the identification of financing for investments and services to implement the transportation plan. Revise Policies PW-7, PW-8, and PW-9 to refer to a transportation plan, with the corridor study as a step in developing the plan. Amend these policies as follows:</p> <p><u>“Policy PW-7 To enable appropriate traffic mitigation of future development at Point Wells, the developer should fund the preparation of a Transportation Corridor Study <u>and Implementation Plan</u>, under the direction of the City. The Study <u>and Transportation Plan</u> should identify, engineer, and provide costs for intersection, roadway, walkway and other public improvements needed to maintain or improve vehicular, bicycle and</u></p>

		<p>pedestrian safety and flow on Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road. <u>The Study and Transportation Plan should identify needed investments and services, including design and financing, for multimodal solutions to improving mobility and accessibility within the Richmond Beach neighborhood and adjacent communities, including but not limited to investments on Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road.</u>"</p> <p><u>Policy PW-8</u> The needed mitigation improvements identified in the Transportation Corridor Study <u>and Implementation Plan</u> should be built and operational concurrent with the occupancy of the phases of development at Point Wells.</p> <p><u>Policy PW-9</u> The maximum daily traffic that the City should permit on Richmond Beach Drive from Point Wells should not exceed 8,250 vehicle trips per day, or a maximum peak hour of 825 trips (trips are counted both entering and leaving). This standard should be included in the <u>Transportation Study and Implementation Plan.</u>"</p>
6	RP	<p>Consider revising the text in the paragraph that precedes draft Policy PW-9 to talk more comprehensively about mobility and accessibility in Richmond Beach and adjacent communities - about other modes of travel in addition to vehicle trips. Add to the discussion information on current and planned transit service, as well as information on bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Consider adding language to provide more context to the brief narrative that references level of service "F."</p> <p>Consider expanding PW-9 to include language that addresses desired level-of-service goals and objectives that provide the basis for the quantified vehicle trip numbers currently in that draft policy. Also consider language that discusses multimodal travel to and from Point wells in addition to vehicle trips. Amend the paragraph preceding Policy PW-9, and Policy PW-9 itself as follows:</p> <p><u>"Historically, mobility and accessibility in Richmond Beach and adjacent communities has been dominated by the single occupancy vehicle. Provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities has been limited because retrofitting an existing road network with these facilities is an expensive undertaking. The Richmond Beach Road corridor has been has been served by a single Metro route and, though rail service to a station in Richmond Beach was evaluated by Sound Transit, no service is envisioned in the transit agency's adopted 20 year plan. Though improved transit, bicycle and pedestrian mobility is a long-term policy objective, the majority of trips in the area will likely continue to be by automobiles utilizing the road network. The City's traffic study completed in 2009 shows that if more than 8,250 vehicle trips a day enter the City's road network from Point Wells, it would result</u></p>

		<p>in a level of service “F” or worse at a number of City intersections. This would be an unacceptable impact. Therefore, the City should establish a maximum daily traffic trip threshold originating from Point Wells and require preparation of a Transportation Corridor Study to identify necessary mitigations.</p> <p><u>Policy PW-9</u> The maximum daily traffic that the City should permit on Richmond Beach Drive from Point Wells should not exceed 8,250 vehicle trips per day, or a maximum peak hour of 825 trips (trips are counted both entering and leaving). <u>The City should address opportunities to improve mobility, accessibility, and multimodal east-west movement in the Richmond Beach Road corridor between Puget Sound and I-5 as part of the update of the city-wide Transportation Management Plan</u></p>
7	RP	<p>Regarding the Intergovernmental Coordination section (page 8 in the draft), expand the discussion to incorporate issues raised at the end of the December 3rd planning commission meeting regarding future opportunities and eventualities for the Point Wells site and adjacent neighborhoods and communities after development occurs. Amend the text on page 8 as follows:</p> <p>“The City should work with the Town of Woodway to identify ways in which potential future development in the lowland portion of Point Wells could be configured or mitigated to reduce potential impacts on Woodway. There is no practical primary vehicular access to the lowland part of Point Wells other than via Richmond Beach Road. However, the City should work with property owners and Woodway to provide a bicycle and pedestrian route to connect Woodway to Puget Sound</p> <p>The Growth Management Act states that cities, rather than county governments, are the preferred providers of urban governmental services. Because urban governmental services and facilities in Shoreline are much closer to Point Wells than are similar services and facilities located in Snohomish County, it is most efficient for the City to provide those services.</p> <p>Working with its public safety partners, Shoreline Fire Department and Shoreline Police Department, the City should invite Snohomish County to discuss an interlocal agreement to address the timing and methods to transition local governmental responsibilities for Point Wells from the County to the City. Included in these discussions should be responsibilities for permitting and inspection of future development at Point Wells, and possible sharing of permitting or other local government revenues to provide an orderly transition.”</p>

		<p><u>Policy PW-10</u> The City should work with both the Town of Woodway and Snohomish County toward adoption of interlocal agreements to address the issues of land use, construction management of, urban service delivery to, and local governance of Point Wells.</p>
8	BP	<p>I agree with Rocky that the subarea plan should have an additional policy statement (or revision of PW-2) that is more comprehensive about the environmental, open-space, public access and sustainability goals for this area. The trail mentioned in PW-2 is a sub-set of that in my opinion. This statement should include a goal to allow no new bulkheads for the entire area and reduce or soften the existing bulkheads through alternative, more natural shoreline stabilization techniques.</p> <p>Consider adding to the new Policy PW-1A proposed in Amendment #1 the following underlined text: <u>“Policy PW-1A: The Vision for Point Wells is an environmentally sustainable mixed-use community that is a model of environmental restoration, low-impact and climate-friendly sustainable development practices, and which has provided extensive public access to the Puget Sound with a variety of trails, parks, public and semi-public spaces. Restoration of the Puget Sound shoreline and aquatic lands at Point Wells should be carefully designed and implemented to minimize impacts and achieve long-term sustainable systems. New bulkheads should not be permitted and the detrimental effects of existing bulkheads should be reduced through alternative, more natural stabilization techniques.”</u></p>

Pre-Annexation Zoning Potential Amendments

1	BP	<p>For the Chapter 20.92 proposal, there should be language addressing our discussion about the value and desire for one comprehensive site plan for the entire area and a contingency if that is not possible to address piecemeal development under more than one owner. Consider amending the PLA 1 code text by adding the following next section: <u>“20.92.035 Minimum Lot Size and Site Plan Review</u> <u>A. Minimum Lot sizes are as follows:</u> <u>1. PLA 1A – 40 acres</u> <u>2. PLA 1B – 5 acres</u> <u>3. PLA 1C - 3 acres</u> <u>B. Site Plan review - Any development in the PLA 1 zone is subject to review of a comprehensive site plan for the entire property held in common ownership.”</u></p>
2	BP	<p>We should also discuss the possibility of planning commission review of the submitted site plan and ADR permit and design departures. To achieve this objective, it would be necessary to amend 20.92.040 as set forth below: <u>“20.92.040 Required Permit Review Processes</u> <u>A. Applicability –</u> <u>1. Any application for site plan approval shall be processed as a Type C permit pursuant to the requirements of SMC 20.30.060.</u> <u>2. No building, grading or other development permission shall be given by the City until an applicatoin for site plan approval the City has first given site plan approval and an Administrative Design Review (ADR) permit is first processed and approved by the Planning Commission, or, if the Commission delegates this responsibility, by the Director. Any application for permit within the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Management Act shall also make application for a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SDP). The ADR permit and the SDP permit are both “Type B” Administrative decisions that may be processed concurrently. Both the ADR permit and the SDP permit are subject to the procedural requirements of SMC 20.30.050 and SMC 20.30.080 through SMC 20.30.290.”</u></p>

3	BP	<p>The language regarding coordination and compliance with the Shoreline Management Act should include aquatic lands in addition to "lands within 200 feet of the Puget Sound shoreline" at the top of p. 4 (p. 38 in the packet). This can be accomplished with the following amendment:</p> <p>“20.92.050 Coordination and Compliance with Shoreline Management Act requirements</p> <p>A. All lands within 200 feet of the Puget Sound shoreline <u>and aquatic lands</u> are subject to the requirements of Chapter 90.58 RCW, the Shoreline Management Act. Consequently, a permit submitted pursuant to SMC 20. 92.040 that lies within the jurisdictional limits of the Shoreline Management Act shall also be required to submit for a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SDP).”</p>
4	BP	<p>The language in section B. on that same page (4) about submittals for ADR and SDP permits should be revised to include these items as goals and topics for a feasibility study that would need to be submitted for these permits. The feasibility study would need to address existing and proposed conditions as related to these goals and describe efforts to include these goals in the plans and establish why they were not feasible if they are not included. This language should also be included or referenced in the discussion of ADR permits on p. 3. Amendment as follows:</p> <p><u>“B. All submittals for <u>site approval</u>, ADR and SDP permits shall include a shoreline restoration plan <u>and feasibility study that addresses existing and proposed future site conditions. The below listed features shall be included in the proposed restoration plan, unless a showing is made that it is not feasible to include.</u> that includes the following features:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of bulkheads to reestablish sediment delivery. 2. Replacement of bulkheads with soft shore stabilization. 3. Replanting of nearshore vegetation. 4. Planting of eelgrass, kelp and other aquatic macrophytes. 5. Replacement or enlargement of undersized culverts to be fish-friendly. 6. Removal of fill from wetlands, intertidal habitats and floodplains. 7. Removal of invasive plant species. 8. Retrofitting of existing impervious surfaces to include stormwater treatment and flow control. 9. Regrading of the site and reconnection of local freshwater sources to re-create a tidal lagoon system with an opening at the north end of the point. 10. Explanation of how active or passive public access within 200 feet of the shoreline will serve and balance recreation, education and conservation objectives.

5	Misc	Replace all references to “view corridors” with “public view corridors”. A motion to this effect would be appropriate.
6	Misc	Clarify the language of section 20.92.050.B, particularly item #6 that discusses removal of fill). It is suggested that this be clarified to note that the note should apply to contaminated fill, but it does not suggest that all fill on the site should be removed. Staff agreed that this is the intent. This could be achieved by the following amendment: “At 20.92.050.B.6, insert the word “contaminated” before the word “fill.”
7	Misc	Clarify 20.92.070C to state that portions of the building less than 65 ft in height could be connected. This can be achieved with the following amendment: “ No <u>The</u> portion of any building that is taller than 65 feet may be <u>no</u> closer than 100 feet to any portion of any other building that is taller than 65 feet.”
8	Misc	Re: 20.92.050B, item 8. Does the stormwater manual require flow control for properties that have direct discharge to a water body? Due to this location and topography there would not seem to be an issue with synchronization with watersheds. The staff agrees and suggest the following: “Amend 20.92.050B.8 to delete the reference and renumber 9 and 10 as 8 and 9.”
9	Misc	Does it make sense to reconfigure the boundary between PLA 1A and 1B so that everything within 1B is within the “View Corridor” shown on Figure 1? The staff will present an alternative version of Figure 1 at the December 10 public hearing if the Commission wishes to adopt this alternative configuration for the zone lines.