

AGENDA

CITY OF SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING



Thursday, May 17, 2007
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room
18560 1st Avenue NE

| | <u>Estimated Time</u> |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1. CALL TO ORDER | 7:00 p.m. |
| 2. ROLL CALL | 7:01 p.m. |
| 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA | 7:02 p.m. |
| 4. DIRECTOR'S REPORT | 7:03 p.m. |
| 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES a. May 3, 2007 | 7:08 p.m. |
| 6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT | 7:10 p.m. |

The Planning Commission will take public testimony on any subject which is not of a quasi-judicial nature or specifically scheduled for this agenda. Each member of the public may comment for up to two minutes. However, Item 6 (General Public Comment) will be limited to a maximum period of twenty minutes. Each member of the public may also comment for up to two minutes on action items after each staff report has been presented. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and number of people permitted to speak. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the front of the room to have their comments recorded. Speakers must clearly state their name and city of residence.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 7. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS | 7:15 p.m. |
| 8. STAFF REPORTS a. Strategic Points for Town Center Projects | 7:25 p.m. |
| 9. PUBLIC COMMENT | 8:45 p.m. |
| 10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS | 8:55 p.m. |
| 11. NEW BUSINESS | 9:00 p.m. |
| 12. AGENDA FOR June 7, 2007 Study Session: South Aurora Triangle Development Public Hearing: Site-Specific Rezone at 14727 32nd Ave NE Election of a Chair and Vice Chair | 9:05 p.m. |
| 13. ADJOURNMENT | 9:10 p.m. |

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 546-8919 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 546-2190.

DRAFT

These Minutes Subject to
May 17th Approval

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

May 3, 2007
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Chair Piro
Vice Chair Kuboi
Commissioner Hall
Commissioner Harris
Commissioner Phisuthikul
Commissioner Pyle
Commissioner Wagner
Commissioner McClelland

STAFF PRESENT

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services
Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Steve Szafran, Planner II, Planning & Development Services
Tom Boydell, Economic Development Manager
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Commissioner Broili

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Kuboi called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:06 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Piro, Vice Chair Kuboi, Commissioners Harris, Phisuthikul, Hall, Pyle and Wagner. Commissioner Broili was excused and Commissioner McClelland arrived at 9:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Director's Report (Item 4) was moved to after New Business (Item 10). The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 19, 2007 were approved as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to speak before the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ON SITE-SPECIFIC COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 416 AND 422 NORTH 145TH STREET (FILE NUMBERS 301436 AND 201599)

Chair Piro reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing. He reminded the Commission of the Rules of the Appearance of Fairness Laws and invited them to disclose any ex parte communications they may have received concerning the subject of the hearing outside of the hearing. None of the Commissioners identified ex parte communications that would prohibit their participation in the public hearing. No one in the audience expressed a concern, either.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation

Mr. Szafran advised that this application is a site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendment and concurrent rezone for properties located at 416 and 422 North 145th Street. The proposal is to change the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from medium-density residential to mixed-use. Concurrently, the request is to change the zoning from R-12 to R-48. He provided a land use and zoning map to show that the subject parcels are surrounded by mixed-use and an R-48 zoning designation. He explained that the existing site has been cleared. He showed pictures to illustrate the current conditions on the site. He advised that the property immediately to the north is a condominium development in an R-48 zone. To the west is a single-family house that fronts along 145th, but an application has been submitted to change the zoning of this parcel to R-48. To the east there is a Seattle Water Tower and a single-family home in an R-48 zone.

Mr. Szafran advised that the proposed request meets the Comprehensive Plan and zoning criteria as follows:

- It would increase the number of housing units in the City.
- It would locate higher density housing towards arterials and away from single-family residential neighborhoods.
- It would locate higher density housing adjacent to public transportation.
- It would be consistent with the mixed-use designation that surrounds the two subject parcels.
- It would be consistent with the R-48 zoning that surrounds it.
- It would be consistent with existing densities in the immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Szafran said the staff's preliminary recommendation on the proposal is to approve the Comprehensive Plan land use change to mixed-use and the rezone to R-48.

Questions by the Commission to Staff

Chair Piro asked if the property located to the west of the subject properties that is occupied by a single family home is currently zoned R-48. Mr. Szafran answered affirmatively and noted that the land use designation is mixed use.

Commissioner Wagner asked what is located to the south of the subject property, which is within the City of Seattle. Mr. Szafran said the property to the south is developed with single-family homes.

Vice Chair Kuboi inquired about ownership of the western portion of the subject property. He noted that the Staff Report indicates that both parcels are owned by the applicant, Shaun Leiser. Secondly, Vice Chair Kuboi asked staff to describe the proposal that was discussed during the neighborhood meeting.

Shaun Leiser, applicant, said the project that was presented at the neighborhood meeting was specific only to the project at the corner at 422 North 145th Street. At the time of the neighborhood meeting, he had not contacted the owner of the western parcel. After the neighborhood meeting, this property owner agreed to apply jointly with him for a rezone and Comprehensive Plan amendment. Mr. Leiser advised that at the neighborhood meeting the proposal was to construct two units on the eastern property, which would be sold as townhomes. The proposed land use and zoning change for the eastern property was supported by the neighbors who attended the meeting. Mr. Leiser noted that he also owns the parcel to the north of the subject property, and the project for this site is currently at the permit stage. Again, Mr. Leiser emphasized that the neighborhood meeting did not include any discussion about possible changes for the western property, which remains in separate ownership.

Commissioner Pyle referred to the frontage improvements that would be required at the time of development. He pointed out that North 145th Street is actually King County right-of-way, which is already built out in this location, including a sidewalk. He inquired if access for the site would come from Dayton. Mr. Leiser answered affirmatively.

Commissioner Wagner requested clarification of Attachment 4, which is an email from Mike Hinrichsen to Mr. Szafran regarding the parking. Mr. Szafran answered that an administrative order was issued in 2003, which granted approval of one parking space per unit. He noted that the original request for a 12-unit development was previously approved, but the applicant is now proposing only 11. Only one parking space per unit would be required. Commissioner Wagner asked if both parcels would gain access from Dayton. Mr. Cohn answered that they don't know where the access for the western property would come from but suggested it would likely come from North 145th Street.

Public Testimony or Comment

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to participate in the public hearing.

Presentation of Final Staff Recommendation

Mr. Szafran said staff recommends the Commission approve the proposal to change the Comprehensive Plan land use designation for the subject parcels to mixed-use and the zoning to R-48.

Final Questions by the Commission and Commission Deliberation

Vice Chair Kuboi requested an opportunity to review a paper copy of the revised site plan (similar to Attachment 3). Mr. Szafran emphasized that the site plan on the paper copy has not been approved, but the site plan included as Attachment 3 has been approved.

COMMISSIONER HARRIS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT TO MIXED USE AND CONCURRENT REZONE OF THE TWO PARCELS TO R-48 AT 416 AND 422 NORTH 145TH STREET. VICE CHAIR KUBOI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Hall noted that there was no opposition voiced by the community related to the proposed changes. In addition, the current R-12 zoning is odd, given that the properties are surrounded by mostly R-48 zoning. He commended the staff on their new approach for putting the findings and conclusions in a more formal, ordinance like format. The analysis was good and captures all of the important criteria that must be considered.

Chair Piro said that, typically, he has concerns about making such dramatic changes in zoning. However, he would support the proposal since all of the immediately adjacent properties are already zoned R-48.

Commissioner Harris recalled that when the development proposal for the property to the north was reviewed in 2000, the City reduced the parking requirement to one space per unit given the property's proximity to bus transit services.

Vice Chair Kuboi asked if the property owner of the western parcel is officially a party to the rezone. Mr. Szafran said the City has a letter from her in the file, along with her signature.

Closure of the Public Hearing

The public hearing was closed.

Vote by Commission to Recommend Approval, Denial or Modification

THE MOTION CARRIED 7-0.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Hall advised that he is the Long-Range Planning Manager for Snohomish County. He noted that, historically, Snohomish County and the City of Shoreline have not always been in complete agreement about the future disposition of the Point Wells site. Therefore, he would excuse himself from any conversations about that subject to avoid a conflict of interest. Mr. Tovar indicated that Point Wells would be the last item in his Director's Report.

Chair Piro noted that Commissioners Broili and McClelland serve with him on the Aurora Business Corridor Team. While they had intended to wrap up their work at the next meeting in May, they recently agreed to extend their service for at least three more meetings. He noted that members of the team have been positive about their experience so far, and they feel the process has been fair and transparent to date. While the group would not develop a recommendation for a particular alternative, members would assess the materials presented to them so far and provide guidance for how it should move forward and be reported to the City Council. The next meeting is scheduled for May 9th.

Vice Chair Kuboi reported on his participation on the Comprehensive Housing Strategy Citizens Advisory Committee. He noted that Commissioners Phisuthikul and Wagner also participate on this committee to represent the Commission. He advised that they recently completed the affordable housing portion of their work, and next week would start on the housing choice component. The last phase would focus on neighborhood character. Vice Chair Kuboi reported that the representatives from the committee recently provided an update to the City Council regarding their progress, and their efforts appeared to be well received.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business scheduled on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

Ridgecrest/Economic Development Update

Mr. Boydell said the Ridgecrest Neighborhood Commercial Center, located east of Interstate 5 at the corner of Northeast 165th Street and 5th Avenue Northeast, is the first project of the Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative of the Shoreline Office of Economic Development, which was adopted by the City Council in 2006. He emphasized that there is enormous positive potential in this area for such things as mixed-use development, public spaces, pedestrian improvements, etc. The City entered into a contract with the University of Washington College of Architecture to conduct a charette with the local neighborhood to allow for a thorough discussion with property owners, business owners, and residents. He explained that the project has been a true collaborative effort, and numerous people attended the three public meetings. They also received positive statements from members of the neighborhood, the business owners, the property owners, and the developers. He advised that the purpose of this

presentation is to summarize the process to date, present the work of the University of Washington Students, and seek the Commission's advice and comments.

Mr. Boydell advised that, as the City moves forward with this project, the key decision points will include:

- Designating the Ridgecrest Neighborhood Commercial Center as a target area for property tax exemption.
- Changing the zoning.
- Deciding whether or not to do capital projects for not only street and sidewalk improvements, but perhaps the creation of a public park or other public features.

Mr. Boydell reviewed that a green building forum was conducted on January 18th, which was attended by about 50 people. In addition, two public meetings were conducted for the Ridgecrest Neighborhood, and each one was attended by about 100 citizens, plus City staff, City Council Members, and University of Washington Students. He noted that Commissioner Broili participated in the public meetings and the mid-term student review at the University of Washington, and Commissioner Phisuthikul attended the public meetings, as well.

Mr. Boydell reported that a draft Capital Improvement Plan Proposal was submitted on April 6th, and internal staff discussions have occurred. He said he has also initiated property development discussions with not only existing property owners, but with potential buyers. The owner of the bingo site decided to reject many offers and wait for this project to proceed. He is currently working with four development teams, who are excited about hearing from the community. Staff has also received responses from the owner and CEO of Landmark Cinemas. The majority of the business owners were present at the community meetings. Although they had some initial concerns, they now support the project.

Next, Mr. Boydell advised that staff is preparing a proposal to add Ridgecrest as an additional target area within the City's Property Tax Exemption program. Staff will also start researching potential investment tax credits and environmental grants. Staff has met with property owners, business owners, and various developers. Small business counseling and loan services have been made available to local business owners. He reviewed the contacts that have already been made with potential new businesses, including organic food co-ops, and individuals who are interested in starting a bookstore, bakery, deli, or other type of business

Mr. Boydell said staff would also be reviewing and identifying possible changes to the zoning and design guidelines to accommodate the future plans. They plan to consider opportunities for improvements to the streetscape, utilities, and traffic signals, as well as opportunities to provide public amenities such as art, bike racks, etc. Staff would work with the parks and recreation department and the school district to research options such as enhancing the entrances and connections to parks, providing walking paths, creating a p-patch type park, establishing an after school theater or film class at the theater, creating a water feature in a pocket park, educating the public about environmental sustainability, etc.

Mr. Boydell announced that the University of Washington Students worked in four teams to come up with a number of ideas. He emphasized that the purpose of the presentation is to brief the Commission, and the Commission would not be asked to make any decisions or recommendations at this time. He further emphasized that staff would not be considering any zoning changes outside of the existing neighborhood commercial area. However, they are considering the option of implementing a form-based code on the commercially zoned land that already exists. He invited LuAnne Smith to provide an overview of the student's work.

LuAnne Smith, indicated that she is an instructor at the University of Washington College of Architecture and Urban Planning, Department of Landscape Architecture. She reviewed that the project was a partnership between the City of Shoreline, the University Of Washington Department Of Landscape Architecture, and the Northwest Center for Livable Cities. She explained that within a 10-week period, the students co-hosted two neighborhood meetings with the citizens of the Ridgecrest Neighborhood and developed four design alternatives. She provided a preview of the booklet the students are producing for the City and noted that a PDF version would be provided for the City to post on their website.

Mr. Boydell explained that the Ridgecrest Commercial Center was chosen by the Economic Development Task Force and Council of Neighborhoods as the first project in the Economic Development Program's Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative. The reasons are that the area is popular and well-known, used to be a more active commercial center, and is small enough in size to make it a good area to test out new ideas and approaches. The major property in the center is up for sale (2.6 acres on the SW corner) and several properties on the NE corner (totaling 4 acres) may become available for new development in the near future, presenting an opportunity as well. Ms. Smith added that the infrastructure is in good shape and the elevation and views make for an exciting location to build new housing (e.g. Ridgecrest is 35 feet higher than Queen Anne hill in Seattle).

Ms. Smith advised that the students conducted extensive research to gather pertinent information. Their research included a review of the 2000 census data and the Puget Sound Regional Council's forecast and projected growth for 2006. They researched bus routes, park and ride locations, crosswalk locations, available parking space in the region, the history of Shoreline, parks in the region, natural features and topography of the site, current zoning designations and requirements, and existing land use designations. The students also studied various existing neighborhoods in the region that had small mixed-use developments surrounded by single-family homes. She reviewed various elements of each of the neighborhoods that were studied.

Ms. Smith advised that all of the student's research work was presented at a well-attended and enthusiastic neighborhood meeting, where four interactive stations were prepared for the community to participate in. At the mapping station, residents were asked to use pencils and stars to show where they worked, lived and walked. Another station provided an introduction to sustainable elements, and the public was asked to respond to concepts such as permeable paving, water catchment systems, bioswales, rain gardens, green roofs, green walls, and alternative energy. She noted that the Ridgecrest Neighborhood seems ready to embrace this type of development. At a third station, students talked to the neighborhood residents about the benefits of environmentally sustainable concepts. The last station

was related to neighborhood services, and its purpose was to brainstorm ideas of what the neighbors want to see in the area.

Ms. Smith explained that the students used their research information, as well as the comments provided by the public at the first neighborhood meeting to develop with physical design scenarios. She noted that there was a wide spread of comments from the neighborhood. Some wanted absolutely nothing to change, and others were willing to accept some changes. Some people wanted more neighborliness and modest housing, while others liked the idea of mixed-use and a more vibrant feel to the corner. Some even recommended that all of 5th Avenue be made commercial.

Ms. Smith reported that City staff set up a professional advisory panel of architectures, City of Shoreline staff, and developers to talk to the students about sustainability. After extensive work, the students developed an innovative description of sustainability that blends economic, social, and environmental considerations and then makes it meaningful at the neighborhood level. They called their new model “Creative Sustainability” with the key elements being a sense of belonging, sense of place, neighborhood identity, walk-ability, practical solutions, and balance. The land use designs reflect creative ways to implement that definition of sustainability.

Ms. Smith explained that the draft designs were presented to the public at a second neighborhood meeting. Students provided digital presentations of the proposed designs. They also provided physical models of the proposed designs so the neighbors could compare the four design alternatives. She reviewed the alternatives as follows:

- **Re-use Infill Alternative Using the Existing Zoning:** Because some residents indicated they didn’t want a lot of change, this alternative took on a very modest scheme. It deals with drainage and pedestrian connections and evolved around bringing sustainable practices into a modest development. There would only be a limited amount of housing with this alternative, which would allow up to 24 units per acre and a height of 50 feet. This scheme introduced the concept of expanding opportunities for mother-in-law apartments around the neighborhood core if the need for more housing arises. She provided maps to describe the various elements of the design alternative.
- **Neighborhood Business Plan:** This alternative proposes mixed-use zoning, with a height limit of 50 feet and a density of 24 units per acre. This alternative does a good job of demonstrating what sustainability would look like. She noted that the team that completed this alternative received an award from the Washington Society of Landscape Architecture. The alternative uses art, open space and education to bring the neighborhood alive. It clearly demonstrates the concept of water catchment, rain gardens, green roofs, plazas, paving patterns, etc. She reviewed maps to illustrate the elements associated with this design alternative.
- **Commercial Business Plan:** This alternative is similar to the zoning already in place in many of Shoreline’s commercial areas, but not in Ridgecrest. The buildings would be allowed a 60-foot height, with 48 units per acre. This alternative focused on the relationship between the Ridgecrest Neighborhood, Interstate 5 and greater Shoreline. The alternative also focused on the social aspect, with the idea of bringing in small cafes, developing more parks and open space, paving patterns, tree-

lined boulevards, etc. Ms. Smith provided maps to identify the more significant elements of this design alternative.

- **Sub-Area Plan:** This alternative utilized the concept of sub-area neighborhood planning and how to optimize the practical limits of development. The students felt it was important to let the citizens of Ridgecrest understand this concept is a possibility. The alternative focused on looking beyond the Ridgecrest Neighborhood to consider opportunities for balancing regional needs for housing and open space. The plan includes three residential towers (20 stories, 17 stories, and 12 stories tall) with retail at the base, while increasing the open space and ecological function of the neighborhood. In the city-wide context, the housing would be concentrated at the central core, and a link of green spaces would be created between Hamlin Park, Northcrest Park and Ronald Bog. In the regional context, the alternative would preserve farms and forests within King County. The group of students who prepared this alternative worked with the Cascade Land Conservancy regarding the concept of transferring development rights to the Conservancy so that no development could occur in the forested and heavily habitated natural areas. In exchange, a greater density would be allowed elsewhere. Development in this alternative would be high density but the shadow study indicated that the neighborhood impacts were not severe. Ms. Smith used a map to illustrate specific elements of this design.

Ms. Smith noted that the citizens who attended the neighborhood meeting initially expressed very negative comments about the sub-area plan alternative, and they were adamant it was not something they wanted to implement in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood. However, they agreed to listen to the student's proposal and in the end, said they understood the concept the students were trying to apply. But they still did not believe the concept would be appropriate for their neighborhood.

Ms. Smith said it was amazing to see the significant public participation in the neighborhood meetings. Those in attendance were very civil. She noted that about 20 percent of the participants provided written comments to the students. She summarized that the Ridgecrest community really liked the neighborhood business plan and the commercial business plan, and some even had some good things to say about the sub area plan.

The Commission took a 10-minute break to allow everyone an opportunity to review the models and presentation boards of the four plans that were prepared by the students.

Ms. Smith thanked the City staff and citizens for working with the students on this project. Chair Piro complimented the students on their hard work and for the high-quality information they provided. He commented that the interaction between Ms. Smith, the students, the staff and the community helped to shape some very intriguing and sustainable concepts for the City to work with. Mr. Boydell commended the Ridgecrest Neighborhood Association for creating a positive environment for the students to present their work.

Commissioner Phisuthikul advised that he participated in the neighborhood meetings. He reviewed that many of the citizens at the first neighborhood meeting emphasized the importance of not changing the Crest Theater. Citizens also commented that they didn't want their business neighborhood to become a

regional shopping center. They were concerned that the Ridgecrest area be a walkable community that serves the local residents. They expressed interest in a community gathering place, as well.

Commissioner Pyle expressed that the students' work was put together very well. He emphasized that so often it seems that the livable environment of Shoreline is based on the requirements of the development code, and the actual regulations drive design. However, the Ridgecrest Neighborhood presents a good opportunity for design to override the circumscribed nature of the development requirements. He said he would like this effort to eventually result in the City analyzing their development code to figure out how to implement a design review element or form-based design element that doesn't rely so much on the exact development regulations. He expressed concern that implementing the concepts illustrated in the plans presented by the students might require extensive code changes.

Commissioner Hall pointed out that one element in the memorandum talks about considering the Ridgecrest Neighborhood for a property tax exemption program. He asked staff to share how this concept would be implemented and whether or not it would decrease City revenues or shift the tax burden to other property owners. Mr. Boydell said staff has been researching the property tax exemption option for the North City Neighborhood. He noted that the property tax exemption would not be a total exemption. It would be 10-year exemption on the residential units, but not on the land or retail portion, the sales tax, utility taxes, etc. Recent studies by other jurisdictions in the region have shown that this concept results in balanced or slightly increased revenues over the 10-year period of the exemption. In exchange, cities have found the exemption actually stimulates other development.

Mr. Boydell explained that the rents for mixed-use developments in Shoreline are lower than what you would see in a downtown core like Seattle. When comparing the cost of doing development with the likely rents, as well as providing amenities such as a plaza or underground parking, projects only marginally pencil out and often do not meet the ratio that Fannie Mae requires. The property tax exemption makes projects that are typically hard to do more reasonable to finance. Brokers and developers have explained that mixed-use developments present a lot of risk, mostly in trying to fill the retail space. The property tax exemption would allow a developer a five to ten-year period of time to take on that risk and work with the City to provide plazas, sidewalks, and other street improvements. He concluded that a combination of incentives would be necessary to encourage mixed-use developments in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood.

Commissioner Hall asked if the mill rate for other property owners in the City have to be increased to off-set the loss if the City decided not to collect property taxes from mixed use parcels. Mr. Boydell said this property tax exemption would apply to development that would not otherwise take place. Therefore, there would likely be no impact. However, he agreed it would be important to consider the increased impact on the surrounding area or other property owners. He suggested that in the long-term, encouraging retail development could actually take pressure off the residential property owners. Commissioner Hall pointed out that when the total amount of property tax collected stays the same, exempting one property owner from the tax rolls could result in others having to pay more. He stressed that it is important to make sure the taxpayers understand this concept and its potential impact to them.

Mr. Boydell asked Commissioner Hall to put his question in writing so staff could discuss the issue internally and provide a precise answer.

Vice Chair Kuboi pointed out the time sensitive nature of the disposition of the bingo property and inquired if the Commission would be asked to take quick action at some point in the near future. Mr. Boydell provided a report on the status of the properties in the Ridgecrest business area, and advised that it is unlikely that most of the properties would be redeveloped in the near future. However, the sale of the bingo property is likely to close in the next few months. Staff has met with most of the interested parties who have made offers to buy the property. They understand that zoning changes and the property tax exemption would take some time to implement. In addition, it would take time to work through the Capital Improvement Budget process to obtain pre-design and design funding for the neighborhood plan. Mr. Tovar briefly described the likely time frame for implementing potential code and comprehensive plan amendments for the Ridgecrest Neighborhood and said it would likely be at least late 2007 or early 2008 before a proposal would be ready for the City Council to adopt.

Commissioner Hall asked if the market price for the bingo property would be impacted if the seller is holding off until a property tax exemption program or rezone has been implemented. If so, this could allow the seller to capture the benefit of the incentives rather than the developer. Mr. Boydell said staff has emphasized the City does not want to be pushed too fast when considering zoning changes, property tax exemptions, etc. On the other hand, the owner of the bingo property is interested in selling as soon as possible. The developers and the seller have been negotiating, and the seller is already asking a premium price for the land. He said he was surprised at the number of mixed-use developers that have expressed a desire to purchase this site.

Commissioner McClelland arrived to the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Meeting with Neighborhood Councils

Mr. Tovar reported on the presentation he made to the Council of Neighborhoods to update them on the following:

- Strategic Points for Town Center Projects. An update of the project was provided, and it was announced that the Commission would conduct a workshop discussion related to the project on May 10th. Chair Piro emphasized that the workshop would be an interactive discussion with the public.
- Aurora Project. It was reported that this project is nearly completed, and a dedication ceremony would be scheduled sometime in June.
- Interurban Trail. It was announced that the final segment of the Interurban Trail is under construction, and a celebration has been scheduled for July 14th.
- Civic Center/City Hall. It was reported that three developer finalists would be submitting requests for proposals. Staff would score the proposals and make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council would likely select one of the three in June or July. A rigorous and brisk public input process would be conducted during the summer. It is anticipated that final design of the building and

site would be completed by the end of 2007 so construction could start in early 2008. The anticipated completion date for the project is mid 2009.

- Speaker Series. Ron Sher would be the next presenter at the Speaker Series that is scheduled for May 24th. The event is being publicized in numerous ways to get the word out to as many people as possible.

Draft Resolution

Mr. Tovar recalled that the Cascade Land Conservancy recently made a presentation before the City Council, which specifically focused on the Cascade Agenda Cities Program. They requested the City Council consider making Shoreline a Cascade Agenda City. He referred the Commission to the draft resolution that was prepared at the request of the City Manager. The resolution is patterned after resolutions that have been adopted by Issaquah and Kirkland and is scheduled to go before the City Council for consideration on May 29th. He asked the Commissioners to review the draft resolution and forward their concerns and suggestions to the staff as soon as possible.

Mr. Tovar advised that when he discussed the proposed resolution with members of the Council of Neighborhoods, they expressed alarm that growth was going to happen and that there would be a significant amount of change in Shoreline. He emphasized that these issues are functions of state law and separate from whether or not the City becomes a Cascade Agenda City. He said the resolution summarizes that Shoreline's choice is not really about whether or not growth would occur and how much, but what they will do about it. The resolution discusses the City's plans for accommodating the growth and outlines the City Council's goals.

Mr. Tovar emphasized that the proposed resolution is a statement of intent. It is not a contract and does not commit the City to anything budget wise. It simply states that the program is good and similar to what the City already does. It indicates the City's desire to have partners to help implement the principles found in their goals.

Commissioner McClelland said one of the tenets of the Cascade Land Conservancy is the promotion of rural villages (incorporated little towns) to accommodate some of the future growth within, on the edge, or outside of the urban growth boundary. She asked if the resolution language would require the City to support this effort. Mr. Tovar answered that approval of the resolution would not require the City to agree on positions the Conservancy takes on legislation or other programs.

Chair Piro agreed that the rural village concept is a controversial part of the Cascade Agenda right now. Therefore, he recommended that Sections 1, 2 and 3 on the second page of the proposed resolution be modified to not just generally talk about the goals and visions that are articulated in the Cascade Land Conservancy agenda as a whole, but narrow it only to the part that references Cascade Agenda Cities. This would eliminate the possibility of suggesting the City supports the whole agenda that is being advanced. Mr. Tovar suggested, and Chair Piro agreed, that the language could be modified to refer only to the goals and visions articulated for the urban areas. Mr. Tovar suggested the green program could be named in this section, as well.

Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that they would be conducting a hearing related to the South Aurora Triangle next month and would talk specifically about this being a receiving area for a density transfer from rural areas of the County. Chair Piro agreed there are some portions of the transfer the City could embrace, but the contentious portion of the proposal is related to rural-to-rural transfers. He cautioned against the City embracing the concept until more work and study is done. The remainder of the Commission agreed.

Commissioner Hall referred to the 4th Whereas Clause and suggested the language be softened by providing contextual information about the City's historic growth rate or other language to help people put the City's current growth rate into perspective. It should be clear that even without regulatory incentives for increased density, the City would grow by at least 200 per year. Mr. Tovar agreed that it is important to convey why growth is inevitable. Chair Piro suggested staff reconsider the 3rd and 4th Whereas Clauses in terms of the established Vision 20/25 numbers. Mr. Tovar suggested this message could be conveyed in the staff report to the Council.

Mr. Tovar invited Commissioners to forward additional comments related to the draft resolution to him no later than May 11th.

Commissioner Hall left the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Update on Point Wells

Mr. Tovar recalled that the City's Comprehensive Plan identifies Point Wells, an unincorporated area across the County line on the shoreline of the Sound, as being in the City's future annexation area. However, Woodway's Comprehensive Plan also says this property should be annexed into the Town of Woodway. He reported that just a few weeks ago, staff became aware of a request to Snohomish County, which controls land use in Point Wells, to docket a proposal for their Planning Commission to consider amending the Comprehensive Plan and zoning to permit mixed-use development (commercial, retail, condominiums, marina, etc.). Snohomish County has invited the public to comment by May 21st on whether the proposed changes should be docketed for future consideration.

Mr. Tovar advised that staff has not spoken with the property owner or representatives from the Town of Woodway. However, an article was published in *THE EVERETT HERALD*, quoting officials from other jurisdictions about how wonderful the change would be with no down side. There is no mention of the fact that the only access to the property comes from Richmond Beach Road. He concluded that staff would draft a letter to Snohomish County, voicing the City's concerns about traffic, access, land use, service delivery, police and fire response, etc. Staff would continue to track the situation.

Chair Piro agreed that now is a good time to establish a dialogue with Snohomish County, and it would be savvy to use this situation as an opportunity to advance the Growth Management Act notion that these are the very types of areas that should be going through a joint planning process rather than a unilateral planning process. While the property is currently within Snohomish County's jurisdiction, it is important to note that it has been classified as part of the urban area. He commended staff for

expressing a desire to work together with Snohomish County and the Town of Woodway to resolve this issue.

Commissioner McClelland said she was under the impression that no matter what jurisdiction had control of the site, it was so compromised by hazardous materials that it would take years to go through the process of cleaning it up. Mr. Tovar agreed that clean up would take a lot of time and money, but it would be possible. He noted that contamination would be a major subject of any environmental review of the comprehensive plan amendment and/or project.

Commissioner Pyle noted that any truckload of dirt that is removed from the site would have to go down Richmond Beach road, which is a narrow two-lane road that overlooks the water. All of the new construction would occur via that road, as well. Mr. Tovar pointed out that the contaminated soil could also be removed by rail or by barge.

Commissioner McClelland recalled that there used to be a road down the slope to access the site from the Town of Woodway. She suggested that perhaps it might be possible to recreate this switchback road. She said years ago there was some discussion about opening a road from 15th Avenue in Edmonds to the site, via the Town of Woodway. This road is only used for emergency access now. Mr. Tovar agreed that access is a significant issue that would have to be worked out. Chair Piro suggested that if the area is to become a part of Woodway, it should be accessed from Woodway, without using Richmond Beach Road.

Mr. Tovar explained that, under the State's annexation laws, the property owner would determine which city the property would be annexed into. The property owner could also choose to remain under the County's jurisdiction. Because it is not currently within either City, the Snohomish County controls the land use on the property. If it were annexed into Woodway, Woodway would make the land use decisions. If it were annexed into Shoreline, Shoreline would be responsible for making these decisions. Chair Piro added that aside from the property owner pursuing one annexation option or another, there is also a formal judicial process and boundary review board that would be called in to assess the viability of the proposal and issue a recommendation.

Noting that the only access to the site is through the City of Shoreline, Commissioner Wagner asked who provides fire and police service to the area. Several Commissioners answered that the City of Shoreline currently provides fire protection to the site.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements were made during this portion of the meeting.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Piro announced that a special meeting has been scheduled for May 10th.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Rocky Piro
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission



City of Shoreline

17544 Midvale Avenue North
Shoreline, WA 98133-4921
(206) 546-1700 ♦ Fax (206) 546-2200

DATE: May 17, 2007
TO: Shoreline Planning Commission
FROM: Paul Cohen, Senior Planner
RE: Town Center Strategic Points

The Planning Commission held a public workshop on May 10th to discuss draft strategic points and to consider proposed alternative points. Staff has compiled those comments from the group discussion, public comment letters, and suggestions from Planning Commissioners. Staff did not draft new points where existing points already covered the topic. Attached are the original draft points followed by several alternatives to those points and then entirely new points that address different topics.

Given the short timeframe for putting the packet together, staff is not including recommendations in the packet. On May 17th staff would like to discuss these ideas and receive the Commission's final recommendations for the City Council's consideration on June 4.

Attachments

1. Proposed Strategic Points
2. Comments from sub-groups at May 10 meeting
3. Emailed additional ideas from Commissioners
4. Emailed additional ideas from the public

5/17/07 DRAFT

Strategic Points for Town Center Projects

1. In the design and furnishing of the four Town Center Projects, seek ways to create a place with civic identity and provide community gathering spaces for weekend and evening activities.
2. Identify and incorporate "green infrastructure" principles and features.
3. Identify and incorporate appropriate historic features and interpretation opportunities.
4. Identify and incorporate architectural patterns and materials that create human scale and visual interest, while also reflecting the City's residential character and heritage.
5. Explore ways to overcome the barrier that Midvale creates between the City Hall and the Interurban Trail.
6. Do not open Stone Ave. N. through to N. 175th St.
7. Provide visual and functional linkage between bus rapid transit stops in Aurora and other Town Center Projects.
8. Work with Seattle City Light to develop a "heritage park" concept that balances City and community goals with SCL needs.
9. Consider design treatments to tie together, visually and functionally, the public spaces of the City Hall with Heritage Park, Shoreline Museum, and the high school.
10. Create a walkable Central Shoreline area, with an emphasis on safety, convenience, and connectivity.

Alternative Strategic Points

11. Alt #1. Create a walkable Central Shoreline area, with an emphasis on safety, convenience, and connectivity within and to the surrounding community.
12. Alt #2. Identify and incorporate "green development" principles and features.
13. Alt #6. Do not open Stone Ave. N. through to N. 175th St. for vehicle access, however, allow pedestrian access from Stone Ave. N. into the Civic Center.
14. Alt #9. Consider design treatments to tie together, visually and functionally, the public spaces of the City Hall with Heritage Park, Shoreline Museum, the high school, and east-west connections into the surrounding community.

New Strategic Points

15. Ensure a direct pedestrian connection from Midvale sidewalks to the Civic Center plaza and entry without driveways and parking between.
16. The Civic Center should incorporate parking management to accommodate Park and Rides and other uses.
17. Provide non-profit service space in the Civic Center.
18. Ensure that construction impacts are minimized on the adjacent neighborhoods.
19. Midvale Avenue from N 175th and N. 185th shall be designed as a vehicle access street but emphasize pedestrian facilities with landscaping, other amenities, and possibly on-street parking.

Planning Commission Community Workshop **Item 8.a - Attachment 2**
Strategic Points for Town Center Projects
Thursday, May 10, 2007

Notes from Group #1

Need to create a safe place for people to come and gather. The park needs to be clean, have good lighting and enough open space to keep it from being isolated and out of sight.

Want area to be: creation of the “core”, a flexible space, a place to people watch, easy to get to using public transportation or other pedestrian pathways and walkable when there.

Park needs to offer amenities that attract people and then accommodate them during their stay – like a stage or platform for entertainment and public restrooms, water fountain, trash cans, bike rack, etc.

Ronald Place (the brick road) and cable cars are a part of Shoreline’s history. The portion of the road remaining needs to be preserved. It could run by or adjacent to the focal point of the park. A cable car would be statuesque next to a platform/stage in the park.

Bricks should be incorporated into the design of City Hall/Civic Center. Look into using the saved bricks that were previously removed from Ronald Place.

Concerned that Heritage Park is not a good place to promote gathering because of its proximity to Aurora and Midvale. Pedestrians and vehicles don’t mingle well and there is a noise factor to consider. Need to explore ways to buffer the park from Aurora.

Who will gather and for what reason? The Heritage Park site is not a particularly safe place for children to play.

Good idea to create a gathering place on the Civic Center/City Hall site.

Want to see pedestrian friendly retail in area.

Must apply grade separation on roads to remove pedestrians from the pathway of vehicles.

Small retail shops located on Aurora that are accessible from the park side/Midvale - could act as a buffer to the heavy traffic on Aurora.

Planning Commission Community Workshop **Item 8.a - Attachment 2**

Strategic Points for Town Center Projects

Thursday, May 10, 2007

Would like to see shops on Midvale.

If the City's goal is to make central Shoreline a more walkable place, there needs to be better transportation, both North to South and East to West.

If the City is going to build "green", do it because it's a good thing to do and be committed to promoting the practice city wide, don't just do it on City Hall to gain "points".

Look into integrating a founding family's history into the central Shoreline theme - like the Boeing Family.

Notes from Group #2

Point 8

Darnell and Echo Lake Park seems like enough park of the area.

Need to assess the areas need

Park should be a "civic" Park.

Good examples at N. 92nd and Fremont and Lynnwoods historic parks

Preserve Redbrick Road

Use old depot architecture/design

Locate near Civic Center

Locate and refurbish old trolley car

Point 5

Combine with point 10

Too pedestrian Friendly makes Midvale less accessible

Midvale needs its own point

Midvale should have vehicle access but not as a cut-through street

Traffic Signal at Midvale and N 175th needs to be better timed to prevent backups.

Planning Commission Community Workshop **Item 8.a - Attachment 2**

Strategic Points for Town Center Projects

Thursday, May 10, 2007

Point 1 and 4

Civic Center should be close to frontage of N 175th and Midvale without allowing cars between building and street

Civic Center should be the real gateway

Gathering places are essential at Civic Center

Allow pedestrian connection from Stone Ave cul de sac into Civic Center

Point 10

Pedestrian surfaces should be the same throughout the town center.

Extend greenway links from the Town Center out through the entire community.

Combine with Point 9

Santa Cruz and Edmonds are great examples of walkable communities

Notes from Group #3

Create linkages between neighborhoods, business centers and parks. East – West connections.

1% for the arts, aesthetics are important and the 1% should be included early in the projects, e.g. during engineering and design so that it is not “plop art” but integrated into the whole.

Strategic Point #2 is not specific enough. It should be divide into structures and infrastructures.

- Structures endeavor to meet a LEED Platinum rating
- Infrastructures should incorporate as much low impact development techniques as possible.

Lifecycle costs are greatly reduced when Strategic Point # 2 is fully met and is important as the City will be the recipient of these reduced maintenance and operations costs.

Planning Commission Community Workshop **Item 8.a - Attachment 2**
Strategic Points for Town Center Projects
Thursday, May 10, 2007

Partnerships should be sought.

- With Shorewood and Shorecrest High Schools and Shoreline Community College through educational opportunities that help link our youth and young adults to sense of place and community.
- Shared services such as providing support and space within city hall for non-profits who provide services and benefits to the city and its residents.

Attention must be given to reducing impacts to adjacent neighborhoods during construction of City Center and Aurora improvements.

Park that accommodates the use of public spaces adjacent to the City Hall facility, e.g., Heritage Park, farmers market, etc.

Item 8.a - Attachment 3

-----Original Message-----

From: repiro@aol.com [mailto:repiro@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, May 11, 2007 1:16 PM

To: Joe Tovar; Steve Cohn

Subject: notes from Rocky on strategic points

Joe/Steve - thanks again to all for the workshop last night. Here are my gleanings in no particular order or priority.

- Address parking management (could be a new, additional point)
 - Address trail connection opportunities, networking out from the spine (for both peds, bikes) - similar comments regarding "greenway connections" how do we create a green connection from Heritage Park to other open spaces throughout the city? (Probably needs to become a new item - or could relate to Point # 5)
 - east-west connections (could tie into the previous item - could also relate to Point # 9) (I assume this means for all modes - peds, bikes, autos?)
 - education/arts/non-profit partnerships (this suite of issues is a little more challenging to figure out where to link up with the points, perhaps with civic identity and community gathering places? Point # 1?)
 - break Point # 2 into 2 parts, (1) city hall and LEED opportunities, (2) innovations i.e., low impact development, urban forestry (vegetation) opportunities, etc.
 - discuss adjacent network of streets and connections (probably expand # 6 to do this) just a thought on Stone Av bullet, perhaps it isn't opened as a roadway, but there is a ped/bike connection made to the city hall site.
 - incorporate Midvale into the process beyond just the issue of connectivity between city hall and interurban trail (Point # 5), e.g., "complete street" treatment for Midvale (for peds, bikes, and autos), "main street" treatment for Midvale, with Edmonds-like streetscaping, sidewalks, shops (expand Point # 5 to discuss role and design of Midvale, i.e., a Midvale element)
 - incorporate some sort of entryway, icon, or landmark feature (relate to Point # 4?)
 - historic features - red brick road, interurban car (relate to Point # 4)
- (Regarding the red brick road - we should have available some definite information on when and how its okay to move and reuse historic features - I'm not sure we want to lock ourselves into preserving it like an archeological artifact, for example, if we end up with grading variations from the rest of Heritage Park - are we simply going to put the road segment behind a rail and view it like some ancient ruin?)
- safe, clean - walkable, buffers from traffic on SR-99; also safe crossing points across Aurora
 - with the park component, address its role as a core of the city, also the "view" down the spine.

That's it - thanks! Rocky

Item 8.a - Attachment 3

-----Original Message-----

From: Chakorn Phisuthikul [<mailto:chakorn@habitatwest.net>]

Sent: Monday, May 14, 2007 11:04 AM

To: Paul Cohen; Steve Cohn; Joe Tovar

Cc: Jessica Simulcik Smith

Subject: Town Center Project

I have additional comments concerning Strategic Points for Town Center Projects.

- * Create pedestrian friendly developments along Midvale Ave. N. starting from N. 175th to N. 185th St.
- * Provide direct pedestrian access to City Hall from Midvale Ave. N. without walking through a parking lot
- * City Hall community gathering space should be linked to Interurban Trail & Heritage Park

Please provide aerial photo, and lot line of properties with in the potential town center projects area to facilitate future discussion. The sketch up perspective of the area was not adequate for discussion last time.

Thank you,
Chakorn

Item 8.a - Attachment 4**Jessica Simulcik Smith**

From: Joan D Giuffre [joanie6@juno.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 10:43 AM
To: Jessica Simulcik Smith; Maggie Fimia; City Council
Subject: Re: May 10 Community Workshop

How about on this plan, doing the buildings in more than one floor and having office space on the first level and City things on the upper floors. Maybe have a city that is friendly to businesses and not one that tears them down ie Redmond Towne Center. Ya know, they may even pay the city taxes, so we homeowners don't have to pay so much and bear the cost of all your destruction.

Just a thought. I can't make it to the meeting and I wanted to give you my thoughts.

What has been done is very pretty, but if there is no one to pay the upkeep, it won't be very pretty a few years down the road. There will be enough jobs here just pruning and watering then raking in the fall to keep our taxes sky high.

Thanks for taking the time to read this.

Joan Giuffre

On Mon, 30 Apr 2007 16:30:39 -0400 (EDT) City of Shoreline <webmaster@ci.shoreline.wa.us> writes:

|

City of Shoreline

MEETING NOTICE -Community Workshop-

Strategic Points for Town Center Projects

Thursday, May 10, 2007

The Planning Commission will hold a Community Workshop on "Strategic Points for Town Center Projects" on Thursday, May 10.

A draft set of "[Strategic Points](#)" has been prepared to assist the City Council in making decisions about Shoreline's four Town Center Projects: Aurora Corridor, Civic Center/City Hall, Heritage Park and the Interurban Trail. With four major public projects in design or construction at essentially the same time, it is important to think strategically to maximize community benefit and minimize problems. The strategic points will be further discussed at the Community Workshop and the public will be invited to offer comment and ideas.



Community Workshop
"Strategic Points for Town Center Projects"
Thursday, May 10 at 7:00 p.m.
Mt. Rainier Room
Shoreline Conference Center