

be crafted based on the Comprehensive Plan policies that are ultimately adopted by the City Council, and a new zoning designation would certainly be one option for accomplishing this task. A new zone would allow the City to be more prescriptive and create as much certainty as possible about how the property would be allowed to develop if annexation were to occur. Vice Chair Wagner asked if the property could potentially have more than one zoning designation. Mr. Tovar explained that the planned area zoning process would allow the City to identify exactly what the regulations should be rather than trying to make an existing zoning designation fit.

Commissioner Kaje referred to the traffic study that staff is in the process of preparing and asked about their assumptions regarding the number of developable acres. Mr. Tovar said the entire lower site is about 61 acres, and the City has made the decision not to consider the upper portion of the site (40 acres). Commissioner Kaje observed that not all of the 61 acres would be considered developable property since vehicular and pedestrian access, etc. would have to be provided. He further observed that if the City were to allow 1,000 units on the site, the density would be about 17 units per acre. On the other hand, the scenario currently being considered by Snohomish County would allow about 3.5 times more density. Mr. Tovar explained that the purpose of doing a traffic study using different development scenarios up to 3,500 units is to illustrate how the most extreme density would impact the City. He cautioned that the City is not advocating 3,500 units on the property and the resolution states that is too high. Staff does not have a recommendation about what the correct density should be, and the issue would be addressed as part of the pre-annexation zoning ordinance process. Mr. Cohn cautioned that rather than talking about the density, i.e. units per acre, that should be allowed on the site, it might be more helpful to talk about the total number of units and square footage that should be allowed.

Commissioner Pyle asked if the City of Shoreline currently provides or has historically provided any services to the Town of Woodway. Mr. Tovar answered no.

### **Public Testimony or Comment**

**Caycee Holt, Shoreline**, said she was present to represent a group of Richmond Beach residents. She asked the Commission to think about the possibility of looking at an alternate egress from Point Wells. They have not seen any studies to indicate this option has been considered, and they feel that Snohomish County should be responsible for their own property. Richmond Beach Road should not turn into the Point Wells Speedway. She submitted a petition, which was circulated in the Richmond Beach area for just three days and already has approximately 115 signatures. She explained that their primary concern is related to Richmond Beach Road being dangerous and noisy. They are also concerned about wear and tear on the infrastructure that goes through their small neighborhood. She suggested that if Richmond Beach Road is the only access for the Point Wells site, the density should be limited to zero. She said she would like the City to consider other options for accessing the property via Snohomish County.

Commissioner Kuboi asked if Ms. Holt's opinion about traffic would change if Point Wells were to annex into the City of Shoreline. Ms. Holt said her group would prefer that the property remain part of Snohomish County and that they figure out how to provide access via Snohomish County. They do not

support annexation into the City of Shoreline because they don't believe Richmond Beach Road could support the additional traffic.

**Sandra Greene, Shoreline**, said she also lives in Richmond Beach and supports the comments provided by Ms. Holt. She requested the City give consideration to a public vote prior to any decision being made by only six members of the Commission. Given the present economic circumstances of the State and the number of homes on the market, she questioned why the Commission is contemplating such a grand project to financially benefit the owner of the Point Wells property.

**Brian Cohee, Shoreline**, agreed with both Ms. Greene and Ms. Holt. He said he lives on one of the "hot spots" on Richmond Beach Road, and his neighbor has had two people die in his yard within the last three years. He said he made a video of an accident where a woman went off the bank and died in his neighbor's yard. He said he has responded first to numerous accidents, one in which a pedestrian was hit while walking on the sidewalk. He said he collected statistic from the Washington State Department of Transportation and the City of Shoreline, which indicate that 257 recorded accidents have occurred over the last 8 years along the section of Richmond Beach Road Proper (1.4 miles between 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northwest and Fremont Avenue). Both the State and the City have indicated that these statistics are incomplete. He noted that this number equates to an accident every 11 days on this one small section of roadway. The accidents have involved 474 vehicles, 121 injuries, 4 fatalities, and approximately \$3 million in vehicle property damage alone. He questioned what price you can put on fatal accidents. He summarized that the residents understand what some of the costs of annexation would be, but he asked the City to clarify what benefits the City would receive.

**Karen Davis, Shoreline**, said she is a new resident of Richmond Beach, and she moved there because she found it had great solitude. She said she previously lived in Mill Creek on Seattle Hill Road, which became a major throughway over the course of just five years. They had to escape this devastating situation because all they heard was traffic and it was not safe for their children to go out and play. She implored the Commission to consider the devastating social and environmental impacts the annexation would have on the community and families of Richmond Beach in the future.

**Scott Becker, Shoreline**, said he is a member of the Richmond Beach Community Association Board. He said they just received the proposal and they intend to put out a white response paper to serve the constituents within the association, as well as the general Richmond Beach Neighborhood. In addition to the issues that have already been raised, he noted the contaminated soils that exist on the Point Wells site. He suggested this should be a major concern, and the remediation and potential down beach impacts need to be seriously considered when scoping what will be allowed on the site and deciding what the land could support. Given that the land has been spoiled for over 100 years, consideration should be given for limiting the development to contain the worst of the contamination. Like traffic, until the contamination is studied thoroughly and to the satisfaction of the residents, he suggested the City should hold off on further action. He observed that some citizens are concerned about what could take place if the Point Wells site is not under the City of Shoreline's control.