



PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

AGENDA

Thursday, February 4, 2016
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber • Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Ave North

	<u>Estimated Time</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	7:00
2. ROLL CALL	7:01
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	7:02
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7:03
a. January 21, 2016 Meeting Minutes - Draft	
Public Comment and Testimony at Planning Commission	
<i>During General Public Comment, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not specifically scheduled later on the agenda. During Public Hearings and Study Sessions, public testimony/comment occurs after initial questions by the Commission which follows the presentation of each staff report. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the podium to have their comments recorded, state their first and last name, and city of residence. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Generally, individuals may speak for three minutes or less, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. When representing the official position of an agency or City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes. Questions for staff will be directed to staff through the Commission.</i>	
5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	7:05
6. STUDY ITEM	7:10
a. Sound Transit Amendments Package # 3, part 1	
• Staff Presentation	
• Public Comment	
7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT	7:55
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	8:00
9. NEW BUSINESS	8:05
a. Election of Interim Vice Chair	
10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	8:10
11. AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 18, 2016	8:12
a. Living Building – Study Item	
b. Wetlands Update – 145 th LRSAP Study Item	
c. Comprehensive Plan Docket – Study Item	
12. ADJOURNMENT	8:15

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 801-2236

This page intentionally blank

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

**SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

January 21, 2016
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Mork

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Julie Ainsworth Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Dan Eernisse, Economic Development Manager
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Craft

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas and Commissioners Maul, Malek, Montero and Mork. Vice Chair Craft was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 7, 2016 were adopted as corrected.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING: LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS/FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS PACKAGE 2

Staff Presentation

Director Markle reviewed that the purpose of the hearing is to consider amendments to the existing development standards that will apply to the design of light rail facilities and systems in Shoreline, as well the permitting process to review and approve them.

Director Markle explained that there is currently a gap in the City's existing development regulations and its ability to apply the regulations to areas of the City that are not zoned or to uses that do not clearly fall within the multi-family, single-family or commercial use definitions. She provided a map to illustrate the location of existing public rights-of-way, which is where the stations, garages and other light rail facilities and structures will either wholly or partially be located. The use tables rely on specific zoning in order to determine where a use is allowed and under what condition, yet the rights-of-way are not currently zoned. The proposed amendments are intended to address this issue.

Further, Director Markle explained that the City's design standards are based on use (single-family, multi-family or commercial), and it would take some interpretation to determine exactly how a station, garage or other facilities related to light rail should be classified. The proposed amendments are designed to take out the interpretation and clarify exactly which of the existing regulations would apply.

Director Markle advised that staff is proposing a Special Use Permit (SUP) as the process for reviewing and permitting light rail facilities/systems. She reviewed that light rail facilities are not allowed in any zone, and the Development Agreement process is currently identified as the process to permit them. However, this process was only identified to be used in the Mixed-Use Residential (MUR) zones, and not in other zones or unzoned properties. Light rail facilities will primarily be located in either the Residential (R-6) or the unzoned rights-of-way, and further legal analysis indicates that the Development Agreement process should not be used in order to deviate standards. Due to their unique nature, light rail facilities/systems cannot comply with all of the development regulations for any of City's zones. For example, where the light rail facility is located adjacent to or in an R-6 zone, the maximum height limit is 35 feet, and the stations and garages will be taller. The uses will need a deviation from that particular standard, and an SUP allows for that to occur. She reminded the Commission that Essential Public Facilities cannot be precluded by a city's regulations. Using the SUP, the applicant would identify the regulations that, if applied, would preclude the development of light rail. Applicants could then request deviations, recognizing that they must still meet specific criteria in order to ensure that the use is as compatible as possible with existing adjacent land uses.

Director Markle advised that the City has four types of actions (or permits), which are based on who makes the decision, the amount of discretion exercised by the decision-making body, the level of impact of the decision, the amount and type of public input sought, and what the appeal opportunities are. Because Development Agreements are legislative decisions that are more suited for area-wide application and not specific projects; they are not appropriate as the process for siting light rail facilities/systems. The Sound Transit project is very specific with a specific applicant, and state law requires a quasi-judicial process, and the City's current quasi-judicial processes use the Hearing

Examiner as the hearing body and decision maker and include an appeal route. She briefly reviewed the SUP process and said City staff has found it to be very orderly, open, fair and transparent.

Director Markle said the second part of the proposed amendments has to do with identifying the development regulations that would apply to light rail stations/facilities since the uses are new to the code. She reminded the Commission that, as part of the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan process, new design standards were adopted for parking garages. However, staff is not recommending any new regulations specific to stations, as the commercial design standards that were recently adopted provide a good basis for design. They have specifically identified the following code chapters as the basis for design of light rail stations/facilities: dimensional standards of the Mixed Use Residential (MUR-70') zone; commercial design standards; tree conservation; parking, access and circulation; landscaping; and signs. More amendments will come forward in the future that get into more detail related to potential issues specific to stations and garages. For example, the next round of amendments will likely include requirements for a multi-modal access plan, parking management plan, construction management plan, etc.

If the Commission recommends approval of the proposed amendments at the conclusion of the public hearing, Director Markle asked that the recommendation include the following correction: The citation in Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) 20.40.438(A) should be changed from SMC 20.30.355 (Development Agreement) to SMC 20.30.330 (Special Use Permit).

Director Markle concluded her report by recommending that the Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council for adoption of the amendments to the Development Code found in Attachment A of the January 21, 2016 Staff Report. She advised that the amendments are scheduled for potential adoption by the City Council on February 29th. Again, she reminded them that more specific amendments will be presented to the Commission in February or March.

Commissioner's Clarifying Questions

Commissioner Mork asked if, using the Hearing Examiner model, staff would provide information directly to the Hearing Examiner. Director Markle answered affirmatively.

Public Testimony

Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and opened the hearing for public testimony.

Wendi DiPeso, Secretary, Shoreline Preservation Society, said she has been authorized by the society's board to speak on its behalf. The society requests legal standing and to be noted as a party of record in the public hearing concerning the proposed development regulations that apply to light rail facilities. The society advocates that the public hearing for the Type C SUP process be conducted by the Planning Commission to the City Council, as both bodies are more accountable to the community than a Hearing Examiner.

Ms. DiPeso recalled staff made a list of existing development regulations that would apply to the design of light rail systems/facilities, and the Planning Commission wisely requested more information regarding the adequacy of public facilities, engineering, and utilities development standards. In the Staff Report, she read notations about making sure the existing water supply system, surface water management system, and streets are sufficient to meet the needs of the transit system. Concern for tree conservation is also noted in the Staff Report, along with notes that if there are inadequacies, the City will require Sound Transit to pay for the necessary upgrades.

Ms. DiPeso reviewed that at the last Planning Commission meeting, it sounded as though the City was preparing to trade trees for something. It is not the intent to upgrade from trees to pavement. The City has an investment in trees; and if Shoreline cannot get Sound Transit to pay for replacements, the City should add the replacements, itself. She noted that many of the trees are located in the freeway right-of-way and the future track will decimate most of them. Shoreline has gotten visual and environmental benefits and value from the trees previously, and it should be increasing stock somewhere else in the City.

With regard to surface water management, Ms. DiPeso pointed out that City Staff has already determined, through spot testing, that the current system is grossly inadequate. This raises the question of whether Sound Transit can be made to pay for existing deficiencies in the surface water system over and above what would be required to upgrade the system to what is needed. It is her understanding that it is not legal to require a developer to pay for existing system deficiencies when doing development. Developers can only be required to pay for the upgrades needed to support future use post redevelopment. She asked the Commission to direct staff to determine if the same is true with regard to working with Sound Transit.

Ms. DiPeso said the society's concerns speak to the need to assess the current condition of the existing infrastructure, the need to collaborate with utility providers, the need to determine ahead of time what the costs will be and who will pay. The society would like to point out that project-level capital facilities planning was missing from the 185th Street rezone, in addition to a project-level impact statement. She suggested that investing the time it takes to do project-level capital facilities planning for the light rail station, as well as the 145th Street area, prior to considering any rezoning will make it possible to plan for change effectively while minimizing disruption to the existing residents and the environment. It would also make it possible to provide the infrastructure needed for the change that includes a plan for how to pay the associated costs.

Ms. DiPeso said she recently discovered ground water seeping up into her home, which is located on a hill. If she is having issues where she lives, she questioned how much more of a challenge it would be to handle surface water along the Sound Transit track in what used to be a streambed. She expressed her hope that the City will finish examining the surface water system in great detail within the Sound Transit footprint and in the two rezone areas.

Janet Way, Shoreline, advised that she is a member of the Shoreline Preservation Society, but was present to speak on her own behalf. She said she lives just a few blocks away from the 145th Street Station area and has some personal concerns about what happens there. She asked that her comments be made part of the record and that she be allowed legal standing. Ms. Way voiced concern about

stormwater in conjunction with the station areas. She noted that, just today, there was a moderate rain storm that created spot flooding in various areas throughout the City. Both of the light rail station areas are located in critical areas. The 185th Station Area has a very steep slope on both sides of the freeway, and the 145th Station Area also has a steep slope and is very close to the route of Thornton Creek. Anything the City puts in place related to stormwater is extremely important. It would be very beneficial if the City were to mandate that natural drainage systems be incorporated, similar to what is required on Aurora Avenue North.

Ms. Way asked what responsibility the City has to Thornton Creek, which runs under the freeway and daylight to the south in the City of Seattle. The light rail line will run right over the creek, but the creek itself is under the freeway. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan relative to the light rail station indicates that the creek should be restored as best possible, and mandating improved fish passage would be a good idea.

Ms. Way commented that the issues raised by Ms. DiPeso, including tree preservation, are very important. She suggested that the City mandate that some of the area at the station be open space, with landscaping and preferably conifers, to make the station areas much more pleasant and functional. She noted that a substantial number of trees will be destroyed to accommodate the light rail system. She encouraged the Commissioners to be mindful of the issues brought forward by the public and try and put in place thoughtful recommendations that will make the station areas places that are beneficial for the community. She voiced support for the Shoreline Preservation Society's recommendation that the Planning Commission conduct the SUP hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council rather than the Hearing Examiner conducting the hearing and making the final decision.

Ginger Villanueva, Shoreline, said she lives about three blocks from where the 145th Street Station will be located. She concurred with Ms. Way's recommendation that Sound Transit be required to provide replacement conifer trees in the area surrounding the station so it remains a welcoming, green Shoreline look for those traveling along 5th Avenue.

Director Markle explained that, relative to tree retention, the City's intent is to apply the existing regulations, which are largely geared at single-family development. The standards offer an aggressive approach for handling the removal of trees and requiring tree replacement. However, she acknowledged that the existing regulations may require more trees than Sound Transit can actually replace within the rights-of-way and still operate a transit system. If that is the case, Sound Transit will have to use the SUP process to describe why they cannot meet the standard and what they propose to do instead. This approach is intended to provide just enough of a tradeoff to allow Sound Transit to operate the system. She added that, as part of the package of amendments that will come forward in February or March, staff will work more on the tree regulations, looking at specific things that can be incorporated in relation to Sound Transit.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Decision

COMMISSIONER MONTERO MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS, AS PRESENTED BY STAFF AND INCLUDING THE CORRECTION TO SMC 20.40.438(A), TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A

RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Maul reviewed that, in addition to the public hearing, the Commission conducted two study sessions on the proposed amendments. He expressed his belief that the amendments adequately address regulations pertaining to trees, landscaping, utilities, stormwater, etc.

Commissioner Mork asked if transit would be addressed as part of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA). Director Markle said transit is one of the items on the TIA workshop that allows the City to request an analysis from the developer. However, no Level of Service (LOS) standard for transit has been adopted in the Development Code as has been done for pedestrians, bicycles and streets. She agreed to seek feedback from the Transportation Engineer regarding the level of accountability for providing transit service.

Commissioner Mork asked how the study area for the TIA would be calculated. Director Markle said the City's Transportation Engineer will review the project to identify the number of trips generated and use a worksheet to determine the scope of the TIA. The study area boundaries are determined on a case-by-case basis. She agreed to seek information from the Transportation Engineer regarding the anticipated study area boundaries for the TIA.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

STUDY SESSION: SHORELINE PLACE SIGN PACKAGE

Staff Presentation

Mr. Eernisse noted that "Shoreline Place" is the official name for what has previously been known as "Aurora Place" and/or "Community Renewal Area." He reviewed that three years ago the City Council adopted a Community Renewal Area (CRA) at Aurora Square, recognizing the fact that economic development would be a positive public value for everyone. A project-based renewal plan was also adopted in conjunction with the CRA, which called for rebranding Aurora Square, constructing iconic signage for Aurora Square, and establishing a special or business improvement district with appropriate signage.

Mr. Eernisse explained that the sign code process specific to the CRA was part of the planned action process that was studied and adopted by the City Council via Ordinance 712, which became effective August 18, 2015. As per Ordinance 712:

- Three pylon signs would be located on Aurora Avenue, 160th and Westminster and the center name must occupy at least 50% of the sign face. No logos for individual businesses would be allowed, but full color could be used for the names. Currently, pylon signs have to be located on one's own property, which is problematic for a center in that some of the properties do not border the major traffic streets. This has resulted in clusters of pylon signs on Westminster, but none on Aurora or 160th. The intent of the ordinance is to allow pylon signs to interact with more passers.

- Electronic Messenger Center (EMC) signs would only be allowed on pylon signs. They must be monochromatic, with 10-second message hold times. They must have dissolved transitions between them, as well. During the City Council's discussion, EMC signs brought out the passion of people. While no one likely got exactly what they wanted, they reached a good compromise. The thought was that requiring them to be monochromatic would add a level of class to the EMC's rather than having full color, and the 10-second hold time made them not as distracting. It was recognized that EMC's can be very useful, particularly for small tenants who do not rank in the pecking order to get their name on the big signs. EMC's can also be useful to advertise community events.
- Driveways can have two monument signs, but the center's name must be at least 50% of the sign. Business names must be monochromatic.
- Wayfinding sign posts would be allowed throughout the site, with no limit on the number of signs. Wayfinding signs are intended to help people navigate the site and locate the different businesses. They are particularly important at Shoreline Place because the center appears to be split into about four different parts, and it is difficult to navigate.

Mr. Eernisse advised that Ordinance 712 also includes a mandate that the new signs shall be installed and the old pylon signs removed by September 1, 2017. A one-year extension on this timeline is possible if the property owners can show evidence they are working towards the requirement.

Mr. Eernisse said Ordinance 712 calls for a Master CRA Sign Package that all signs that are installed must adhere to. While the sign package is not necessarily construction drawings, it gives a clear style of the different signs. The City was to prepare the initial package, which is being presented to the Commission at this time for approval. He noted that the owners have the ability to amend the sign package in the future. He reviewed that Aurora Square is made up of nine different property owners, and mandating the signage will give the owners a sense of urgency to get together to come up with a cohesive look and feel for the center.

Mr. Eernisse said the intent of the study session is to seek input on the Master CRA Sign Package, particularly which alternatives should be included and whether additional information is needed. Staff's intent is to come back to the Commission in a few weeks with a final product, depending on how much new information they have to provide. The goal is to create a signage package that has a cohesive look. He introduced Peter and James Klauser, Bullseye Creative, who assisted staff in preparing the marketing and branding package for Shoreline Place Master Sign Package and were present to answer the Commission's questions.

Mr. Eernisse advised that the name "Shoreline Place" was selected for the center after an extensive public process with a lot of different invited interest groups to provide input. "Shoreline" is intended to be a prominent part of the name, and the bridge icon is representative of the pedestrian bridge that was built over Aurora Avenue. There are some negative connotations associated with the name "Aurora Place" and the name was never embraced by all of the property owners. The intent is to brand, not rebrand the center.

James Klauser, Bullseye Creative, shared rough composite designs for the pylon signs to illustrate possible options and invited Commission feedback. He noted that the composite designs were based on the square footage of the existing pylon signs. The intent is to identify the center's name and anchor the store signage under the umbrella of the unifying Shoreline Place.

Commissioner Montero noted that all three options could use the existing poles. Aesthetically, the third sign gives more flexibility and square footage/copy for each of the tenants. He suggested that perhaps an EMC sign could be incorporated to give flexibility to other tenants and provide an opportunity to advertise community events. As far as technique and attractiveness, he prefers the third option. Commissioner Maul agreed and said the tenant signage is more visible on the third option, as well.

Commissioner Montero said that to address cost, the brick side work in the third option could be faux brick rather than actual brick. Vinyl could be used to give the same textured look, and the cost would be less in the long run than the other two options.

Mr. Eernisse noted that all of the backgrounds for the tenant signs are the same on the third option, and that gives a cohesiveness that the other options lack. It was pointed out that the look of the sign could change somewhat, depending on the number of tenants, but the white background helps a lot with visibility. Incorporating an EMC sign could also change the scale somewhat in order to stay within the framework allowed for square footage and height and still give real estate to the name of "Shoreline Place."

Commissioner Maul asked if the Commission is being asked to choose a sign style or a sign concept. He observed that the three different sign needs (pylon, monument and wayfinding) seem very logical, and the existing signage is poor. Mr. Eernisse said staff is asking the Commission to identify their preference for each sign category. The intent is to establish a master sign package that includes specific designs. When the owners are ready to install the signs, they must submit construction drawings, and it would be the discretion of the Planning and Community Development Department to determine whether or not the proposed design would sufficiently match the style shown in the master sign package. If the sign is a major departure from the chosen style, the applicant would have to approach the Planning Commission to amend the master sign package.

Commissioner Maul recalled that, earlier in his presentation, Mr. Eernisse indicated that the property owners would have the right to change whatever the City approves. Mr. Eernisse said that is correct, but it would require review and approval from the Planning Commission. Commissioner Maul asked if the nine property owners have bought into the name "Shoreline Place." Mr. Eernisse said two of the major retailers have indicated support for a master sign package and they are happy to have the City do the work since it will require the property owners to get together to implement the package. Funding for the sign changes will not likely be an issue.

Commissioner Malek voiced support for Option 3, as well. Not only are the individual signs more visible, the entire sign has a fresher look and would be a better branding element. He asked if Shoreline Place could also be included in an EMC sign. Mr. Klauser answered affirmatively, but added that it would be nicer to use metallic materials to give some dimensionality to the piece. Mr. Eernisse pointed

out that EMC signs are costly, so the property owners will have to be convinced of their worth before deciding to go that direction.

Commissioner Mork also agreed that Option 3 is the best. However, she noted that “Shoreline Place” is smaller in relation to the other signage. Mr. Klauser pointed out that Option 3 is the only one that has the graphic component of the bridge attached to it as opposed to removing it and treating as more of an accent element above the sign. It is possible they could go with just the font treatment and enlarge the letters quite a bit. Perhaps they could even incorporate the metal bridge piece at the top, as shown in the other two options. Commissioner Mork said “Shoreline Place” is a nice name and should be prominent on the sign. Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas voiced a preference for Option 3, as well.

Next, Mr. Klauser shared rough composite designs for the monument signs to illustrate possible options and invited Commission feedback. He noted that the monument signs would be placed at the key entries. Option 2 was meant to work in concert with one of the pylon sign options, and Option 1 would work with any of the pylon design options, including Option 3 that was preferred by the Commission. However, Option 3 was meant to be entirely unique and different and treat the sign as a marker (or pin) on a map. Option 3 is intended to be fresher and more progressive, appealing toward a more youthful audience.

Commissioner Maul asked why none of the monument sign options directly emulate the pylon sign options. Mr. Klauser answered that the monument sign options were created early in the process, and the Option 3 pylon sign was designed later to go with the Option 3 monument sign. He noted that the materials used in the design options are intended to be representations only. For example, the stone shown in Option 3 pylon sign could be used in the Option 1 monument sign, as well. Commissioner Maul commented that the horizontal stone base at the bottom of Option 1 seems old and overdone. Mr. Klauser concurred that it might be overdone, but it is also a recognizable structure. He suggested they could incorporate elements of the Option 3 pylon sign into the Option 1 monument sign by getting rid of the base and taking the materials all the way to the ground. Mr. Klauser commented that now that the Commission has indicated a preference of Option 3 for the pylon sign, they can incorporate some of its elements into the monument sign. For example, a vertical stone accent could be incorporated into the Option 1 monument sign.

Mr. Klauser reviewed three options for wayfinding signs, noting that Option 3 incorporates a vertical stone accent that is consistent with Option 3 for the pylon sign. Commissioner Maul commented that using the exact same design for all three sign types could get boring. He said he prefers the design illustrated in Option 1 for the wayfinding sign. Commissioner Moss-Thomas agreed and noted that it is higher and more visible. Mr. Klauser noted that while the stone accent on the side of the pylon and monument sign would be appropriate, he cautioned that adding it to the wayfinding signs would reduce the amount of space available for businesses to advertise on the smaller signs. He suggested that the stone accents could be used on the pylon signs and also incorporated into the monument signs, but Option 1 would be the more appropriate design for wayfinding signs. The majority of the Commissioners concurred.

Mr. Eernisse clarified that there is no the number of monument signs allowed, and up to two can be placed at each entrance. While the mandate is that monument signs be placed at a minimum of three

driveways, he hopes they will be placed at every entrance to the center, with two at the larger entrances. Mr. Klauser said it may be determined that the main entrance is at the Central Market level entrance, and the full treatment could be provided on these signs. The scale of the other monument signs could be smaller, but still be visible from Highway 99. Mr. Klauser noted that their proposal also includes other items that could be added at some point in the future to bring additional life, energy and enthusiasm to the property. These include additional planting areas, gathering places, celebratory banners on existing light poles. He explained that as they get feedback from the community on what they envision for Shoreline Place, the more they can get buy in from the many owners.

Commissioner Montero explained that, as proposed, the monument signs would have the flexibility of having 50% of the copy for the tenants. Although the teardrop design (Option 3) is beautiful, it does not give the flexibility of adding copy for a tenant. Mr. Klauser summarized that none of the monument options are favored by the Commission. Instead, they will use the design in Option 3 that was originally proposed as a wayfinding sign, modifying it to become more of a monument design.

Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas commented that, not only does Option 1 for wayfinding signs provide some cohesiveness, it keeps people looking up and they can see to the other side. She felt the taller design would make it more visible.

Mr. Eernisse summarized that the pylon and monument signs would be taller pieces that include the "Shoreline Place" identity. It appears the Commission prefers Option 1 for wayfinding signage. He noted that he did not include the other options referenced by Mr. Klauser in the current proposal before the Commission because they were not mandated in Ordinance 712. He felt that including the mandated signs provides enough direction to the property owners, and they can hire their own consultants to prepare their full sign packages. He asked the Commission for guidance on whether they are comfortable with just addressing the design for the three sign types at this time. He said one of his 2016 goals is to work with the property owners to install at least some banner poles, particularly around the farmer's market area. Four strategic lamp posts are already located on the four corners of the farmer's market area, and getting banners on those would be a start.

Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas said she supports providing street addresses on the monument signs. Westminster is such a short street, and it is important to provide sufficient direction for people who aren't familiar with the area. The Commissioners agreed that the bridge logo and 3d piece are both nice additions that should be incorporated in to the signs.

Mr. Eernisse indicated he would continue to work with the consultant to prepare new alternatives based on the Commission's feedback. They could also provide drawings that illustrate how the signs will look at night.

Mr. Eernisse announced that the owner of the triangular property has decided to move toward selling, which is exciting news. He said he has been approached by numerous parties who are interested in purchasing the property, and he is sure there will be a lot of interest in picking the project up and moving it forward. He said he continues to have encouraging conversations with the owners of the Sears Property. They have indicated concerns about the timing and said they might not be ready to install the signs when they do their remodel.

Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas asked if the City is going to encourage similar signage in the Denny's Triangle area. Mr. Eernisse answered affirmatively and said one of the pylon signs would be located on this property (Aurora frontage).

Public Comment

Christine Southwick, Shoreline, said she likes the curved sign design, which fits with park signs. She also likes the metal, 3d bridge element, which makes the signage more dramatic. The signage on the light posts could be designed to tie in but not be as costly.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Markle reminded the Commissioners that an open house for the link light rail is scheduled for Wednesday, January 27th, from 6:00 to 8:30 in the Commons and theater areas of Shoreline High School. The event will be the introduction to design elements for the stations and garages.

Director Markle recalled that the City Council approved some additional expenditures for the 145th Street Subarea Plan to do a geotechnical white paper on ground water and liquefaction and implications for how the area should be zoned. They also requested work on wetland assessment to identify additional information that could be used as zoning changes move forward. Staff will report on both of these items at the Commission's February 18th meeting. At their March 3rd meeting, the Public Works Department will provide an update on the 145th Street Corridor Study. She said she anticipates the Planning Commissioners will begin to reacquaint themselves with the scenarios analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on March 17th and identify modifications based on the information gained from the studies. She summarized that the Planning Commission will begin working again on the subarea plan itself in April, May, and June. It will then go back to the consultant to be updated and forwarded to the City Council. The earliest adoption date by the City Council is September of 2016.

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor recalled that last year the Shoreline Preservation Society and some citizens appealed the 185th Street Subarea Plan to the Growth Management Hearings Board, and a decision was issued in December fully upholding the City's action and finding the planning and environmental review on the project sufficient. On January 15th, the Shoreline Preservation Society appealed the Board's decision to the court. It may take a couple of years for the appeal to move through the court system. In the meantime, the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan still stands, and the appeal will not impact any of the City's steps moving forward on the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan or any other Sound Transit decisions unless the court issues a stay, which they haven't filed for yet.

Commissioner Montero asked what is meant when citizens indicate they want "legal standing," in an issue. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth Taylor answered that legal standing is the ability to bring a matter before the court. Though they may request legal standing at the podium, whether they do or do not have legal standing is an issue to be decided by the court rather than the City or its staff.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Point Wells Subcommittee

Commissioner Montero reported that he and Commissioner Malek met on January 12th with the representatives from Richmond Beach to discuss the current status of the Point Wells Project. It appears the project has been moved back one year, and they are currently waiting for the results of the traffic corridor study, which has been completed but not released.

Light Rail Subcommittee

Commissioner Maul reported that the Light Rail Subcommittee met with Director Markle and the City's Transportation Manager to come up with a list of thoughts and concerns that should be considered in the next batch of development code amendments. The items include:

- Consider opportunities for multi-modal access (buses, metro, community transit, private services, etc.) to encourage the reduction in vehicle trips and how people use the facility.
- Provide safe and protected bicycle paths. Right-of-way connections to existing paths need to be provided as bicycle commuters are expected to come from a wider radius than pedestrians. They are starting to see designs for the 185th Street Station, and they want to be sure that bicycle storage is at the station and not across the freeway in the garage.
- Provide pedestrian safety and pleasant walking conditions within a half mile radius of the station. Existing sidewalk networks, bridges, and signalization improvements were also discussed for safety and timely road crossings.
- Encourage people from the neighborhoods to reduce vehicle traffic safety access from the parking garage over to the station.
- Provide safe drop-off locations for para-transit.
- Provide design and infrastructure for access in and out of the station for parking and carpool drop offs to limit potential hazards.

Commissioner Maul commented that both stations are different and must be looked at individually for all of the above mentioned things. A lot of time has been spent on the station area design, and the committee is interested in knowing what kind of protection and codes might be necessary to ensure there is safe access to the parking garage and between the parking garage and the actual station. They are particularly interested in learning what Sound Transit is doing in terms of separation between private property owners and the line, whether at grade or overhead. They also talked about construction and parking plans that go along with the construction phases, and of course, the permit completed stations.

Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas added that the committee had a lot of conversation about the corridor that will run parallel to the line, itself. They also had a lot of discussion about how to preserve the feel of the single-family neighborhoods. It is important to find ways to provide a benefit that enhances the community and increases mobility at the same time. If a lot of trees are removed, perhaps they could be replaced elsewhere to serve as screening between the tracks and the residential neighborhoods. She shared an example of how this concept was utilized in Washington, D.C.

Commissioner Mork said it is important that multi-modal components are emphasized. It should be as easy as possible for people to access the station without having to drive there and park. This will make the project better for all. Commissioner Malek commented that the station areas represent one of the biggest steps the City is taking to transition out of being a motorist community into a more multi-modal and walkable community.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran advised that the February 4th agenda will include a study session on the Package 3 Development Code Amendments. Chair Pro Tem Moss-Thomas added that the Commission will also advance Commissioner Craft to interim Chair of the Commission and elect an interim Vice Chair. Full elections for the next year will occur at the first meeting in April.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Donna Moss-Thomas
Chair Pro Tem, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission

Planning Commission Meeting Date: February 4, 2016

Agenda Item

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Development Code Amendments – Light Rail System and Facilities Permitting Process and Applicable Regulations

DEPARTMENT: Planning & Community Development

PRESENTED BY: Rachael Markle, AICP, Director

Public Hearing

Study Session

Recommendation Only

Discussion

Update

Other

INTRODUCTION

Light rail is on its way to Shoreline beginning service in 2023. Based on Sound Transit's latest schedule, permit review will begin as early as 2016. The Planning Commission recommended that Sound Transit's system and facilities be approved through a Special Use Permit at the January 21st meeting. The Special Use Permit includes criteria that an applicant must justify when seeking approval. This criterion is general and applies for all special uses and is not specific to light rail transit systems and facilities.

The purpose of tonight's proposed Development Code amendments are to create unique Special Use Permit decision criteria and also create supplemental application submittal requirements for light rail transit. The unique decision criteria and supplemental submittal requirements will work in unison to mitigate the impacts of Sound Transit's light rail system and facilities on Shoreline's streets and neighborhoods.

The purpose of tonight's study session is to:

- Have a collaborative discussion with the Commission about proposed amendments
- Respond to questions regarding the proposed amendments
- Determine what amendments need more research/analysis
- Identify if there is a need for additional amendments
- Develop a recommended set of Development Code amendments for the Public Hearing

Amendments to Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) Title 20 (Development Code) are processed as legislative decisions. Legislative decisions are non-project decisions made by the City Council under its authority to establish policies and regulations. The Planning Commission is the reviewing authority for legislative decisions and is responsible for holding an open record Public Hearing on the official docket of proposed Development Code amendments and making a recommendation to the City Council on each amendment.

BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission spent multiple meetings discussing draft amendments regarding the land use entitlement process that will allow Sound Transit's development activities. The Planning Commission studied these amendments on September 3, 2015. On October 1, the Commission held a public hearing on the draft amendments and it was at this meeting staff recommended removing Sound Transit related amendments to be brought back at a later date.

Staff returned to the Planning Commission with the Sound Transit related amendments for study sessions on December 17, 2015 and January 7, 2016. On January 21, the Commission recommended approval of the first group of Sound Transit related Development Code amendments (amendment package 2) that adopted the procedure for land use approval for light rail transit system/facilities. The Commission recommended to Council that the Special Use Permit is used to:

- Locate the light rail system/facilities as an essential public facility in zones where this use would be prohibited;
- Through the application of criteria, condition the light rail system/facilities to be more compatible with adjacent land uses; and
- Approve deviations from the regulations as appropriate to accommodate the light rail transit system/facilities as essential public facilities.

Following the January 21st public hearing, the Planning Commission also recommended to the City Council amendments to the Development Code that establish which development regulations apply to light rail transit system/facilities, especially when located on land that is not zoned, which is primarily various types of right of way.

The following is list of specific existing development regulations recommended to apply to the design of light rail system/facilities such as stations, parking garages, and associated accessory structures:

1. SMC 20.50.020(2) - Dimensional standards of the MUR-70' Zone;
2. SMC 20.50.220 through 20.50.250 – Commercial design standards;
3. SMC 20.50.290 through 20.50.370 – Tree conservation, and clearing and site grading standards;
4. SMC 20.50.380 through 20.50.440 – Parking, access, and circulation;
5. SMC 20.50.450 through 20.50.520 - Landscaping;
6. SMC 20.50.530 through 20.50.610 – Signs for the MUR-70' Zone;

7. SMC 20.60 Adequacy of Public Facilities;
8. SMC 20.70 Engineering and Utilities Development Standards; and
9. SMC 20.80 Critical Areas.

The Planning Commission and staff also recommended that the following list of specific existing development regulations apply to the design of light rail transit system/facilities located between the stations along the rail alignment:

1. SMC 20.50.290 through 20.50.370 – Tree conservation, and clearing and site grading standards;
2. SMC 20.50.450 through 20.50.520 – Landscaping;
3. SMC 20.60 Adequacy of Public Facilities;
4. SMC 20.70 Engineering and Utilities Development Standards; and
5. SMC 20.80 Critical Areas.

The January 21 Planning Commission staff report can be found here:

<http://www.shorelinewa.gov/Home/Components/Calendar/Event/9476/182?toggle=allpast>

DISCUSSION

As previously indicated by staff, there are additional amendments to consider in relation to the upcoming design, construction and operation of Sound Transit's light rail transit system and facilities in Shoreline. The following group of proposed Development Code amendments includes:

- Revised and new definitions;
- Additional decision criteria for approval of a Special Use Permit for light rail transit system/facilities;
- Supplemental application submittal requirements;
- Options for accelerated review and approval time for light rail transit system/facility projects; and
- A requirement for water and power at high capacity transit centers.

Revised and New Definitions

There are two proposed amendments to Chapter 20.20 Definitions. The first proposal amends SMC 20.20.016 – D definitions. Staff proposes to strike “which provides an essential public facility” from the definition of Development Agreement”. Staff believes the option should be open to any public agency requesting a Development Agreement. This change is also precipitated by the recommendation to change the land use entitlement process for essential public facilities from a Development Agreement to a Special Use Permit, which was recommended by the Planning Commission on January 21st.

The second amendment to Chapter 20.20 is a new definition for Multi-Modal Access Improvements. Multi-Modal Access improvements are offsite improvements that improve travel options to make safe connections to public facilities. These offsite

improvements may include sidewalks, bicycle lanes and/or paths, and traffic calming measures. This definition works with amendments to SMC 20.40.438 which lists required plans that are required as part of light rail transit system/facilities.

Decision Criteria for Special Use Permits

In addition to the existing criteria used to review a Special Use Permit, staff is proposing additional decision criteria specific to light rail transit system/facilities. Staff wants to ensure that the proposed light rail stations, garages and other associated facilities: 1) use energy efficient and environmentally sustainable architecture and design; 2) demonstrate the availability of sufficient capacity and infrastructure to safely support light rail system/facilities; and 3) reflect the City's Guiding Principles for Light Rail Facility design.

The City anticipates that the future light rail stations, parking garages, rail line and associated facilities may impact City's streets, neighborhoods, and infrastructure. The proposed decision criteria will add more certainty that Sound Transit will fully evaluate the local impacts and provide the necessary mitigation to address impacts arise from their project. The local impacts will largely be defined by Shoreline's adopted standards and thresholds.

Supplemental Application Submittal Requirements

SMC 20.40.140 and .160 lists Light Rail Transit System/Facilities as a use that is allowed through the approval of a Special Use Permit with added conditions (indexed criteria). What this means is an applicant must submit a Special Use Permit application and also meet the conditions listed in SMC 20.40.438. The Planning Commission recommended several amendments to SMC 20.40.438 following the January 21, 2016 Public Hearing. The recommendation included the addition of the following four (4) criteria:

1. 20.40.438(A) - A light rail transit system/facility shall be approved through a Special Use Permit as specified in SMC 20.30.355.
2. 20.40.438(B) – A Light Rail Transit System/Facility stations and parking garages shall conform to the listed development standards.
3. 20.40.438(C) – A Light Rail Transit System/Facility improvements located between the stations shall conform to the listed development standards.
4. 20.40.438(D) – Modification of 20.40.438 (B) and (C) Requirements. If the applicant demonstrates that compliance with one or more of the requirements set forth in this Section 20.40.438(B) and (C) is impracticable, would result in reduced public benefits, or alternative actions could meet or exceed the intended goals of such requirements, then the City may waive or modify such requirements as part of the Special Use Permit process.

The following supplemental index criteria are proposed by staff to add to the existing and

previously recommended criteria:

E. The following supplemental submittal items are required to permit a light rail transit facility or light rail transit system within the City:

1. A Construction Management Plan is required for light rail transit system/facilities. The requirements for a Construction Management Plan can be found in the Engineering Design Manual. The Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to the City of Shoreline in advance of the submission of any development permits or prior to the completion of the 60% design and engineering phase for the Lynnwood Link Extension project, whichever is sooner.

2. A Parking Management Plan is required for light rail transit system/facilities to mitigate offsite impacts of parking. The Parking Management Plan shall include parking management and enforcement techniques to guard against parking impacts to surrounding neighborhoods. The Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to the City of Shoreline no later than the completion of the initial design and engineering phase for the Lynnwood Link Extension project.

3. A Multi-Modal Access Improvement Plan is required for light rail transit system/facilities. The Multi Modal Access Plan shall be submitted to the City of Shoreline no later than the completion of the 60% design and engineering phase for the Lynnwood Link Extension project.

4. A Neighborhood Traffic Plan is required for light rail transit system/facilities. A Neighborhood Traffic Plan shall include an assessment of existing traffic speeds and volumes and include outreach and coordination with affected residents to identify potential mitigation projects to be implemented within two years of the light rail facilities becoming operational. The Neighborhood Traffic Plan shall be submitted to the City of Shoreline no later than the completion of the 60% design and engineering phase for the Lynnwood Link Extension project.

5. A Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) is required for light rail transit system/facilities. This analysis is intended to supplement the analysis and mitigation included in the FEIS for the Lynnwood Link Extension project to meet the Special Use Permit criteria. The City will require third party review of the TIA at the applicant's expense. The TIA shall be submitted to the City of Shoreline no later than the completion of the 60% design and engineering phase for the Lynnwood Link Extension project or as part of the SUP application, whichever is sooner.

The TIA at a minimum shall include:

6a. Light Rail System and Facilities Permitting Process and Applicable Regs - Study item

- a. A regional Traffic Analysis as defined by the City's Traffic Study Guidelines and proposed mitigation where impacts will result in a failure to meet the City's LOS standards;
- b. An assessment of accident risks at sidewalks and pedestrian paths including possible mitigation;
- c. A reassessment of the Synchro analysis to include increased pedestrian and bicycle activity and bus blockages at the intersections within a ¼ mile of proposed light rail transit system/facilities including proposed mitigation;
- d. Analysis of traffic impacts and proposed mitigation at additional intersections including but not limited to intersections along 155th Street and 5th Avenue;
- e. Evaluation of intersections with collision histories to determine if protective phasing and mitigation are necessary;

F. Project and Permitting Processes Light Rail System/Facility.

1. Accelerated Project and Permitting Process.

- a. All City permit reviews will be completed within a mutually agreed upon reduced number of working days within receiving complete permit applications and including subsequent revisions in accordance with a fully executed Accelerated Project and Permitting Staffing Agreement between the City and Sound Transit.
- b. The fees for permit processing are determined as part of the Accelerated Project Permitting Staffing Agreement.
- c. An Accelerated Project and Permitting Staffing Agreement shall be executed by the parties prior to the applicant's submittal of the Special Use Permit application; or the applicant may choose to utilize the City's standard project and permitting processes.

2. Standard Project and Permit Process.

- a. All complete permit applications will be processed and reviewed in the order in which it is received and based on existing resources at the time of submittal.
- b. Cost: Permit fees will be charged in accordance with SMC 3.01.010. This includes the ability for the City to charge its

established hourly rate for all hours spent in excess of the estimated hours for each permit.

c. Due to the volume of permits anticipated for development of the light rail system/facilities in Shoreline, in absence of an Accelerated Project Permitting Staffing Agreement, the Target Time Limits for Decisions denoted in SMC 20.30 may be extended if adequate staffing is not available to meet demand.

The intent behind the proposed additions to SMC 20.40.438 is to address with mitigation specific direct impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the Lynnwood Link Extension project.

The Construction Management Plan will place restrictions such as hours construction may occur, requirement for sound muffling on tools, equipment and vehicles, hauling routes, traffic control, erosion sediment control. The specific regulations regarding construction management will be drafted and placed in the City's Engineering Development Manual.

The Parking Management Plan will be required to mitigate the possible overflow of vehicles onto City streets and into the surrounding neighborhoods. Some of the techniques used to control and manage parking include onsite parking enforcement, parking enforcement by police on city streets, Residential Parking Zones (RPZ's), secure bike lockers, incentives for carpools, and ORCA cards. The Parking Management Plan will be required to the City no later than the completion of the initial design for each station and garage. The Parking Management Plan will ultimately be approved by the City's Traffic Engineer.

The Multi-Modal Access Improvement Plan will be required no later than the completion of the 60% design plans. Multi-Modal Access improvements are offsite improvements that improve travel options to make safe connections to public facilities. These offsite improvements may include sidewalks, bicycle lanes and/or paths, and traffic calming measures. The intent of a Multi-Modal Access Improvement Plan will ensure that residents and travelers will have safe connections to and from the stations to other point in the City of Shoreline.

The Neighborhood Traffic Plan will be required no later than the completion of 60% design and engineering. The proposed light rail stations have the possibility of creating cut-through traffic on low volume and low speed nonarterial streets. A Neighborhood Traffic Plan shall include an assessment of existing traffic speeds and volumes and include outreach and coordination with affected residents to identify potential mitigation projects to be implemented within two years of the light rail facilities becoming operational.

A Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) will be required for a light rail transit system/facility. This TIA is intended to analyze the projects impacts on locally adopted

standards and levels of service. This work will supplement the analysis and mitigation included in the FEIS for the Lynnwood Link Extension project. The TIA information is needed to meet the Special Use Permit criteria. The City will require third party review of the TIA at the applicant's expense. The TIA shall be submitted to the City of Shoreline no later than the completion of the 60% design and engineering phase for the Lynnwood Link Extension project or the submittal of the SUP, whichever is sooner.

The TIA at a minimum shall include:

- Regional traffic analysis as defined by the City's Traffic Study Guidelines and propose mitigation where impacts will result in a failure to meet the City's LOS standards;
- An assessment of accident risks at sidewalks and pedestrian paths including possible mitigation;
- A reassessment of the Synchro analysis to include increased pedestrian and bicycle activity and bus blockages at the intersections within a ¼ mile of proposed light rail transit system/facilities including proposed mitigation;
- Analysis of traffic impacts and proposed mitigation at additional intersections including but not limited to intersections along 155th Street and 5th Avenue; and
- Evaluation of intersections with collision histories to determine if protective phasing and mitigation are necessary.

Options for Accelerated Review and Approval Time for Light Rail Projects

Staff has proposed adding a section to SMC 20.40.438 (F) that gives Sound Transit the option of applying for accelerated permit processing. Accelerated processing will be mutually agreed upon through an accelerated project and permitting staffing agreement between Shoreline and Sound Transit. The accelerated permitting and staffing agreement will give Sound Transit the assurance that plans and permits will be processed with little delay and the City will be assured that we have sufficient funding to hire the staff and consultants to carry out accelerated timelines. This is a process Sound Transit has used with past light rail projects in other jurisdictions such as Redmond.

If Shoreline and Sound Transit cannot come to an agreement regarding accelerated permitting and the necessary staffing to carry out the accelerated timeline, Sound Transit's permits will be processed like all other permit applications. All complete permit applications would be processed and reviewed in the order in which it is received and based on existing resources at the time of submittal. Due to the volume of permits anticipated for development of the light rail system/facilities in Shoreline, in absence of an Accelerated Project Permitting Staffing Agreement, the Target Time Limits for Decisions denoted in SMC 20.30 may be extended if adequate staffing is not available to meet demand.

Requirement for Water and Power at High Capacity Transit Centers

Staff is proposing to add a requirement to SMC 20.50.240 (F) which is the public places section of the commercial design standards. Public places are those areas of commercial and multifamily development that encourage and accommodate pedestrians and street level uses between buildings and the public realm. 20.50.240 (F) currently includes:

1. Public places are required for the commercial portions of development at a rate of four square feet of public place per 20 square feet of net commercial floor area up to a public place maximum of 5,000 square feet. This requirement may be divided into smaller public places with a minimum 400 square feet each.
2. Public places may be covered but not enclosed unless by subsection (F)(3) of this section.
3. Buildings shall border at least one side of the public place.
4. Eighty percent of the area shall provide surfaces for people to stand or sit.
5. No lineal dimension is less than six feet.
6. The following design elements are also required for public places:
 - a. Physically accessible and visible from the public sidewalks, walkways, or through-connections;
 - b. Pedestrian access to abutting buildings;
 - c. Pedestrian-scaled lighting (subsection H of this section);
 - d. Seating and landscaping with solar access at least a portion of the day; and
 - e. Not located adjacent to dumpsters or loading areas;
 - f. Amenities such as public art, planters, fountains, interactive public amenities, hanging baskets, irrigation, decorative light fixtures, decorative paving and walkway treatments, and other items that provide a pleasant pedestrian experience along arterial streets.

Staff is recommending the addition of the following language:

g. Publically accessible water and electrical power supply shall be supplied at high capacity transit centers and stations and associated parking.

High Capacity transit centers and light rail stations should have the infrastructure in place to encourage services for transit riders such as coffee carts, food vendors, and other uses that will make the transit center more accommodating to transit riders.

NEXT STEPS

There is still a few remaining issues staff and the Planning Commission Light Rail Subcommittee may like to address with amendments to the Development Code. These issues include:

- Tree protection and replacement in relation to the development of the Lynnwood Link Extension project; and
- Additional standards to address public safety, noise and vibration on private property adjacent to the light rail system/facilities.

TIMING AND SCHEDULE

- March 3, 2016 – 2nd Planning Commission Study Session on Part 1 of Batch 3 of the ST Amendments. Introduction of Part 2 of Batch 3 of Sound Transit Related Development Code Amendments.
- April 7, 2016 – Planning Commission Public Hearing on Sound Transit Related Development Code Amendments Parts 1 and 2 of Batch 3.
- May 9, 2016 - City Council discussion
- May 23, 2016 - City Council adoption

RECOMMENDATION

No recommendation is provided for this study session. Staff may make revisions based on tonight's discussion and bring a revised set of amendments to Commission for a second study session on March 3, 2016.

ATTACHMENT

Attachment A – Draft Development Code Amendments related to Light Rail System/Facilities Package 3 Part 1

Amendment Package #3 Part 1: Development Code Amendments Delayed to Allow for Additional Review by Sound Transit and Coordination with the City of Shoreline

20.20.016 D definitions.

Development Agreement A contract between the City and an applicant having ownership or control of property, or a public agency ~~which provides an essential public facility~~. The purpose of the development agreement is to set forth the development standards and other provisions that shall apply to, govern and vest the development, use, and mitigation of real property within the City for the duration specified in the agreement and shall be consistent with the applicable development regulations and the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan. (Ord. 706 § 1 (Exh. A), 2015).

20.20.034 M definitions.

Multi-Modal Access Improvements – Multi-modal Access Improvements are offsite improvements that improve travel options to make safe connections to public amenities or facilities such as schools, high capacity transit facilities, bus stops, and commercial uses. Multi modal access improvements include, but are not limited to offsite sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, traffic calming and amenity zones.

20.30.330 Special use permit-SUP (Type C action).

Note: The sections and amendments below in italics were reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning Commission following the January 21, 2016 Public Hearing and are provided for context.

A. Purpose. The purpose of a special use permit is to allow a permit granted by the City to locate a regional land use on unclassified lands, unzoned lands, or when not specifically allowed by the zoning of the location, but that provides a benefit to the community and is compatible with other uses in the zone in which it is proposed. The special use permit is may be granted subject to conditions placed on the proposed use to ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses.

B. Decision Criteria (applies to all Special Uses). A special use permit shall be granted by the City, only if the applicant demonstrates that:

- 1. The use will provide a public benefit or satisfy a public need of the neighborhood, district or City or region;*
- 2. The characteristics of the special use will be compatible with the types of uses permitted in surrounding areas;*
- 3. The special use will not materially endanger the health, safety and welfare of the community;*
- 4. The proposed location shall not result in either the detrimental over-concentration of a particular use within the City or within the immediate area of the proposed use, unless the proposed use is deemed a public necessity;*
- 5. The special use is such that pedestrian and vehicular traffic associated with the use will not be hazardous or conflict with existing and anticipated traffic in the neighborhood;*
- 6. The special use will be supported by adequate public facilities or services and will not adversely affect public services to the surrounding area or conditions can be established to mitigate adverse impacts;*
- 7. The location, size and height of buildings, structures, walls and fences, and screening vegetation for the special use shall not hinder or discourage the appropriate development or use of neighboring properties;*
- 8. The special use is not in conflict with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan or the basic purposes of this title; and*
- 9. The special use is not in conflict with the standards of the critical areas regulations, Chapter 20.80 SMC, Critical Areas, or Shoreline Master Program, SMC Title 20, Division II.*

C. Decision Criteria (Light Rail Transit Facility/System only). In addition to the criteria in SMC 20.30.330(B), a Special Use Permit for a light rail transit system/facilities located anywhere in the City may be granted by the City only if the applicant demonstrates the following standards are met:

January 28, 2016

1. The proposed light rail transit system/facilities uses energy efficient and environmentally sustainable architecture and site design;
2. There is either sufficient capacity and infrastructure (e.g., roads, sidewalks, bike lanes) that meet the City's adopted Level of Service standards (as confirmed by the performance of a Transportation Impact Analysis) in the motorized and non-motorized transportation system to safely support the light rail transit system/facility development proposed in all future phases or there will be adequate capacity and infrastructure by the time each phase of development is completed. If capacity or infrastructure must be increased to meet the Decision Criteria set forth in this Section 20.30.330(C)(3)(B), then the applicant must identify a plan for funding their proportionate share of the improvements; and
3. The applicant demonstrates that the design of the proposed light rail transit system/facility reflects the City's Guiding Principles for Light Rail System/Facilities and other impacted facilities, such as Ridgcrest Park, 195th Street Pedestrian Bridge, and the 185th and 145th Street multi modal access connections.

20.40.438 Light rail transit system/facility.¹

Note: The sections and amendments below in italics were reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning Commission following the January 21, 2016 Public Hearing and are provided for context.

A. A light rail transit system/facility shall be approved through a ~~development agreement~~ Special Use Permit as specified in SMC 20.30.~~33055~~ (Ord. 706 § 1 (Exh. A), 2015).

B. A Light Rail Transit System/Facility stations and parking garages shall conform to the required standards below:

- 1. SMC 20.50.020(2) - Dimensional standards of the MUR-70' Zone;*
- 2. SMC 20.50.220 through 20.50.250 – Commercial design standards;*
- 3. SMC 20.50.290 through 20.50.370 – Tree conservation, land clearing and site grading standards;*
- 4. SMC 20.50.380 through 20.50.440 – Parking, access, and circulation;*

5. SMC 20.50.450 through 20.50.520 - Landscaping;

6. SMC 20.50.530 through 20.50.610 – Signs for the MUR-70’ Zone;

7. SMC 20.60 Adequacy of Public Facilities;

8. SMC 20.70 Engineering and Utilities Development Standards; and

9. SMC 20.80 Critical Areas.

C. The Light Rail Transit System/Facility improvements located between the stations shall comply with the applicable sections below:

1. SMC 20.50.290 through 20.50.370 – Tree conservation, land clearing and site grading standards;

2. SMC 20.50.450 through 20.50.520 – Landscaping;

3. SMC 20.60 Adequacy of Public Facilities;

4. SMC 20.70 Engineering and Utilities Development Standards; and

5. SMC 20.80 Critical Areas.

D. **Modification of 20.40.438 (B) and (C) Requirements.** If the applicant demonstrates that compliance with one or more of the requirements set forth in this Section 20.40.438(B) and (C) is impracticable, would result in reduced public benefits, or alternative actions could meet or exceed the intended goals of such requirements, then the City may waive or modify such requirements as part of the Special Use Permit process.

E. The following supplemental submittal items are required to permit a light rail transit facility or light rail transit system within the City:

1. A Construction Management Plan is required for light rail transit system/facilities. The Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to the City in advance of the submission of any development permit applications or prior to design and engineering for the proposed project reaching the 60% completion phase, whichever is sooner;

2. A Parking Management Plan is required for light rail transit system/facilities. The Parking Management Plan shall include parking management and enforcement techniques to mitigate off-site parking impacts to surrounding neighborhoods. The Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to the City no later than the completion of the initial design and engineering phase for the proposed project;

3. A Multi-Modal Access Improvement Plan is required for light rail transit system/facilities. The Multi Modal Access Plan shall be submitted to the City no later than the completion of the 60% design and engineering phase for the proposed project;

4. A Neighborhood Traffic Plan is required for light rail transit system/facilities. A Neighborhood Traffic Plan shall include an assessment of existing traffic speeds and volumes and include outreach and coordination with affected residents to identify potential mitigation projects to be implemented within two years of the light rail facilities becoming operational. The Neighborhood Traffic Plan shall be submitted to the City no later than the completion of the 60% design and engineering phase for the proposed project; and

5. A Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) is required for light rail transit system/facilities. This analysis is intended to supplement the analysis and mitigation included in any environmental review document prepared for the proposed project. The City will require third party review of the TIA at the applicant's expense. The TIA shall be submitted to the City no later than the completion of the 60% design and engineering phase for the project or as part of the SUP application, whichever is sooner.

The TIA at a minimum shall include:

- a. A regional Traffic Analysis as defined by the City's Traffic Study Guidelines and proposed mitigation where impacts will result in a failure to meet the City's LOS standards;
- b. An assessment of accident risks at sidewalks and pedestrian paths including possible mitigation;
- c. A new or updated analysis that includes increased pedestrian and bicycle activity and bus blockages at the intersections within a ¼ mile of proposed light rail transit system/facilities including proposed mitigation;

d. Analysis of traffic impacts and proposed mitigation at additional intersections as determined by the City, that may be impacted by the proposed project.

e. Evaluation of intersections with collision histories to determine if protective phasing and mitigation are necessary;

F. Project and Permitting Processes Light Rail System/Facility.

1. Accelerated Project and Permitting Process.

a. All City permit reviews will be completed within a mutually agreed upon reduced number of working days within receiving complete permit applications and including subsequent revisions in accordance with a fully executed Accelerated Project and Permitting Staffing Agreement between the City and the project proponent.

b. The fees for permit processing will be determined as part of the Accelerated Project Permitting Staffing Agreement.

c. An Accelerated Project and Permitting Staffing Agreement shall be executed prior to the applicant's submittal of the Special Use Permit application; or the applicant may choose to utilize the City's standard project and permitting processes set forth in SMC 20.40.438(F)(2).

2. Standard Project and Permit Process.

a. All complete permit applications will be processed and reviewed in the order in which they are received and based on existing resources at the time of submittal.

b. Cost: Permit fees will be charged in accordance with SMC 3.01.010. This includes the ability for the City to charge its established hourly rate for all hours spent in excess of the estimated hours for each permit.

c. Due to the volume of permits anticipated for development of a light rail system/facilities in the City, in absence of an Accelerated Project Permitting Staffing Agreement, the Target Time Limits for Decisions denoted in SMC 20.30 may be extended by the Director if adequate staffing is not available to meet demand.

20.50.240 Site design.

F. Public Places.

1. Public places are required for the commercial portions of development at a rate of four square feet of public place per 20 square feet of net commercial floor area up to a public place maximum of 5,000 square feet. This requirement may be divided into smaller public places with a minimum 400 square feet each.
2. Public places may be covered but not enclosed unless by subsection (F)(3) of this section.
3. Buildings shall border at least one side of the public place.
4. Eighty percent of the area shall provide surfaces for people to stand or sit.
5. No lineal dimension is less than six feet.
6. The following design elements are also required for public places:
 - a. Physically accessible and visible from the public sidewalks, walkways, or through-connections;
 - b. Pedestrian access to abutting buildings;
 - c. Pedestrian-scaled lighting (subsection H of this section);
 - d. Seating and landscaping with solar access at least a portion of the day; and
 - e. Not located adjacent to dumpsters or loading areas;
 - f. Amenities such as public art, planters, fountains, interactive public amenities, hanging baskets, irrigation, decorative light fixtures, decorative paving and walkway treatments, and other items that provide a pleasant pedestrian experience along arterial streets.
 - g. Publically accessible water and electrical power supply shall be supplied at high capacity transit centers and stations and associated parking.