

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
(Via Zoom)

September 17, 2020
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present

Chair Mork
Vice Chair Malek
Commissioner Callahan
Commissioner Galuska
Commissioner Lin
Commissioner Rwamashongye
Commissioner Sager

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Planning Director
Nora Gierloff, Planning Manager
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner
Andrew Bauer, Associate Planner
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Mork called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by Ms. Hoekzema the following Commissioners were present: Chair Mork, Vice Chair Malek, and Commissioners Callahan, Galuska, Lin, Rwamashongye and Sager.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of August 20, 2020 and September 3, 2020 were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

STUDY ITEM: 2020 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DISCUSSION

Mr. Szafran explained that the State Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to once a year, with limited exceptions. To ensure the public can view the proposals in a citywide context, the GMA directs cities to create a docket or a list of the amendments to be considered for that year. Proposed amendments are collected throughout the previous year with a deadline of December 1st for public and staff submissions to be considered the following year. The docket establishes the amendments that will be reviewed and studied by the staff and Planning Commission prior to their recommendation to the City Council for final approval to amend the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Szafran advised that the City Council set the Final 2020 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket on March 16th. He presented the amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 1** – Table 6.6 of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan is a list of general capital projects that are targeted for acquisition between 2024 and 2029. The amendment adds acquisition of park and open space between Dayton Avenue and Interstate 5 and between 145th and 165th Streets. This area is greater than the more constrained area in the original table, which was Aurora Avenue N to I-5 and 155th to 165th Streets. The amendment would provide additional opportunities to meet the level of service (LOS) targets for park space in the Westminster Triangle Neighborhood.
- **Amendment 2** – This amendment proposes to amend the Point Wells Subarea Plan and associated Comprehensive Plan Land Use Policy LU51 related to Point Wells to implement the Settlement and Interlocal Agreement (ILA) between the City of Shoreline and the Town of Woodway, which was approved by the City of Shoreline on October 7, 2019. The ILA pertains to Shoreline’s support for Woodway’s future annexation of Point Wells and coordination of land use planning and development regulations for the area by the Town of Woodway and the City of Shoreline.

The ILA addresses services, infrastructure, mitigation impacts and other issues related to the future development of the Point Wells site. As part of the ILA, a joint planning working group comprised of staff from the Town of Woodway and the City of Shoreline was formed to develop and recommend mutually-agreeable Comprehensive Plan policies, development regulations and design standards. The recommended goals, policies and development regulations will be adopted by both the Town of Woodway and the City of Shoreline in order to have consistent development regulations under either of the jurisdictions.

The Point Wells Subarea Plan is required to meet the goals and policies of the State’s GMA, Puget Sound Regional Council’s Vision 2050, King County Countywide Planning Policies, and Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies. The plan considers these goals and policies, as well as the adopted visions of the Town of Woodway and the City of Shoreline. The site has been considered since at least 1995 with policies that speak to annexation of the site, and the Woodway Planning Commission prepared a new plan for Point Wells in April 2013. That plan designates and zones the entire 67 acres of Point Wells as Urban Village. The City of Shoreline also prepared a subarea plan for Point Wells in 2011, given that the primary access to the site is

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 17, 2020

via Richmond Beach Drive and the majority of future transportation trips to and from the site will impact Shoreline.

The Comprehensive Plan lists goals and policies for land use, capital facilities, utilities, transportation, environmental preservation and protection, and governance. It is important to emphasize that the updated subarea plan would not lose any of the hard-fought battles, analysis and public input. All of the goals and policies are protected in the new plan. Transportation trip counts are addressed, as well as secondary access and environmental preservation goals and policies. A new section (Governance Goal 5) states that if Point Wells is annexed into the Town of Woodway, any development activity on the site will be coordinated with Shoreline to ensure all impacts and mitigations are addressed. Also, if Woodway chooses not to annex Point Wells, it will notify the City of the decision and then Shoreline may seek annexation.

Land Use Policy LU51 would be updated to acknowledge the ILA between the two jurisdictions. Language was also added that, if annexed into the City of Shoreline, the City would add a new Planned Area 4 Land Use Designation. Point Wells is currently designated Mixed-Use 1 in the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. In order to have a consistent Subarea Plan and implementing Development Code regulations, staff is proposing to change the designation to Planned Area 4 which will match the proposed pre-annexation zoning regulations for the site.

Vice Chair Malek commented that, although the ILA includes a secondary ingress/egress to the area, the concern expressed in a written comment regarding cut-through traffic is still legitimate. Where 116th Street in Woodway turns sharp into 205th Street in Shoreline, people cut through to go to the beach or to 185th Street. He asked if there is a plan in place to address that concern. Mr. Szafran said Transportation Policy TC2 requires that any development on the site would have to prepare a transportation corridor study and mitigation plan, and any issues would be addressed through that plan. In addition, Policy TC3 states that development at Point Wells shall not generate more than 4,000 average daily trips (ADT) onto Richmond Beach Drive and the remaining Richmond Beach Road Corridor shall not exceed a level of service (LOS) D. This policy is intended to ensure that the traffic generated by the site does not cause local streets to fail. Vice Chair Malek noted that the ADT limitation would pertain to both ingress and egress. Mr. Szafran pointed out that Policy TC3 is a carry-over policy from the previous subarea plan.

Vice Chair Malek asked about the City's thresholds related to transportation. It is important to give the community an idea of what is currently considered acceptable as far as cut-through traffic that might overwhelm and transform several neighborhoods. He noted that Richmond Beach Road is already a very busy and fast-moving street, and traffic on that street, as well as other streets would increase significantly if the Point Wells site is developed. Mr. Szafran said that, as per Policy TC2, any development on Point Wells, regardless of size, would have to prepare a transportation corridor study and provide mitigation. Vice Chair Malek summarized that, while traffic might not determine the density of development on the site, it will determine how the density is handled. If the proposed density doesn't fit with the requirements, the project will need to be scaled back.

Chair Mork observed that Policy TC3 is quite specific to the Richmond Beach Road Corridor. She asked if the other secondary routes referenced by Vice Chair Malek would be part of a required corridor study.

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 17, 2020

Mr. Szafran said it would fall on the City's Traffic Engineer to identify the streets that need to be studied, but he can't answer how the methodology for a transportation study works.

Commissioner Rwamashongye explained that, generally speaking, a developer would address all of the potential impacts to surrounding neighborhoods as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He felt that Policy TC1, which requires a transportation corridor study and mitigation plan, is adequate. However, should the City of Shoreline annex the Point Wells property at some point in the future, the dynamics of the situation would change and the City would have to negotiate a new ILA with the Town of Woodway regarding where the secondary road would be located. Mr. Szafran said an overarching point of the new subarea plan is both the Town of Woodway and the City of Shoreline are creating the goals and policies in concert. No matter what jurisdiction Point Wells falls under it is expected that the policies and development regulations will be the same.

Commissioner Rwamashongye commented that doing a traffic analysis on cut-through traffic that predicts volumes and at what time of the day can be very difficult since it is highly dependent on the people who live in the neighborhood. However, he concurred that cut-through traffic is a real concern.

Vice Chair Malek pointed out that Woodway has three years to annex Point Wells. If they choose not to do so, the City of Shoreline can advance its bid to annex the property. If that were the case, the policies in the ILA would stay the same. He commented that development of Point Wells could reshape several neighborhoods. While he understands that there is always pain with growth, it doesn't have to be debilitating and at the expense of one neighborhood. Mitigation and analysis are necessary, and the proposed policies will ensure it happens. He commented that the concerns raised by Mr. Amundson and Mr. McCormick are valid.

Chair Mork summarized that there is clearly concern about potential traffic impacts, and it would be helpful for staff to develop a more detailed response to address the concerns that have been raised for the public hearing. Her interpretation of the proposed policy is that a corridor study would only be required for Richmond Beach Road. Mr. Szafran agreed to discuss the concern with the Traffic Engineer and prepare a more detailed answer about the methodology for transportation corridor studies.

Chair Mork noted that King County is not specifically mentioned in the geographic context, county and regional context, planning background, transportation circulation goal, environmental protection goal, and governance goal. It is important to be certain that King County knows what is being proposed by the two cities. She suggested that, where Snohomish County is mentioned, it would be appropriate to talk about King County. Mr. Szafran said that, even if the City were to annex Point Wells, it would still be located in Snohomish County. He doesn't foresee that the county boundaries would change. Staff did review to make sure the City's Comprehensive Plan amendments were consistent with the King County's Countywide Planning Policies.

Chair Mork said it isn't clear to her that King County understands what is being proposed, and she is concerned that there might be misunderstandings. It is important to make sure King County is completely included in the process.

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 17, 2020

Commissioner Galuska asked if the transportation corridor plan would be similar to an EIS, which identifies the impacts associated with a project. Or would it be more like a traffic concurrency study that identifies arithmetic limits at intersections or road sections where certain levels of congestion wouldn't be appropriate. Mr. Szafran responded that a transportation corridor plan was prepared for the previous proposal for the site, but he isn't familiar enough to know what was considered in that plan. He agreed to research the methodology and report back to the Commission.

Commissioner Galuska asked if a developer would simply need to identify the potential impacts, or would a developer be limited to a certain level of impact before mitigation would be required. How much ability does the City have to require a developer to mitigate impacts? Ms. Gierloff noted that Policy TC3 talks about not reducing the LOS in either Woodway or Shoreline. She noted that there could be a wide range of development proposals for the site, depending on whether the secondary access makes sense or not. The intent is for the policies to be broad because there is no specific proposal at this time.

Commissioner Galuska asked if the ILA has everybody, including the Growth Management Hearings Board, on the same page as far as annexation. This would be important given that it would be a cross-county annexation. Mr. Szafran answered that Mr. Bauer would provide more information about the ILA during his presentation.

Commissioner Lin asked if staff has an idea of how much buildable land is available at Point Wells. Having this information would help her better understand what the traffic impacts might be. Mr. Szafran responded that it is difficult to answer that question. There is about 50 acres on the lower portion, and density can range between 18 and 44 units per acre. However, the limiting factor will be the policy that limits the trips on Richmond Beach Drive to 4,000.

Commissioner Lin asked if the proposed policy would require a developer who wants to develop a small portion of the entire site to extend the traffic corridor study to include a possible secondary access. Mr. Szafran answered that if the proposed development would result in more than 250 ADTs, the applicant would have to provide another access to Point Wells through the Town of Woodway. Ms. Gierloff said the 250 ADT limit would apply to the entire site, and would be equivalent to about 25 houses.

Commissioner Callahan observed that the Point Wells subsite on the City's website is nice and provides up-to-date news, but the Frequently Asked Questions section needs to be updated before the public hearing.

STUDY ITEM: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT ESTABLISHING A POINT WELLS-PLANNED AREA 4 ZONE AND REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE POINT WELLS SUBAREA PLAN.

As discussed earlier, Mr. Bauer reviewed that the City of Shoreline and the Town of Woodway entered into a Settlement and Interlocal Agreement (ILA) in late 2019. The ILA aligns the two cities on many key issues for the Point Wells Subarea. The subarea is called out in both Shoreline's and Woodway's plans as an area for potential annexation, and the ILA notes that Woodway would be first in line for annexing the subarea. Shoreline would only have the ability to annex the subarea if the Town of Woodway declines annexation.

DRAFT

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 17, 2020

Mr. Bauer said the ILA sets out a unified approach for how future development of the subarea would occur. It addresses transportation, secondary access through Woodway, residential density, public access to the Puget Sound shoreline, building height, etc. To align the two cities on these topics, the ILA included a provision for the formation of a joint work group that consists of staff from both Shoreline and Woodway. The workgroup was formed after the ILA was signed and has been meeting since last October, with a brief pause during the spring due to the pandemic. It has completed its recommendation on the unified subarea plan policies and development regulations. The proposal being presented to the Commission is the result of the group's work, and the Woodway Planning Commission will be considering similar amendments. This unified approach is intended to create certainty for future plans for the subarea.

Mr. Bauer provided an aerial view of the subarea, which is about 61 acres in size. It is located in unincorporated Snohomish County and has been in industrial use for more than 50 years. It is surrounded on all sides by Puget Sound, Woodway and Shoreline. The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) rail lines cuts through the eastern side of the site, and a facility for the Brightwater treatment pipeline is near the southern area of the site. This facility would be exempt from many of the development standards. The only vehicular access is through Shoreline via Richmond Beach Drive.

Mr. Bauer reviewed that the proposed regulations are intended to implement the subarea plan and key components of the ILA. He advised that, if the Commission wants to pursue substantial changes to the draft regulations, they would likely be presented to the Woodway team for review. He reminded them that the goal is for both jurisdictions to adopt similar plans and regulations and to stay aligned with one another on key issues. He reviewed the proposed regulations, which were developed by the joint work group, as follows:

- **Transportation.** As set out in the ILA, new development in the subarea would be limited to generating 250 ADTs (roughly the equivalent of 25 units) before being required to provide a secondary access through Woodway, with no connection to Shoreline's roads. The road would have to be constructed to Woodway's standards and serve vehicles of all types. Traffic on Richmond Beach Drive would be limited to 4,000 ADTs (roughly the equivalent of 400-800 multifamily units) dependent on mitigation factors to offset some of the vehicle trips. The proposed regulations also include two conceptual street cross sections, a primary street and a secondary street. The cross sections are intended to be a starting point and could be modified or additional cross sections developed via a development agreement. The idea is to establish a baseline that conveys the types of features they want to see in a street, but also have the flexibility for the cross sections to scale up or down according to the size and scope of the development.
- **Land Uses.** The ILA requires that any future redevelopment in the subarea is pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use, and consists primarily of residential uses with a variety of housing types and limited commercial uses. The Land Use Table in the proposed regulations outlines the range of housing uses that would be allowed, as well as a limited range of commercial uses. It also prohibits auto-oriented uses such as drive-throughs. Other allowed uses would include parks, open space, government and public service uses.

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 17, 2020

- **Dimensional Standards.** The intent of these standards is to minimize the bulk and scale of buildings to recognize the unique and sensitive nature of the subarea and the potential for preserving and/or enhancing the public views. Density is limited to 44 units per acre, and buildings are limited to maximum of 60 units each and a maximum footprint of 10,000 square feet.
- **Building Height.** The building height varies depending on the location on the site. The base height east of the BNSF rail line is 35 feet and cannot be exceeded. This area is closer to the single-family neighborhoods in Richmond Beach and Woodway and the height limit is intended to create a transitional area. The height west of the BNSF rail line is 45 feet, with provisions to go to a maximum of 75 feet with a view analysis that looks at enhancing and/or preserving public views. The view analysis would be reviewed and approved along with a development agreement. The height limits were carried over from the existing subarea plan.
- **Open Space.** Open space and public access would be required to be integrated and phased in throughout any development. The public access and public parking requirements are noted in the ILA and are also key components of the State Shoreline Management Act (SMA).
- **Aligning Existing Standards.** The work group talked a lot about how to align other basic elements of each of the respective development regulations. In the end, the work group felt it was still keeping with the intent of the ILA to refer to each city's existing regulations for typical standards like parking, landscaping, signs and tree management. The City's proposed regulations would simply cross reference the existing standards that are already adopted in the Development Code. Woodway's proposed regulations point to their existing adopted regulations, as well. While things like landscaping and signs may not be the same, they are similar enough that the group felt comfortable pointing to existing adopted standards. In Shoreline's case, there are existing green building and design standards, both of which are required elements in the ILA. Woodway is proposing new standards since they don't currently have a complete set of adopted design standards.
- **Development Agreement.** Mr. Bauer summarized that the regulations are structured such that any development within the subarea would require a development agreement. The City Council would be the final decisionmaker on a development agreement. A neighborhood meeting would be required, and a hearing would also be required before a decision on the agreement is made. As part of a development agreement, specifics related to phasing, land uses, roads and infrastructure would all be reviewed and agreed upon. The development agreement would then be the overarching land use entitlement for a development. It would also set out any conditions related to public benefits, transportation mitigation, etc. as needed to adapt and respond to the scale, size, and level of impact associated with future development. As discussed earlier by Mr. Szafran, the regulations require that the neighboring city be invited to early pre-application meetings and be provided an opportunity to review and comment on plans.

Mr. Bauer concluded his presentation by advising that a public hearing on the proposed regulations is tentatively scheduled for the Commission's October 15th meeting. Following the public hearing, the Commission will be asked to forward a recommendation to the City Council. Because this is pre-

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 17, 2020

annexation zoning, two public hearings will be held at the City Council level. The goal is for the City Council to adopt the subarea plan in 2020 followed by the regulations in 2020 or early 2021.

Vice Chair Malek noted that there will be three public hearings before the subarea plan is adopted (one at the Planning Commission level, and two at the City Council level). He stressed the importance of getting the word out so that people can provide comments and input.

Vice Chair Malek asked staff to clarify the difference between active and passive open space. Mr. Bauer answered that passive open space is more like an interpretive trail that is for more passive uses. Active open space includes such things as tennis courts or other types of active uses. A beach area would be considered more of a passive open space.

Vice Chair Malek asked if Shoreline's staff would be given enough notice to solicit public input from Shoreline citizens via the Planning Board and City Council process before presenting feedback to the Town of Woodway regarding a proposed development agreement. Mr. Bauer answered that citizens of Shoreline would be given an opportunity to comment at Woodway's neighborhood meeting, and Shoreline staff would also have an opportunity to review and comment on the development application, but it wouldn't necessarily mean that Shoreline would hold an entirely separate process. Vice Chair Malek asked if Shoreline residents would be welcome to attend Woodway's neighborhood meeting and comment, and Mr. Bauer answered affirmatively. The meetings would be open to the public, regardless of where they live.

Commissioner Rwamashongye asked how access to the waterfront would be addressed in the policies and planning process. Mr. Bauer said the ILA includes a provision that implements the Shoreline Management Act, which requires public access to shorelines of the State. Developers will be required to provide a public access plan, which includes public access to Puget Sound. He noted that public access can take many different forms and shapes. Mr. Szafran added that one of the subarea plan policies requires public access to the shoreline, as well.

Vice Chair Malek recalled that, at one point, Blue Squares Real Estate had planned a 16,000 square foot marina in the deep-water port that currently exists. Whether that happens or not remains to be seen. However, he agreed it is important to clarify that water access is required as part of any development.

Vice Chair Malek observed that, as per the ILA, the zoning would allow roughly 2,400 units to be constructed on the site. This is more on par with an urban village than an urban center. Mr. Bauer said the density allowance is 44 units per acre, and the property is about 60 acres. Theoretically, the density would allow just over 2,400 units, but there are other limiting factors, transportation being the main one. Vice Chair Malek summarized that any developer would have to address the traffic limitations.

Chair Mork asked if the Emergency Fire provider for the property has provided input. Mr. Bauer said the work group has not reached out for this input yet. However, the subarea plan policies include a provision that public services must be procured before anything can be developed within the subarea. Chair Mork cautioned that capital facilities policies must be carefully worded, and the special purpose districts and utilities need to be involved in the process so there are no surprises later down the road.

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 17, 2020

Chair Mork asked who would pay if Woodway annexes Point Wells, but Shoreline is required to do a study to address potential impacts of development at Point Wells. Mr. Bauer explained that if the property is annexed to the Town of Woodway, Shoreline would have a seat at the table during early meetings to review a development proposal. The City of Shoreline would have an opportunity to weigh in on what is included in the scope of the transportation corridor study, and he anticipates that the City's Traffic Engineer and Public Works Department would provide input. Typically, with a large-scale development, the developer would fund all of the environmental analysis, the preparation of the EIS, and the associated studies that need to occur to support the analysis and EIS. As the ILA is currently written, the studies would include both Shoreline and Woodway.

Chair Mork asked staff to respond to the written citizen comment concerning how to find information about the Point Wells Subarea Plan. Ms. Gierloff advised that the two staff presentations could be linked to the Point Wells Subarea Plan webpage, and the webpage could be updated to eliminate outdated information, as suggested by Commissioner Callahan. Chair Mork asked if Shoreline staff could work with Woodway staff to create a more robust fact list. Ms. Gierloff said the City's webpage could provide links to the Town of Woodway's process, as well.

Vice Chair Malek commented that Shoreline Area News and The Everett Herald are excellent sources for consistent and outstanding information. Both provide good historical data for points of reference, and the Richmond Beach Community Association has its own website for Point Wells that has a wealth of data. There is also an online Facebook site called Save Richmond Beach. Chair Mork said her interpretation of the public comment was that there is a certain rigor that goes with government sponsored facts, with the interest of getting something that has been vetted through a public agency.

Chair Mork said a late-coming written comment raised a specific question about the process of combining the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code amendments. She asked if staff could respond now or if the response would be postponed to the next meeting. Director Markle said it is not uncommon for a subarea plan to have accompanying development regulations. This process was used for both the 145th and 185th Street Subarea Plans. It appears that, in this case, the subarea plan would be adopted first, followed closely by the development regulations. She said if the legal team provides more information regarding the comment, staff would share it with the Commission at their next meeting on the topic.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

DRAFT

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Mork announced that she attended the 2nd portion of the diversity training that was provided by the National League of Cities. It was informative, and she is grateful to the City for allowing her to attend.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran announced that a public hearing on the 2020 Development Code Amendments is scheduled for October 2nd.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Laura Mork
Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission