

Discussion Issues

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>A. Community Character & Historic Preservation and Urban Centers – Downtown Section (Policies, Exhibit A)</p>		
<p>What is the relationship of the proposed policy amendments to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP): Are they consistent with and/or guided by the TMP? -(Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> The community’s vision guides the development of the City’s priorities and the Comprehensive Plan. From these, the City developed its guiding principles and the overarching transportation vision. Using this citywide transportation vision, five transportation strategies were developed as part of the 2013 TMP update. Each of the five strategies describes core activities needed to achieve desired outcomes. The five strategies provide the basis for identifying projects and programs to be completed by 2030. Implementation activities needed to achieve each strategy will also be guided by the sustainability principles of safety, maintenance, environmental stewardship and economic vitality.</p> <p>The five transportation strategies are found in TMP Chapter 1, on page 3 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Light Rail • Ensure Strong Support for Urban Centers • Improve Travel Choices and Mobility • Increase Neighborhood Connections • Enhance Freight Mobility <p>Below is an analysis of how the proposed policy amendments and proposed new policies would facilitate the TMP strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed new policy CC-32(b) speaks to a plan that would continue to provide strategies and support for the Downtown’s urban center. • Proposed new policy DT-25(b) is consistent with the TMP urban center strategy by calling for design standards that address high quality and complementary designs as 	<p>Opened 7/8</p> <p>Closed 7/15/15</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>well as ensuring the creation of an engaging pedestrian experience in the Historic Core.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed amendments to existing policy DT-28 and DT-29 and proposed new policy DT-30(b) and DT-30(d) support the TMP urban center and light rail strategies particularly by calling for seating and landscaping as components of the streetscape, by calling for landscaping between on-site parking and the pedestrian realm, and by encouraging other outdoor seating, dining, landscaping, and coordinated waste disposal in the context of pedestrian activity and the future Downtown light rail station. • Proposed new policy DT-30(c) supports the TMP urban center strategy by calling for visibility for and connection to the commercially-based Historic Core, particularly from Downtown Park. • Proposed new policy DT-25(b), amendment to policy DT-28 and DT-29, and new policies DT-30(b), (c) and (d) support travel choices and mobility associated with the Historic Core and may provide some support for connections. <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
B. Tripartite Architecture and Design (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 19 to 32)		
<p>At what threshold would the new standards apply when renovating a structure?</p> <p>- (Murray, Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioners asked if implementation of the proposed new standards would be required in the case of a tenant improvement to a building or a minor exterior renovation. They asked staff to provide more information of what threshold of renovation would require the application of the proposed new standards.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff’s response is summarized below.</p> <p><u>7/15/15:</u> The Planning Commission was satisfied with the staff response. The following levels of impact or thresholds would apply based on the amount of</p>	<p>Opened 7/8</p> <p>Closed 7/15/15</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>modification proposed as a tenant improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tenant Improvement (to interior only) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No modification to exterior would be required 2. Change of Use (modification to interior only) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible requirement at entry such as for meeting accessibility and building code standards ▪ If an entry change required, would also trigger design standards though specific to the portion of the building being modified such as the entry and its framing 3. Tenant Improvement (with minor exterior modifications) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would trigger requirements of design standards and would look for consistency with standards based on the portion of the building or element(s) being modified such as entry, windows, trim, etc. 4. Tenant Improvement (with major exterior modifications) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would trigger requirements of design standards and would be consistent in scope/scale with the portion of the building being modified. For example, a change of an exterior wall would warrant use of the design standards in addressing the wall’s architecture and design. ▪ However, based on the amount of modification, this still may not trigger requirements over the entire building. 5. Extension to the building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An addition or extension to the building such as by adding a story or new portion to an existing building would require use of the design standards. However, the existing structure and its design would be taken into consideration. The goal would be to not move the structure further away from the overall character of the Historic Core as well as from the building itself. 6. Reconstruction of a building or new construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This type of change would require implementation of the design standards. 7. Modifications to a Historic Landmark <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These structures are addressed through the <i>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> (http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm). Building code comes into play 	

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p style="text-align: center;">such as for life safety including seismic retrofitting and fire suppression.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> How will amendments affect existing buildings? At what point such as during tenant improvements will the new design standards become requirement? (Johnson)</p>	
<p>C. Materials (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 6 to 10)</p>		
<p>1. At what threshold would the new standards apply when renovating a structure? -(Murray, Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> (See also, item B. above) Commissioners asked if implementation of the proposed new standards would be required in the case of a tenant improvement to a building or a minor exterior renovation. They asked staff to provide more information of what threshold of renovation would require the application of the proposed new standards. <u>7/15/15:</u> The Planning Commission was satisfied with the staff response. (See Item B. above)</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> See Item B above.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> See Item B. above.</p>	<p>Opened 7/8</p> <p>Closed 7/15/15</p>
<p>2. Do the new standards allow that the era of a building can be maintained when renovated? (Example of art deco style building not having to comply with standards for tripartite architecture) - (Murray, Miller, Captain)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> The existing structure and its architecture, design, and time period come into account when working with an applicant regarding proposed tenant improvements. Provided that improvements meet building code such as regarding life safety, improvements would be assessed in the context of the existing structure until such a time that the majority of the structure were proposed for alteration, a major addition, or reconstruction following demolition. Therefore, in the case of the art deco structure, the amount of proposed improvement would lead to the amount of consistency with the</p>	<p>Opened 7/15/15</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>structure itself and with the proposed design standards that would be implemented. Additional information is included in Item B above.</p> <p>The proposed amendments also speak to timeless architecture and design. For example, the proposed portion of code that addresses material includes “Reflect the time period when the individual structure was built and create a sense of timelessness through the use of high quality material” {page 7 of new code section M in Technical Committee exhibits, F.1.a.}.</p> <p>Staff referred to several architectural resources for defining timeless architecture and design - an aspect of buildings that can be challenging to pinpoint as a single element or design treatment. The design elements depicted in the proposed amendment also illustrate various architectural and design treatments that would be respectful of historic structures, particularly those found in the Historic Core. To be respectful through architecture and design would mean to demonstrate sensitivity to existing historic treatments while incorporating and innovating with modern forms and material.</p> <p>Timeless architecture and design demonstrates the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong likelihood of relevancy over many generations. 2. Utilitarian by responding to the intended function of the building such as commercial, office, or residential uses. 3. Strong relationship to natural elements such as solar, precipitation, and temperature. 4. Responsive to and incorporates the weathering process. 5. Demonstrates human-scale proportions in which the setting or environment (building, entry, ceiling height) relates closely and predominantly to human dimensions. To provide an example of contrast, Notre Dame’s exterior would not demonstrate human-scale though portions of its interior possess design and forms that are in keeping with human dimensions. 6. Graceful siting in location. For example, the western portion of Allez (NE 85th Street and 158th Avenue NE) steps down to the Sammamish River Trail and includes vegetated elements adjacent to the King County demonstration garden. <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
D. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Historic Core Pedestrian Connection (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)		
<p>What is the purpose of the proposed Pedestrian Connection and how will it function? -(Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> 4-Mobility</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner Miller asked if the proposed new east/west pedestrian connection will support pedestrian mobility and requested more information on how the connection is proposed to function, especially without proposed mid-block crossings on Leary Way and Gilman Street.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> The following describes the goals and other aspects of the three proposed nonmotorized pathways:</p> <p>Section 1 (Downtown Park to Leary Way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A nonmotorized pathway providing an alternate route to businesses along Leary Way • Economic vitality is one of the primary goals whereby businesses could activate their “back of house” and outdoor area for café seating • The opportunity would be available for existing businesses • And, the connection and outdoor opportunities would be incorporated in new development • The opportunity for Section 1 has been coordinated with Downtown Park design • Would include existing and potential business, such as for outdoor café seating: Homegrown, Molly Moon’s, El Toreador, Palmers • The following image shows the location of potential and existing outdoor café areas in addition to Downtown Park and O’Leary Park, both as opportunities for dining outside: 	<p>Opened 7/8/15</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	 <p>Section 2 (Leary to Gilman)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be created as an interior pathway • This section would also help support economic vitality for new commercial spaces • Section 2 could also be create to provide access between commercial businesses and interior parking <p>Section 3 (Gilman to 164)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be created as an interior or exterior, nonmotorized pathway • The route could be located to ensure preserving historic landmark visibility • Alternately, it could be incorporated like Section 2, connecting commercial and interior parking • This section could also be coordinated to align or connect with future outdoor café seating along Gilman Street 	

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>E. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Leary Way Width (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)</p>		
<p>What is the appropriate cross-section for Leary Way and how should we accommodate parking and pedestrian mobility?</p> <p>What is the relationship to mobility needs in the context of future light rail? What is the relationship to parking?</p> <p>- (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria: 4-Mobility, 5-Parking</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>A recent study with assistance from Nelson Nygaard consultants considered parking in several areas of the City, including Downtown. The final report for this Parking Strategies Project was completed on Oct. 27, 2014. Overall, the results show that there is not a parking supply problem in the Downtown. On Jan. 27, 2015, the Council held a study session to review and discuss the report’s recommendations, which included alternative approaches and associated strategies. The Council asked staff to come back in the fall of 2015 with responses to the issues raised at the study session. The date to do this has not yet been scheduled.</p> <p>Some of the issues raised by Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify-what are market based parking solutions. • How are market forces taking advantage of our regulations? • How are public parking facilities financed? <p>More specifically for Leary Way, there are 19 on-street parking spaces along the portion of the street that does not have turn lanes. This parking serves the function of both supporting access to businesses in the area as well as providing a separation between people on the sidewalk and vehicles in the street.</p> <p>Even if on-street parking were removed, this would not provide additional space along the</p>	<p>Opened 7/8/15</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>entire length of Leary Way since on-street parking is only a portion of the street.</p> <p>Regarding mobility needs in the context of future light rail, staff reviewed Sound Transit’s (ST) projections for ridership and pedestrian flow from the East Link Final Environmental Impact Statement. Based on review of ST’s analysis, the specifics of which are below, the Downtown light rail station is unlikely to create sidewalk capacity problems on Leary Way if the proposed 12 foot sidewalk standard is implemented, even at double Sound Transit’s projected ridership.</p> <p>ST’s analysis indicates that during the peak hour of the day in the peak direction (boarding/toward the station), there will be approximately two pedestrians entering the station per minute, from both the Leary and 161st entries $[190 * 0.6 / 60]$. Pedestrians walking to high frequency transit routes tend to trickle in and catch the next available train, so in this direction a per-minute average is appropriate.</p> <p>In the non-peak direction (alightings), pedestrians will exit the station in pulses numbering about 13. Assuming 50% of passengers exit at Leary, and that 75% of those would travel north on Leary without turning or crossing the street, then a Leary sidewalk in the Historic Core might experience up to 5 people at a time walking north in the peak hour due to the presence of the light rail station. This group of pedestrians might elongate in its travel pattern, across multiple blocks as people moved through the corridor, due to individual differences in walking speed.</p> <p>Staff plans to provide additional information that the Commission requested, such as existing and proposed cross sections, at the July 22nd study session.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>F. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Gilman Street (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)</p>		
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p>	<p>7/15/15</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p>Should Gilman be closed to auto traffic? Seems that current use is more in line with parking versus for through trips. Should the street create a place for people? (Buhlman)</p> <p>Can Gilman be signed to mitigate cut-through traffic or can its speed be reduced? Concern about speed and frequency of cut-through trips with the streets function in supporting parking for adjacent businesses. (Bieri)</p>	
<p>G. Pedestrian Experience and Streetscape Elements (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 21 to 27)</p>		
<p>1. How can the sidewalk be improved? - Public comment</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> Can and how can the sidewalk along Leary Way be improved? Pavers have been damaged and tree grates seem to need maintenance and/or updating. (Sherpa)</p>	
<p>2. Are waste receptacles needed along Leary Way? - Murray</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff will provide information regarding this question.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	<p>7/15/15</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>3. To what extent should transparency requirements apply to the interior of buildings (just inside the windows)? - Miller</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff will provide information regarding this question.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	7/15/15
<p>4. What is the appropriate depth for awnings? - Murray</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff will provide information regarding this question.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	7/15/15
<p>5. To what extent do the proposed design standards related to streetscape support ADA requirements? Should there be visual markers? - Miller, Murray</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff will provide information regarding this question.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	7/15/15
<p>H. Building Corners and Entries (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 13 to 18)</p>		
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>I. Building Windows</p>		

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
(Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 10 to 13)		
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
J. Signs (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, Attachment 6)		
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
K. Building Height (tbd)		
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> Can building heights be modified? Concern that allowed height creates an incentive for redevelopment. Tenants can be phased out as redevelopment occurs. (Bieri)</p>	7/15/15
L. Building Mass		

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 17, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
(tbd)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
M. Building Stepbacks (tbd)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
Additional Topics		

Questions

1. Question? (Commissioner{s})

Answer/reply/information