

AGENDA

Finance and Economic Development Committee Meeting

Thursday, March 13, 2014

5:30 p.m. – 6:50 p.m.

South Conference Room

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the February 20, 2014 meeting minutes
3. Pacific Highway South Subarea Planning: Policy Direction – 30 Minutes
4. Comprehensive Plan Update – 30 Minutes
5. Development Updates – 10 minutes
6. Committee member comments – 10 minutes

MINUTES – FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

February 20, 2014

South Conference Room

21630 11th Avenue South, Des Moines, WA

Council Members

Chair Matt Pina

Jeremy Nutting

Jeanette Burrage

City Staff

Tony Piasecki – City Manager

Lorri Ericson – Assistant City Manager

Dan Brewer – PBPW Director

Denise Lathrop – Community Development Mgr

Marion Yoshino – Economic Development Mgr

Grant Fredricks – Consultant

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:36 p.m. by Chair Matt Pina

2. Approval of the January 28, 2014 Meeting Minutes

There was unanimous approval of the minutes for 1/28/2014.

3. Economic Development Update

City Manager Tony Piasecki reviewed the requests for the Des Moines Creek Business Park area that will be presented at the public hearing on the agenda for tonight's council meeting.

ED Manager Marion Yoshino discussed the progress of the purchase of Landmark on the Sound. The sales agreement was signed last Friday and the 6 month due diligence clock has started.

Highline Place project is also moving forward and Economic Development Manager Yoshino described how the financing is coming together. She also stated the City, the developers and Highline Community College had a very positive meeting to discuss the project.

ED Manager Yoshino received an e-mail today from the architect for the Barcelona project (a mixed use project on the west side of Pacific Highway) stating they are ready to move forward on the project and will be talking with the City about it later this week.

Artemis is in the process of placing footings. They have not yet determined which solution to employ for the issue with the sewer; however, they are close to a decision.

4. Business Attraction Plan

City Manager Piasecki and ED Manager Yoshino reviewed the Business Attraction Program including potential development sites and business and development targets with committee members. The committee wanted to add both the theater and Des Moines Elementary to potential development sites. Discussion ensued about available land for proposed/desired projects. Committee members will review and e-mail staff if they have suggestions.

5. Envision Midway Briefing

Community Development Manager Denise Lathrop provided an overview of the Envision Midway Project, a grant funded joint planning project with the City of Kent for the Midway area. She highlighted the zoning for the portion of Midway that is in the City of Kent and described how it compares to the zoning in the City of Des Moines both in the Midway area and in the Pacific Ridge area. Community Development Manager Lathrop will provide detailed zoning information for the committee members. Consultant Grant Fredricks reminded the committee that there are significant differences between permitted uses in Kent and permitted uses in Des Moines. Community

Development Manager Lathrop will also provide the permitted uses information for the committee members.

5. Committee Member Comments

There was not time for Committee Member comments.

The next regular meeting is currently scheduled for March 13, 2014, from 5:30-6:50 p.m. in the South Conference room.

Adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Lorri Ericson, Assistant City Manager

DRAFT

Highway-Commercial (H-C) Zoning Code Policy Questions

Threshold Policy Questions to Draft a Proposed Ordinance for Finance & Economic Development Committee Review for April F&ED Committee Meeting

Permitted Uses. Goals: (1) Rationalize permitted uses with adjoining zones. (2) Facilitate new development.

1. As a matter of policy principle, should the H-C permitted uses mirror to the extent possible the Kent Midway Transit Community 1 (MTC-1) zoning across PHS?

MTC-1 Midway Transit Community-1 District: The purpose and intent of the MTC-1 district is to provide an area that will encourage the location of moderately dense and varied retail, office, or residential activities commonly developed in concert with mass transit options and resources like link light rail and rapid ride metro bus service, to enhance a pedestrian-oriented character while acknowledging the existing highway corridor character, and to implement the goals and policies of the Midway Subarea Plan.

- a. Exclusive outright permitted multi-family, transitional, assisted living allowed in MTC-1, but only mixed use with UUP is allowable in H-C.
 - b. No manufacturing in MTC-1 (except incidental storage and accessory uses), but very limited in H-C.
 - c. Conditional parking lots and structures, transit facilities, utilities, unconditional retail uses in MTC-1; generally not allowed in H-C.
2. Is there a policy reason to have a difference in permitted uses between H-C (between KDM and 242nd) and PR-C (north of KDM)?
 - a. 55 uses permitted in PR-C are not permitted in H-C under any conditions
 - b. 22 uses permitted in H-C are not permitted in PR-C under any conditions
 3. As a policy principle, should the more permissive use/regulation be allowed in the more restrictive zone?

Development Standards. Goal: (1) Rationalize development regulations with adjoining zones. (2) Facilitate new development.

4. Maximum Building Heights. Should allowable building heights be increased from 35 feet? To 55 feet as permitted on the west side of PHS in PR-C and west side of PHS in MTC-1 in Kent? To 75 feet as permitted within the adjoining IC zoning for Highline Community College? To 85 feet outright as permitted on the east side of PHS? To 100 feet as requested by the proposed Highline Place development? To 200 feet with floor area clustering as permitted on the east side of 30th Avenue South in Kent?
 - a. Should allowable building heights vary within the zone? For example, should taller buildings be allowed adjacent to the IC zone?
5. Minimum Front Setback from PHS. Should current 60 foot minimum setback be changed to 20 feet in MTC-1 or eliminated completely (as in PR-C)?

6. Minimum rear and side setbacks from residential property. Should current 10 foot minimum rear and side setbacks from residential property be increased? Decreased? Or addressed through building modulation (refer to next question)?
7. Setback from Residential Property to West. Should maximum building height be stepped back from abutting residential property as is required in PR-C (35 feet within 20 feet; 45 feet within 40 feet)?
8. Parking. Should alternative modes of transportation be required or encouraged within this zone? Are the provisions in the code for the approval of alternative parking studies adequate for alternative parking proposals in the TOD zone?
9. Design Guidelines. Should the design guidelines that mirror Pacific Ridge or Kent's MTC guidelines apply to this area?

Other.

10. Should Multi-family Tax Exemption (MFTE) be extended to include the H-C zone?
11. Is there concern about updating the name of the zone to more accurately reflect the vision for this area?

Schedule

- March 26th: Open House at Highline Community College (building 2)
- April 10th: F&ED Committee Meeting – review and provide direction on Draft Ordinance related to the H-C rezone
- April: Send Draft Ordinance to the Department of Commerce Review and begin SEPA work
- May – Continue SEPA process
- June – Public Hearing

2015 Comprehensive Plan Update
Council Finance and Economic Development Committee Meeting
March 13, 2014

Purpose of the Comprehensive Plan

The *Des Moines Comprehensive Plan* is a blueprint that expresses our community's goals and aspirations for how we want to grow and prosper into the future. It is the City's official policy guide that defines—through goals, policies and implementation strategies—how Des Moines should best accommodate forecasted household and job growth, manage traffic, and provide open space and recreational opportunities and other vital services. The plan is "comprehensive" in both scope and coverage. It addresses the use of land and buildings, the movement of traffic and pedestrians, the provision of parks, schools, and public facilities, and protection of the environment. It also addresses residential neighborhoods, commercial areas, public and institutional lands, and public rights-of-way. The plan also provides a guide for public investments and capital improvements, and can help to ensure that local public dollars are spent wisely.

Finally, the comprehensive plan can serve as a marketing tool to promote Des Moines's unique assets, and help to attract new families, businesses, investment and development to the community.

Community Outreach

Public involvement is vital to the update effort and also a requirement of the Growth Management Act. An open house planned for Wednesday, April 23, 2014 from 5 to 7 PM at Des Moines Activity Center. We will also be providing information on the City website and are considering other opportunities to obtain input throughout the update process such as an online survey and/or comment forum.

Staff Recommended Updates and Additions

- Formatting: update text and layout, add color and pictures, remove numbered paragraph format, and make text more concise and reader friendly (e.g., Healthy Des Moines Element).
- Background Sections: update to clarify purpose, streamline text, remove numbered paragraph format
- Goals/Policies: remove duplicative language, combine like policies, improve layout, make goal/policy numbering consistent between plan elements (see proposed outline)
- Strategies: rename "Implementation Strategies," remove duplicative language, streamline
- Overall: create a positive tone, update or remove negative language
- Consider replacing the General Planning Element with a Vision Statement for the City and general introduction to the Comprehensive Plan
- Consider adding an Economic Development Element or Economic policies to the Land Use Element

Policy Questions:

- Does the Committee concur with the direction?
- Is there anything else the Committee would like Staff to consider?

Proposed Outline

Chapter No: Element

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal 1

Goal 2

Goal 3

Policies

1.1

1.2

1.3

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1.1.1

1.1.2

1.1.3

IHB Architects

DRAFT Zoning Review Comments to HC Zone and Pac Hwy S.

3/3/14

RECOMMENDATIONS to ORDINANCE 1591

1. PG. 96 - CHART

First, it seems that the Highway Commercial name may require updating, since the purpose of the zone is likely different than originally conceived. It may be more similar to the new PR-C, as far as purpose/intent. Consider a new designation such as TO-C (Transit Oriented Commercial) or S-C (South Commercial).

2. PG. 97- 100- CHART

a. The following uses should be considered as 'Permitted uses (P)' in order to further encourage development in this zone:

- i. Banks
- ii. Barber
- iii. Business Offices
- iv. Financial and Insurance Services
- v. Mixed Use
- vi. Professional Offices, medical, dental
- vii. Public Admin facilities
- viii. Services, misc (allowing most service oriented businesses)
- ix. Retirement housing, maybe CUP or P/L....since properties are on a bus-line and future transit line,makes sense to encourage this use here

b. Day care - CUP like all other zones (since dense mixed-use may provide the need for adjacent or on-site day care)

c. Add College Housing / Dormitories

d. Where is Multi-Family Housing on the chart?

e. Consider adding Structured Parking as a P/L , requiring it to be part of a primary use, such as mixed-use, office, retail, multi-family or college housing. The intent is to NOT allow private parking structures that stand alone. However, consider allowing stand-alone parking structures as part of public transportation (ie,new transit station) for park-n-ride options.

3. CH. 18.125 - HC ZONING LANGUAGE - STARTING PG 210

In general, I suggest modeling this section very similar to PR-C, since it will have the same high density qualities, yet integrated with TOD development criteria as well.

- Purpose: model after PR-C purpose with TOD language included
- Permissible floor area: use the new PR-C FAR chart
- Height: Use the PR-C min and max height language, except start at 100' for this zone
- Setbacks: sim to PR-C:
 - Front: none
 - Side: none with exceptions for adjacent to single-family
 - Rear, 15' with exceptions for adjacent to single-family

- Include all the following sections, similar to PR-C:
 - Ht limitations adjacent to single-family
 - Floor area clustering bonus
 - Ht allowance for enhanced design of rooflines
 - Adjustment of required yards.....20' separation requested
 - Open space requirements: wherever this occurs for College Housing, I suggest making it slightly lower for both common open space and private open space, since college students are less likely to have families and play area needs for kids. On-site indoor and outdoor amenities for college housing should be highly encouraged.
- Compare zoning regulations with Kent zoning adjacent and across Pac Hwy
- If not already in your DMMC, consider a section in the H-C zone addressing and encouraging Transit Oriented Development in the South Des Moines Neighborhood. (ie, high-density mixed-use, office, retail, housing, services, walkable, near public transportation, safe, vibrant)

4. PARKING

- a. pg 341, 15,(c), iii, address H-C zone to comply sim. to PR zone.
- b. same at (g) (ii) mixed-use, address H-C zone
- c. under residences, add College Housing / Dormitories
 - i. address parking for college housing, I recommend ratio to be much lower than market rate multi-family, allowing the development to pencil out for developers (college students living adjacent to campus, foreign students no license, access to transit, TOD development, limited vehicle access, walk to campus, all reasons for reduced parking at college housing near HCC)
 - ii. consider reduced provisions for college housing within ½ mi. of a public transit station
 - iii. consider reduced provisions for college housing developments that provide a joint-use parking agreement within ¼ mi. of development
- d. pg 343, compact cars, I thought this percentage was changed to 30% in the PR zone?
- e. pg. 346, item (ii) consider allowing high-density college housing to have some off-site parking.

Thank you for this opportunity! Please contact me with any questions or clarifications.

Sincerely,

Imad H. Bahbah, Principal Architect
 IHB Architects
 253.468.7696
 imad@ihbarchitects.com