From: William Shadbolt
To: Robin Proebsting
Subject: Comments on MICA parking
Date: Friday, March 24, 2017 12:51:32 PM

Dear Robin,

Please find below my comments that I just posted on Nextdoor re the proposed parking at MICA.

In addition to this I strongly object to:

1. Complete loss of Bicentennial Park.

2. Loss of any future traffic mitigation by the City by vacating SE 32nd West of 77th.

3. What was originally put forward as using an underused recycling center is now significantly larger than the old center, new paved fire road 20' wide, installs a underground stormwater retention vault etc etc etc.

If MICA was purchasing town center property and complying to City Code similar to the new Vashon Center for the Arts, I would support it. However the using park land and having no on-site parking is just unacceptable.

Regards

William Shadbolt

Post on Nextdoor:

Reading the latest submission to the City from MICA, they are proposing changing the City code to create an exemption for MICA from having any on-site parking.

Please note that every other public building (or commercial for than matter) is required to have parking. Government buildings one space per 200 sq ft of gross floor area and schools two places per classroom (elementary and middle) or one place per 10 students (high schools).

My issues with this are:

1. MICA is not a public building, it would be a non-profit owned building on public land, however given the length of the lease, the land is effectively owned MICA (it's what is known as a conveyance).

2. City Code already has a permitted use in the Commercial zoning of:
B. Uses Permitted.
1. Government services, utilities, and museums and art exhibitions.
9. Theaters.

This is the crux of the matter, if MICA wanted to purchase land in the Town Center and

complied to City Code there wouldn't be an issue. This is similar to want happened on Vashon, the new Vashon Center for the Arts was built on land owned by them and conforms (actually exceeds) code for parking, building, landscaping etc.

3. The proposed text is poorly worded. Section C refers to 'property owner or owners' but it's not clear if this is MICA or property owners giving MICA the right to park on their land.

4. I've not seen anything that even suggests one commercial property owner is willing to let MICA use their land. Property owners typically don't just given up a right without compensation.

5. It refers to it being an 'unrecordedwritten[sic] agreement' and not an easement. If the poorly worded section refers to the other commercial property owners, then it's unlikely they would enter into an agreement that would require them to find replacement parking.

6. No other building, including City owned, is allowed to use on-street parking to meet parking requirements. The City Code was written to take that into account.

7. In the Parking Management Plan it states "It is assumed that no owner will want to commit his/her parking permanently, or even for an extended period of time. MICA expects any
agreement to be able to be cancelled with perhaps as little as 30 days' notice." So even MICA recognizes that in a month's time, they may zero off-street parking spaces available.

8. MICA states the peak parking demand would be 192 spaces. City Code requires for theaters would require either 453 spaces (34,000 sq ft divided by 75 for facilities without fixed seats) or significantly more than 238 spaces (500 seats divided by 4 plus 1 for each 100ft for the non-theater space, I can't find the sq ft for the non-theater space so estimating a third of the building is not theater).

Proposed text:

3. Mercerdale Park Public Facilities shall provide parking as follows:
a. A parking demand study shall be prepared by a professional traffic engineer and approved by the City Engineer determining the parking requirements for the proposed public facility.
b. The amount of parking required by the approved parking demand study may be met by entirely off-site with a combination of onstreet parking and shared off-street parking pursuant to a traffic management plan approved by the City Engineer determining that parking demand for all land uses shall not significantly overlap and that uses will be served by adequate parking if on-street parking
and shared parking reductions are authorized.
c. Prior to establishing shared parking, the property owner or owners shall enter into an unrecordedwritten agreement approved by the code official that can only be terminated upon not less than ninety (90) day notice to the code official, provided that one of the affected property owners has agreed to either enter into a replacement parking contract or make alternative parking arrangements,

such as shuttle service, in either case satisfactory to the code official prior to the end of the notice period.

4. Mercerdale Park Public Facilities shall be exempt from the requirements of MICC 19.05.020.B.4.