



City of Burien  
400 SW 152nd Street  
Suite 300  
Burien, WA 98166-1911

P 206.241.4647  
F 206.248.5539

[burienwa.gov](http://burienwa.gov)

# Burien 2044 Advisory Committee 3: Meeting Notes

May 10, 2023, 5:30-7:30 pm

---

## Welcome and Introductions

The meeting took place at Burien City Council chambers. A Zoom meeting link was provided and some persons participated online.

## Staff and Consultants

- Susan McLain, City of Burien, Community Development Director
- Michele Barrera, City of Burien, Administrative Assistant
- Lisa Grueter, Principal, BERK
- Hayden Campbell, Associate, BERK
- Ian Crozier, Associate, Makers
- Rachel Miller, Senior Associate, Makers

## Advisory Committee Attendance

- Davis, Ryan, Planning Commission
- Davis, Kim, Business and Economic Development Partnership
- Devito, Rocco, Planning Commission
- Gobeille, Rebecca, Planning Commission
- Gould, Dave, Planning Commission
- Han, August, Planning Commission
- Hauser, Joe, Planning Commission
- Martin, Daniel, Human Services Commission
- Negeri, Alemtsehay, Community Connector
- Myers, Leit, Parks and Recreation Advisory Board
- Mouser-Guerra, Holly, Airport Committee
- Pace, Lena, Planning Commission
- Schafer, Charles, Planning Commission

### *Not in Attendance*

- Brittingham, Shelley, Arts Commission
- Estevez, Sofia, Community Connector
- Garcia, Hugo, City Council
- Kassa, Mesti, Community Connector
- Khuc, Nha, Community Connector
- Llanes, Diana, Community Connector

## Spring Engagement Sharing

Hayden Campbell, BERK, shared the results of Youth Engagement on April 13, 2023 and the Shape Your City Open House on April 18, 2023.

## Evolution of Alternatives

The consultant team presented the evolution of conceptual alternatives with neighborhood centers and Greater Downtown. Advisory Committee comments included:

- Like focus on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue S, good infrastructure, appropriate for greater density. SW 128<sup>th</sup> Street arterial with infrastructure, a lot of low density, why not look at greater density between 1<sup>st</sup> and Ambaum?
  - Comments from Ambaum Boulevard Park Community Plan – ability to access transit and live “off of” major streets.
  - Burien needs more east-west connections: 128<sup>th</sup> or 136<sup>th</sup>.
  - Side roads on 128th Street. Hard to see to make turns.
- Is there a concern about displacement?
  - City has a lot of single family land, and ways to add homes on the lot while keeping single family.
- There are areas with environmental features between Ambaum and Boulevard Park.
- Centers need a “root” to grow. Disperse neighborhood centers.
- Don’t remove Shorewood “neighborhood center” concept. Could serve border area. Center on edge. Discussion about fairness.
- Do not want a center at Shorewood. Already have a center at Salmon Creek. Other areas don’t have centers that close together.
  - The neighborhood has a park and school.
  - It lacks sidewalks currently.
  - Over 20 years the conditions could change.
- Need infrastructure prior to growth.
- Have growth in higher income neighborhoods too and offset displacement elsewhere.
- 116<sup>th</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> – why not address a node there?

## Middle Housing and Urban Center Code concepts

- The consultant team shared slides on middle housing concepts and had questions.

- Break out group results on Middle Housing Criteria and Urban Center Boundaries/Heights are shared below.

## Middle Housing Small Group 1

Discussion about what's already allowed and what types should be allowed. E.g., prefab and RVs are currently allowed, but containers are not. Desire for containers to be allowed.

### Desire for flexibility and variety everywhere

Interested in a **density approach—so lot size drives it.**

Interested in **8-plexes. All types, don't specify, let market decide.** (Another person mentioned interest in 6-plexes everywhere.)

Allow **all throughout city.**

**Variety, Different homes work for different people.**

Open up everywhere. **If appropriate for the lot, can build it.**

Consider **allowing more around transit** (including non-RapidRide H line), even if not required by state bill.

Likes housing everywhere, **likes all options.**

### Diverging views on design requirements

Good and bad examples in Ballard:

- Nicely laid out garden apts—2 story condos.
- Zero-lot-line 4 townhouses next to homes, no architectural aesthetics.

**Design** should drive, setbacks, landscaping, make attractive

But don't make so **onerous**, allow whatever fits

**Diverging views about what's allowed vs what's required.**

Biggest concern—**height and blocking sunlight.**

20' front yard setback? Rowhouses much closer to sidewalk, stoops encourage neighborly conversations. **Sociable design.**

Likes modular units stacked together, innovation.

Interplay of 3-story duplexes on back with existing small house in front is not desired (by one person).

### Open space

Kids play spaces are desired.

Some people want private outdoor space for children's play. Others don't want to maintain large lawns and concern about environmental impacts of monoculture, etc. **Allow for variety of tastes and lifestyles.**

**Roof top space can be allowed for usable open space.** Market should produce types with outdoor space. There's a market for all types—some people don't want outdoor space.

Usable open space/impervious surface limit—Tree code is likely sufficient. Do keep permeable surfaces for stormwater.

## Other considerations

Staggered approach over time? Allow some things now, and as housing needs continue to grow and services are more available, allow more.

Grab off the shelf ADUs, **pre-permitted ADUs**.

Alleys are great for middle housing

## Middle Housing Small Group 2

- How does a change to allowed lot size affect value of existing homes?
- Could do either way re: mapped vs criteria. But is it appropriate to allow smaller lots in Boulevard Park?
  - Generally supports criteria-based approach
- Accessory dwelling units and missing middle:
  - It would be good to allow more use of large residential lots
  - Support criteria-based approach – and better use of alleys. Like the duplex-court layout best.
- May be a mix of things but as much as possible prefer the criteria-based approach
- Where are there alleys? Consider just applying a specific zone to alley areas.
- Big supporter of ADUs, and helped push for them in the past. They're very desirable in the real estate market.
  - Note: ADUs are expensive to build. They're not going to be affordable.
  - Seattle has a database of pre-approved ADU designs to help ease permitting – consider something similar.
  - People like detached units. They like to have their own space they don't share with anybody.
- There are places where there are overgrown impassable alleys – using the construction of infill housing as an opportunity to clean those up and making them usable would be really great
- Prefer a criteria-based approach. Simple is good, flexible is good. Flat parcels without critical areas should be prioritized for development.
  - There should be considerations for impervious vs pervious areas – and consider taking into account pervious pavement, so that it's incentivized.
  - Primary access should be allowed on alleys

- How would you explain the pros/cons of infill development to neighbors?
  - Think ahead 20-30 years, should this place be exactly the same?
  - Property owners control their own property – no one will force them to sell
  - Small individual choices make gradual change over time
  - Also, we're required to do comprehensive planning, and having so much single family residential doesn't allow us to comply with the Growth Management Act
  - People worry about change, but there is also interest
  - It's really hard to help people understand, but we can try to do something – the framing can be difficult
  - There are programs to support more options + condos
  - Would like to see more education about the costs of new construction. If we build all this new housing it's not going to bring down the costs of housing because it's expensive.
- Important design standards items:
  - Transitions to single-family areas
  - Port package- funding for better windows, sound proofing
  - Tree code compliance
  - Height, sociable design, front yards, but maintain flexibility for usable open space.

## Summary and Next Steps

The consultant team intend to bring back the revised alternative concepts. A focus for the next meeting are the results of the climate vulnerability assessment and policy review.

## Video and Attachments

The video and materials presented at the meeting are available online in the Agenda:

<https://connect.burienwa.gov/burien-2044-advisory-committee-to-guide-comprehensive-plan-update/>.