

Table 2.2 for FEIS Analysis Purposes, Consider the Following Land Use and Zoning Assumptions—COW GUIDED PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE—WORKING DRAFT FOR MAY 14, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION

	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	Key Questions and Discussion Points
<b>For FEIS Analysis Purposes, Consider the Following Potential Code Amendments and New Design Standards/Guidelines</b>		
Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally agreeable to studying similar framework of uses as current code allows (with mixed use allowed everywhere) <i>but</i> would like to analyze a zoning district approach that would emphasize certain uses in certain areas (residential to the north; commercial to the south; civic to the east).</li> <li>Potential to limit the amount of mixed use/retail in the north; the amount of housing in the south; etc. with analysis of this in the FEIS.</li> <li>COW is in agreement with a mix of uses and that residential should not dominate the site.</li> <li>Subarea Plan and Code provisions should indicate flexibility and willingness to relocate the civic core/city hall/community gathering space as part of site master planning and phases redevelopment plans over the long-term future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the City want to emphasize certain land uses on certain portions of the site for analysis in the FEIS?</li> <li>Should mixed use be allowed everywhere as it is under the current Code?</li> <li>Should incentives be attached to providing mixed use and density/height bonus provisions as under current Code, or just to density/height?</li> <li>If a “district” approach is applied it might be best to emphasize certain types of uses in certain areas, but not restrict to 100% of the use in that area.</li> <li>Confirmed that EIS analysis assumes an increased level of restaurant uses and related parking demand.</li> <li>Be sure to include provisions in Code to allow (and maybe even encourage) rooftop restaurants and uses (such as public space/civic space), so it is clear that residential is not required for all above floors.</li> <li>Encourage the use of podium setback areas for public space, restaurant terraces, etc. as well.</li> <li>Consider that future redevelopment will be phased over time, and that some phases may emphasize a specific type of use (residential, commercial, etc.); allow flexibility for phasing.</li> <li>As part of design standards in Code, consider loading areas for deliveries, etc. as part of ground floor design of commercial/mixed use buildings – where are these best located and how access should be designed to serve these areas without negating a “pedestrian first” design approach.</li> </ul>
Height Limits—Residential/Office /Mixed-use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For multi-story residential, office, and mixed use buildings studied in the FEIS, evaluate a base height of four levels (3/1) and a maximum height of five levels (4/1) with the provision of amenities (potential for bonus height/density as incentive with additional open space, site amenities, etc.</li> <li>Would like Planning Commission to consider the potential for trade offs or Code provisions that allow additional building height with provision of more open space around buildings (for more access to light, air, etc. and to enhance Town Center character).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to develop clear standards for desired amenities as part of incentives.</li> <li>Could place priority on certain amenities, types of open spaces, etc.</li> <li>These height parameters are similar to those allowed under the 2005 framework design guidelines, and now updated Code modifications would more clearly indicate what is allowed as a base height and what amenities and features must be provided to build an additional bonus height level and/or bonus density.</li> </ul>

<b>Height Limits—Commercial Only</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For one story commercial/retail only uses, suggest considering 20-foot height limit. For two story, could look at current Town Center heights as the max. – or 35 feet? Discuss with Planning Commission and look at regional examples.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If commercial only buildings are developed, what height flexibility is needed to support a variety of different types of uses (grocery, brewery/brew pubs, restaurants, etc.)?</li> </ul>
<b>Height Limits—Parking Structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For a stand-alone parking structure the height limit for study in the FEIS should be 5 levels; consider setting a base height of 4 levels and allowing fifth level with incentives, such as public rooftop space/viewing area on the top level/upper level or other type of community/civic space. Considering that upper level is a parapet level, five levels may not be as tall as other five level buildings; however consider convertible floor to floor heights as well (see below).</li> <li>Consider that at grade level may need to be higher if garage is to be used for farmers market and/or to match wrapping or integration of commercial/active use space around the parking structure. Consider what height limit is appropriate – should be lower than 20-foot level analyzed for commercial/retail use buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to carry forward importance of a design with level floors (rather than slanting/ramping of floor levels).</li> <li>Continue to carry forward importance of floor to floor heights that can be converted to other uses in the future (such as office or residential) if the initial quantity of parking built is not needed in the future. This may be a floor to floor height of 11.5 or 12 feet...to be studied.</li> <li>Continue to carry forward importance of wrapping the parking structure with space for active uses at grade.</li> </ul>
<b>Density—Residential</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyze a maximum of 700 residential units in the FEIS, along with the assumption that addition of housing may be phased over time in lower increments. A first phase project could potentially be 300 or 350 units or less.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With implementation of the 2005 Town Center Framework Guidelines, density shall be determined by form and other provisions related to setbacks, heights, and there is no maximum density, so this would be introducing a maximum density of housing into the Code provisions.</li> </ul>
<b>Density—Commercial</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning Commission needs to review and consider an appropriate maximum GSF for commercial single use (not applicable to residential or office space). COW is inquiring if 50,000 GSF is too much? Do we need to go to an assumption of double level commercial space that would be greater than 50,000 GSF? What types of uses would these be and would they fit the scale and character of Town Center? (previous discussions had considered 50,000 GSF on one level max., and up to 75,000 GSF on two levels with a conditional use permit. Any commercial space (single use) greater than 50,000 would require conditional use permit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current code: no single store front should exceed 60,000 GSF; individual uses of less than 60,000 GSF allowed outright; non-residential uses between 60,000 and 100,000 GSF allowed through conditional use permit; no non-residential use (single tenant) over 100,000 GSF</li> <li>These needs further study and review of regional comparables, as well as consideration of the specific types of uses that might occur at TC in the future. There are no single use commercial spaces today over 50,000 (and in fact most are much less space in size).</li> <li>There may be a need to limit the overall GSF of commercial/retail/office use at the site to no more than the upper level studied in the FEIS or than currently exists. Discuss with Planning Commission.</li> </ul>
<b>Setbacks and Edge Conditions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See suggested setback approach for study/analysis in FEIS, which changes perimeter dimensions in some locations and removes interior setbacks, retaining the overall same SF in setback areas.</li> <li>Increases setback areas along Lyon Creek (west and south site areas).</li> <li>Consider the potential to include a “willing neighbor” or property owner agreement provision in Code to change existing setback requirements.</li> <li>Retain 20-foot setback along Ballinger Way and elsewhere at Town Center.</li> <li>No buildings or roadways in setback areas; consider if sidewalks/paths could be allowed; consider requirement to preserve existing trees in these areas.</li> <li>Verify ROW line along Ballinger Way to better understand design implications; should stoops/stairways be allowed to extend to sidewalk in ROW within the setback zone? Perhaps with design review? Find examples of stoops/stairways for townhouses or live/work units that might work for along Ballinger Way; some questioned if the street is too busy for front door connections to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20 foot building setbacks are currently required by Code (see attached exhibit) along ALL property lines – rear, front, side yards.</li> </ul>

	<p>the sidewalk? Others feel this would be a friendly use across from other residences along the street. Perhaps stoops/stairways with open spaces and trees in between could work. FIND GOOD EXAMPLES TO SHARE.</p>	
<b>Open Space</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COW is fine with following Planning Commission's recommendations for open space; would like centrally located contiguous open space areas, not just in north, but also south and south of City Hall as another potential space. Tend to agree with not counting private balconies and patios in private open space. Tend to agree with prioritizing certain areas of open space. COW suggests that setback areas along Town Center perimeter and Lyon Creek also should not be counted as part of required open space.</li> <li>• PC and consultant/staff team will be studying appropriate metric/size for open space requirement, as well as locational provisions. Perhaps could study one contiguous open space area in each "district" no less than .5 acres in size....to be analyzed in the FEIS along with other open space requirements per Planning Commission's recommendations.</li> <li>• Be sure to address preservation of the function of Third Place Commons as part of open space requirements and amenities to incentives additional height/density.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under study by the Planning Commission</li> <li>• Current Code: existing footprint of buildings, structures, and pavement could be retained in redevelopment (underlying Critical Areas ordinance provision). Open space requirements are less stringent in the existing Code than currently under study in the FEIS.</li> </ul>
<b>Building Step Backs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussed the benefits of a step back requirement at the top of the first level (podium level); have discussed the importance of how buildings look and feel at grade (from the pedestrian scale/perspective); podium level should not be too high/tall.</li> <li>• May not need additional building step backs if property line setbacks are increased and with the building heights now proposed for study by the COW. Step backs seem to make more sense for taller buildings than proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current code: building step backs may be considered for buildings adjacent to public realm and certain locations on the site (such as 12- to 16-foot step backs of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor similar to 2005 Framework Design Guidelines), but also may consider potential for flexibility through development agreement and design review process</li> </ul>
<b>Housing Choice and Affordability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were differing perspectives on this, but it seemed that most COW members tended to support the idea of having an affordable housing requirement considered for the Code and incentivizing this through MFTE. This is something that can be mentioned in the FEIS that is part of the preferred alternative analysis, and then further reviewed and developed as part of the subarea plan and code amendments. The most common metric throughout the region is 20 percent of the units must be affordable to 80 percent AMI. For King County, the projected AMI is about \$90K per year; 80 percent AMI would be about \$72,000 and considered a living wage to support workers in the community who may be teachers, entry level firefighters, police, shopkeepers, etc.</li> <li>• Note that the King County/Regional Affordable Housing Task Force (see link below to study), projecting the need for 244,000 additional affordable homes by 2040 in King County, and the task force has set a goal of preserving or building 44,000 units of affordable housing to serve people earning less than 50 percent AMI over the next five years.  <a href="https://www.kingcounty.gov/~/media/initiatives/affordablehousing/documents/report/RAH_Report_Final.ashx?la=en">https://www.kingcounty.gov/~/media/initiatives/affordablehousing/documents/report/RAH_Report_Final.ashx?la=en</a> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider if provision of affordable housing should be mandatory or voluntary and if the multi-family tax exemption should be applied as an incentive.</li> </ul>
<b>Incentives for Redevelopment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COW Feedback: YES ABSOLUTELY; need to clarify standards and priorities in relation to allowing an additional level of height/density.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider specific incentives options that if applied could allow additional height and density.</li> <li>• Consider priorities for incentives options (open space types, size, uses, amenities, etc.)</li> <li>• Note to remember: if we just have one maximum height level, we lose the ability to award an additional height level as an incentive.</li> </ul>
<b>Site Interior Design, and Pedestrian Connectivity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of pedestrian seating, furnishings, lighting, visual connectivity and "eyes on" pedestrian- and transit-oriented design, public amenities such as water features, public art, and other elements would all be integrated into new Town Center Design Standards and Guidelines as part of LFPMC amendments.</li> <li>• The provision of pedestrian connectivity at regular intervals north-south and east-west within the site and around the perimeter of Town Center will be addressed in LFPMC amendments and design standards and guidelines. PLANNING COMMISSION – discuss</li> </ul>	

	appropriate interval metric and that connectivity need not be an exact grid – discuss appropriate language for Code/design standards.	
<b>Sustainability/Green Building</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability features as required by Code and Design Standards and Guidelines. Compliance with IBC. Additional provisions could be built into incentives options.</li> </ul>	
<b>Trees and Landscaping</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trees are extremely important and would like to consider a requirement for tree canopy coverage similar to that required for other commercial areas (Southern Gateway is 15% at 30-year maturity). Otak to study and determine potential percentage for Town Center with setback, open space requirements, parking lot and street trees and landscaping requirements, etc.</li> <li>Follow the City's Tree Canopy Preservation and Enhancement LPMC provisions (Chapter 16.14): <a href="https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/LakeForestPark/html/LakeForestPark16/LakeForestPark1614.html">https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/LakeForestPark/html/LakeForestPark16/LakeForestPark1614.html</a></li> <li>Updated and expanded requirements related to preservation and planting of new trees and landscaping are being integrated into the Code amendments and design standards and guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COW – ask Planning Commission to consider an appropriate tree canopy coverage (percentage) to be required for Town Center with future phases of redevelopment and leading to a cumulative metric.</li> </ul>
<b>Bicycle</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provision of bicycle facilities including weather protected parking and storage areas and design standards for bicycle connectivity within the site and around the perimeter of Town Center will be addressed in LPMC amendments and design standards and guidelines.</li> <li>Quantity of bicycle parking to be required is under study and will be specified in Code/standards and guidelines with reference to other regional precedent requirements.</li> </ul>	
<b>Transit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transit-oriented design provisions are proposed to guide redevelopment and specific requirements for lighting of pedestrian ways, connectivity to transit, weather protection, information and wayfinding, and other elements would be integrated into the Town Center Design Standards and Guidelines.</li> </ul>	
<b>Vehicular Routes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific design provisions related to lengthening of distances between access points and internal drive aisles, provision of traffic calming and other design measures to deter short cutting of intersections, as well as other design treatments and necessary improvements to support implementation of the preferred alternative would be integrated into the Town Center Plan and LPMC amendments as applicable.</li> <li>Consistent with pedestrian-first/pedestrian- oriented design, the EIS analyzes the potential to create a better-defined internal street network with sidewalks, on street parking (encourages activity at street level, buffers pedestrians from traffic, and serves traffic calming function), curb extensions/bulb-outs, and other features that would support function similarly to public streets (even though access ways may continue to be privately maintained).</li> </ul>	
<b>Parking—Residential</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The FEIS analyzes the requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit, which could be retained; or could be reduced as incentive given TOD, with the provision of updated traffic and parking analysis by applicants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research of multi-family projects in Kenmore shows a lower ratio of parking spaces per unit allowed.</li> </ul>
<b>Parking--Commercial</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The FEIS assumes 4 spaces/1,000 GSF for commercial use and compares to the King County Right Size Parking model. This is slightly MORE parking than currently exists at Town Center. This may be too much given potential parking structure and potential for shared use.</li> <li>Consider allowing flexibility with further analysis/study by applicant on a case by case basis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider including a Code provision that requires a parking management plan be developed and maintained by larger property owners in the Town Center zoning district (such as owners of the shopping center, housing areas, ST parking structure, City Hall, etc.)</li> </ul>