



Memorandum

To: City Council
CC: Mayor Jeff Johnson
Phillip Hill, City Administrator
Kim Adams Pratt, City Attorney
From: Steve Bennett, Planning Director
Date: December 24, 2020
Re: Town Center Code Update Materials for Review on January 9, 2021
Attachment: Compiled Verbal and Written Comments from November 12th Public Hearing and Responses posted by City

The attached document contains a summary of the verbal comments from the Town Center Code Update public hearing held by Council on November 12, 2020. The document also includes the text of the written comments received in response to the hearing. At the end of the document are a set of responses addressing some of the issues raised by citizens during the hearing. The responses were posted on the City website after the hearing. The intent of this document is to provide a single source for Council and the public to reference recent input on the draft proposals. Although as Council's review of the draft code and guidelines continues, this document could be updated with side notes indicating where to find draft amendments addressing issues raised by commenters.

November 12, 2020 Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Comments pertaining to the Town Center Code Update

Public Hearing

1. James Gwilliam, Merlone Geier: Mr. Gwilliam said he provided a letter to the Council which further details his comments. He said Merlone Geier has been following the process of the code amendments at the Planning Commission level, and acknowledges that there has been quite a bit of work that has been done under some unusual circumstances. He said that Merlone Geier reviewed the draft code amendments and indicated that there are still a lot of elements that seem to need work. He said that Merlone Geier identified twenty-four comments that had been provided to the Council. He said that in general they would like a code that can be fairly implemented and that planning for the unknown can be difficult. He said that some of the definitions and code provisions may have unforeseen outcomes. Mr. Gwilliam said the envelope for the parking garage will likely have an impact on the Merlone Geier property and the impact to existing tenants and vehicular flow will be significant. He said that the additional fifty stalls for City use don't have any supporting rational. He said that parking displaced should be replaced. He said that he has concerns with the design review process because it is burdensome and creates barriers to the development process. He said traffic studies, City Council hearings, and public noticing will have a significant effect on the development potential of their property. He went on to say that they will be following progress. He said that the City's responses to their past communication is an indication on the level of interest from the City on working with Merlone Geier.
2. Julian Anderson: Mr. Anderson said that the Lake Forest Park Stewardship Foundation commends the work done by the Council and Planning Commission. He said that many months ago the Foundation provided comments on the environmental aspects of the proposed code amendments and provided an alternative to the options being proposed. He said that many community members have supported their alternative. He said that the alternative has been emailed to the Council. He said that the draft code incorporates some of the suggestions from the Foundation. Mr. Anderson said that pedestrian oriented space should take precedent. He said that development proposals for town center should not be administrative but use the Council as a decision making body. He said that elected officials have a responsibility to the public and oversee development. He said the Foundation urges the Council to retain decision making authority.
3. Don Fiene: Mr. Fiene said that, in 1960, LFP became a City, citizens ran for Council positions, and the success of those early elected officials made LFP a special place. He said that the first elected officials made some difficult decisions and that they did not turn away from legislative responsibility. He said that the new code for development regulations proposes to remove the Council from the role of decision making in the town center and that it passes on the legislative responsibility onto a design review board and the planning department.

Regular Public Comment Segment

1. Randi Sibonga: Randi Sibonga suggested that the draft code contain a provision for impact fees. She would like to see impact fees paid for development in town center. She said that other cities impose these fees. She would also like to see a sunset clause in the draft development agreement. She said that she fears that an approval would be given and the project would not be built. She suggested that timelines should be imposed on developments in town center, especially for the public benefit portions of the project such as open space.
2. Ann Payne: Ann Payne asked about the Sound Transit route that is planned for LFP. She said that there will be a lot of people coming and going from LFP. She said there are a lot of units planned and said she was concerned about vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

November 12, 2020 - Written Comments received pertaining to Town Center Code Update Public Hearing

Merlone Geier

November 12, 2020

Mr. Steve Bennett, Planning and Building Director
City of Lake Forest Park
17425 Ballinger Way NE
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

RE: Town Center Code Update – Public Comment

Dear Steve:

Following are our comments related to the proposed code updates that will be discussed at your meeting this evening. We recognize the effort that has gone into the preparation of these code changes and the unique challenges that Covid-19 has introduced to your collaboration and process.

As you will note in our comments below, it appears that there is still considerable work that needs to be done on this document. As such, these comments do not represent the universe of comments we will have on the proposed Town Center Code. In addition to the comments below, we have provided many comments in the past urging the Planning Commission and City Council to avoid placing overly restrictive provisions in the code as it relates to our property. Again we urge you to take our feedback into consideration.

Specific Comments:

18.08.035 – We have found that active ground floor uses in a mixed-use setting can take several forms that were not included in this definition including daycare centers, garden centers and other place of gathering. The idea is to have people creating a vibrant fabric on the street. Specific use should not be overly restrictive.

18.08.131 – Auto Oriented Retail – If the document does not allow for fast food per the added definition, Starbucks (not our property) would end up being a non-conforming use despite the fact that there are minimal alternative uses given the constraints on this parcel. As we have learned with Covid, takeout options have become increasingly common and important for businesses to remain viable.

18.08.325 – Freestanding parking structure – Language seems to conflict with section 18.08.035 for active ground floor uses. This section indicates that it does not include accessory uses which is in direct conflict with the idea of activating the ground floor.

18.08.599 – Retail sales and services – It is unclear whether uses such as salons and gyms/fitness would fall under this category. We think that it should. Requires clarification.

18.42.022 / section B – Commercial and nonresidential uses shall occupy ground floor of mixed use buildings. Ground floors should have active street fronts but not limited to commercial. Permitted uses/features should include leasing lobbies, common amenity areas such as fitness, co-working as well as back of house, parking, ingress/egress, etc.

18.42.022 / section C – This section is overly prescriptive. Having the municipal code address sound attenuation is not necessary. The building code should control in these areas.

18.42.022 / section E /2 – This section requires this use to be street fronting. While aspirational and perhaps well intentioned, this is overly prescriptive again and may conflict with what may otherwise be a better layout for “artisanal/craft” operations within the context of an overall project.

18.42.022 / section H /a – The building code should be left to define these requirements.

18.42.022 / section H /b – We cannot allow a limit on retail space size to 35K. Grocery stores are now requiring 42K-45K. Another potential conflict could be medical office. These anchor tenants are the revenue generating opportunities that allow the other components of a large scale project to be implemented.

18.42.022 / section H /c – This section would preclude Starbucks (which we don’t own) or a future user to legally operate. In addition, it also would eliminate the bank drive thru. We need the ability to re-lease our buildings.

18.42.090 / section A /1 – Setback distances for freestanding garages should mirror building setbacks. Setbacks were studied in EIS along with shadows – the analyzed data should be the basis for setbacks for all structures, including garages.

18.42.090 / section A /4 – Overall height would need to exclude rooftop parking light poles, elevator and stair towers required to serve the upper level, etc.

18.42.090 / section C – Parking deck slopes – The building code and ADA Guidelines should define this. Areas of the deck where there are roof drains will more than likely exceed this.

18.42.090 / section D/2 – Ramp slopes – The building code will define this. 10% or more on parking garage ramps is not unusual.

18.42.090 / section F/1 – City parking spaces – The City is requiring Sound Transit to build them 50 parking stalls for free. ST mandate was to construct a 300 stall garage here for public use. Now that needs to be 350 not to mention the offset required to replace MGP's missing stalls as part of any taking. Based upon the height limitation, this envelope cannot accommodate all of the demands. What is the basis for the 50 additional parking stalls? During nights and weekends when the City primarily needs the parking stalls the structure will be empty.

18.42.090 / section I/2 – Sidewalks – With a requirement to place 8' sidewalks on all sides of the parking garage in addition to the setback of the garage from City Hall and Ballinger Way, we have concerns that Sound Transit will be forced further into the center of the site, thereby impacting the access drives and buildings that house existing operating businesses. Rite Aid and Ace Hardware in particular would be at risk of being demolished. Furthermore, the grades on the long sides of this garage would more than likely exceed standards.

18.42.090 / section L/1/b – Retail SF – This section requires a minimum of 10,000 square feet of retail. If 60' deep shops are also required (per 18.40.090 / section L/1/a) and a maximum width of 150' (per section 18.40.090/section A/3), that equates to only 9,000 square feet. Stair wells and vehicular entrance/exits would equate to approximately 50 LF. If a minimum square footage is required, this number should be reduced to 6,000 square feet.

18.40.090 / section L/1/c/ii – Vehicular entries – As written, vehicular entrances to the garage cannot occur on the lower level facing Bothell Highway. Due to existing grades and the requirement to maintain visibility of City Hall, these entrances cannot occur on the east or west side of the parking structure. This would leave all vehicles to enter/exit at the top near Ballinger Way entry. This would likely create a significant backup and stacking issues at the signaled intersection. Inbound cars would need to wait to make a left hand turn into the garage. Additionally, access to and from the police station could be hampered for the same reason.

18.42.110 – The list of projects that are exempt from review under this chapter should include tenant improvement related projects, tenant relocations due to Sound Transit, and more. 18.42.110 section 3 in particular places too much restriction on building alterations.

18.42.110 - Council Role - The draft code presents two options for Council involvement in Major Design Review project decisions. One option contemplates that the City Council, not the hearing Examiner, makes the final decision on development proposals associated with Major Design Review approvals. We believe the Hearing Examiner is better suited to make detailed decisions applying elements of the Municipal Code and Design Guidelines to a proposed project. The Council would have the benefit of the Examiner's analysis and still play a key role in the final approval process.

18.42.110 / section B/1/c – Major Town Center Design Review – Many of the provisions in this section should not trigger a Major Town Center Design Review which includes City Council Approval, public noticing and a traffic study. The likely result from this scenario would be a lack of re-investment into the center which runs contrary to the City's Town Center code update objectives.

18.42.110 / section B/1/d – Major Town Center Design Review – If we change a tenant out and they want to change an awning, window or trellis, we need city council approval, public noticing and a traffic study? Moving this to a Minor Town Center Design review will be problematic as well. Re-tenanting and related improvements need to be carved out from this overly burdensome and non-customary process.

18.42.120 / Bonding – How can the City require bonding on private improvements? Unforeseen circumstances such as Covid, bankruptcy or any number of other situations can stop a project in its tracks.

18.42.170 Amendments to Development Agreements - We believe the highlighted limitations below are overly restrictive.

B. The Director may approve minor modifications to an existing development agreement. 31 Criteria for approving minor modifications include but are not limited to the following: 32 a. Shall conform to the terms of the development agreement; 33 b. Shall not reduce landscaping, buffering, or open space areas; 34 c. Shall not reduce setback requirements; 35 d. Shall not result in an increase in height of any structure; 36 e. Shall not result in a change in ingress or egress; and 37 f. Shall not increase any adverse impacts or undesirable effects;

How can a minor modification to the development agreement conform to the terms of the existing development agreement? Would not any modification to the development agreement, except scrivener's errors, by definition, not conform to the terms of the development agreement? The most likely changes to a DA would be development standards such as height, buffers, size of open space, and potentially

There is a great opportunity for the City of Lake Forest Park to facilitate the creation of a unique project that could meet the desires expressed by so many in the community. To effectively bring about this change a process must incentivize and encourage development to occur rather than place arbitrary restrictions and overly burdensome processes in place, many of which result in unintended consequence of deterring investment. We hope that our comments can constructively be taken into consideration as you attempt to put a framework in place that will incentivize and facilitate redevelopment of the Town Center.

Respectfully,

James Gwilliam,
Vice President, Development
Merlone Geier Partners

cc: Jeff Johnson, Mayor
Philip Hill, City Manager
Phillippa Kassover, Deputy Mayor and Council Chair
Tom French, Councilmember
Mark Phillips, Councilmember
Semra Riddle, Councilmember

John Wright, Councilmember
John Resha, Councilmember
Lorri Bodi, Councilmember

Don Fiene

COMMENTS FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON TOWN CENTER CODE NOVEMBER 12, 2020 Submitted by Don Fiene

Council Involvement in the Application Process 18.42.022, 18.42.110C & 18.42.110F

18.42.022

18.42.022E(6) Are the limits of production too large for Town Center?

Residential Density 18.42.050 I have documents that support 150-350 units were in place at the time MG purchased the Town Center.

Freestanding Parking Structures 18.42.090

#2 Option A. Add to Option A: If the façade alignment is for the purpose of Civic use the extension could be up to 60 feet.

#3 Option B is the better choice as it includes both partially below ground and underground.

18.42.090 A (3) Footprint & Base Height should be revised to conform with the recent consultant drawings at the meeting -- Drawings Option 2.

18.42.090 A (5) This paragraph should be deleted resulting in no bonus height provisions exchange for public benefits.

18.42.090 A (6) “and bonus height provisions” should be deleted for this paragraph

18.42.090 E (2) Parking

Sound Transit

November 19, 2020

Phillip Hill
City Administrator
City of Lake Forest Park
17425 Ballinger Way NE
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

Subject: Comments on proposed town center code updates and garage architectural guidelines

Dear Mr. Hill:

Thank you for continuing to work with us on development of the bus rapid transit (BRT) project along SR 522 in Lake Forest Park, including the park-and-ride garage at the Town Center. We recognize that the park-and-ride garage is a significant project element for both the City and Sound Transit, and we look forward to working with you to advance a project that the community regards as an important asset. Sound Transit is writing to comment on proposed updates to the City's Town Center regulations and the Freestanding Parking Structure Architectural Guidelines currently under consideration. These proposals may have significant impacts on the City and Sound Transit's current partnership, and on the parking garage Sound Transit anticipates developing in the Town Center. **We respectfully request that the City delay action on the town center code update to allow Sound Transit and the City to further collaborate on approaches for the development of the garage.** After the Sound Transit Board determines realignment related updates to the project schedule in July 2021, we will be able to provide a better indication to the City regarding our garage design schedule and permitting timeline, so we can identify a path forward for development of the garage.

Background

Consistent with the voter-approved ST3 Plan, Sound Transit is working to develop transportation facilities across the region, including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service along SR 522 and NE 145th Street, and a 300-space transit parking garage in the City of Lake Forest Park (the "Project"). Environmental review for the Project is underway, and is anticipated to be concluded by the second quarter of 2021. After conclusion of environmental review, the Sound Transit Board will select the Project to be Built. For the garage, the Project to be Built will be based on our initial 10 percent design.

The City and Sound Transit recently executed a Partnering Agreement (dated February 4, 2020), which provides a framework for the City and Sound Transit's cooperative efforts to advance the Project through the design, approval, and construction process. This Agreement confirms the Project's status as an essential public facility to be accommodated under the Growth Management Act and the City's land use policies; and provides for a collaborative process for future amendments to the City's development regulations.

Sound Transit is supportive of the City's desire for a sustainable, community-focused project. However, we believe that some of the process and prescriptive design features currently proposed should be closely evaluated and discussed further by the City and Sound Transit before they are enacted. Sound Transit is concerned that some of the proposed updates will hinder the advancement of the Project, as opposed to facilitating it, as envisioned in the Partnering Agreement.

Comments on Proposed Code Updates

As you consider our request to delay code updates, please consider the following comments. These are based on the Council edits to the Planning Commission recommendations on the Town Center Code Update (9/21/20) and the Freestanding Parking Structure Guidelines presented to the City Council (6/21/20). We believe the Project would benefit from continued City and Sound Transit staff collaboration to address these concerns before the proposed updates move forward:

- Section 18.42.090 (A and L). Compliance with all of the proposed code regulations, including façade, footprint, height, and mixed use requirements, would hinder the advancement of the scope for the Project—i.e., 300 stalls of commuter parking in an above-ground parking garage at the Town Center.
- Section 18.42.090 (L) requires a minimum of 10,000 square feet of commercial, public, or other active use space integrated into the freestanding parking structure at a minimum depth of 60 feet. This requirement is outside the scope of the Project, and would be more appropriate for future private developments in the Town Center.
- Section 18.42.090(D). The requirements to have ramps internal to the garage and to have pathways through the garage indicate a different type of structure than is currently anticipated, and would result in a much wider footprint in order to keep exterior edges of the garage flat, which we understand is the City’s preference.
- Section 18.42.090 (F) indicates the structure “shall” accommodate 50 non-transit parking spaces. Sound Transit is not authorized to use transit dollars for non-transit uses or purposes. While Sound Transit remains open to discussing these additional spaces as a partnership with the City, an alternate source of funding would be required for these additional spaces.
- Section 18.42.090 (F and M). We recommend modifying the code requirement related to Electric Vehicle (EV) charging. As discussed with the City Council at the workshop on November 9th, 2020, we anticipate that most transit customers using the parking garage will be coming from their homes just a few miles away. Most EV owners charge their vehicles at home, and because of the short distance traveled would not require charging during the day while at the park-and-ride to get back home. However, we recognize that the City is interested in provisions for some EV charging stalls. If you decide to include EV charging requirements in your code update, we suggest no more than 2 percent of park-and-ride stalls include EV charging, plus 4 additional percent of be “EV charging ready” so they can more easily be equipped with charging equipment in the future if needed.
- Bicycle parking requirements of Section 18.42.090 (G). Sound Transit’s bicycle program provides guidance on the amount and type of bicycle parking and related bicycle facilities to provide at facilities. To facilitate consistency (in maintenance, replacement, etc.) Sound Transit purchases bike racks and bike lockers for multiple transit facilities across the region, rather than providing custom racks and lockers for specific facilities. The Lockers are provided through a contract with BikeLink and are consistently the same based on the options they provide throughout the Sound Transit system. As the design progresses we can look into the feasibility of providing specialty racks where applicable and space allows that are suited to odd sized bicycles such as cargo bicycles, tandems etc. However, for the code update we recommend a simplification of this section to instead indicate that secure bike parking is provided in sufficient quantity and quality to meet the needs of transit commuters that will bike to the future BRT station at the Town Center.
- Section 18.42.110, which would require notifying “all tax parcels in the city,” is in our view overly broad for a project of this type. We recommend that the requirement stay at 500 or 1,000 foot radius, or reflect existing notification requirements for similar types of developments. Sound Transit also conducts a robust public outreach process for all of our projects.
- City land use process for Project approvals; Development Agreement. In the spirit of the Partnering Agreement that seeks to facilitate the development of the park and ride, we believe the land use approval process for the Project warrants further discussion:
 - The proposed updates would appear to limit the development of a 300 -stall above ground transit parking garage, other than through the negotiation of a development agreement. This process is likely to require longer than the 120-day approval timeline the City and Sound Transit

agreed to in the Partnering Agreement. In Sound Transit's experience, development agreements typically require 9-12 months to develop and execute.

- Allowable departures should be closely considered as well, as the provisions that would allow modifications through a development agreement appear to be limiting. For example, section 18.42.090 (N) appears to restrict an increase in the allowable height of a freestanding parking structure to 35 feet, unless the bonus height option is enacted, which would increase the height up to 45 feet. However, the bonus height option requires the inclusion of Project elements that may be considered betterments and/or may not be feasible within the scope of the Project.
- We believe that the City and Sound Transit can work together to develop a permitting plan with a more streamlined process for single stand-alone structures such as the Project, or Essential Public Facilities (EPFs) in general, which is consistent with the 120-day approval period established in the Partnering Agreement. This could include an administrative design review process, or a single review by the City's Hearing Examiner without additional levels of local review.
- As recognized in the Partnering Agreement, the Project is an Essential Public Facility (EPF) under state law, meaning the City must accommodate its construction. The Project is a public service use, which is permitted outright per City Code section 18.42.020. We recognize that the garage is of great interest to the community and look forward to further collaboration with the City on the development of the garage, following a more streamlined process than reflected in the draft code updates.

In addition, Sound Transit has three suggestions related to the Freestanding Parking Structure Architectural Guidelines:

- We suggest using the term "should" rather than "shall" throughout the design guidelines, in recognition of the need for some flexibility in the design and layout of the garage. Some of the design requirements indicated (e.g., repeated distinctive window patterns, window fenestration) increase the complexity, cost and feasibility of the garage structure so we request more flexibility.
- The background and introduction section of the Design Guidelines state that ST has stated the parking structure may need to accommodate approximately three hundred vehicles. This sentence should be replaced with the following: "The ST3 Plan authorizes a 300-stall parking structure in the City."
- The proposed code updates requiring commercial, public, or other active use space and building massing constraints integrated into the design may be inconsistent with the project voters approved in the ST3 Plan and restrictions on use of funds for transit related purposes.

Without modifications to the proposed code updates to provide a greater degree of flexibility and a more efficient approval process, these proposed code updates and guidelines could hinder the development of the transit parking garage as contemplated in the ST3 Plan. In the interest of avoiding any such unintended consequences, Sound Transit respectfully requests that the City delay action on the town center code update for a parking garage as described above to allow Sound Transit and the City to further collaborate on approaches for the development of the garage. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this proposal further with City staff and leadership. Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at (206) 903-7413.

Sincerely,

Bernard van de Kamp
HCT Corridor Development Director
Planning, Environment, and Project Development

Responses to questions and issues raised at the 11/12/2020 Town Center Code Update public hearing

The City Council held a public hearing during its regular meeting on November 12th pertaining to the draft Town Center Code regulations and design guidelines that are currently under review. The Council received thoughtful comments from members of the public that raised some questions and issues that the City Attorney and Planning Director have attempted to address below.

1. Design Review Board duties. Will the new Design Review Board have any role in the review and adoption of a development agreement?

No. As proposed in draft Chapter 2.41 LFPMC, the Design Review Board (DRB) has no role in the development agreement process. Its role is to provide recommendations to the hearing examiner and the Director after review of design review applications and a public meeting it holds for Major applications. Draft Chapter 18.72 LFPMC includes roles for the City Council, Planning Commission, city staff and the public in the development agreement process.

2. City Council role. What is the City Council's role in the Town Center zone development process?

As always, the City Council has the role of adopting the development regulations and design guidelines that will govern any development in the Town Center zone. These regulations will shape and govern all development in the Town Center zone. These regulations and guidelines must be complied with by the applicant, city staff, DRB, Hearing Examiner, and City Council. By tightening up the enforceability of the Town Center regulations, Council is playing its most important role in redevelopment of the Town Center.

State statute and draft Chapter 18.72 LFPMC also provide that the City Council is the final decision maker regarding the adoption of any development agreement (DA) for a Town Center zone development. Council may reject any DA terms proposed, Council may require negotiation focus on certain terms, and Council may hold a public hearing in addition to the public hearing held by the Planning Commission in draft Chapter 18.72 LFPMC. Council as final decision maker will decide how long each development agreement shall remain in place based on analysis of each project. City staff's role is to put forward the initial draft of a DA to the Planning Commission. This initial draft will be

considered at a public hearing held by the Planning Commission who will make a recommendation to the City Council.

The City Council is also considering a role for itself as the final decision maker in place of the hearing examiner for projects that include 100 or more dwelling units or 3 acres or more in area. Another option Council is considering is acting as an appellate body for decisions made by the hearing examiner for projects that include 100 or more dwelling units or 3 acres or more. In either of these roles, any appeal of the City Council's decision would be to Superior Court.

3. Impact Fees. Will impact fees be imposed on new development in the Town Center zone?

Chapter 82.02 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) sets limits on what impact fees can be imposed on and used for. The statute allows impacts fees for four categories of public facilities (owned or operated by a public agency):

- Public streets and roads;
- Publicly-owned parks, open space, and recreation facilities;
- School facilities; and
- Fire protection facilities.

The basic legislative premise of impact fees is that new development pays a "proportionate share of the cost of new facilities needed to serve new growth and development" (RCW 82.02.050). Cities must balance impact fees with other sources of public funds and impact fees cannot be the only source paying for the new facilities. This means that in developing an impact fee schedule, jurisdictions must evaluate the kind of impacts that each type of use creates. Impact fee studies also must include analysis of the type of the new facilities that will be needed in the future and the cost of the new facilities. Each category of impact fee requires a unique type of study to establish that the fees are justifiable.

In built-out cities like Lake Forest Park, it is questionable whether new development triggers enough investment in new public facilities for impact fee systems to be viable. It should also be noted that Sound Transit is exempt from all impact fees for buildings and structures built by or on behalf of the transit agency. If the City Council determined that impact fees should be pursued for LFP, the study and legislative process necessary would need to be separate from the current amendments to the Town Center zone development regulations.

Apart from impact fees, the Town Center code updates being reviewed by the City Council strengthen the authority the City has to require studies and mitigation of impacts from any Town Center development. Applicants are required to submit a traffic study and internal circulation study prepared by a qualified professional. They can also be required to submit studies addressing other potential impacts including geotechnical (soils), parking, critical areas, trees, and stormwater design (including water quality analysis). The purpose of these studies is to identify improvements to public infrastructure (such as roads, sewer, storm drainage, and water systems) that are needed to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development. The City then requires that these improvements be design and construct by the developer according to City specifications.

4. Increased Traffic and Congestion. With the addition of a park & ride garage and possibly residential units in the Town Center, how will the increase in vehicles and pedestrians on site be handled?

As mentioned above, Sound Transit and applicants for redevelopment of the Town Center will be required to submit traffic and internal circulation studies prepared by qualified professionals with their development applications. City staff and consultants will use those studies to initiate the discussion of improvements to the entrance/exit points in the Town Center and to plan for circulation improvements so internal traffic can move more efficiently and pedestrians can navigate safely around the site. The applicant will be required to construct these improvements before any new parking structure or buildings can be occupied.

New buildings in the Town Center will have to provide parking for any residential units and commercial space that they contain. In order not to impact the rest of the uses in Town Center, new buildings will likely need one or more levels of internal parking.