

**Summary of Written and Oral Public Comments from
January 21, 2021 Public Hearing on proposed Town Center code and design guidelines**

Chapter 2.41 Design Review Board

- Public opportunity to comment - is there enough with the DRB process?
- Suggest DRB be comprised of 5 persons who reside in the City, 3 of which are property owners.

Chapter 18.08 Definitions

- Auto-Oriented - Does Council intend to for current drive thru businesses to become nonconforming and for there to be no new drive-thru businesses? Does Council intend to restrict picking up food from restaurants?

Chapter 18.42 Town Center

18.42.020 Permitted

- (A)3 assisted housing and (A)12 multifamily – not in favor of any residential in TC because of traffic concerns and displacement of other uses.
- Allow all Essential Public Facilities such as BRT stations.

18.42.040 Limitations

- (A) Residential density of 275 is a good number for the character of LFP and takes into consideration comments from prior public forums. Does 17 units/acre allow more than 275?
- (A) 275 with a development agreement is too low, need at least 400 to justify
- (A) Residential use only buildings should be allowed. Conducive to affordable housing and transit-oriented development.
- (A) A limit of 7 units per acre without a development agreement is not workable for any residential redevelopment scenario.
- (D) Concerned with development agreement required for a 3+ acre project. Should be hirer.
- (H) Marijuana sales should be treated the same as alcohol sales and allowed.
- (H) Disagree with limit on retail space of 35,000. Grocery store typically requires more than 40,000 sf of area, medical office may need more too.

18.42.095 Parking Garage

- (B) Solar – in favor
- (B) Solar – encourage but not require
- (E) Motorcycle stalls – draft may require too many stalls for ST to be able to fit them into otherwise unusable vehicle parking spaces
- (F) Replacement Parking – Parking in addition to the 300 in ST3 is beyond scope of ST project
- (I) Pedestrian- in favor of the focus on pedestrian safety that is currently lacking at TC
- (L) Mixed use – in favor of ground floor active use, there is a market for same
- (L) Mixed use – Active public uses should be optional. ST public funds cannot be used for same.

18.42.130 General Criteria

- (C) Want to see significant trees in TC
- (C) 1. Perimeter Landscaping – need to specify where the buffer from Lyon Creek is measured from – ordinary high water mark?
- (C) 1. Perimeter Landscaping - 10 feet of buffer landscaping around the parking garage will likely not fit in what is left after the footprint and covered walkway.
- (C) 1. Perimeter. Unclear how buffers and setbacks work together.
- (C) 1. Perimeter. How will buildings already constructed within 20 of Lyon Creek be dealt with?
- (C) 2. Open Space – with additional units increase requirement from 1/8 acre to 1/4 acre.
- (D) Concerned with height of buildings. Residential buildings at 84 feet much too high.
- (D) Height. Unclear if this applies to the parking garage.
- (D) Height – 38 feet only allows 2/1 for mixed use. Commercial ground floor is “loss-leader.”
- (E) Low impact development – ST does evaluate feasibility of same in its projects.
- (F) Land Coverage – ST concerned 65% will limit the footprint of the garage, require conversion of current surface parking to open space/landscaping.
- (F) Land Coverage – 65% infeasible; not allow a viable site plan.
- (F) Unclear on how the Lyon Creek Stream buffer modification works
- Include a site plan requirement so that TC cannot just develop one building at a time.
- Will parking for residential buildings be required separate from the Sound Transit garage.

18.42.135 Affordable Housing

- Are bonus units allowed over the max of 275 units? Are bonus units allowed over base height or heights in design guidelines?
- In favor of increasing from 10% to 20/25% mandatory and from 80% AMI to 60% AMI
- In favor of incentivizing affordable housing rather than mandatory because cost may otherwise be passed onto the buyer/renter of market rate units. Bonus units are needed “outright.”
- MFTE is a better tool for creating affordable units.
- Why does affordable housing have separate bonus from other community bonuses even though both have additional height as a bonus?

18.42.160 Administration

- Concerned about lack of opportunity to give City Council input during the process.
- Concerned the 2005 process had more public input in it than the current draft process.
- Unclear on how the administrative process would work in concert with negotiating a development agreement.
- (A) Exempt. Concerned that bar for requiring design review set too low, need more exemptions.
- (C) DRB may not have enough flexibility in the design guidelines to work with applicants and make code compliant recommendation to Hearing Examiner.

18.42.170 Development Agreement

- Height and density should not be allowed to change.
- Include in .170 all of the prohibitions that Planning Commission had included.

- It is not clear when a development agreement is required.
- Maximum density and height should be “iron clad.”

Other

How will redevelopment impact City budget?

Chapter 18.72 Development Agreements

No comments.

Chapter 18.58 Off-Street Parking

- Does this only apply to surface parking lots?

Chapter 18.62 Screening and Landscaping

- Get the Tree Board’s input on what trees are appropriate for the area.
- Perimeter landscape depth will likely restrict footprint of parking garage.

Chapter 3.23 MFTE

- Recommend having both an 8 year (10%/80% AMI) and 12 year (20% /50% AMI) option. Yield desirable mix market rate and affordable units.

Design Guidelines

- Support green walls
- Concerned with using natural gas for a public fireplace, use electric instead.
- Include public water spigots for people to fill their water bottles
- Like fireplace for public, but it electric or solar powered
- DRB may not have enough flexibility in the design guidelines to resolve issues with applicants.
- Encourage solar energy use in residential and commercial buildings, encourage community solar project(s).
- Green infrastructure as a requirement is too rigid when it may not be the most effective strategy for this specific parking garage design as it advances.