



**City of Lake Forest Park**  
**COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE SPECIAL MEETING**  
**MONDAY, May 6, 2019**  
**6:00 p.m.**  
**Council Chambers**  
**17425 Ballinger Way NE**  
**AGENDA**

- 6:00 p.m.**
- 1. Introduction/Meeting Overview**
    - Process and timeline updates
  - 2. Discussion of Preferred Alternative**
    - Key parameters: height and density; open space and setbacks; bulk and scale; parking and other parameters

- 8:00 p.m.**
- 3. Wrap Up/Adjourn**

**Future Schedule**

Thursday, May 9, 2019 City Council Work Session 6 pm *canceled*  
Thursday, May 9, 2019 City Council Regular Business Meeting 7 pm  
Thursday, May 16, City Council Budget and Finance Committee Meeting 6 pm  
Monday, May 20, 2019 City Council Committee of the Whole Meeting 6 pm  
Thursday, May 23, 2019 City Council Regular Business Meeting 7 pm  
Thursday, June 13, 2019 City Council Work Session Meeting 6 pm  
Thursday, June 13, 2019 City Council Regular Business Meeting 7 pm  
Thursday, June 20, 2019 City Council Budget and Finance Committee Meeting 6 pm  
Monday, June 24, 2019 City Council Committee of the Whole Meeting 6 pm  
Thursday, June 27, 2019 City Council Regular Business Meeting 7 pm

**Table 2.2 For FEIS Analysis Purposes, Consider the Following Land Use and Zoning Assumptions for PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE—WORKING DRAFT FOR MAY 6, 2019 COW**

	<b>PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</b>	<b>Key Questions and Discussion Points</b>
<i>For FEIS Analysis Purposes, Consider the Following Potential Code Amendments and New Design Standards/Guidelines</i>		
<b>Uses</b>	<p>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 west).</p> <p>Potential to limit the amount of mixed use/retail in the north; the amount of housing in the south; etc. The impact of this scenario could be studied in the FEIS.</p> <p>Agree to a mix of uses; residential should not dominate the site.</p>	<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 as under the current Code?</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> </ul>
<b>Height Limits—Residential/Mixed-use</b>	To be discussed and determined tonight after conceptual height/bulk/scale exercise tonight. Height limits should be varied on the site with transition areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If residential only or mixed use residential/commercial buildings are developed, what should the height limit be for analysis in the FEIS?</li> </ul>
<b>Height Limits—Commercial Only</b>	To be discussed after conceptual height/bulk/scale exercise tonight. – for one story, suggest considering 20-foot height limit. For two story, could look at current Town Center heights as the max.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If commercial only buildings are developed, what should the height limit be for analysis in the FEIS?</li> </ul>
<b>Density—Residential</b>	# residential units to be studied in FEIS - to be discussed/determined tonight after conceptual height/bulk/scale exercise.	<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, etc.</li> <li>• With application of bonus guidelines, an additional level of building height is allowed.</li> </ul>
<b>Density—Commercial</b>	# maximum GSF to be studied in FEIS – suggest moving forward with Planning Commission’s direction of 50,000 GSF on one level; max. 75,000 GSF on two levels and CUP for any size above 50,000.	<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>• Planning Commission had previously discussed this as a possibility: no single use (commercial or office) footprint</li> </ul>

		<p>should exceed 50,000 GSF on one level; conditional use permit required for 50,000 to 75,000 GSF single uses (max. 75,000 GSF).</p>
<b>Setbacks and Edge Conditions</b>	<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 foot building setbacks are currently required by Code (see attached exhibit)</li> <li>• Should setback lines be altered?</li> <li>• Should existing trees be required to be retained within perimeter setback areas?</li> </ul>
<b>Open Space</b>	<p>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.</p>	<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).</li> <li>• Should a greater setback dimension be required along Lyon Creek for analysis in the FEIS?</li> <li>• Should an interior contiguous open space area of minimum .5 acres be analyzed in the FEIS along with other open space requirements per Planning Commission's recommendations?</li> <li>• How should preservation of the function of Third Place Commons be addressed in the FEIS?</li> </ul>
<b>Building Step Backs</b>	<p>Discussed the benefits of a step back requirement at the top of the podium level; have discussed the importance of how buildings look and feel at grade (from the pedestrian scale/perspective); may not need additional building step backs if property line setbacks are increased. To be further discussed and determined tonight.</p>	<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>	<p>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</p>	<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>

	<p>\$72,000 and considered a living wage to support workers in the community who may be teachers, entry level firefighters, police, shopkeepers, etc.</p> <p>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></p>	
<b>Incentives for Redevelopment</b>	<p>Feedback: YES...but need to discuss/determine how this relates to height – if we just have one maximum height level, we lose the ability to award an additional height level as an incentive. We could also look at awarding different formulas of density bonuses instead of height levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider potential for incentives options that if applied could allow additional height and density.</li> </ul>
<b>Site Interior Design, and Pedestrian Connectivity</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<b>Bicycle</b>	<p>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 LFPMC amendments and design standards and guidelines.</p> <p>Quantity of bicycle parking to be required is under study and will be specified in Code/standards and guidelines.</p>	
<b>Transit</b>	<p>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.</p>	
<b>Vehicular Routes</b>	<p>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 LFPMC amendments as applicable.</p> <p>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, 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).</p>	
<b>Parking—Residential</b>	<p>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.</p>	
<b>Parking--Commercial</b>	<p>The FEIS assumes 4 spaces/1,000 GSF for commercial use and compares to the King County Right Size Parking model.</p> <p>Could allow flexibility with further analysis/study by applicant on a case by case basis.</p>	
<b>Sustainability/Green Building</b>	<p>Sustainability features as required by Code and Design Standards and Guidelines. Compliance with IBC. Additional provisions could be built into incentives options.</p>	

<p><b>Trees and Landscaping</b></p>	<p>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. Follow the City's Tree Canopy Preservation and Enhancement LFPMC 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></p> <p>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.</p>	

DRAFT