

AGENDA

BOTHELL PLANNING COMMISSION

Bothell City Hall, 18415 101st Avenue NE

Wednesday, January 8, 2020, 6:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS
A chance for members of the audience to address the Commission on a topic NOT scheduled for a public hearing on this evening's agenda. Please limit comments to 3 minutes per speaker.
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
December 18, 2019
4. NEW BUSINESS
5. PUBLIC HEARING
Downtown Public Space - Continued Hearing
6. STUDY SESSION
 - a. Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update
 - b. 2020 Planning Docket
7. OLD BUSINESS
8. REPORTS FROM STAFF
9. REPORTS FROM MEMBERS
10. ADJOURNMENT

Official tapes of meetings are available through the Community Planning Division.

SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS: The City of Bothell strives to provide accessible meetings for people with disabilities. If special accommodations are required, please contact the ADA Coordinator at 425-806-6150 at least three days prior to the meeting.

Projected Schedule of Land Use Items as of

City Council (CC) meetings shown in **bold**; *Planning Commission (PC)* meetings shown in *italics*;
Other Board meetings shown in normal text.

All meetings start at 6 p.m. in the City Hall building at 18415 101st Avenue NE unless otherwise noted.

For planning purposes only: schedule subject to change without notice

January 2020

| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
|--------|--|--|----------|--------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 <i>Downtown Public Space continued Public Hearing</i> <i>Planning Commission 2020 Docket</i> <i>Study Session PROS (Parks Plan) Update briefing</i> | 9 | 10 |
| 13 | 14 Study Session: Multi-Family Tax Exemption | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 20 | 21 | 22 <i>Canyon Park Briefing and Project Schedule</i> <i>Downtown Historic Preservation Code Amendments continued Public Hearing</i> | 23 | 24 |
| 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 |

February 2020

| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
|----------------------------------|---|--|----------|--------|
| 3 | 4 2020 Planning Docket Title 22 Public Hearing and action | 5 <i>Downtown Public Space Public Hearing cont'd and recommendation</i> <i>Commission Bylaws Update</i> | 6 | 7 |
| 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 17 <i>Presidents' Day</i> | 18 Multi-Family Tax Exemption Public Hearing | 19 <i>Canyon Park Subarea Plan - Preferred Alternative Public Hearing and recommendation</i> <i>Downtown Historic Preservation Code amendments</i> | 20 | 21 |
| 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |

Minutes

BOTHELL PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING – December 18, 2019

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Patrick Cabe, Carston Curd, Kevin Kiernan, Brad Peistrup, David Vliet

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT AND EXCUSED: Jason Hampton

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Michael Kattermann and Senior Planner David Boyd and Historic Preservation Consultant Sarah Desimone.

CALL TO ORDER: The Regular Meeting of the Bothell Planning Commission was called to order by Chair David Vliet on December 18, 2019, at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at the Bothell Town Hall, 18415 101st Avenue NE.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

CURD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 4, 2019. PEISTRUP SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

NEW BUSINESS: None – the PROS Plan presentation scheduled for this meeting will be rescheduled due to illness of staff scheduled to present.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chair Vliet opened the Public Hearing regarding the Downtown Historic Preservation Code amendments. Vliet introduced David Boyd, Senior Planner.

Boyd shared a presentation regarding the Downtown Historic Preservation Code amendments.

Discussion ensued.

KIERNAN MOVED TO CONTINUE THE DOWNTOWN HISTORIC PRESERVATION CODE AMENDMENTS HEARING UNTIL JANUARY 22, 2020. CABE SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

STUDY SESSION: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

REPORTS FROM STAFF:

Director Kattermann reported on the following:

- Changes to the January agenda items –

- Briefing on Canyon Park project has been rescheduled for the January 22, 2020 meeting.
- Move the Study Session on the 2020 Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update to the January 8, 2020 meeting.
- Last call for APA membership
- Attendance Record verification
- Planning Commission Appointment Applications due by January 10, 2020

REPORTS FROM MEMBERS: None

ADJOURNMENT:

| |
|--|
| CURD MOVED TO ADJOURN. PEISTRUP SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR. |
|--|

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 P.M.

Public Hearing:

MEMORANDUM

Community Development Department



DATE: January 8, 2020
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Dave Boyd, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Downtown Public Space Code Amendments – Continued Public Hearing

Note: Much of the information in this memo is repeated from past memos for context and background, especially for members of the public who may not have received previous memos. New text is in ***bold italics***.

Purpose/Action

The purpose of this continued public hearing is for the Planning Commission to take additional testimony, receive additional staff analysis, and provide additional direction to staff on potential amendments to the draft regulations.

There is no action required for the Commission at this time.

Background

The basis for the public space requirement can be found in the Community Vision section of the Downtown Subarea Plan & Regulations (part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Downtown Subarea), which envisions the creation of “a sequence of unfolding spaces that inspire people to walk and to linger in the center of the city.”

In addition, including public spaces as part of private development serves to break up building mass and provide relief from the denser development of downtown. Even spaces that are only visually accessible can provide breathing room, additional landscaping and more solar access. ***Public space in the form of passages, especially in larger townhome developments, also augment pedestrian connections and make the downtown more walkable.***

In the 2018 Planning Docket, Council initiated amendments to the downtown public open space regulations to achieve better outcomes and to better clarify those requirements as independent of the separate citywide parks and open space impact fees. Planning Commission began review of the public open space regulations along with other downtown plan and code amendments. Due to the overall scope of these amendments, the initial effort was limited to a minor, technical amendment intended to distinguish the downtown public open space requirement from the citywide parks and open space impact fee. Thus, the general term which also includes private outdoor space is changed from “open space” to “outdoor space” and “public open space” will be referenced as “public space” from this point forward. More detailed examination of ways to assure better outcomes for the downtown designated public space requirements was deferred to 2019.

Additional analysis was presented at the June 5 study session and July 17, September 18, November 6 and December 4 public hearings, and the Commission provided feedback that is addressed in the following section, along with additional staff analysis.

Analysis

For earlier analyses of the downtown public space requirements, please refer to the June 5, July 17, September 18, November 6 and December 8 Planning Commission packets. Below are additional analyses based on feedback from the Commission at the December 8 public hearing and from staff. Past packets are available online at <http://www.bothellwa.gov/AgendaCenter/Planning-Commission-4>.

At the December 4 hearing, Commissioners had a number of comments and questions regarding the method of calculation, the amount of space required, allowances for project size and application of fee in lieu. Options for consideration included:

- reducing the square footage per dwelling unit to 60-67% or 50% of the current requirement;
- establishing a cap on the maximum amount of the site area that could be required as public space at 15 or 20%;
- calculating the public space requirement on the floor area of the building rather than per dwelling unit (the method currently applied to office buildings);
- allowing an option for larger projects to apply an in lieu fee for a percentage of the requirement;
- exempting smaller, infill projects from the requirement; and
- explicitly allowing the transfer of public space between downtown projects of the same developer and treating adjacent sites by the same developer as one, for purposes of applying the public space provisions.

The Commission reviewed additional examples of how public space requirements have been applied to past projects and the amounts of public space provided. The Commission raised a question about requiring additional amenities, such as benches, for public passages, generally expressed concern about large reductions in the requirements, and supported efforts to provide flexibility, emphasize quality over quantity and a tiered system of requirements for small to large projects. Analysis of the various amendments being considered follows.

Reduction in required amount

Attachment 1 provides an *updated* comparison of options for different amounts and methods for calculating public space requirements and how those would apply to different existing and proposed developments in two downtown districts – Downtown Neighborhood and Downtown Transition (General Downtown Corridor and SR 522 Corridor have the same requirements as Downtown Transition). ***The table lists the current requirements in addition to options for a reduction to 60% and 67-70% of the current level. The previous version compared reductions to 50% and 60% of the current level, but the direction received was to explore smaller reductions, so the column for reductions of 67-70% of the current level replaced the greater reduction amount.***

Another option for applying a reduction to some projects is to establish a maximum cap on the amount of site area that would be provided to meet public space requirements. This could be applied in conjunction with any method for calculation or for any amount of requirement. The purpose of this cap would be to provide predictability to an applicant on the maximum amount of space that would be required. Two caps are included for consideration, 15% and 20%. **Attachment 1** indicates which projects would have benefitted from either cap.

Alternative calculation method

The current method of calculation for residential requires a specified amount of square footage per dwelling unit. For office uses the calculation is based on the gross floor area of the building. One option for consideration is to apply the office methodology to residential uses as well. This approach would remove density (i.e. dwelling units/acre) from the equation and more directly link the calculation to the potential occupancy of the building. For example, an apartment building with all one-bedroom units would have a greater density than an equally sized apartment building with some two- and three-bedroom units. The latter building could have more residents but would be required to provide less public space based on the current method of calculation. **Attachment 1** indicates the effect this could have on projects applying the current requirement for office to residential.

The fact that office projects in downtown have been able to meet or exceed the current requirement indicates that the requirements for office may not need to be amended, as previously proposed. It also raises the possibility of basing the requirement for residential on the same percentage of floor area used for office space, rather than adjusting the per unit requirement. This would have the effect of reducing the overall amount of required public space across the board, but requiring relatively more public space for projects with larger units, like townhomes, which have been able to meet the current requirements. A column in **Attachment 1** shows the effect of such an approach on the completed projects.

A recent pre-application for affordable housing includes micro-apartments and small efficiency dwelling units and raises new questions about how we define a dwelling unit and apply requirements for public space (as well as parking). The micro-apartment portion of the proposal groups up to 18 bedrooms with private bathroom facilities around a common area with a full kitchen. If the individual units are treated as dwellings, the current dwelling-unit based requirement would result in an amount of public space that would likely be prohibitive. Conversely, treating as many as 18 bedrooms around a common kitchen as a single unit would likely result in an inadequate public space requirement. Using a requirement based on project floor area would likely result in a more equitable result.

While it appears that a requirement based on floor area may be the best approach, staff needs additional time to analyze the exact percentage. The proposed goal would be to get approximately the same amount currently required for townhome developments, and a modest decrease in the amount required for apartment developments (in the range of the reductions discussed to date of 60-70% of the current requirement).

In lieu fees

After each column indicating the reduced required amount is a calculation for an additional 10% reduction that the developer could achieve by paying the fee in lieu amount. This would be at the option of the developer and provide some flexibility in meeting the public space requirement. No other fee in lieu options, including at the director's discretion, would be allowed for larger projects.

Projects on smaller sites would be eligible to pay the fee in lieu for the full amount of public space required. This option would be at the discretion of the applicant and would only apply to projects required to provide less than 3,000 square feet but 1,000 square feet or more of public space.

Exemption for small projects

At the November 6 hearing some commissioners favored an exemption for small infill projects, citing the benefit of having a range of project sizes to lend variety to the urban fabric, and the slim margins for small projects that do not enjoy the economies of scale. The code currently requires public spaces to be a minimum of 1,000 square feet in situations where a project has a requirement of at least 3,000 square feet and can divide their public space. **At the December 4 hearing a potential exemption for projects that have a requirement of less than 1,000 square feet was discussed and received support.**

Following is additional discussion about the potential effects of these various options on several projects in two of the downtown districts.

Downtown Transition district:

The revised conceptual plan for the Ross Road Apartments, **provided at the December 4 hearing**, illustrates the applicant's latest proposal for meeting the current public space regulations for apartment developments. This and most other apartment developments in these downtown districts have used the in lieu fee, transfers to other sites or other creative provisions of public space to meet the requirement. **Some of the proposed public space, including a passage through the building along its north side, were questioned as to their public value. The 15% cap or options for calculating public open space based on residential area would reduce the requirement to an amount that could conceivably be achieved by concentrating the public space along the project's street frontages.**

The larger townhome developments seen to date, Dawson Square and The Landing, have been able to meet the current public space requirements without use of in lieu fees, mostly through the use of passages connecting through the sites. This raises the question of whether the reduced requirements should only apply to apartment developments, which would tend to incentivize the denser housing form, **or if a requirement based on residential area would be more appropriate. The alternate methods shown in Attachment 1 would require public space amounts similar to those currently required and provided by these developments.**

Smaller townhome developments, like the two examples on the 10300 block of NE 185th Street, have used the in lieu fee option, and are well under the proposed threshold for automatically applying in lieu fees.

Downtown Neighborhood district:

The Downtown Neighborhood district requires less public space per unit than the Downtown Transition and corridor districts, largely because it is intended to have denser development that can use more of the site area.

The 104 was the first multifamily development done under the Downtown Plan, and while it was a relatively large site, the developers chose to limit it to three stories instead of the allowed five and still had difficulty fitting the required public space on site. The same developers were also developing Six Oaks, which had a significantly smaller public space requirement since it is mostly in the Downtown Core, with no public space required. The developers requested and were allowed to transfer about 40% of the required open space from the 104 to Six Oaks.

The Pop had a public space requirement of 12,644 square feet, nearly 28% of its site area. The developers requested and were allowed to provide public open space exceeding this amount in the form of a second-level terrace and a pedestrian passage partly shared with the parking entrances and partly on an easement shared with Northshore School District, connecting to Horse Creek Plaza. A reduction from 100 to 60 square feet per unit would result in a requirement of 7,830 square feet, or about 17% of the site area. ***Options based on usable building area would result in somewhat smaller requirements.***

Edition Apartments provided 6,110 square feet of its required public space on site, which is nearly 15% of the site area, paying an in lieu fee for the rest of the required 13,500 square feet. A reduction to 60 square feet per unit would result in a requirement of 8,100 square feet. Allowing in lieu fees for 10% of that would still require 7,290 square feet on site. ***A requirement based on net floor area would result in 7,233 square feet, or 6,510 square feet with a 10% in lieu fee allowance.***

The 98th Ave Apartments project is paying in lieu fees for 69% of required public space, well above what would be allowed in any of the options shown in **Attachment 1**. The project is also providing a pedestrian connection along the south frontage to 183rd St. to the west that does not meet the public space dimensional criteria. Neither the current nor the proposed code have a mechanism to give credit for a pedestrian connection. ***Allowing credits for such connections, even if they don't meet the current dimensional criteria, would help make such projects compliant while also providing important connections.***

The adjacent office project by the same developer is providing almost twice what would be required in an extension of the public space provided for the adjacent apartment project. In the case of The Pop two phases were allowed to consider their public space requirement jointly. In the case of The 104 and Six Oaks, required public space was transferred between the two projects. There is currently no code provision to allow these practices explicitly so they have been handled on a case-by-case basis. **Staff**

recommends amendments to allow these practices, with clear criteria to ensure public benefit.

Quality of public spaces:

Measures to achieve better results were discussed and included in earlier proposed drafts. At the December 4 hearing, there was a suggestion to consider requirement amenities, like benches, along passages. Since passages are intended primarily to provide pedestrian connection, rather than places to gather and linger, staff proposes instead to include wayfinding and directional signage for passages in the provisions for signage of public spaces.

Next Steps

Because staff is continuing to analyze the different options being considered by the Commission, no recommendation is requested at this meeting. Staff is seeking Commission direction on issues discussed above. **Specifically, staff requests feedback on the following issues:**

- 1. If the residential requirement remains based on the number of units, is a reduction to 60% or 67-70% of the current requirement preferred?**
- 2. Would the Commission support a residential requirement based on floor area, and if so, would it support a formula that would keep the requirement similar to the current one for townhomes and reduce it for apartments to 60 or 67-70% of the current requirement?**

Staff recommends that the public hearing be continued to **February 5, 2020.**

Attachments

1. Updated Downtown Bothell Public Space Comparisons

Downtown Bothell Public Space Comparisons – REVISED 1/8/2020

| Downtown Transition Projects (% of site area) | Units/ Office Area | Total GFA ⁶ | NFA ⁸ | Current Requirement: 150sf/unit, 10% office | 100sf/unit 10% office | -10% ILF | 90sf/unit 10% office | -10% ILF | 20% of site area | 15% of site area | 10% total NFA ⁶ | -10% ILF | 8% total NFA | -10% ILF |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| Ross Rd. Apartments 6,881sf proposed (19%) | 95 | ⁹ 62,498sf | ⁹ 54,902sf | 14,250sf | 9,500sf | 8,550sf | 8,550sf | 7,695sf | 7,403sf | 5,552sf | 5,490sf | 4,941sf | 5,000sf | 4,500sf |
| Dawson Square 8,661sf provided (9%) | 45 | ⁷ 93,330sf | ⁷ 93,330sf | 6,750sf | 4,500sf | 4,050sf | 4,050sf | 3,650sf | 18,526sf | 13,895sf | 9,333sf | 8,400sf | 7,466sf | 6,720sf |
| The Landing 8,827sf provided (9%) | 58 | ⁷ 102,138sf | ⁷ 102,138sf | 8,700sf | 5,800sf | 5,220sf | 5,220sf | 4,698sf | 18,730sf | 14,047sf | 10,214sf | 9,192sf | 9,611sf | 8,650sf |
| 10304 185 th Townhomes 740 proposed (5%) | 13 | ¹⁰ 21,168sf | ¹⁰ 21,168sf | 1,950sf | 1,300sf | 1,170sf | 1,170sf | ¹ 1,053sf | 3,204sf | 2,403sf | 2,117sf | 1,905sf | 1,693sf | 1,524sf |
| 10320 185 th Townhomes 0 proposed | 5 | ¹⁰ 8,267sf | ¹⁰ 8,267sf | 750sf | 500sf | 450sf | 450sf | ¹ 405sf | 1,439sf | 1,079sf | 827sf | 744sf | 661sf | 595sf |
| Downtown Neighborhood Projects (% of site area) | | | | Current Requirement: 100sf/unit, 6% office | 70sf/unit 6% office | -10% ILF | 60sf/unit 6% office | -10% ILF | 20% of site area | 15% cap | 6% total GFA ⁶ | -10% ILF | 6% total NFA ⁸ | 10% ILF |
| The 104 6,959sf provided ² (12%) | 115 | 142,783sf | ⁸ 88,141sf | 11,500sf | 8,050sf | 7,245sf | 6,900sf | 6,210sf | 11,612sf | 8,709sf | 8,567sf | 7,710sf | 5,288sf | 4,760sf |
| The Pop 15,629 provided ³ (34%) | 118 14,071sf | 106,412sf | ⁸ 92,341sf | 12,644sf | 9,010sf | 8,109sf | 7,830sf | 6,879sf | 9,153sf | 6,864sf | 6,385sf | 5,746sf | 5,108sf | 4,597sf |
| Edition Apartments 6,110sf provided ⁴ (15%) | 135 | 160,833sf | ⁸ 120,552sf | 13,500sf | 9,450sf | 8,505sf | 8,100sf | 7,290sf | 8,201sf | 6,151sf | 9,653sf | 8,688sf | 7,233sf | 6,510sf |
| 98 th Ave Apartments 1,467sf provided ⁵ (3%) | 79 | 88,606sf | ¹⁰ 57,953sf | 7,900sf | 5,530sf | 4,977sf | 4,740sf | 4,266sf | 11,164sf | 8,373sf | 5,316sf | 4,785sf | 2,953sf | 2,658sf |
| Harbour Homes office 2,099sf proposed (12%) | 0 17,668sf | ¹⁰ 17,768sf | ¹⁰ 10,729sf | 1,066sf | 1,066sf | 959sf | 711sf | ¹ 640sf | 3,584sf | 2,688sf | 1,066sf | 959sf | 644sf | 579sf |
| Fir Street Flats 335sf proposed (13%) | 3 583sf | 5,233sf | 4,253sf | 335sf | 245sf | 220sf | 203sf | ¹ 183sf | 528sf | 396sf | 314sf | 283sf | 255sf | 230sf |

¹ 10% in-lieu-fee limit would not apply to projects with a public space requirement of less than 3,000sf, as written in the draft amendments.

² The 104 requested and was allowed to transfer the remainder of their required open space to the Six Oaks site.

³ The Pop proposed and was allowed to provide its Phase 1 public space in a second-level terrace and a passage partly shared with the parking entrances and partly on an easement shared with Northshore School District, connecting to Horse Creek Plaza, and to treat Phase 1 and 2 public space as one project.

⁴ Edition Apartments paid an in lieu fee for 55% of its required public space.

⁵ 98th Avenue Apartments is paying an in lieu fee for 69% of its required public space, but is also providing a pedestrian connection along its south frontage, connecting to 183rd St. to the west. The in lieu fee would be limited to 10% in the proposed amendments.

⁶ Gross Floor Area for a project, regardless of uses, minus parking.

⁷ Based on KCA average unit size.

⁸ Net Floor Area, based on KCA or net usable area minus residential common areas, service spaces and circulation.

⁹ Gross and net residential floor area per revised PreApp packet

¹⁰ Areas per permit application (or revisions, per applicant)

Study Session:

MEMORANDUM

Community Development



DATE: January 8, 2020

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Tracey Perkosky, Parks Planning & Grants Program Manager, Parks & Recreation Department

SUBJECT: 2020 Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update

NOTE: This item was rescheduled from December 18, 2019. The packet materials have not changed, other than the date.

Objective

To provide an overview of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan update to date.

Requested Action

There is no action requested on this item during the Study Session. This is an update only.

Summary

The City must update its Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan every six years to be in compliance with the Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) for grant eligibility and this document serves as the 6-10 year plan for the Department. It is also the basis for an update to the *Imagine Bothell... Comprehensive Plan Parks and Recreation Element*. While many previous plans were very ambitious, the City is striving to create a realistic plan of what can be achieved given staff and financial considerations through 2026.

To update the plan, Parks and Recreation staff undertook an extensive community engagement effort in 2019 to “meet the community where they are”. The consultant team assisted with a community survey and park inventory assessment to help set the base line for the plan update. The summary of the community survey plus two supplemental surveys on teens and a permanent dog park are included in this report.

The forthcoming 2020 PROS Plan builds on the city's comprehensive plan and previous planning efforts and the proposed goals meet the Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements.

The final PROS Plan will be presented to the City Council in early 2020 for final review and adoption. After the required submittal to RCO, Parks and Recreation staff will be working with Community Development staff and the Planning Commission to update the Parks and Recreation Element of the *Imagine Bothell...* Comprehensive Plan.

Policy Considerations

There are no policy considerations for the Planning Commission to consider at this time. This is an introduction to the 2020 PROS Plan process only.

Background

The citywide 2020 Parks, Recreation & Open Space (PROS) Plan is an update to the 2014 Parks, Recreation & Open Space Action Program (PROSAP). It will build on the recreation planning foundation provided in that plan, and will incorporate the diverse feedback from an extensive community engagement program conducted for the update. The 2020 PROS Plan will create a fiscally responsible vision for an innovative, inclusive and interconnected system of parks, trails and open spaces that promotes recreation, health and environmental conservation as integral elements of a thriving, livable Bothell. The Plan will also provide a blueprint for the growth, enhancement and management of Bothell's park and recreation system.

It is intended that the 2020 PROS Plan will be a document that will guide City elected and appointed officials, management and staff when making decisions or taking actions regarding planning, acquiring, developing or implementing parks, open space or recreational facilities and programs. The PROS Plan is part of the City's broader Comprehensive Plan and is consistent with the guidelines established by the Growth Management Act (GMA). Following Council adoption of the Plan in early 2020, staff will be working to convert the Plan in to an update of the Parks & Recreation Element for the *Imagine Bothell...* Comprehensive Plan.

The PROS Plan must be updated every six years for Bothell to retain eligibility for state grants through the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), which administers a variety of outdoor recreation and conservation grant programs. Bothell's current document expires in March of 2020 with RCO.

The 2020 PROS Plan will consider the park and recreation needs of residents citywide and will propose a path forward for enabling and enhancing high quality, community-driven parks, trails, open spaces and recreational opportunities while being mindful of

fiscal challenges. It will provide updated inventories, demographic conditions, needs analysis, management considerations and capital project phasing. It will update the City's policies, practices and projects and sets a long-range vision for the City with clear action items and strategies for implementation for the next 6-10 years.

Discussion

Process Background

The 2020 PROS Plan process began in March 2019 with a staff briefing to Council, following consultant selection. There were Council Study Sessions in July and November and several discussions with the Parks and Recreation Board. As a plan "update", this PROS is building on the *Imagine Bothell...Comprehensive Plan* and the previous park plan or PROSAP.

Bothell's demographics have changed since the last plan update in 2014. Therefore, a key component of this plan was an extensive community engagement effort to "meet people where they are". The consultant team worked on the community survey, stakeholder interviews, park inventory and needs assessments while staff worked on the community outreach via pop-up and other events, teen and dog park surveys, and general community engagement activities. Staff hosted 18 events – the usual is 2 or 3 – to listen to the community and encourage survey responses. In addition to the primary community survey and there were two more target surveys on a permanent dog park and teen feedback.

The project solicited direct feedback on goals and values from the City Council and the Parks and Recreation Board. The consultant team, in coordination with staff, has revised the maps, determined updated park walksheds, and written the draft plan. Council has provided feedback on the proposed capital planning projects.

After additional consultation with the Parks and Recreation Board, the plan will be finalized and then presented to the City Council for adoption. It will then be sent to RCO. In early 2020 Parks and Recreation staff will work with Community Development staff and the Planning Commission to update the Parks and Recreation Element of the *Imagine Bothell... Comprehensive Plan*.

Survey Results

The result of the community engagement effort was a community survey with 1,241 responses from both a mail-in and online survey, over 1,400 responses to the dog park online survey and a teen-focused survey which had 159 responses. This is a good representation of the community's feedback.

For the primary community survey, a paper copy was mailed to about 2,500 residential addresses and then the online survey was open to anyone. 381 surveys were received from the mail in group, which is a 15% response rate. The paper copy serves as a “test” of the online results to help determine the source of any inconsistencies in the data. The responses were kept separate and the results were similar.

Over 97% of the respondents feel that parks and recreation are essential or important to the community. The majority of park users go for trails (73.3%) and relaxation (54.3%) with fitness, playgrounds and wildlife viewing rounding out the top 5 reasons for using a Bothell park. When asked about which amenities have more than enough, about the right number and not enough “walking/biking trails” topped out the list with just under half (48%) of the respondents indicating that Bothell does not have enough walking and Biking trails. Developing new parks amenities was the highest single priority (27%) with expanding the trail network and acquiring land for future parks highlighting the top 3. There was high support (70% or better) for lower cost park improvements such as trails, all-inclusive play equipment, off-leash dog opportunities, community gardens and picnic shelters/gathering spaces. For high cost amenities strong support for river access and splash pads, with less support for skateboard/bmx park, artificial turf fields and a cricket field. Slight majorities support increasing taxes to provide a community center (56%) and splash pad (52%).

For classes and programs, there was great interest in adult enrichment classes (67%) and volunteer opportunities (69%). The survey results said that needs are not met for youth and teen programs as well as adult sports. However, the respondents also indicated that they did not know what recreation opportunities are available, so there could be some correlation or it could be that the City’s offerings are not aligning with community needs. The majority of survey respondents did not have children in their homes with 56% of the households having zero children under 18. Households with 1 child represented 16% of the responses, 23% had 2 or more children and 5% had 3 or more. The largest age group to respond was 25% from 35 to 44; 4% of the respondents were younger than 20 and the remaining divided fairly evenly between 20 to 34, 45 to 54, 55 to 64 and 65+.

The dog survey and the high usage of the “pop-up” dog park shows a need for one or more places for off-leash parks for dogs in the City. Almost 97% of the respondents said that an off leash dog park was definitely or probably needed, with 90.75% responding “definitely need”. 83.82% of the respondents are Bothell residents. While most people had no concerns regarding a permanent dog park, the largest concerns were excess dog waste (11.10%), animal vaccinations/illness/diseases (10.71%), and safety (7.85%). The most important dog park amenities were drinking water for dogs, shade for

dogs and humans, double gate entry and a space for smaller/shy dogs. Five potential locations were listed for a permanent site – Park at Bothell Landing, East Norway Hill Park, Blyth Park, Cedar Grove Park, and William Penn Park – and all ranked about equal for location with a slight majority preferring the Park at Bothell Landing as their top choice.

A final short survey was focused toward the needs and insights of Bothell's teens. A five-question survey was circulated through Inglemoor and Bothell High Schools and was available online. The survey was conducted between mid-October and early November, and 159 responses were collected. The most popular activities for teens include hanging out with friends (79%), watching movies (60%), sports (55%), going to the beach (47%) and hiking (47%). The top amenities teens would like to see in Bothell are a hang out space similar to the Hangar in Kenmore (84%) and walking trails (63%). The top event types that teens would attend include movies in the park (79%), food truck nights (71%), teen concerts (70%) and festivals and special events for teens (62%).

Financial Responsibility and Stability

For the past several years, one of the City Council's goals is Fiscal Responsibility and Sustainability. Previous iterations of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plans, often featured potential projects or project ideas that had very high projected costs and were often not achievable. This left residents confused on why projects or programs did not move forward.

This Plan will be structured with Council's goal in mind and a recognition of budget challenges to come. This includes a determination of potential project's ability to leverage other funding sources, consideration of future maintenance and operations and potential development costs of land.

The City is forecasting operating and capital shortfalls in the coming years and faces fiscal impacts yet unknown from the passage of I-976, Limits on Motor Vehicle Taxes and Fees Measure (2019). These factors will place additional constraints on maintenance, and potential expansion or acquisition of parks and recreation programming.

Goals and Objectives

The previous PROSAP plan had over 70 goals, policies, and actions. This large number is very difficult to achieve in a six-year planning period. As a result, the 2020 PROS Plan will use a goals and objectives classification which meets the GMA requirements.

The GMA adopted by the Washington State Legislature in 1990 provided a foundation for land use planning in selected cities and counties throughout the state, including King and Snohomish Counties and the City of Bothell. It identified 14 planning goals to guide the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations (codified in Chapter 36.70A of the Revised Code of Washington). Four of these goals directly affect the development and implementation of PROS Plan:

- “Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks.” RCW 36.70A.020(9);
- “Protect the environment and enhance the state’s high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.” RCW 36.70A.020(10);
- “Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical or archaeological significance.” RCW 36.70A.020(13); and
- “Carry-out the goals of the Shoreline Management Act with regards to shorelines and critical areas.” RCW 36.70A.020(14).

Staff is building on what previous planning efforts started. The revised goals build on the *Imagine Bothell... Comprehensive Plan*, the previous parks and recreation system plan and county-wide planning policies. All of these documents provided a framework for the goals which will be included in the 2020 PROS Plan.

The draft goals include:

- Provide an inclusive, diversified system of parks, trails and open spaces that deliver a variety of active and passive recreational opportunities that maintains the high quality of life for residents and reflect the community’s changing needs.
- Develop a network of shared-use trails and bicycle/pedestrian corridors to enable connectivity between parks, neighborhoods, commercial areas and other destinations.
- Facilitate and promote a range of recreational and special event opportunities for the community.
- Maintain and operate a modern, efficient park system that provides a high level of user comfort, safety and aesthetic quality, and protects capital investments.
- Pursue and maintain effective partnerships and provide volunteer opportunities to support the parks and recreation system.
- Provide leadership and fiscal responsibility in the management of the park, recreation and open space system.

Capital Planning

Based on community feedback, a needs assessment performed by the consultant team, a Council-directed focus on safety and maintenance and a recognition of current fiscal constraint, several potential projects have been identified. The draft plan proposes \$5.8 million projects of which 54% are for repair and renovation of existing facilities and 45% for new development which are ideally completed in the next 6 years. These projects, once included in the adopted PROS Plan, would then have to be vetted through the operating budget or Capital Facilities Plan budget processes.

To ensure connectivity and momentum based on funding, including grant applications which often require applications a year or two before project commencement, additional projects are proposed for years 2026 through 2030 and then a short list of other projects that could be completed at any time but would require a significant infusion of funding such as from voter approved bonds.

Recommended Motion

There is no action for this item; it is an information update only.

Next Steps

Final PROS Plan is scheduled for City Council adoption in early 2020. Staff will then work with Community Development and the Planning Commission to adopt an updated Parks & Recreation Element to the *Imagine Bothell...* Comprehensive Plan.

MEMORANDUM

Community Development



City of Bothell

DATE: January 8, 2020

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Michael Kattermann, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: Draft 2020 Planning Docket

Purpose/Action

Staff is seeking Commission feedback to City Council on the tasks and priorities for the draft 2020 Planning Docket. No action is required.

Background

The Commission was briefed on the status of the 2019 Docket (**Attachment 1**) and on a preliminary 2020 Docket at the December 4 meeting. Commissioners suggested a few additions at that time.

2019 Docket Status

Following is the information on the status of the 2019 docket provided to the Commission on December 4, 2019 and summarized in **Attachment 1**. No additional information is planned for this briefing unless requested by the Commission.

Of the 12 highest priority tasks, all or part of 11 were completed or are underway. The amendments to the Transportation Element were deferred to 2020 (task #4). The Northshore School District request to have the City process school impact fee payments was not initiated by the District (task #12) and is deferred.

In terms of staff resources, the major tasks for 2019 were:

- periodic update of the Shoreline Master Program (task #1)
- code amendments for small cell wireless facilities (task #3)
- Comprehensive Plan amendments (task #4)
- Canyon Park Subarea Plan update (task #6)
- housekeeping code amendments (task #8)
- downtown code amendments (task #9), and

- privately initiated code amendment to allow nursing homes as a conditional use in single family zones (task #11).

The following major tasks will continue into 2020 and are anticipated to use a significant amount of the available staff resources:

- completion of amendments to the Critical Areas Ordinance (task #2)
- ongoing buildable lands data and analysis work with King and Snohomish Counties that will continue into 2021 (task #5)
- completion of Canyon Park Subarea Plan update, development regulations and planned action EIS (task #6 and part A of #7)
- implementation of multi-family tax exemption program (part C of task #7) and
- completion of downtown code amendments related to public space and historic resources regulations (parts A and B of task #9).

Draft 2020 Planning Docket

Attachment 2 is a draft list of docketed tasks for 2020. The number in the far-left column indicates a priority recommendation. The number in the far-right column is an estimated number of staff hours needed in 2020 to complete the task. The continuation of several significant tasks into 2020 reduces the amount of staff resources available to undertake additional priority tasks. The 2020 items in bold reflect the current staff capacity. Additional items would require a change in priorities or additional resources.

Mandatory

Of the six mandatory tasks, buildable lands (task #3) and growth targets (task #4) are expected to require the most staff time. These tasks are integral to each other and to the next required update of the *Imagine Bothell...Comprehensive Plan* in 2023. The buildable lands report will provide the official estimate of the city's capacity to accommodate future growth. The growth targets will determine the amount of growth in residents and jobs that city will need to accommodate for the planning period of 2023 to 2043. These two tasks, along with countywide planning policy amendments (task #5) will require significant coordination with both counties.

Task # 6 is a new mandate from the 2019 legislative session that requires a reduction in parking for specific types of housing within one-quarter mile of frequent transit service. A preliminary analysis by staff of current transit service indicated that there are eligible areas. This item will require additional analysis to better define which properties are eligible and then draft code amendments to be consistent with state statutes. It may be possible to combine the work with other parking related amendments described in task # 11A.

Council Goals

Canyon Park Subarea Plan update will continue to be a major priority project for the city in 2020. The additional state funding approved by the legislature in 2019 will complete the subarea plan, development regulations and planned action EIS in 2020. The state funds need to be expended by June 30, 2020 so the work of the consultant team will be completed by then with action by Council anticipated before the August break. In order to meet that timeline staff anticipates dedicating one senior planner virtually full time for the duration of the project.

The other Council goal, implementation of the housing strategy (task #8), includes continuing tasks from 2019 as well as two new items. Affordable housing in Canyon Park will be addressed through the subarea plan process described above. Accessory dwelling unit code amendments will be mostly dependent upon additional work by A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) that was suspended in 2019 but is expected to begin again in 2020. The multi-family tax exemption (MFTE) program is currently underway with work being done by ARCH and city staff. The Commission suggested the addition of item D (Cottage housing). Even though this is a Tier 1 action from the Housing Strategy staff is proposing deferral to 2021 at this time. Another new item in this category is to specifically address micro-apartments in the code. The Bothell Municipal Code currently does not address how to count the number of units, minimum size requirements or parking requirements.

Other Tasks

Overall code amendments (task #9) include two items previously deferred (short plats, residential care facilities) and three new items. Two of the new items (transfer of development rights and incentives for solar power and sustainable practices) were suggested by the Commission. The other new item is a code amendment to allow duplexes on corner lots in all single-family residential zones. Bothell received a grant for \$50,000 from the Washington Department of Commerce to develop code amendments described in task #9 A and B.

Downtown code amendments are expected to be an ongoing task in 2020 with the continuation of refinement of the downtown public space and historic resources regulations. Either of the previously deferred items or new items identified by the Commission or Council may also be added to this task. Other potential amendments related to downtown city-owned properties (task #11) for 2020 would be to address specific constraints identified as part of a proposed affordable housing development on Parcel "A." Parcel "D" is currently on the market and P-South is expected to be available for sale later this year. There may be additional code issues that arise through the negotiation of the sale of those properties. The other item related to

downtown is an update of the planned action EIS to increase the capacity threshold analyzed for new development. Without an update of the planned action EIS, once the capacity threshold has been met projects would be required to conduct individual environmental analysis – a potential disincentive to downtown redevelopment, particularly on city-owned properties.

With the exception of the Northshore School District request regarding impact fees (task #12), the task proposed by the Shorelines Board (task #18) and the two additional private amendment requests (task #19 B and C), the remaining tasks were all deferred by the Council to at least 2020.

Next Steps

This information is provided for the Planning Commission to discuss and provide feedback to City Council on priorities for 2020. The Commission does not make a formal recommendation to the Council on the docket; however, staff will convey the Commission's suggestions from the January 8th meeting. The draft docket is tentatively scheduled to be presented to Council for consideration and action February 4.

Attachments

1. 2019 Planning Docket Status
2. Preliminary 2020 Planning Docket

2019 PLANNING DOCKET STATUS

| # | 2019 Docket Task | Year initiated - Status |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| MANDATORY | | |
| 1 | <i>Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Periodic Update</i> | 2018 – Complete |
| 2 | <i>Code amendments to the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO):</i> | 2017 – Underway |
| 3 | <i>Code amendment to 12.11 to Wireless Communication Facilities (WCF) regarding ‘small cell’ facilities</i> | 2018 – Complete |
| 4 | <i>Comprehensive Plan Amendments</i> A. Capital Facilities Element – add fire station rebuilds B. Transportation Element – Bike Plan adoption C. Establish R-AC minimum density/FAR requirements | 2019 – Underway 2019 – Deferred 2019 – Underway |
| 5 | <i>Buildable Lands Report</i> | 2019 – Underway |
| SUPPORTING COUNCIL GOALS | | |
| 6 | <i>Plan and Code Amendments for Updating the Canyon Park Regional Growth Center</i> A. Phase 1 - Visioning B. Phase 2 - Subarea Planning. C. Phase 3 – Regulations & Planned Action EIS | 2016 Phase 1 - Complete Phase 2 – Underway Phase 3 - Underway |
| 7 | <i>Housing Strategy Implementation</i> A. Affordable housing in Canyon Park B. ADU Code amendments C. Multi-Family Tax Exemption | 2018 Canyon Park – Underway ADU – Underway MFTE – Underway |
| COUNCIL PRIORITIES 2019 | | |
| 8 | <i>LEAN Process as it is applied to Development Services Initiative</i> A. Clarify whether Planned Unit Development (PUD) clustering provisions can be applied to multi-family residential zones. Current language does not provide certainty. B. Clarify prohibition on ‘rounding up’ unit and lot yield in Title 12 (Zoning). Applicants often request ‘rounding up’ of unit or lot yield which is prohibited under current Plan and Code requirements. C. Amend Title 11 (Administration) to give applicants 180 days to re-submit additional materials requested by City. Code currently allows 90 days. Grants additional time for complex resubmittals and aligns with recent Title 20 amendments. D. Correct Title 12 (Zoning) requiring deduction of surface water facilities from net buildable area, which is inconsistent with other sections of and Code Comprehensive Plan. E. Clarify subarea descriptions in Title 12 (North Creek/NE 195th St. Subarea). Description of subareas needs clarification and map. F. Clarify Title 12 regarding sign height. Code unclear that overall sign height includes base. G. Amend Title 11 to define “detached condominium units.” Currently no definition. Detached condos have appearance of single family but are technically multi-family residential uses. H. Amend Title 11 procedures for plan and code amendments to reflect current structure. I. Increase Short Plat size from 4 lots to 9. Reduce processing time for applicants and staff for smaller-scale subdivisions. J. Code amendments to Title 12 for consistency with state regulations regarding “Residential Care Facility”. | 2019 A - Complete B – Complete C - Complete D – Complete E – Complete F – Complete G – Complete H – Complete I – Council defer 2020 J – Council defer 2020 |

2019 PLANNING DOCKET STATUS

| # | 2019 Docket Task | Year initiated - Status |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Code amendments to the Downtown Subarea regulations.</p> <p>A. Public open space regulations to achieve better outcomes;</p> <p>B. Downtown Historic Resources Regulations and possibly Title 22, Landmark Preservation, to preserve historic buildings/facades on Main Street and in the historic downtown core, in coordination with the Downtown Historic District and Landmark Feasibility Study (see Landmark Preservation # 2);</p> <p>C. Remove 3-story overlay in General Downtown Corridor and add affordable housing overlay;</p> <p>D. Parking requirements related to outcome of parking management plan or Phase 2 study (not funded).</p> | <p>2018</p> <p>A - Underway</p> <p>B – Underway</p> <p>C – Council defer 2020</p> <p>D – Council defer 2020</p> |
| 10 | <p>Potential Downtown Plan and Code amendments regarding city-owned parcels</p> <p>A. Amendments as needed related to sale and development (e.g. architectural guidelines, land uses, and building heights).</p> <p>B. Update Planned Action EIS capacity analysis if needed.</p> | <p>2019</p> <p>A – Complete</p> <p>B – Council defer 2020</p> |
| 11 | <p>Property Owner Request - Code amendment to allow Nursing Homes / Rehabilitation facilities as conditional use in single family residential zones.</p> | 2019 - Complete |
| 12 | <p>Northshore School District Impact Fee Collection.</p> | 2019 – Not Started |
| OPTIONAL-COUNCIL DEFERRED | | |
| 13 | <p>Comprehensive Plan and Code amendments regarding private streets.</p> | 2019 – Deferred 2020 |
| 14 | <p>Review of BMC Chapter 12.22: Signs and potential Code amendments in light of the US Supreme Court ruling in <u>Reed vs Town of Gilbert, Arizona</u> in June, 2015.</p> | 2018 - Deferred 2020 |
| 15 | <p>Comprehensive Update to the Landscape Regulations.</p> | 2018 – Deferred 2020 |
| 16 | <p>Code amendments to regulations pertaining to adult entertainment.</p> | 2016 – Deferred 2020 |
| 17 | <p>Code amendments for City Council review of proposed park land dedications.</p> | 2019 – Deferred 2020 |
| 18 | <p>Amend the Shoreline Master Program regarding buffer enhancement incentives.</p> | 2019 - Deferred 2020 |
| 19 | <p>Property Owner Request – Plan and Code amendment to change 10116 and 10126 NE 187th from R 4,000 to R 2,800.</p> | 2019 - Deferred 2023 |
| 20 | <p>Nike Hill Plan and Code amendments.</p> | 2016 - Deferred 2023 |

2020 DRAFT PLANNING DOCKET

| # | Source / Status | Tasks | Proposed Timing | Estimated Hours |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | State Mandate, Initiated 2017, Underway | Code amendments to Title 14, Critical Areas. Updates are needed to comply with FEMA and Ecology requirements regarding flood plains and wetlands, respectively. Additional analysis (BAS) per Council in 2019. | 2020 | 80 |
| 2 | GMA Consistency "A" deferred from 2019 | Comprehensive Plan Amendments A. <i>Transportation Element</i> : Add policy and text amendments from Bike Plan adoption. B. Update annual amendment provisions for consistency with GMA. C. Incorporate updated Canyon Park Subarea Plan into <i>Imagine Bothell...Comprehensive Plan</i> . D. Private amendment requests see Task #19. | A-C 2020/2021 D – Defer 2023 | A - C 100 PW D – See Task #19 |
| 3 | State Mandate Initiated 2019 | Buildable Lands Report (King and Snohomish). Between 2019 and 2021, counties and cities will be updating buildable lands inventories and analyses that inform new growth targets and capacity for 2023 Comprehensive Plan Update. | Report due 6/30/2021, data & analysis 2020-2021 | 200 GIS |
| 4 | State Mandate New | Growth Targets (King and Snohomish). Establishing population and employment targets that will inform the 2023 <i>Imagine Bothell...Comprehensive Plan Update</i> . | 2020-2021 | 80 |
| 5 | State Mandate New | Countywide Planning Policy amendments (King and Snohomish). Revisions to reflect Vision 2050 updates that will inform the 2023 <i>Imagine Bothell...Comprehensive Plan Update</i> . | 2020-2021 | 40 |
| 6 | State Mandate New | Reduced parking/HB 1923. 2019 legislation requires reduced parking for affordable, senior and disabled housing within ¼-mile of frequent transit service. | 2020 | 160 |
| 7 | Council Goal, Initiated 2016, Underway | Canyon Park Subarea and Regional Growth Center (RGC) Plan Update Phase 2. Develop and analyze land use and transportation alternatives; draft environmental review. Phase 3 unfunded – Final EIS, Amend code & policies. | 2020 (state funding thru 6/2020) | 800 PW, Fire, Parks, GIS, Finance, Police |
| 8 | Council Goal A – Underway B – Ongoing | Housing Strategy Implementation – Work plan approved 7/2018 includes: A. Plan and Code amendments for affordable housing provisions in Canyon Park. B. Continue with ADU Code amendments initiated in 2018 (e.g. fees, maximum area limitations, elimination of other barriers) with input from ARCH study. | A – 2020 B – Defer 2021 | A – Included in #7 B - 120 |

Note: *Source/Status* column includes previous Council action.

2020 DRAFT PLANNING DOCKET

| # | Source / Status | Tasks | Proposed Timing | Estimated Hours |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| | C – Underway D – New (Planning Commission) E – Housing Strategy, New | C. Plan and Code amendment to develop a Multi-Family Tax Exemption (MFTE) program. D. Cottage Housing – Tier 1 action in Housing Strategy to encourage innovative housing types in SF zones. E. Revise regulations for micro-apartments. | C – 2020 D – Defer 2021 E – Defer 2021 | C – 80 D – 200 E – 60 |
| 9 | A – Initiated 2018 (grant funded thru 6/2021) B – New (grant funded thru 6/2021) C – Initiated 2016, Deferred D – New (Planning Commission) E – New (Planning Commission) | Code Amendments. A. Increase Short Plat size from 4 lots to 9. Reduce processing time for applicants and staff for smaller-scale subdivisions. B. Allow duplexes on corner lots in single family zones. C. Code amendments to Title 12 for consistency with state regulations regarding “Residential Care Facility”. D. Assess steps needed to participate in King and Snohomish County transfer of development rights (TDR) programs. E. Incentivize solar power and include other sustainable practices in building and development regulations. | A – 2020 B – 2020 C – Defer 2021 D – Defer 2021 E – Defer 2021 | A – 80 PW B – 160 C – 100 D – 40 E – 200 PW, Fire |
| 10 | Initiated 2018 A – Underway B – Underway C – Housing Strategy, Deferred D – Deferred | Downtown Subarea Code amendments: A. Revise public space regulations to achieve better outcomes. B. Downtown Historic Resources Regulations and Title 22, Landmark Preservation, to preserve historic buildings/facades on Main Street and historic downtown core, in coordination with the Downtown Historic District and Landmark Feasibility Study. C. Remove 3-story overlay in General Downtown Corridor and add affordable housing overlay; D. Parking requirements related to outcome of parking management plan or Phase 2 study (not funded). | A – 2020 B – 2020 C – Defer 2021 D – Defer 2021 | A – 80 B – 120 C – 100 D – 80 |
| 11 | New Initiated 2019, deferred | Potential Downtown Plan and Code amendments regarding city-owned parcels A. Revise regulations to address site-specific constraints of Parcel A. B. Update Planned Action EIS capacity analysis. | A – 2020 B – Defer 2021 | A – 120 B – 160 |

Note: Source/Status column includes previous Council action.

2020 DRAFT PLANNING DOCKET

| # | Source / Status | Tasks | Proposed Timing | Estimated Hours |
|----|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| 12 | Initiated 2019, Awaiting NSD application | Northshore School District Impact Fee Collection – District requesting City collect school impact fees. | Defer 2021 | 40 |
| 13 | Initiated 2019, deferred | Comprehensive Plan and Code amendments regarding private streets – Seeking policy direction on private streets. A. Policy direction from Council B. Comp plan and code amendments | A, B – Defer 2021 | A – 80 B - 160 |
| 14 | Initiated 2018, deferred | Review of BMC Chapter 12.22, Signs, and potential Code amendments per US Supreme Court ruling (Reed v Town of Gilbert). This concerns regulation of signs based on content and review of City's regulations for compliance with Court decision. | Defer 2021 | 60 |
| 15 | Initiated 2018, deferred | Comprehensive Update to the Landscape Regulations - Current landscaping regulations are geared toward a suburban style of development and should be updated. | Defer 2021 | 200 |
| 16 | Initiated 2016 – 2018, deferred | Code amendments to regulations pertaining to adult entertainment. Council initiated Code amendments to clarify current regulations pertaining to espresso stands. | Defer 2021 | 60 |
| 17 | Initiated 2019, deferred | Code amendments for City Council review of proposed park land dedications. Earlier and defined process for proposals to dedicate parkland. | Defer 2021 | 80 |
| 18 | Initiated 2019, deferred | Amend the Shoreline Master Program regarding buffer enhancement incentives – Review current provision allowing reduction of standard buffer width in exchange for buffer enhancement. | Defer 2021 | 120 +consultant |
| 19 | A - Initiated 2019, deferred B – New C – New | Property Owner Requests – Plan & Code Amendments A. 10116 and 10126 NE 187 th ST from R 4,000 to R 2,800 – Property adjacent to R 2,800. Increases allowed units from 5 to 7. B. 20316 90 th Ave NE in Westhill Subarea from R 9,600 to R 7,200. C. 24328, 24232, 24318, 24310 - 7 th Ave SE in Westhill Subarea from R 9,600 to R 7,200. | A – C Defer 2023 periodic update | A – 100 B – 80 C - 100 |
| 20 | Initiated 2016-18, Planning Commission recommendation 2016 | Nike Hill Plan and Code amendments. Apply three story (35 feet) Residential Activity Center and mixed-use zoning classifications in the Neighborhood Activity Center at Meridian Avenue and 228 th Street SE/SW with affordable housing requirements. | Defer 2023 periodic update | 150 |

Note: *Source/Status* column includes previous Council action.