

# Land Use Element

---

## Background and Analysis

### Purpose and Relationship to GMA

In accordance with the Growth Management Act, the purposes of the Land Use element are as follows:

1. To designate a Bothell Planning Area, comprising land within the present City limits plus adjacent unincorporated land deemed appropriate for annexation at some point in the future (termed Potential Annexation Areas, or PAAs, within King County, and Municipal Urban Growth Areas, or MUGAs, within Snohomish County);
2. To inventory existing land uses and analyze forecasted growth against land capacity;
3. To identify types of land uses suitable for the Bothell Planning Area, define for each land use densities and intensities appropriate to the community, and allocate land within the Planning Area for each land use in a manner which ensures sufficient capacity to accommodate forecasted growth;
4. To provide for greenbelts and open space areas within and on the perimeter of the Planning Area; and
5. To provide for the control of storm water runoff to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute area streams, rivers, ponds, lakes and Puget Sound (this state requirement is addressed in the Capital Facilities element).

The Land Use element is a required element under the Growth Management Act.

### Urban Growth Areas

The Growth Management Act requires counties planning under the Act to designate an urban growth area or areas "within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can only occur if is not urban in nature."

The Act provides, "Each city that is located in such a county shall be included within an urban growth area. An urban growth area may include more than a single city. An urban growth area may include territory that is located outside of a city only if such territory already is characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth."

Urban growth areas, according to the Act, are to "include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county for the succeeding 20-year period," based on population forecasts made for the county by the state Office of Financial Management (OFM).

In Snohomish County, Bothell is contained within the Southwest Snohomish County Urban Growth Area (SWUGA). The SWUGA contains eight cities (Bothell, Mill Creek, Lynnwood, Brier, Everett, Mukilteo, Edmonds, and Mountlake Terrace) and one town (Woodway), and the unincorporated area between and around those municipalities. Bothell's corporate boundaries are coterminous with those of the SWUGA at the King / Snohomish County line and along a small portion of the eastern boundary of the SWUGA. Most of the City's eastern boundary in Snohomish County is between 600 and 3,200 feet west of the eastern boundary of the SWUGA.

In King County, Bothell is part of a very large Urban Growth Area which contains all but five King County municipalities (Duvall, Carnation, Snoqualmie, North Bend and Enumclaw). Bothell's boundaries are coterminous with those of this large UGA at the King / Snohomish County line. The eastern boundary of the King County UGA follows the City of Woodinville's eastern boundary, and thus is much farther removed from Bothell than is the eastern boundary of the SWUGA. See Figure LU-1.

## Bothell Planning Area

The Bothell Planning Area comprises land within the city limits plus adjacent unincorporated land logically served by Bothell at some point in the future via the process of annexation. Different terms for such land are utilized in King County and Snohomish County. In King County, land identified as appropriate for annexation is termed a Potential Annexation Area, or PAA. In Snohomish County, such land is termed a Municipal Urban Growth Area, or MUGA.

The original 1994 *Imagine Bothell... Comprehensive Plan* included a PAA which consisted of unincorporated King County territory to the west, southeast and east of the Bothell city limits. The Plan assigned land use designations throughout the PAA. In 1999 the PAA was reduced in size after the westernmost portion, between 80<sup>th</sup> and 84<sup>th</sup> Avenues NE, was included in the incorporation of Kenmore. No other changes have occurred to the PAA.

In Snohomish County, a MUGA for Bothell was not established until 2003, and as of the 2004 update, the MUGA boundary between Bothell and Brier remained unresolved. The 2004 update expanded the Canyon Creek and Fitzgerald subarea plans to include that portion of the MUGA south of Maltby Road, between the existing city limits and the eastern SWUGA boundary. However, no other portions of the MUGA were incorporated in the 2004 update. It is anticipated that in 2005 or 2006, the remainder of the MUGA (including an area between Bothell and Brier, once agreement is reached between the two cities) will be the subject of subarea planning and formally incorporated in the *Imagine Bothell... Comprehensive Plan*.

Acreages of the various areas described above are as follows:

**Table LU-1: Planning Area acreage**

County	Incorporated Bothell	Unincorporated			Total
		PAA	MUGA, in 2004 update	MUGA, in future update	
King	3650.5	1018.6	NA	NA	4669.1
Snohomish	4099.7	NA	722.9	2107.4	6930.0
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>7750.2</b>	<b>1018.6</b>	<b>722.9</b>	<b>2107.4</b>	<b>11,599.1</b>

The Bothell Planning Area is depicted in Figure LU-2.

# Historical and Current Land Uses

Within the Bothell Planning Area, land form and features have historically dictated the geographic distribution of land uses (see also Natural Environment Element).

The Sammamish River provided the earliest, most convenient and most efficient transportation corridor to and through the area. The original land use in the area established by humans consisted of Indian encampments along the river. Similarly, when white settlement of the area began, most homesteads were built along the Sammamish, or its tributaries, Horse and North Creeks.

The first substantial industries to evolve in the area were logging and the milling of lumber. The Sammamish provided the only means to transport logs, shakes and other products to larger markets for sale. As population increased, so grew the need for locally-provided goods and services, and the Town of Bothell came into being along the shores of the river.

The Sammamish remained the primary transportation "facility" between Bothell and other communities until 1914, when a brick road connecting Bothell with Seattle was completed. This road generally followed the Sammamish River valley and the Lake Washington shoreline. Other roads were constructed soon after, again primarily following waterways. The most notable of these in Bothell were the Bothell-Everett Highway, generally following Horse Creek and North Creek, and Waynita Way, generally following the unnamed creek separating Norway and Finn Hills.

Houses and businesses sprang up along these routes, concentrating in downtown Bothell and at major intersections. Other roads were extended up the surrounding hills, and additional residential development ensued.

This general pattern of development continued until the 1960's, when Interstate 405 was constructed. The route selected for I-405 was not as topography-driven as were the routes of the historical arterials through the area. As a consequence, the locations of the freeway interchanges, combined with the ability of the freeway to transport many people long distances in a short time, created demand for commercial and industrial land uses where none had existed before. Moreover, two of the freeway interchanges within the Planning Area were immediately adjacent to large expanses of virtually flat, easily developable land in the North Creek Valley.

Due to the availability of reasonably-priced land closer to Seattle and to Bothell's relative isolation at the time, development of the land around the interchanges did not ensue immediately. By the early 1970's, however, development proposals were taking shape. In 1974, a proposal to develop a regional shopping center in the North Creek Valley in Bothell was approved by the City Council, but the Council's action was later overturned by the state Supreme Court.

In the late 1970's and early 1980's Bothell and Snohomish County updated their comprehensive plans to provide for the development of business parks in the North Creek Valley. The last two decades have seen residential, commercial and industrial development activity at a pace and magnitude unprecedented in Bothell's history. Most notable has been the development within the North Creek Valley, consisting of business parks, retail and services centers, and single and multi-family residential development in a variety of configurations.

Since approximately 1980, Bothell has evolved from a bedroom community, sending its workers to Seattle, Everett and Bellevue, to a regional employment center, while still maintaining a family-oriented residential character.

Following are descriptions of the various land uses within the Planning Area.

## Vacant land

Vacant or undeveloped land is scattered throughout the Planning Area, and is commonly found where environmental constraints have prevented earlier development. With nearly all unconstrained land in the Planning Area developed or committed to development, however, land with wetlands, streams, slopes or other critical areas are rising in value to the point where development, even at lower yields, has become profitable. Another source of buildable land is under-developed land, typically consisting of a five- or ten-acre parcel containing one house.

## Agriculture

Agriculture, once a prominent land use and source of employment in Bothell, has virtually disappeared from the area. There are a few “hobby farms” within the Planning Area, but nothing on a commercial scale. Magnolia Dairy on Westhill has not functioned as a dairy for many years, but retains its appearance as a farm because King County purchased the development rights to the property in 1987. That contract did not require that agricultural uses be continued, but severely restricted development potential so as to ensure that the property remain almost entirely in open space.

## Single family residential

Single-family residential development is by far the predominant land use within the Planning Area, comprising over one-fourth of total developed land. Within the Planning Area, single-family development (including mobile homes) is the primary use on the sides and tops of the seven hills which comprise Bothell (West Hill, Beckstrom Hill, Norway Hill, East Norway Hill, Finn Hill, Bloomberg Hill, and Nike Hill).

## Multiple family residential

Multi-family development is found primarily in and around the Downtown and Canyon Park community activity centers as well as the North Creek and Canyon Park regional activity centers. However, individual multi-family projects may be found throughout the Planning Area. Multi-family development has occurred both on land designated solely for multiple family residences and on land where a mix of residential and commercial uses is desired: the total area in which multi-family is allowed comprises about one-tenth of the Planning Area. Multi-family densities range from eight to about 30 dwelling units per acre. Plan and Code amendments in 2002 eliminated residential density limits from the Downtown and Canyon Park community activity centers and the North Creek and Canyon Park regional activity centers, allowing an estimated 40 units per acre when site and building design regulations are taken into account. In addition, senior housing developments within multi-family zones and within the Specialized Senior Housing Overlay near the Northshore Senior Center are not subject to a density cap: the number of units attainable in such developments is controlled by site and building design regulations.

## Retail and services

See also **Economic Development Element**. There are four types of retail and commercial services businesses in Bothell:

- Regional-serving businesses, providing goods and services to a geographic area larger than the Planning Area. These tend to consist of “big-box” retail outlets and businesses which sell

high-cost items, such as automobiles, which have a market beyond the boundaries of the Planning Area. Regional-serving businesses in Bothell are located at high-visibility, high-traffic locations on SR 522 and SR 527 and near I-405.

- Community-serving businesses, providing shopping, dining, entertainment and personal and professional services for the entire Planning Area or large segments thereof. Most of these types of businesses in Bothell are co-located in multi-tenant developments, at the Thrasher's Corner (SR 527 and Filbert / Maltby Roads), Canyon Park (SR 527 and 228<sup>th</sup> Street SE) and Downtown (SR 527, SR 522 and Main Street) community activity centers. A multi-tenant community-serving shopping center has also been proposed for the intersection of SR 527 and 240<sup>th</sup> Street SE, but had not begun construction as of the end of 2004.
- Neighborhood-serving businesses, comprising small-scale retail and services businesses which meet the convenience shopping and services needs of the immediate surrounding residential area.

The Planning Area currently contains three neighborhood retail / services clusters of varying sizes. These are located at 228th Street and Meridian, NE 160th and I-405, and NE 145th Street and Juanita-Woodinville Way.

- Specialty themed retail and services, catering to a particular market by a combination of synergy among several like businesses and ambiance of the setting. Country Village, on SR 527 north of 240<sup>th</sup> Street SE, is such a specialty themed center, drawing shoppers from as far away as Canada.

## **Business parks / office / technology / light industrial**

See also **Economic Development Element**. These uses comprise a wide variety of businesses, from small software developers to mid-size insurance firms to large international biotechnology companies. These organizations are located in the Canyon Park and North Creek regional activity centers, in four business parks plus a few stand-alone corporate campuses. The Downtown community activity center also is expected to attract some of these types of businesses in the coming years as redevelopment occurs.

## **Utilities, transit and government property**

See also **Utilities and Capital Facilities elements**. Utilities, transit facilities and government property take up a small but significant portion of the Planning Area. Such uses include utility corridors or facilities (oil, natural gas and water pipelines and electrical transmission lines and substations), transit park-and-ride lots and service centers, federal facilities such as the FEMA center on Nike Hill and FDA office in the Canyon Park Business Park, state- and county-owned property, and City-owned property such as City Hall, the police station, the three fire stations, the Dawson Building property, and the City's public works shop.

## **Schools**

See also **Capital Facilities Element**. The Bothell Planning Area contains public and private primary and secondary schools, a community college and a university. The Northshore School District provides public K-12 education: within the Planning Area, Northshore schools include eight elementary schools, three junior high schools, one high school, a special education center and an alternative high school. Private schools are operated by St. Brendan Parish, First Baptist Church

(Heritage Christian School) and Cedar Park Assembly of God. Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington, Bothell share a campus at the south end of the North Creek Valley.

## Parks

See also **Parks and Recreation and Capital Facilities elements**. Parks include areas designated for active play (whether fully developed or not) and areas of passive open space associated with the active areas. The City of Bothell is responsible for 18 parks, located around the City and ranging in size from less than 0.1 acre (Triangle Park) to 54 acres (Thrasher's Corner Park). Outside the City limits but within the Planning Area boundary, King County maintains East Norway Hill park, located north of the Tolt Pipeline and west of 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

## Quasi-public meeting places

Meeting places such as churches and fraternal lodges which are privately owned but serve a wide range of residents are considered quasi-public. These are geographically distributed throughout the City, in both residential and commercial areas.

## Private open space

A number of residential and non-residential developments provide open space which remains privately owned and may or may not be publicly accessible. These may be in the form of open space tracts held in common ownership by a homeowner's association or trail areas such as those through the North Creek business parks which are privately maintained but open to the public.

## Right of way

Right of way consists of land dedicated to modes of travel, inclusive of motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian travel. Right of way typically accommodates utilities as well. Right of way is often overlooked as a use by itself, but in Bothell - as in most jurisdictions - it comprises around a fifth of all land.

# Land Use Plan Development

The proposed distribution of land use types, densities, and intensities resulted from a process which emphasized public involvement.

At the outset of the original comprehensive planning process in 1990, the Bothell City Council directed that the land use element be constructed "from the neighborhood up." In order to accomplish this, the Planning Area was divided into 13 subareas, each averaging about one square mile in area and containing an average population of about 2,150 (see **Figure LU-4**). Each subarea is the subject of its own plan, coordinated with the plans of adjacent subareas and consistent with overall city goals and policies, countywide planning policies, multi-county policies and the goals of the GMA.

The subarea planning process began in June, 1992, with a series of eight open houses held throughout the Planning Area designed to gather public opinion to provide initial direction for the development of draft subarea plans. These draft plans were presented at Planning Commission "Town Meetings" structured as informally as possible to encourage public comment. In some cases, the Planning Commission reached consensus on subarea land use issues in one evening. Other subareas required two or three separate Town Meetings to resolve land use issues.

From the subarea plan meetings emerged certain values and directions which are common to all subareas. These have been incorporated within this Land Use element as "framework" goals and policies to ensure Planning Area-wide consistency among subarea plans. This element also contains a land use allocation map integrating the individual land use allocation maps from each of the subarea plans.

The 2004 Plan Update followed the precepts of the original Plan development in encouraging public involvement at both the Planning Area-wide and neighborhood levels. Open houses and public hearings were held for the updates of the Planning Area-wide elements and subarea plans. An added feature in the 2004 Update, not available for the original Plan development, was the extensive use of the City's website to disseminate draft documents for public review. The public participation process for the 2004 Update is detailed in the Introduction.

## Growth targets v. capacities

One of the key principles of the Growth Management Act is that jurisdictions must accommodate their fair share of the region's growth. The state Office of Financial Management (OFM) is responsible for projecting each county's population growth over a 20-year period. Based upon these projections, the Act states, "the county and each city within the county shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county or city for the succeeding twenty-year period, except for those urban growth areas contained totally within a national historical reserve."

King and Snohomish counties each sub-allocate the county-wide population projections they receive from OFM to their cities, unincorporated areas within UGAs, and unincorporated areas outside of UGAs (rural areas). Additionally, the counties generate and sub-allocate employment projections which are based on forecasts generated by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC).

Each county's sub-allocation process incorporates input from its cities, in King County through the Growth Management Planning Council, and in Snohomish County through Snohomish County Tomorrow. The processes result in jurisdiction-specific population and employment targets: each jurisdiction is required to accommodate its targets in its comprehensive plan. In other words, each jurisdiction must designate adequate amounts of land at sufficient ranges of densities and intensities to ensure that the population and employment targets are realistically attainable. The total amount of population or employment a jurisdiction could conceivably accommodate, independent of time, is its capacity: capacity should not be less than the target, but it may be greater, to accommodate growth beyond the target year.

It should be noted that the Snohomish County countywide planning policies provide for a "reconciliation process" in the event new plans or plan amendments do not accommodate assigned population and/or employment targets. The King County countywide planning policies do not contain such a process.

The following five sections examine the relationship between Bothell's growth targets and the City's population and employment capacities as a result of the 2004 Plan Update. The sections address, in order;

- 2025 population and employment growth targets
- Capacity as of 2002, as determined under the Buildable Lands requirements of the GMA;
- Changes to capacity as a result of Plan and Code amendments adopted late in 2002;
- Further changes to capacity as a result of the 2004 Plan amendments; and

- How total capacity after the 2004 amendments compares to the forecasted growth targets.

## 2025 population and employment growth targets

In 2002 OFM released countywide population forecasts for 2025. Both King County, through its Growth Management Planning Council, and Snohomish County, through its Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee, have sub-allocated these OFM forecasts and PSRC-based employment forecasts for the same time frame, and have assigned targets to their respective municipalities and urban and rural unincorporated areas. However, the methodologies used by the two counties are not directly comparable. For one example, King County projects households, while Snohomish County projects population. For another, King County forecasts to 2022, while Snohomish County forecasts to 2025. And for a third, King County expresses its forecasts in additional households and jobs, while Snohomish County expresses its forecasts in total population and employment.

For these reasons, adjustments must be made when the two counties' numbers are combined, so that Bothell's growth targets can be measured against the City's capacity to accommodate those targets.

The following tables present the King County and Snohomish County growth targets for Bothell exactly as the two counties have provided them, and then adjust the targets to achieve comparability. The adjustments are explained in footnotes. Please note that growth targets are not provided for Bothell's PAA or the portions of its MUGA (in the Canyon Creek and Fitzgerald subareas) which have been included in the 2004 update. In these cases, insufficient data exists for these areas to be able to accurately calculate total forecasted population and employment.

**Table LU-2: 2025 population growth targets**

Portion of City	Baseline year		Forecast for selected end year		Adjustments to achieve comparability	2025 target expressed as total population
	2000	2002	2022	2025		
Incorporated area within King County	16,119 population (per Fed. Census)		+1,751 new units		See Footnote	20,836
Incorporated area within Sno. County		14,490 population (per OFM)		22,000 total population	None needed	22,000
<b>Total incorporated area population target:</b>						<b>42,836</b>
<p><b>Footnote:</b> Units were converted to population based on 2004 OFM persons per household calculation for Bothell of 2.37: <math>1,751 \times 2.37 = 4,150</math>. That number was then extrapolated from 2022 to 2025 by adding to 4,150 three times the average annual increase in population between 2001 and 2022: <math>4,150 / 22 = 189 \times 3 = 567 + 4,150 = 4,717</math>. 4,717 was then added to the 2000 population of 16,119 for a total forecasted population of 20,836.</p>						

**Table LU-3: 2025 employment growth targets**

Portion of City	Baseline year		Forecast end year		Adjustments to achieve comparability	2025 target expressed as total employment
	2000	2002	2022	2025		
Incorporated area within King County	10,560 (per PSRC)		+2000 new jobs		See footnote	12,833
Incorporated area within Sno. County	10,150 jobs (per Sno. Co.; 8,565 per PSRC)			15,840 total jobs	None needed	15,840
<b>Total incorporated area employment target:</b>						<b>28,673</b>
<b>Footnote:</b> The number of new jobs was extrapolated from 2022 to 2025 by adding to 2000 three times the average annual increase in employment between 2001 and 2022: $2,000 / 22 = 91 \times 3 = 273 + 2,000 = 2,273$ . 2,273 was then added to the 2000 employment of 10,560 for a total forecasted employment of 12,833.						

Having established the population and employment targets Bothell is required to accommodate, the analysis will now proceed to examine the City’s population and employment capacities to determine whether the targets are realistically attainable. For baseline population and employment capacities, the results of the 2002 Buildable Lands analysis, a GMA-required program, are utilized. These capacities are then adjusted for Plan and Code amendments which were adopted late in 2002, and further adjusted for the 2004 Plan amendments.

### 2002 Buildable Lands analysis

To ensure that jurisdictions are taking the necessary actions to accommodate growth, the state legislature in 1997 amended the GMA to incorporate a review and evaluation program. The Buildable Lands amendment required King, Snohomish and four other Washington counties to determine the amount of land suitable for urban development and evaluate its capacity for growth based on measurement of five years of actual development activity. The affected counties were required to report to the State by September 1, 2002 and every five years thereafter.

The King County and Snohomish County 2002 Buildable Lands Reports are incorporated in this 2004 Update as Appendices C and D, respectively. Following are excerpts from each of the reports concerning Bothell’s growth up to 2000 / 2001 within the existing city limits (analyses were not done for Bothell’s PAA or MUGA due to lack of sufficient detailed data for those areas). Please note that the two counties used somewhat different land capacity methodologies, time periods and reporting formats. For example, King County reports remaining residential capacity, stated in terms of numbers of units: Snohomish County reports total residential capacity, in terms of number of persons.

Please note that the targets referred to in the Buildable Lands reports were for 2012 population and employment, rather than 2025 (the 2025 forecasts were not available when the Buildable Lands process began). This does not affect the capacity numbers, however, since capacity is independent of time. Note also that the tables are not assigned numbers, since they are excerpted from the King County and Snohomish County Buildable Lands reports.

#### From King County Buildable Lands Report:

##### “Residential capacity analysis

“Bothell has a total residential capacity of 2,280 units. Its remaining target to 2012 is 651 households. This amounts to a capacity for 1,629 units greater than its target. Bothell has achieved 67 per cent of its target in the first eight years of the twenty-year planning period.

“Residential capacity in relation to target					
Net New Units: 1993-2000	20-Year Housing Target	Percent Achieved	Remaining target	Current Residential Capacity	Surplus or Deficit in Relation to Target
1,304	1,955	67%	651	2,280	+1,629”

**“Employment capacity in relation to target**

“Data on employment change for the years 1995 to 2000 indicate that Bothell has achieved about 50 percent of its current twenty-year target of 2,900 jobs. After accounting for this increase, the city has a remaining target of 1,454 jobs. Bothell has capacity for 2,201 new jobs including about 750 jobs in excess of what is needed to accommodate the target.

“Net New Jobs 95-00	20 yr. Job Target	Percent of Target Achieved in 5 Yrs. (25% of Target Period)	Remaining Job Target	Remaining Job Capacity	Surplus or Deficit in Relation to Remaining Target
1,446	2,900	50%	1,454	2,201	+747”

**From Snohomish County 2002 Buildable Lands Report:**

Please note that the Snohomish County report contains two different capacity scenarios. Scenarios A and B use the same parcel information, but reflect different methodological assumptions, and therefore have different calculations of remaining residential and employment capacity. Scenario A was developed through the Snohomish County Tomorrow review process: Scenario B was developed through the County Council review process.

**Population capacity analysis**

“2001 Estimate	2002 Estimate	Scenario A		Scenario B		Capacity difference between A and B	
		Additional capacity as of 2001	Total capacity	Additional capacity as of 2001	Total capacity	Amount	Percent
14,160	14,490	5,317	19,477	4,402	18,562	(915)	-17.2%”

**Employment capacity analysis**

“2000 Estimate	Scenario A		Scenario B		Capacity difference between A and B	
	Additional capacity as of 2001	Total capacity	Additional capacity as of 2001	Total capacity	Amount	Percent
10,150	4,185	14,335	3,292	13,442	(893)	-21.3%”

“For the period 1995-2000, the cities and county are achieving urban densities, consistent with their comprehensive plans, within urban growth areas.”

“Under Scenario A, there is sufficient individual and collective residential and employment land capacity within the existing UGAs to accommodate the remaining portion of the adopted 2012 population and employment growth ranges.”

“Under Scenario B, using population and employment forecasts updated as of January 2002, there is sufficient collective population and employment capacity for 2012. However, there are two individual UGA capacity exceptions: 1) insufficient population capacity for 2012 in the Gold Bar UGA, and 2) insufficient employment capacity for 2012 in the Lake Stevens UGA.”

Population and employment capacities from the two Buildable Lands analyses are combined in the table below. Please note that since the King County Buildable Lands Report only provided remaining capacity (and in the case of population only in number of units), total capacity had to be calculated using additional information from OFM and PSRC. How these numbers were derived is explained in footnotes in the tables.

**Table LU-4: Population capacity based on 2002 Buildable Lands reports, v. target**

Portion of City	Existing (2004)	Population capacity per 2002 Buildable Lands Report	2025 target expressed as total population
Within King County	16,250	21,523 (1)	20,836
Within Snohomish County	14,680	18,562 - 19,477 (2)	22,000
<b>Total:</b>	<b>30,930</b>	<b>40,085 - 41,000</b>	<b>42,836</b>
(1) 2000 population of 16,119, per federal census + (remaining dwelling unit capacity of 2,280 units x 2.37 persons per unit, per OFM) = 21,523			
(2) Expressed as range to reflect Scenarios A and B from Snohomish County Buildable Lands report			

**Table LU-5: Employment capacity based on 2002 Buildable Lands reports, v. target**

Portion of City	Existing (2004)	Employment capacity per 2002 Buildable Lands Report	2025 target expressed as total employment
Within King County	11,000 est.	12,761 (1)	12,833
Within Snohomish County	10,000 est.	13,442 - 14,335 (2)	15,840
<b>Total:</b>	<b>21,000 est.</b>	<b>26,203 - 27,096</b>	<b>28,673</b>
(1) 2000 employment of 10,560, per PSRC, + remaining job capacity of 2,201 = 12,761			
(2) Expressed as range to reflect Scenarios A and B from Snohomish County Buildable Lands report			

In summary, as of early 2002 the population capacity in the King County portion of Bothell was sufficient to meet the 2025 King County target, but the population capacity in the Snohomish County portion fell short of meeting the 2025 Snohomish County target. Employment capacities in the King and Snohomish County portions of Bothell were both insufficient to meet the respective county targets.

## 2002 Plan and Code amendments

In 2002 the Bothell City Council adopted Plan and Code amendments which significantly revised maximum allowed building height and removed residential density limits in the City's community and regional activity centers, in which all but a handful of the City's employment is located. These amendments were completed after data was finalized for King County's and Snohomish County's 2002 Buildable Lands reports: as a consequence, the capacity impacts of the amendments were not incorporated in those reports.

The amendments provided for the following:

- In the Canyon Park regional activity center, the amendments increased maximum building height from 50 to 100 feet, with added height allowed for manufacturing uses which required facilities taller than 100 feet.
- In the North Creek regional activity center, building heights on the valley floor were lowered, from unlimited height (with setback limitations) to 100 /150 feet.
- In the Thrashers Corner, Canyon Park and Downtown community activity centers, allowed building height was increased from 35 to 65 feet, subject to conditions.
- Finally, in the Downtown and Canyon Park community activity centers and in the Canyon Park and North Creek regional activity centers, the previous residential density limit of 15 units per acre was removed: actual density realized is expected to be around 40 units per acre in these areas.

Most of the land in the above-referenced centers is already developed, although many buildings are only one story in height, and very few contain residential units. The under-developed nature of much of the land in these centers (even under the prior regulations), combined with the magnitude of the increase in development potential created by most of the amendments, are together very likely to prompt substantial redevelopment in the affected areas within the next 20 years. Accordingly, the Buildable Lands capacity numbers require adjustment to reflect increases in population and employment capacity resulting from these amendments.

The need to adjust capacity for redevelopment potential is recognized in the King County and Snohomish County Buildable Lands reports.

A methodology discussion in the Snohomish County report reads, in part;

“In most cities, zoning designations were used to predict future densities since it was determined to be the most reliable predictor of future residential densities and commercial / industrial intensities.”

“If there was no development history experienced within a designation between 1995 - 2000, city staff was consulted as to an appropriate and likely substitute future density assumption to use. These instances are labeled ‘assumed’ in the development history summary tables. Similarly, if city or county staff indicated that conditions had changed sufficiently since the observed development history was obtained (i.e., development regulations had recently changed), making it unlikely that past densities would be the best indicator of future densities, the replacement densities by plan/zone designation were also labeled ‘assumed’ in the development history tables.” (Pages 21 and 22; emphasis added)

On this same topic, the King County report reads;

**“Redevelopable land zoned for multifamily residential, commercial, industrial, and mixed uses.** The Buildable Lands Program Guidelines refer to such lands as ‘under-utilized’ and define them as follows:

“All parcels of land zoned for more intensive use than that which currently occupies the property. For instance, a single family home on multifamily-zoned land will generally be considered under-utilized. This classification also includes redevelopable land, i.e., land on which development has already occurred but on which, due to present or expected market forces, there exists the strong likelihood that existing development will be converted to more intensive uses during the planning period.’

“Parcels zoned for multifamily residential uses that met this definition were identified primarily based on comparisons of current and potential densities and uses. Parcels zoned for commercial, industrial, or mixed uses were identified primarily using the ratio of improvement to land value as determined by the Assessor. The most common threshold for redevelopability was a ratio of < 0.5. Alternatively, several cities used a measured gap between existing development densities and maximum-zoned densities as a primary indicator of redevelopment potential.” (Page 16; emphasis added)

The above excerpts can be summarized as stating that although each county’s basic methodology, in accordance with GMA, is to project future densities and intensities based on densities and intensities achieved in the past, assumed future densities and intensities based on Plan designations and zoning may be used where the basic approach is found not to reliably predict future development.

Accordingly, as a part of the policy analysis for the 2002 Plan and Code amendments, the assumed future density and intensity approach was utilized to quantify the impacts of the then-proposed amendments on population and employment capacity.

Because the affected activity centers were considered to be under-developed even under the then-existing regulations, the analysis calculated assumed future densities and intensities under both the then-existing regulations and the then-proposed amendments, and compared the two (the complete analysis is included as **Appendix E**).

The deductions incorporated in the analysis were the same as those employed in the King County Buildable Lands analysis (20 percent for critical areas and their buffers; 18 percent for right of way; two percent for other public purposes; and a 15 percent market factor). In addition, the maximum development potential after these deductions was further discounted by between 25 and 50 percent (depending on the maximum height allowed), to account for the historical tendency of development in commercial and mixed use areas to not achieve maximum allowed densities and intensities throughout those areas.

Even with this additional discount, the assumed future intensities approach generated employment capacities under the then-existing regulations and then-proposed amendments which were substantially larger than those obtained under the achieved-intensity approach utilized in the King County and Snohomish County Buildable Lands analyses.

In the Snohomish County part of Bothell, the Snohomish County Buildable Lands report determined employment capacity prior to the 2002 amendments to be between 13,442 and 14,335. In comparison, the assumed future intensity analysis for the amendments determined the employment capacity under the then-existing regulations to be 16,961, and under the then-proposed amendments

to be 37,217, later reduced to 26,394 (please note that the original amended height considered was 150 feet, and was later lowered to 100 feet).

In the King County portion of Bothell, the disparity was far greater. The King County Buildable Lands report determined employment capacity prior to the 2002 amendments to be 12,761. In contrast, the assumed future intensity analysis determined the employment capacity under the then-existing regulations (i.e., unlimited height) to be 53,955, and under the then-proposed amendments to be 52,727 (at 150 feet maximum), later lowered to 41,158 (at 100 feet maximum). Note that the post-amendments employment capacity was lower than the pre-amendments capacity due to the change from unlimited heights to 150 feet, and then to 100 feet. Note also that the total includes the projected 10,000-student enrollment at the University of Washington, Bothell / Cascadia Community College campus. This enrollment, expected to be achieved within the 20-year planning horizon, was counted as employment because students occupy buildings in the North Creek regional activity center that might otherwise be occupied by employees (albeit not in such high concentrations).

The assumed future intensities approach also generated higher pre- and post-amendment population capacities in the affected areas than those obtained under the achieved-intensity approach utilized in the Buildable Lands analysis. The differences in results between the approaches were not so dramatic for population as they were for employment, due to the smaller amount of land designated for community activity centers, which is where the new residential units generally would be built; the lesser height increases in those activity centers (from 35 feet to 65 feet); and the assumption that such units would be part of mixed-use developments.

Estimated 2001 population in the affected King County activity centers was 1,074, and in the affected Snohomish County activity centers was 568, for a total of 1,642. Buildable Lands population capacity numbers were not obtainable for the discrete areas comprising the activity centers. Under the assumed future densities approach utilized for the 2002 amendments, however, pre-amendment capacities for these areas were calculated to be 2,954 in King County and 1,422 in Snohomish County, while post-amendment capacities were calculated to be 4,353 in King County and 3,523 in Snohomish County (population capacities were originally included for the North Creek valley floor in King County, but have been excluded because residential development in that area is not realistic, given the nature and extent of office and light industrial development which has occurred there). Therefore, the increases in population capacities as a result of the 2002 Plan and Code Amendments are +1,399 in the King County portion of Bothell, and +2,101 in the Snohomish County portion of Bothell.

The tables on the following page add the above-described increases in population and employment capacity as a result of the 2002 amendments to the capacities from the Buildable Lands reports to derive total population and employment capacities after the 2002 amendments.

**Table LU-6: Population capacity based on Buildable Lands report + 2002 Amendments, v. target**

Portion of City	Total capacity per 2002 Buildable Lands Report	Adjustment for 2002 Plan and Code amendments	Total population capacity after 2002 amendments but before 2004 amendments	2025 target, expressed as total population
Within King County	21,523	+ 1,399	22,922	20,836
Within Snohomish County	18,562 - 19,477	+ 2,101	20,663 - 21,578	22,000
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>40,085 - 41,000</b>	<b>+ 3,500</b>	<b>43,585 - 44,500</b>	<b>42,836</b>

**Table LU-7: Employment capacity based on Buildable Lands report + 2002 Amendments, v. target**

Portion of City	Total capacity per 2002 Buildable Lands Report	Adjustment for 2002 Plan and Code amendments	Total employment capacity after 2002 amendments but before 2004 amendments	2025 target, expressed as total employment
Within King County	12,761	+ 28,397*	41,158*	12,833
Within Snohomish County	13,442 - 14,335	+ 12,059 to 12,952	26,394	15,840
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>26,203 - 27,096</b>	<b>+ 40,456 to 41,349</b>	<b>67,552</b>	<b>28,673</b>
* Includes projected 10,000 student enrollment at UWB/CCC				

In summary, the 2002 amendments increased the prior surplus in population capacity over the 2025 target in the King County portion of Bothell. In the Snohomish County portion of Bothell, the 2002 amendments increased population capacity to within 422 individuals, or about two percent, of meeting the 2025 target.

With respect to employment, the 2002 amendments, in combination with the effects of changing from an achieved-intensity methodology to an assumed future intensity methodology, resulted in large surplus capacities over the 2025 targets in both counties.

## 2004 Plan Update

Further adjustments to capacity are necessary as a consequence of the 2004 Plan Update. This update, the first overall review of the Imagine Bothell... Comprehensive Plan and implementing development regulations since the original adoption of the Plan in 1994, resulted in a number of changes to Plan designations which affected capacity.

All but one of these changes responded to decisions by the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board concerning threshold urban density. In these decisions the Board ruled that residential development at four dwelling units per net buildable acre - termed a "brightline" by the Board - clearly constituted compact urban development, and that densities below the brightline had to be justified on environmental or possibly other grounds. Accordingly, the Planning Commission and City Council considered all those areas within the City with existing designations of less than four dwelling units per acre. The results of these deliberations are summarized in the tables that follow.

The one Plan designation revision which is not brightline-related concerns the establishment of a boundary between an R 9,600 designation and more intensive designations in the area between Beardslee Boulevard and Ross Road in the North Creek Subarea, and the determination of what those more intensive designations should be. The impetus for consideration of this non-GMA-related amendment was a hitherto undetermined Plan boundary in this area: since a specific location for the boundary was being considered, the Council elected at the same time to address land use designations on the Beardslee Boulevard side of the boundary.

The implementation of these Plan amendments through revised and new development regulations - including rezones - is scheduled for 2005. The 2005 Code Update will also include some Code amendments which respond to Growth Management Act requirements or interpretations of the Act by the Central Puget Sound Growth Hearings Board but are not the direct result of 2004 Plan amendments.

The 2004 Plan Update originally included 34 property-owner-initiated requests for land use designation changes. The Planning Commission forwarded to the Council recommendations on these requests - some to approve, some to deny, and some to defer - but the Council determined that

insufficient time existed to adequately consider all these requests prior to the December 1, 2004 deadline established by the state for compliance with the Growth Management Act. Consequently, the Council deferred to 2005 consideration of all of these requests except for one which happened to be located between Beardslee Boulevard and Ross Road, in the North Creek Subarea, and was thus heard in conjunction with the larger boundary and designation issue discussed above.

Finally, the reader is reminded that the land use designations discussed here are all within the existing Bothell city limits, since the available information for calculating capacities and relating them to growth targets is limited to that geographic area (the obligation of cities to accommodate forecasted growth under the GMA is limited to their corporate boundaries). The Comprehensive Plan also assigns designations to unincorporated King County and Snohomish County territory within the Bothell Planning Area, but such designations of unincorporated land are not addressed in this capacity analysis.

The following tables analyze the effects on capacity of the 2004 Plan Amendments which revised land use designations within the city limits. The first table describes each issue and its disposition. The second table applies the Buildable Lands methodologies (using the assumptions of either King County's or Snohomish County's approach, as applicable) to each amendment to determine the net increase or decrease to capacity as a result of each action. The third table summarizes and totals the capacity changes.

**Table LU-8: Descriptions of 2004 land use designation revisions**

Please see **Figure LU-3** (in map pocket) and the relevant subarea plan for the location of each of the proposed revisions.

No.	GMA compliance issue?	Description of issue and <i>decision</i>
1	Yes	Brightline issue - Shelton View Subarea, south of 228 <sup>th</sup> , west of 4 <sup>th</sup> - Existence of R3 (R 12,500) Plan designation and R 12,500 zoning - <b><i>Change Plan from R 3 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 12,500 to R 9,600</i></b>
2	Yes	Brightline issue - Shelton View Subarea, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue north of 240 <sup>th</sup> - Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning - <b><i>Change Plan from R1 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 40,000 to R 9,600</i></b>
3	Yes	Brightline issue - Westhill Subarea, south of 240 <sup>th</sup> west of 7 <sup>th</sup> - Existence of R2 (R 20,000) Plan designation and R 20,000 zoning - <b><i>Change Plan from R2 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 20,000 to R 9,600</i></b>
4	Yes	Brightline issue - Waynita Subarea, top of Norway Hill - Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning - <b><i>Retain existing R 40,000 Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning</i></b>
5	Yes	Brightline issue - Fitzgerald Subarea, south of 228 <sup>th</sup> east of North Creek - Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Growth Reserve Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning - <b><i>Retain existing R 40,000 Plan designation and remove Growth Reserve; retain R 40,000 zoning</i></b>
6	Yes	Brightline issue - Canyon Creek Subarea, north of 228 <sup>th</sup> between 31 <sup>st</sup> and 35 <sup>th</sup> - Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Growth Reserve and R 40,000 zoning - <b><i>Change Plan from R1 to R 9,600 and remove Growth Reserve; change zoning from R 40,000 to R 9,600</i></b>
7	No	Plan boundary and designation issue - North Creek Subarea, between Beardslee Boulevard and Ross Road - Establish Plan and zoning boundary, and consider expansion of land use designations - <b><i>Establish boundary and change OP portion to R-AC, OP, NB; OP, NB; R 2,800, OP, NB; and R 5,400d, all with conditions.</i></b>

**Table LU-9: Effect of 2004 Plan amendments on Bothell population and employment capacity**

No.	Gross acres	KC deduct-ions (1)	SC deduct-ions (1)	KC mkt. factor (2)	SC mkt factor (2)	Availa-ble net builda-ble acres	A: Pre-amend-ments pop or emp capacity (3)	B: Post-amend-ments pop or emp capacity (3)	B - A: Net increase or de-crease in pop or emp capacity (SC / KC)
1	55.8		- 24		- 9.5	22.3	201 pop	268 pop	+ 67 pop (SC)
2	98.0		- 42		- 16.8	39.2	118 pop	471 pop	+ 353 pop (SC)
3	31.3		- 13.5		- 5.3	12.5	75 pop	150 pop	+ 75 pop (SC)
4	NA - Plan and zoning retained as is								0
5	NA - Plan and zoning retained as is (without Growth Reserve)								0
6	96.4		- 41.5		- 16.5	38.4	115 pop	462 pop	+ 347 pop, (SC)
7	12.2 (4)	- 4.9		- 1.1		6.2	0 pop	350 pop	+ 350 pop (KC)

**Footnotes:**

1. Critical areas and their buffers, right of way and land for other public purposes were deducted from gross acres. For critical areas and their buffers, and right of way, deductions were 20 percent and 18 percent, respectively, representing the City-wide percentages of these features. For land for other public purposes, deductions were 2 percent in King County and 5 percent in Snohomish County, utilizing the numbers applied in each county's Buildable Lands analyses.
2. A further market factor deduction was applied to account for the tendency of some developable properties not to be available during the planning horizon, due to the owner's disinterest in selling or other reasons. For properties in the King County portion of Bothell, 15 percent was applied, consistent with that county's Buildable Lands analysis. In the Snohomish County Buildable Lands analysis, 15 percent was applied to vacant land and 30 percent to under-utilized land. To err on the side of conservativeness, 30 percent was applied to all Snohomish County properties in this analysis. The market factor was deducted after other deductions were taken.
3. In accordance with the Buildable Lands methodologies, population capacity = net buildable acres x achieved or assumed number of units per acre x persons per household (per OFM) x occupancy rate (per OFM); employment capacity = net buildable acres x 43,560 x employment sector floor area ratio / number of square feet per employee.
4. The area between Beardslee Boulevard and Ross Road was assigned several different designations: R 9,600; R-AC, OP, NB; OP, NB; R 2,800, OP, NB; and R 5,400d. Population capacity was affected by the change from OP to R-AC, OP, NB; R 2,800, OP, NB; and R 5,400d. Employment capacity was not affected by any of the changes. The above analysis of effect on population capacity is only for the areas designated R-AC, OP, NB; R 2,800, OP, NB; and R 5,400d.

Table LU-10: Summary table of changes to population and employment capacity

No.	GMA compliance issue?	Description of issue / request, and <i>disposition</i>	Effect on population capacity (King / Sno.)	Effect on employment capacity (King / Sno.)
1	Yes	Brightline issue - Shelton View Subarea, south of 228 <sup>th</sup> , west of 4 <sup>th</sup> - Existence of R3 (R 12,500) Plan designation and R 12,500 zoning - <b><i>Change Plan from R3 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 12,500 to R 9,600</i></b>	+ 67 (SC)	0
2	Yes	Brightline issue - Shelton View Subarea, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue north of 240 <sup>th</sup> - Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning - <b><i>Change Plan from R1 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 40,000 to R 9,600</i></b>	+ 353 (SC)	0
3	Yes	Brightline issue - Westhill Subarea, south of 240 <sup>th</sup> west of 7 <sup>th</sup> - Existence of R2 (R 20,000) Plan designation and R 20,000 zoning - <b><i>Change Plan from R2 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 20,000 to R 9,600</i></b>	+ 75 (SC)	0
4	Yes	Brightline issue - Waynita Subarea, top of Norway Hill - Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning - <b><i>Retain existing R 40,000 Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning</i></b>	0	0
5	Yes	Brightline issue - Fitzgerald Subarea, south of 228 <sup>th</sup> east of North Creek - Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Growth Reserve Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning - <b><i>Retain existing R 40,000 Plan designation and remove Growth Reserve; retain R 40,000 zoning</i></b>	0	0
6	Yes	Brightline issue - Canyon Creek Subarea, north of 228 <sup>th</sup> between 31 <sup>st</sup> and 35 <sup>th</sup> - Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Growth Reserve and R 40,000 zoning - <b><i>Change Plan from R1 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 40,000 to R 9,600</i></b>	+ 347 (SC)	0
7	No	Plan boundary and designation issue - North Creek Subarea, between Beardslee Boulevard and Ross Road - Establish Plan and zoning boundary, and consider expansion of land use designations - <b><i>Establish boundary and change OP portion to R-AC, OP, NB; OP, NB; R 2,800, OP, NB; and R 5,400d, all with conditions.</i></b>	+ 350 (KC)	0
Net change in population capacity, King County portion of Bothell:			+ 350	
Net change in population capacity, Snohomish County portion of Bothell:			+ 842	
Net change in employment capacity, King County portion of Bothell:				0
Net change in employment capacity, Snohomish County portion of Bothell:				0

The following tables combine the above numbers with the population and employment capacities adjusted for the 2002 Amendments to derive total population and employment capacities after the 2004 Amendments, and compare these to the 2025 population and employment targets.

**Tables LU-11: Population capacity based on Buildable Lands report + 2002 Amendments, adjusted for 2004 Amendments, v. targets**

Portion of City	Total capacity per 2002 Buildable Lands Report + 2002 Amendments	Adjustment for 2004 Plan and Code amendments	Total population capacity after 2004 amendments	2025 target, expressed as total population
Within King County	22,922	+ 350	23,272	20,836
Within Snohomish County	20,663 - 21,578	+ 842	21,505 - 22,420	22,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>43,585 - 44,500</b>	<b>+ 1,192</b>	<b>44,774 - 45,692</b>	<b>42,836</b>

**Table LU-12: Employment capacity based on Buildable Lands report + 2002 Amendments, adjusted for 2004 Amendments, v. targets**

Portion of City	Total capacity per 2002 Buildable Lands Report + 2002 Amendments	Adjustment for 2004 Plan and Code amendments	Total employment capacity after 2004 amendments	2025 target, expressed as total employment
Within King County	41,158*	0	41,158*	12,833
Within Snohomish County	26,394	0	26,394	15,840
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>67,552</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>67,552</b>	<b>28,673</b>

\* Includes projected 10,000 student enrollment at UWB/CCC

## Growth targets v. capacities

The final step in this analysis is to combine in one set of tables the results of the three capacity analyses (Buildable Lands, Buildable Lands + 2002 Amendments, and Buildable Lands + 2002 Amendments + 2004 Amendments) and the 2025 population and employment targets.

**Tables LU-13: Summary of population capacities v. targets**

Portion of City	Population capacity based on Buildable Lands reports	Population capacity based on Buildable Lands + 2002 Amendments	Population capacity based on Buildable Lands + 2002 Amendments + 2004 Amendments	2025 Forecast expressed as total population
Within King County	21,523	22,922	23,272	20,836
Within Snohomish County	18,562 - 19,477	20,663 - 21,578	21,505 - 22,420	22,000
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>40,085 - 41,000</b>	<b>43,585 - 44,500</b>	<b>44,774 - 45,692</b>	<b>42,836</b>

Table LU-14: Summary of employment capacities v. targets

Portion of City	Employment capacity based on Buildable Lands reports	Employment capacity based on Buildable Lands + 2002 Amendments	Employment capacity based on Buildable Lands + 2002 Amendments + 2004 Amendments	2025 Forecast expressed as total employment
Within King County	12,761	41,158*	41,158*	12,833
Within Snohomish County	13,442 - 14,335	26,394	26,394	15,840
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>26,203 - 27,096</b>	<b>67,552</b>	<b>67,552</b>	<b>28,673</b>
* Includes projected 10,000 student enrollment at UWB/CCC				

In summary, Bothell has sufficient capacity following the 2004 Plan Update to accommodate 2025 population and employment growth targets in both King and Snohomish Counties.

## Consistency with Countywide Planning Policies

The Land Use Element has been reviewed against and is consistent with relevant King County and Snohomish County countywide planning policies. See **Appendix A**.

# Land Use

## Goals, Policies and Actions

### Goals

- LU-G1 To delineate through collaborative inter-jurisdictional processes in King and Snohomish Counties, Urban Growth Areas sufficient to permit the urban growth projected to occur in the two counties.
- LU-G2 To define a Bothell Planning Area, within the King and Snohomish County Urban Growth Areas, which comprises the land within the existing city limits plus unincorporated land within identified Potential Annexation Areas (in King County) and Municipal Urban Growth Areas (in Snohomish County) to which Bothell may feasibly provide future urban services, either directly or by contract, over the term of the Plan.
- LU-G3 To create a vibrant, sustainable, family-oriented community through the balanced allocation of land for housing, commerce, industry, recreation, transportation, open space, cultural resources and other uses.
- LU-G4 To provide for development first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, and second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources.
- LU-G5 To ensure consistency among land use designations near jurisdictional planning boundaries.
- LU-G6 To accommodate the amount of population and employment growth forecasted by the state Office of Financial Management, King County and Snohomish County for the City of Bothell over the term of the Plan.
- LU-G7 To preserve open space corridors within and at or near the boundaries of the Bothell Planning Area in order to provide for the aesthetic needs of the citizens of Bothell, to protect critical areas including floodprone lands, and to conserve fish and wildlife habitat.
- LU-G8 To preserve the 'feathered edge' visual transition from treed hillsides to sky which is an important part of Bothell's aesthetic character.
- LU-G9 To control storm water runoff in a manner which utilizes natural detention, retention and recharge techniques to the maximum extent possible.
- LU-G10 To protect the property rights of landowners from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.

# Policies

LU-P1 The Bothell Comprehensive Plan shall apply to that area depicted on **Figure LU-2** and termed the Bothell Planning Area. The Bothell Planning Area lies within designated Urban Growth Areas in both King and Snohomish Counties and comprises the land within the present city limits plus adjacent unincorporated land, termed Potential Annexation Areas (PAAs) in King County and Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs) in Snohomish County, to which the City is the logical long-term provider of urban-level services, via the process of annexation.

The Planning Area boundaries reflect a variety of considerations, including topography; existing land uses, including open space corridors; school district boundaries; boundaries of nearby municipalities; special district boundaries; postal service area boundaries; existing and planned infrastructure improvements; and community and neighborhood identification.

Land within identified Potential Annexation Areas and Municipal Urban Growth Areas shall be planned in a coordinated manner by the City and the applicable county. Following this planning effort but prior to annexation of such land, the City and the applicable county shall develop an interlocal agreement addressing matters including but not limited to assignment of Plan designations, implementation of development regulations in accordance with the Plan, transition of infrastructure responsibilities, reciprocal mitigation of impacts, and transfer of revenues.

LU-P2 The City shall not accept annexations outside the Urban Growth Area boundary, as delineated in accordance with King and Snohomish County countywide planning policies.

LU-P3 Collaborate with other jurisdictions within the UGA at least once every five years to evaluate the effectiveness of adopted UGA boundaries.

LU-P4 The City shall maintain a Comprehensive Plan Map (see **Figure LU-4** in map pocket) for the purpose of illustrating the proposed allocation of land uses throughout the Bothell Planning Area. Land uses shall be categorized by the following designations. It is intended that these designations be utilized separately where only one type of land use is determined to be appropriate, and in combination where more than one type of land use is determined to be appropriate. The development potential of any individual property under the land use designations of this Comprehensive Plan shall be based on the net buildable area of that property, and shall be further subject to planned unit development provisions, availability of necessary utilities, critical area regulations, impact mitigation, and other applicable development policies, regulations and standards. Net buildable area, for the purposes of this Comprehensive Plan, shall mean the gross land area, measured in acres, minus land area in roads and other rights of way, surface stormwater retention / detention / water quality facilities, critical areas, critical area buffers, and land dedicated to the City.

Comprehensive Plan Map designations shall be implemented through zoning classifications on the City's official Zoning Map.

1. **Residential, 40,000 square foot minimum lot size (R 40,000).**  
This designation shall provide for detached residential development at a minimum lot size of 40,000 square feet, plus compatible uses such as schools and churches.

This designation is appropriate for land encumbered by critical areas determined to be large in scope, complex in structure and function, and high in rank order value; land found to be a particularly important source of cool groundwater benefiting the health of anadromous fisheries in North Creek and its tributaries, and the Sammamish River; and/or land constrained in some other way so as to preclude the full range of public facilities and services necessary to support urban development.

The R 40,000 Plan designation shall be implemented by the R 40,000 zoning classification.

2. **Residential, 9,600 square foot minimum lot size (R 9,600);  
Residential, 8,400 square foot minimum lot size (R 8,400);  
Residential, 7,200 square foot minimum lot size (R 7,200);  
Residential, 5,400 square foot minimum lot size, detached (R 5,400d).**  
These designations shall provide for detached residential development at minimum lot sizes of 9,600, 8,400, 7,200 and 5,400 square feet, and compatible uses such as schools and churches.

In the R 9,600 designation, limited lot size averaging shall be allowed. Under this approach, the total area of all lots within a proposed R 9,600 subdivision divided by the number of lots shall amount to an average lot area of at least 9,600 square feet: 20 percent of lots in such a subdivision may be smaller than 9,600 square feet, but no smaller than 8,400 square feet nor larger than 14,400 square feet.

Generally, these designations are appropriate for most land in the planning area suitable for residential use with the exception of land located convenient to principal arterials and/or business and commercial activity centers, where higher densities may be warranted.

These Plan designations shall be implemented by identically named zoning classifications. That is, the R 9,600 Plan designation shall be implemented by the R 9,600 zoning classification; the R 8,400 Plan designation shall be implemented by the R 8,400 zoning classification; and so forth.

3. **Residential, one dwelling unit per 5,400 square feet of net buildable area, attached or detached (R 5,400a);  
Residential, one dwelling unit per 4,000 square feet of net buildable area (R 4,000);  
Residential, one dwelling unit per 2,800 square feet of net buildable area (R 2,800).**  
These designations shall provide for attached or detached residential development at one dwelling unit per 5,400, 4,000 and 2,800 square feet of net buildable area, and compatible uses such as schools, churches and day care centers.

Generally, these designations are appropriate for land which is located convenient to arterials and to business and commercial activity centers.

These Plan designations shall be implemented by identically named zoning classifications. That is, the R 5,400a Plan designation shall be implemented by the R 5,400a zoning classification; the R 4,000 Plan designation shall be implemented by the R 4,000 zoning classification; and the R 2,800 Plan designation shall be implemented by the R 2,800 zoning classification.

**4. Residential - Activity Center (R-AC).**

This designation shall provide for multi-family residential development in designated activity centers, and is intended to promote a variety of housing types in sufficient numbers to support a range of shopping, dining and entertainment opportunities within those centers. No specific density is prescribed: the number of units which may be constructed on an individual property or within the center shall be controlled by site and building regulations concerning height, parking, landscaping, setbacks and other aspects of development.

**5. Specialized Senior Housing Overlay (SSHO).**

This overlay designation shall allow specialized senior housing development (for persons 62 years of age and over and their spouses and/or live-in caregivers) at densities higher than normally permitted within R 40,000, R 9,600, R 8,400, R 7,200 and R 5,400d residential designations in specified locations where such development has been determined to be appropriate due to proximity to facilities and services which especially benefit the elderly. The particular density for a Specialized Senior Housing Overlay, as well as policies concerning the design and/or operation of specialized senior housing, shall be set forth in the Subarea Plan in which the SSHO is located. The Specialized Senior Housing Overlay provides for an additional use within, but does not replace, the underlying plan designation.

**6. Mobile Home Park (MHP).**

This designation shall be assigned to mobile home parks, and is intended to promote retention of such uses as a source of affordable detached single-family housing.

**7. Office-Professional (OP).**

This designation shall include personal and professional service businesses which commonly locate in office buildings, such as banks, medical and dental clinics, accounting, law, real estate, insurance, travel agencies and similar businesses.

**8. Neighborhood Business (NB).**

This designation shall comprise retail and service businesses which serve the limited item convenience shopping and personal service needs of the immediate surrounding neighborhood.

**9. Community Business (CB).**

This designation comprises most retail, dining, entertainment and similar businesses which are conducted primarily indoors. Such uses include but are not limited to grocery stores, drug stores, furniture stores, clothing stores, book stores, music stores, restaurants, movie theaters, and bowling alleys.

**10. General Commercial (GC).**

This designation comprises more intensive retail and service uses than described under Community Business above. General Commercial uses typically require outdoor display and/or storage of merchandise and tend to generate noise as a part of their operations. Such uses include but are not limited to auto, boat and recreational vehicle sales lots, tire and muffler shops, equipment rental, and mini-warehouses and vehicle storage.

**11. Motor Vehicle Sales Overlay (MVSO).**

This overlay designation shall allow motor vehicles sales on properties designated Community Business (CB) in specified locations where such development has been determined to be appropriate due to meeting three or more of the following criteria:

- a. Abut an arterial street;
- b. Adjacent to an intersection of two State Routes;
- c. The presence of intense retail activities in the vicinity including proximity to properties currently conducting motor vehicle sales; and
- d. The presence of an existing screening type landscape buffer or the ability to create such a buffer between any property designated MVSO and residential properties.

Policies concerning the design and/or operation of motor vehicles sales shall be set forth in the Subarea Plan in which a MVSO is located. The Motor Vehicle Sales Overlay provides for an additional use within, but does not replace, the underlying plan designation.

**12. Downtown Subarea Districts**

The Downtown Subarea Plan utilizes district designations unique to this subarea. These districts are described in summary below, and in detail in the Downtown Subarea Plan and Regulations.

**a. Downtown Core District (DC)**

The Downtown Core forms a “T” shaped area centered on connected segments of Main Street and SR 527. It is where a lively and synergistic mix of ground floor shops, restaurants, cafes, entertainment venues, and personal services are clustered, continuously lining and activating the key streets. It is also a pedestrian haven with comfortable, well-lit sidewalks along small blocks that combine to create a compact and walkable core area. Above the ground floor are offices and residences to support the pedestrian-oriented businesses and enliven the area.

**b. Downtown Neighborhood District (DN)**

The Downtown Neighborhood District completes the part of the subarea that most people will primarily identify as “Downtown.” Overall, Downtown is distinguished from its surroundings by its urban character: this is visible in the form of Downtown buildings built significantly closer together, closer to the sidewalk, and with a greater mixture of uses. The Downtown Neighborhood shares all of these distinguishing physical characteristics with the Downtown Core, with two key differences. First, buildings in the Downtown Neighborhood will more typically (but not exclusively) be single-use and second, the Urban Neighborhood provides a transition between

the Downtown Core and the characteristically less urban and more residential uses beyond in Downtown Transition districts.

**c. Downtown Transition District (DT)**

Downtown Transition Districts define areas of transitional development character between the denser Downtown Core and Downtown Neighborhood Districts and adjacent lower density existing residential neighborhoods outside of the Plan Area.

**d. SR 522 Corridor District (522)**

The corridor district zones - the SR-522 Corridor, and the General Downtown Corridor - are structured to strengthen the place distinction between the urbanized town center and the surrounding forested suburban districts, while continuing to accommodate important business functions on routes to and from the Downtown Core. With their commercial access and visibility, corridor properties are envisioned to continue to provide opportunities for existing and future businesses along with sites for corridor-configured lodging, workplace and residential buildings. The SR 522 Corridor consists of two contiguous segments of SR 522, divided by SR 527.

**e. General Downtown Corridor (GDC)**

The General Downtown Corridor District Zone includes two separate corridor segments. One is the Beardslee Boulevard corridor extending from 104th Avenue NE to the NE 195<sup>th</sup> Street/I-405 interchange, and the other is SR 527/Bothell Way NE, extending northward beyond the downtown core's multiway boulevard segment.

The intent for General Downtown Corridors is similar to that for SR 522 Corridors, with a few important differences: General Downtown Corridor arterials are presently narrower in numbers of lanes than those within the SR 522 Corridor; they are less intense in terms of the impact of the road facility; they contain more sensitive uses; surface parking will be restricted at both fronts and sides of buildings; and more types of smaller-scale residential building entrances will be permitted.

**f. Sunrise / Valley View District (SVV)**

The Sunrise / Valley View District consists of two primarily single family residential neighborhood areas flanked by both Downtown Corridors. It will be protected and renovated over time as the revitalized downtown increases the attraction of properties close to it. The pattern of quiet streets and the mixture of housing types and styles of these Downtown neighborhood areas will remain the foundation of their character and identity.

**g. Campus District (C)**

The co-located University of Washington Bothell and Cascadia Community College (UWB/CCC) provide a landmark eastern presence for Downtown Bothell. The Downtown Plan recognizes the potential for mutual benefit in strengthening safe and attractive pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between the downtown core and the campus and

strengthening the downtown to better serve as a convenient and attractive “campus town” and residential district for students, faculty and staff.

**h. Parks and Public Open Space District (PPOS)**

Downtown Bothell is gifted with the strong visual and physical proximity of natural forest and river environment that form the Subarea’s southern and eastern edges, by means of the Sammamish River and North Creek corridors. The UWB/CCC Campus and Beardslee Boulevard connect to the North Creek Trail, which in turn joins with the Sammamish River Trail to the south. South of the downtown core, the Park at Bothell Landing is the City’s focal gathering space, beloved by the community and site of many festivals and performances as well as a place for weekend picnics and everyday relaxation. It connects over the Sammamish River via the Park’s pedestrian bridge to the Sammamish River Trail which follows the river’s edge both east and west, connecting to the Burke-Gilman Trail and areas beyond Bothell.

**13. Light Industrial (LI).**

This designation comprises non-polluting manufacturing and processing, wholesaling, warehousing and distribution and other similar activities. Such uses tend to require large buildings and to generate more large truck traffic than do other types of land uses.

**14. Mixed Use (MU).**

This designation does not indicate a land use by itself, but is intended to be utilized where integrated development of more than one type of land use within a property or area is desired. Such integrated development may include but not be limited to coordinated building design, signage, landscaping and access.

**15. Civic Educational (CE).**

This designation shall include but not be limited to such public facilities as schools, libraries, community centers, police stations, fire stations, and municipal or school district administration buildings. Potential sites for civic-educational facilities shall be denoted on the plan map by the letters CE in brackets to indicate that a facility is appropriate in an area but that the exact location may not yet be determined. Depiction of an existing or potential site for a civic-educational facility shall not supersede the underlying plan designation.

**16. Park (P).**

This designation shall include public neighborhood, community and regional parks and recreation facilities. Potential sites for parks and recreation facilities shall be denoted on the plan map by the letter P in brackets to indicate that a facility is appropriate in an area but that the exact location may not yet be determined. Depiction of an existing or potential park site shall not supersede the underlying Comprehensive Plan designation.

**17. Open Space (OS).**

This designation shall be assigned to land which has been preserved as undisturbed natural open space, through purchase by the City or other public entity, acquisition of development rights, or other mechanism. Potential dedicated open space is denoted on the land use allocation map by the letters

OS in brackets to indicate that preservation of land as open space is appropriate, but that the exact location and amount of land to be reserved may not yet be determined. It is intended that a corridor with a minimum width of 50 feet to enhance wildlife movement shall be preserved within these areas. Depiction of existing or potential open space shall not supersede the underlying Comprehensive Plan designation. The basis for establishment of an open space system shall be the existing network of heavily treed steep slopes, wetlands and waterway corridors depicted in **Figure LU-5**.

A second component of open space is the aesthetic concept termed the 'feathered edge'. The feathered edge comprises the silhouette of hillside or hilltop coniferous trees against the sky, and is an important part of Bothell's visual character. Such treed areas also provide habitat and retard erosion and runoff. Trees which constitute the feathered edge typically are those located along ridgelines and for a distance of 50 to 75 feet or more downhill from the ridgelines. The City shall strive to preserve the feathered edge through the imposition of clearing restrictions on development proposals located on or near ridgelines and hilltops. The feathered edge is mapped on **Figure LU-6**.

**18. Transit facility (T).**

This designation shall include transit facilities including but not limited to park and ride lots, transit centers and stations, and dedicated transit rights of way. Potential transit facilities shall be denoted on the plan map by the letter T in brackets to indicate that a transit facility is appropriate in an area but that the exact location may not yet be determined. Depiction of an existing or potential transit facility shall not supersede the underlying Comprehensive Plan designation.

**19. Utility facility (U).**

This designation shall include utility facilities including but not limited to water tanks, electrical distribution substations, microwave and other transmission towers, and high-voltage electrical transmission corridors. Potential utility facilities shall be denoted on the plan map by the letter U in brackets to indicate that a utility facility is appropriate in an area but that the exact location may not yet be determined. Depiction of an existing or potential utility facility shall not supersede the underlying Comprehensive Plan designation.

**20. Critical Area (depicted on critical areas maps).**

Critical areas include wetlands, areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas. Within these areas City policies and regulations may restrict development to a lesser density or intensity than that allowed by the underlying plan designation. Critical areas are depicted on critical areas maps separate from the Land Use map. The critical areas maps are intended to alert users to the likely existence of critical areas, and should not be construed as providing an exact depiction of the location or extent of those areas, or their exact character.

Critical areas regulations are intended to protect environmentally sensitive portions of properties without unduly limiting development on environmentally unconstrained portions. The City recognizes that in order to be effective, this approach relies heavily on enforcement of critical areas regulations. The City

shall monitor developments containing critical areas for any degradation to those critical areas resulting from violations of regulations. Should it be found that the level of protection mandated by the regulations is not being achieved, the City shall consider additional or alternative approaches including but not limited to reducing permitted densities and intensities of development allowed near critical areas.

- LU-P5 Promote integration of housing and commercial development in locations where combining such uses would be mutually beneficial.
- LU-P6 Preserve the character of established neighborhoods and protect such neighborhoods from intrusion by incompatible uses. Infill development in established neighborhoods should be sensitive to and incorporate to the maximum extent possible those features which impart to each neighborhood a unique identity and sense of coherence. Examples of such features include a particular scale or style of housing, commonality in building materials (e.g. brick vs. wood siding), a predominant street pattern, a prevailing lot size and width, and similarities in landscaping from property to property.
- LU-P7 Ensure that private property is not taken for public use without just compensation having been made.
- LU-P8 Allow adult entertainment businesses within the City subject to locational, signage, landscaping and operational controls designed to reduce and mitigate the deleterious secondary impacts of such businesses while preserving constitutionally protected forms for expression.

Properties within the General Commercial zoning of the Downtown Subarea which are located south of a point approximately 300 feet south of the intersection of SR 522 and Hall Road, and which have frontage on SR 522, have been determined to be appropriate locations for adult entertainment businesses. The adverse secondary impacts of adult entertainment businesses can be minimized and mitigated by restricting their location to this area because it is separated from residential areas and other sensitive uses vertically by topography and/or horizontally by the width and amount of traffic on SR-522. No more than three adult entertainment establishments shall be allowed within this area at one time. Signage for adult entertainment businesses in this area shall not contain language, drawings, pictures or other depictions representing or suggestive of sexual acts.

In order to promote city urban design and transportation goals and policies, future development should incorporate the following features, to the degree allowed by the severe topography in the area:

- a. Driveways should be a minimum of 300 feet apart and/or shared between adjacent properties in order to minimize congestion caused by vehicles entering or exiting traffic;
- b. Internal vehicle access should be provided from property to property in such a manner as to allow a smooth flow of traffic across consecutive adjoining properties;
- c. Plantings and other techniques such as berming shall be utilized along the street frontage to mitigate the visual impacts of development along SR-522, provided that a clear view of the building entrances and parking lot of any adult entertainment business is preserved for law enforcement purposes.

- LU-P9 The City should consider options, when presented, to preserve passive or active open space.
- LU-P10 Pursue the establishment of a network of open space corridors (urban separators) within and on the boundaries of the Planning Area and especially along the Sammamish River and North Creek corridors through acquisition of property, reservation of easements, or other means subject to criteria as contained in the City's Long Range Parks, Recreation and Open Space Action Program and elsewhere in this Element. See **Figure LU-5**.
- LU-P11 Protect and preserve tree-covered hillsides and hilltops – particularly the feathered edge ridgeline image so valued by the community – for their visual and aesthetic benefits to Bothell, as well as for their functions as habitat, erosion control, and runoff retardation. See also Land Use Policy LU-P4, designation 16, Open Space. See **Figure LU-6**.
- LU-P12 Prohibit any development within the floodplain which would tend to worsen upstream or downstream flooding and pursue the discontinuation of such uses which now exist in the floodplain as these uses lose their economic life. Manage floodprone areas and storm and flood waters of the City in accordance with the Critical Areas Ordinance and the City of Bothell Comprehensive Stormwater Master Plan, which is adopted by reference as a part of this Comprehensive Plan (see Capital Facilities Element).
- LU-P13 Monitor development to determine whether assumptions made in the Plan regarding the rate, nature and distribution of development remain valid.
- LU-P14 Ensure that essential public facilities are sited in an equitable manner which balances local and regional objectives.

Essential public facilities are those facilities owned and/or operated by a unit of local or state government, a public utility or transportation company, or any other entity providing a public service as its primary mission, which facilities have the following characteristics:

1. They are necessary components of a system or network which provides a public service or good;
2. They serve a population base extending beyond the limits of the host community;
3. They have perceived or real adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding area which commonly result in local opposition to such facilities.

Essential public facilities include, but are not limited to, sewage treatment plants, reservoirs, electrical substations and transmission lines, local airport and port facilities, landfills and solid waste transfer stations, senior high schools, community colleges, four-year colleges and universities, correctional institutions, special population diagnostic or treatment facilities, stormwater retention or detention facilities serving large drainage basins, and major transit facilities.

The City supports the use of a common site review process for essential public facilities, and has incorporated such a process in the development regulations.

- LU-P15 Update the Plan on a regular basis to ensure that it continues to reflect community values and desires as they may change over time. The scope of a Plan update may vary:

- It may concern the entire Plan (although such major updates are anticipated no more often than every seven years).
- It may concern individual or multiple elements or subareas of the Plan. For example, the capital facilities element needs to be revised regularly to reflect completed projects, new planned projects, and changing city priorities.
- It may concern specific property designations or policies, in response to amendment requests from citizens or appointed or elected City officials.

The scope and timing of each Plan update will be determined by the City Council.

In accordance with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the Comprehensive Plan may be updated only once each year, except that amendments may be adopted more frequently for the initial adoption of a subarea plan, the adoption of a Shoreline Master Program, to resolve an appeal of an adopted comprehensive plan filed with a Growth Management Hearing Board or with the Court, or in cases where an emergency exists (cumulatively referred to herein as emergency amendments). The GMA requires that the Council, the Planning Commission and other advisory bodies participating in a Plan update consider the cumulative effects of all proposed amendments included in that update. In other words, although the Planning Commission, other advisory boards and Council may consider a number of element and subarea plan amendments separately over the course of an update they may act on any proposed amendments to the Plan as a unit only (excluding emergency amendments), and then only after assessing the cumulative effect of the amendments and confirming that the amendments are internally consistent with other portions of the Plan.

In the event that a proposed amendment is denied, the amendment shall not be considered again for a period of at least five years, unless the Council determines that the amendment should be considered again in a shorter time period. This waiting period is to ensure that the same amendment request is not repeatedly considered, which would be an inefficient use of city resources and would unfairly burden citizens in the area affected by the proposed amendment.

- LU-P16 If capital facilities and operational levels of service fall below adopted standards or guidelines, reassess this land use element to determine whether changes in designations or other aspects of this element are warranted.
- LU-P17 If, as a result of the periodic review and evaluation required by RCW 36.70A.215 (also known as the Buildable Lands review), it is demonstrated that this Plan and implementing development regulations are not achieving the goals of the Growth Management Act, identify and implement measures that are reasonably likely to promote consistency with the Act through the Comprehensive Plan update process.
- LU-P18 Withhold development approvals in the event that levels of service for which standards have been adopted in this Plan fall below the adopted standards.

## Actions

- LU-A1 Take action as necessary to implement the above policies, in accordance with the Growth Management Act. Such actions shall include but not be limited to the following:

1. Rezoning of properties and revision of the official Zoning Map as warranted to implement comprehensive plan designations;
2. Review and adoption of regulations addressing siting of essential public facilities;
3. Adoption of regulations addressing preservation of the feathered edge in development proposals on and near hilltops and ridgelines;
4. Negotiation of interlocal agreements with King and Snohomish County regarding the identification of Potential Annexation Areas and Municipal Urban Growth Areas and the annexation of land and consistency of zoning and development regulations within those areas.

LU-A2 Establish a process by which development activity is monitored and assessed against projected population, dwelling unit and employment growth as quantified in the land use capacity analysis. On a periodic basis, report to the Council the results of this monitoring. Identify a threshold at which departures from projected population, dwelling unit and employment growth warrant consideration of amendments to land use designations.

LU-A3 Develop strategies and allocate resources to ensure aggressive enforcement of environmental and development regulations. The City shall monitor developments for compliance with such regulations. Should it be found that the level of environmental protection or quality of development mandated by the regulations is not being achieved, the City shall consider additional or alternative regulations or, in the case of critical areas, reassessment of land use designations, to ensure the desired objectives.

LU-A4 Explore the possibility of “sunsetting” concomitant pre-annexation development agreements that resulted from the 1992 Canyon Park annexation.