Planning Commission Recommendation

The Planning Commission considered proposed amendments to the Land Use Element on September 3, October 1, 15 and 29, and November 12, 2014, and February 2 and March 11, 2015 (as part of an integrated review of all major Plan Elements) and on April 1, 2015 recommended the following amendments.

Proposed new language is underlined; language proposed to be deleted is shown in strikethrough text. Iterations of proposed amendments are accompanied by the source and date of the change from the original proposal (e.g., Planning Commission, or PC for short, 9/24/14).

Proposed amendments to the Imagine Bothell... Comprehensive Plan for the 2015 Periodic Update are presented in the format of the existing Plan, which was conceived primarily as a paper document. Insofar as the public has indicated a preference for online access to the Plan, staff contemplates some reformatting once the Update is completed, including added images and links, to optimize the usefulness of the Plan as an electronic document. No substantive changes to text or illustrations would be made in such a reformatting. The Plan will remain available as a paper document as well.

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

Staff 10/1/14 - revisions are proposed in the section below to update the information provided and to reflect the annexation activity that occurred in recent years, particularly within the King County PAA.

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 80th and 84th Avenues NE, was included in the incorporation of Kenmore. No other changes have occurred to the PAA. Additional small annexations occurred between then and 2014, when all of the remaining land within the PAA was annexed via nine separate annexations. These were accomplished through the city / county / fire district inter-local agreement method, in accordance with RCW 35A.14.480. Under that statute, the annexing city enters into an agreement with the affected
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county and fire district or districts to clearly spell out each jurisdiction’s responsibilities concerning the transfer of services which occurs with annexation. Bothell has now annexed out to its Planning Area boundaries in King County.

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. One of the two areas comprising the MUGA in Snohomish County was annexed effective December, 2012. The remaining potential annexation area comprises 3,608 acres of unincorporated Snohomish County territory, wrapping around the Bothell city limits to the west, north and east. Two citizen efforts to annex this area in its entirety failed, in 2011 and 2012. It is likely that this area will annex incrementally, neighborhood by neighborhood, over the coming years, as property owners seek access to City services.

The City does not anticipate designating any additional potential annexation areas prior to the next Periodic Update, which would occur in 2023. The only circumstances under which this might be warranted would be if Snohomish County were to expand the Southwest County Urban Growth Area to the east, or if Brier, Lynnwood or Mill Creek were to desire to abandon portions of their designated potential annexation areas adjacent to Bothell’s planning area. Additional information about the MUGA and potential future annexations can be found in the Annexation Element.

Acreages of the various areas described above are as follows:
Table LU-1: Planning Area acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Incorporated Bothell</th>
<th>PAA</th>
<th>MUGA, in 2004 update</th>
<th>MUGA, in future update</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>3650.5</td>
<td>1018.6 NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4669.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>4099.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>722.9</td>
<td>2107.4</td>
<td>6930.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>7750.2</td>
<td>4018.6 NA</td>
<td>722.9</td>
<td>2107.4</td>
<td>11,599.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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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.

Staff 10/1/14 - A minor revision is recommended in the section below to reflect that fewer and fewer parcels of land of five acres or more exist and much infill development occurring now consists of parcels often under five or ten acres in size.

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,
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has become profitable. Another source of buildable land is under-developed land, typically consisting of a five- or ten-acre larger parcels of an acre or more 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).

Staff 10/1/14 - Staff recommends minor revisions to the section below to reflect the actual densities achieved with some recent R-AC developments (Six Oaks has a density yield of approximately 105 dwelling units per acre, and The 104 realized a yield of approximately 86 dwelling units per acre. However, Six Oaks is likely a relatively rare development in that the site is very flat and the developer was able to maximize the available building envelope through in-building parking and other factors.

In addition, reference is made to the area of R-AC zoning around the I-405 / NE 160th St interchange, which was adopted in 2010.

PC 3/11/15 At the Planning Commission’s request, the range of multi-family densities in the section below was changed from “eight to about 30 dwelling units per acre” to “eight to about 100 dwelling units per acre” to be consistent with data in the remainder of the paragraph.

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 30 100 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 up to an estimated 40 100 units per acre when site and building design regulations are taken into account and are able to be maximized. Lower densities (due to lower building height limits) can be realized within the R-AC designated area around the I-405 / NE 160th St interchange. 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.
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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 228th 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 240th 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 240th 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 Public Works Operations Center (PWOC).
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PC 3/11/15 - The Planning Commission recommended striking “Community” from “Cascadia Community College” in the section below to reflect that institution’s correct name.

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 124th 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
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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-43). 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.

The 2015 Periodic Plan and Code Amendment continued the 2004 Plan update’s emphasis on utilizing the City’s on-line resources to provide information and solicit input from the public.

Growth targets v. capacities

Staff 10/1/14 - This section is proposed to be revised extensively to reflect updates to growth target mandates. In addition, staff is proposing that, rather than have an extensive discussion of the King and County Buildable Lands Reports (BLRs) here, the section instead simply summarizes Bothell’s growth targets, with each county BLR included as an Appendix to the Plan (the actual Appendix number will be assigned once all appendices to the Land Use Element are identified and finalized).

Planning Commission 4/1/15 The Planning Commission directed staff to add a sentence to the Growth Targets v. Capacities section below stating the possible ramifications of the City not meeting its Vision 2040 growth targets. A sentence addressing such ramifications has been added.

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).
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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 Growth Management Act (GMA) requires adjacent counties with populations of 450,000 or more to adopt multi-county planning policies (MPPs) in order to provide a common planning framework for urban areas throughout those counties. In 1995 the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) adopted Vision 2020, which incorporated the four counties’ initial MPPs under the GMA. In 2008 the PSRC adopted Vision 2040, an updated and detailed refinement of the earlier framework policies.

Vision 2040 presents a Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) which outlines how growth within the four-county region is to be distributed among seven “regional geographies”: Metropolitan Cities, Core Cities, Larger Cities, Small Cities, Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas, Rural Areas, and Natural Resource Lands.

The RGS, states Vision 2040, “focuses the majority of the region’s housing and employment growth into the Metropolitan Cities and Core Cities, which together comprise more than two dozen designated regional growth centers. The centers in these cities are intended to attract residents and businesses because of their proximity to services and jobs, a variety of housing types, access to regional amenities, high quality transit service, and other advantages.”

Under the RGS, Bothell is a Core City. Bothell was assigned this regional geography in Vision 2040 by virtue of the fact that the Canyon Park area has been designated an Urban Center since Vision 2020 was adopted in 1995. One of the reasons the City Council sought this designation at the time is that, according to Vision 2020, Urban Centers were to receive higher priority than other urban areas in infrastructure funding. In return, Urban Centers were to be planned to accommodate more population and employment than other areas. Please note that Vision 2040 changed the term “Urban Center” to “Regional Growth Center”.

For each of the counties, Vision 2040 assigns total population and employment targets by each of the regional geographies. In almost all cases, there are multiple cities having the same regional geography designation within a county. In other words, while a county may only have one or two Metropolitan Cities, it is likely to have several Core Cities, Larger Cities and Small Cities.

The possible consequences should a jurisdiction not meet its assigned growth targets include loss of eligibility for various state funding sources and potential appeal to the Growth Management Hearings Board.

Bothell’s land use capacity for both population and employment is calculated as part of King and Snohomish County’s Buildable Land Reports. The conclusion of those reports
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is shown in the table below, while the reports themselves are included as part of this element as Appendix LU-A-3 and LU-A-4 respectively.

Bothell’s 2035 growth targets, and its population and employment capacity under 2014 Plan designations, break down as follows:

Staff 2/4/15 - At the November 29, 2014 meeting, the Planning Commission requested that staff revise the table below to reflect total population numbers (i.e. existing population plus target population), rather than just the target numbers that were initially shown. Staff has revised the table to reflect that approach for the City’s population capacity and targets. The employment numbers are more difficult to show using totals, since annual employment estimates are not generated as they are for population. Thus, a separate table has been produced that only shows the employment targets and capacity. Since the City has an adequate employment capacity surplus in both counties, this is less of an issue.


Population Targets Versus Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (portion)</th>
<th>2014 OFM* Pop. Est.</th>
<th>2035 Pop. Target in additional persons</th>
<th>Current (2014) plus target population</th>
<th>Pop. Capacity (2014 Pop. + additional capacity)</th>
<th>Population Capacity Surplus (+) or Deficit (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>24,610</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>31,105</td>
<td>35,263</td>
<td>+4,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>17,020</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>23,960</td>
<td>20,406</td>
<td>-3,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41,630</td>
<td>13,435</td>
<td>55,065</td>
<td>55,669</td>
<td>See footnote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Washington State Office of Financial Management

Footnote: A total population capacity is not given for both combined counties, since surplus in one county cannot be used to offset a deficit in another county. All numbers in the above table are stated in terms of population (persons).

Employment Targets Versus Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (portion)</th>
<th>Employment Target (2035) (additional jobs)</th>
<th>2035 Employment Capacity (surplus jobs [+1] or deficit [-])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>6,344 (+3,247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>5,500 (+540)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, under 2014 Plan designations, Bothell has a surplus capacity for both population and employment in the King County portion of the city and a surplus capacity for employment (jobs) in the Snohomish County portion of the city, but a deficit (shortfall) in population capacity of 3,554 persons within the Snohomish County portion of the city. The reason for the population capacity shortfall in the Snohomish County portion of the City is relatively simple: because Bothell is a Core City in Snohomish County, its growth targets there are higher than in the King County portion, where it does not have the Core City designation. Thus, as part of the state-mandated 2015 Periodic Plan and Code Update, the City must provide adequate population capacity to accommodate at least the full amount of that deficit.

Accommodating the Population Capacity Shortfall in the Snohomish County Portion of Bothell

There are essentially only two ways that additional population capacity can be provided in any given area: providing for residential development in areas where none is currently planned for, or allowing
higher residential densities in areas currently designated for residential development. The latter approach can be problematic, both from a practical as well as a political standpoint. Little vacant land exists within the city (at least not in amounts sufficient to accommodate the identified population capacity shortfall) and increasing permitted densities in areas already developed (say, from single to multi-family housing densities) is usually controversial, as it fundamentally changes the established character of the area.

Providing for residential development in areas where none is currently planned, however, is more practical and likely to better accepted within those areas, since the existing development is already at a greater intensity than typical residential uses. Fortunately, within the Snohomish County portion of Bothell, two opportunities exist where a residential land use designation could be added where none currently exists. These are the Canyon Park Business Center area and Country Village. The Canyon Park Business Center, which comprises the City's designated Regional Growth Center (RGC), contains 2014 Plan designations for commercial, business, retail and light industrial uses. The Country Village development is designated CB (Commercial Business) exclusively. Both of these areas then, could accommodate additional population through the application of a residential Plan designation. The Country Village designation would likely be implemented as part of an expanded Red Barn Village, in order to create a unified activity center in that area (Note: a third potential location, the FEMA property on Nike Hill, was considered but ruled out due to the fact that it is less likely to redevelop during the lifetime of 2035 growth targets allocations).

Because of existing surrounding land uses, and their locations on arterials, multi-family residential land use designations are appropriate in both locations. The potential population capacity of each location was therefore analyzed at various multi-family residential densities, as follows:

**Staff 10/1/14** - Staff recommends the two Plan designation scenarios shown in the shaded cells in the table below (All 2035 re-developable parcels under a R-AC Plan designation in Canyon park and a R-AC Plan designation in an expanded Red Barn Village (i.e. the Country Village scenario).

Adding a R-AC Plan designation at Canyon Park accommodates the population capacity shortfall (with a slight surplus), provides for mixed use development in the future at Canyon Park and opens up the opportunity for implementing Transfer of Development Rights in that area also.

Adding a R-AC Plan designation to an expanded Red Barn Village helps create a mixed-use “mini” activity center at the intersection of the Bothell-Everett Highway and 240th Street SE - similar to the activity center created at I-405 and NE 160th Street in the King County portion of the City. As with the Canyon Park area, adding a R-AC Plan designation also opens up the possibility of implementing TDR in this area.
The above table shows that the population capacity shortfall of 3,544 persons can be accommodated at Canyon Park (with all 2035 re-developable parcels designated R-AC). Implementing the two scenarios shown in the highlighted cells in the above table would also provide for a surplus of approximately 2,127 persons overall (4,498 + 1,173 = 5,671 persons additional capacity, or 2,127 over the growth target of 3,544 persons).

Implementation of the above scenarios would be accomplished within the Canyon Park and Country Village / Lake Pleasant / 527 Corridor Subarea Plans, since the actual Plan designations for land use reside within the Subarea Plans.

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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portion of City</th>
<th>Baseline year</th>
<th>Forecast for selected end year</th>
<th>Adjustments to achieve comparability</th>
<th>2025 target expressed as total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated area within King County</td>
<td>16,119 population (per Fed. Census)</td>
<td>+1,751 new units</td>
<td>See Footnote</td>
<td>20,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated area within Sno. County</td>
<td>14,490 population (per OFM)</td>
<td>22,000 total population</td>
<td>None needed</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total incorporated area population target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>42,836</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnote:** Units were converted to population based on 2004 OFM persons per household calculation for Bothell of 2.37: 1,751 x 2.37 = 4,150. 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: 4,150 / 22 = 189 x 3 = 567 + 4,150 = 4,717. 4,717 was then added to the 2000 population of 16,119 for a total forecasted population of 20,836.
### Table LU-3: 2025 employment growth targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portion of City</th>
<th>Baseline year</th>
<th>Forecast end year</th>
<th>Adjustments to achieve comparability</th>
<th>2025 target expressed as total employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated area within King County</td>
<td>10,560 (per PSRC)</td>
<td>±2000 new jobs</td>
<td>See footnote</td>
<td>12,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated area within Sno. County</td>
<td>10,150 jobs (per Sno. Co.: 8,565 per PSRC)</td>
<td>15,840 total jobs</td>
<td>None needed</td>
<td>15,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total incorporated area employment target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnote:** 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: \( \frac{2,000}{22} = 91 \times 3 = 273 \). 2,000 + 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.
Planning Commission Recommendation

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>+1,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net New Jobs: 95-00</th>
<th>20 yr. Job Target</th>
<th>Percent of Target-Achieved in 5 Yrs. (25% of Target Period)</th>
<th>Remaining Job Target</th>
<th>Remaining Job Capacity</th>
<th>Surplus or Deficit in Relation to Remaining Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>+747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;2001 Estimate</th>
<th>2002 Estimate</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Capacity difference between A and B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional-capacity as of 2001</td>
<td>Total capacity</td>
<td>Additional-capacity as of 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,160</td>
<td>14,490</td>
<td>5,317</td>
<td>19,477</td>
<td>4,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment capacity analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;2000 Estimate</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Capacity difference between A and B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;2000 Estimate</td>
<td>Additional capacity as of 2001</td>
<td>Total capacity</td>
<td>Additional capacity as of 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>14,335</td>
<td>3,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within King County</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>21,523 (1)</td>
<td>20,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Snohomish County</td>
<td>14,680</td>
<td>18,962–19,477 (2)</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>30,930</td>
<td>40,085–41,000</td>
<td>42,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within King County</td>
<td>11,000 est.</td>
<td>12,761 (1)</td>
<td>12,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Snohomish County</td>
<td>10,000 est.</td>
<td>13,442–14,335 (2)</td>
<td>15,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>21,000 est.</td>
<td>26,203–27,096</td>
<td>28,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 2000 employment of 10,560, per PSRC, + remaining job capacity of 2,201 = 12,761
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.”
Planning Commission Recommendation

“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.” (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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portion of City</th>
<th>Total capacity per-2002 Buildable Lands Report</th>
<th>Adjustment for 2002 Plan and Code amendments</th>
<th>Total employment capacity after 2002 amendments but before 2004 amendments</th>
<th>2025 target, expressed as total employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within King County</td>
<td>12,761</td>
<td>+28,397*</td>
<td>41,158*</td>
<td>12,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Snohomish County</td>
<td>13,442 – 14,335</td>
<td>–12,059 to 12,952</td>
<td>26,394</td>
<td>15,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>26,203 – 27,096</td>
<td>+40,456 to 41,349</td>
<td>67,552</td>
<td>28,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>GMA compliance issue?</th>
<th>Description of issue and decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Shelton View Subarea, south of 228th, west of 4th – Existence of R3 (R 12,500) Plan designation and R 12,500 zoning – <strong>Change Plan from R 3 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 12,500 to R 9,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Shelton View Subarea, 3rd Avenue north of 240th – Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning – <strong>Change Plan from R 1 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 40,000 to R 9,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Westhill Subarea, south of 240th, west of 7th – Existence of R2 (R 20,000) Plan designation and R 20,000 zoning – <strong>Change Plan from R 2 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 20,000 to R 9,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Planning Commission Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>GMA-compliance issue?</th>
<th>Description of issue and decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Brightline issue</strong> – Waynita Subarea, top of Norway Hill – Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning – <strong>Retain existing R 40,000 Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Brightline issue</strong> – Fitzgerald Subarea, south of 228th east of North Creek – Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Growth Reserve Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning – <strong>Retain existing R 40,000 Plan designation and remove Growth Reserve; retain R 40,000 zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Brightline issue</strong> – Canyon Creek Subarea, north of 228th between 31st and 35th – Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Growth Reserve and R 40,000 zoning – <strong>Change Plan from R1 to R 9,600 and remove Growth Reserve; change zoning from R 40,000 to R 9,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>Plan boundary and designation issue</strong> – North Creek Subarea, between Beardslee Boulevard and Ross Road – Establish Plan and zoning boundary, and consider expansion of land use designations – <strong>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.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Gross acres</th>
<th>KC deductions (1)</th>
<th>SC deductions (1)</th>
<th>KC mkt. factor (2)</th>
<th>SC mkt. factor (2)</th>
<th>Available net buildable acres</th>
<th>A: Pre-amendments pop or emp capacity (3)</th>
<th>B: Post-amendments pop or emp capacity (3)</th>
<th>B – A: Net increase or decrease in pop or emp capacity (SC / KC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>201 pop</td>
<td>268 pop</td>
<td>+ 67 pop (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>118 pop</td>
<td>471 pop</td>
<td>+ 353 pop (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>75 pop</td>
<td>150 pop</td>
<td>+ 75 pop (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1 pop</td>
<td>0 pop</td>
<td>0 pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10 pop</td>
<td>0 pop</td>
<td>0 pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>115 pop</td>
<td>462 pop</td>
<td>+ 347 pop (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0 pop</td>
<td>350 pop</td>
<td>+ 350 pop (KC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 underutilized 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
**Planning Commission Recommendation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Gross acres</th>
<th>KC deduct-ions (1)</th>
<th>SC deduct-ions (1)</th>
<th>KC mkt. factor (2)</th>
<th>SC mkt. factor (2)</th>
<th>Available net buildable acres</th>
<th>A: Pre-amendments-pop or emp. capacity (3)</th>
<th>B: Post-amendments-pop or emp. capacity (3)</th>
<th>B–A: Net increase-decrease in pop-or emp. capacity (SC / KC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.*
### Planning Commission Recommendation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>GMA-compliance issue?</th>
<th>Description of issue / request, and disposition</th>
<th>Effect on population capacity (King/ Sno.)</th>
<th>Effect on employment capacity (King/ Sno.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Shelton View Subarea, south of 228th, west of 4th – Existence of R3 (R 12,500) Plan designation and R 12,500 zoning – Change Plan from R3 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 12,500 to R 9,600</td>
<td>± 67 (SC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Shelton View Subarea, 3rd Avenue north of 240th – Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning – Change Plan from R1 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 40,000 to R 9,600</td>
<td>+ 353 (SC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Westhill Subarea, south of 240th, west of 2nd – Existence of R2 (R 20,000) Plan designation and R 20,000 zoning – Change Plan from R2 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 20,000 to R 9,600</td>
<td>± 75 (SC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Waynita Subarea, top of Norway Hill – Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning – Retain existing R 40,000 Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Fitzgerald Subarea, south of 228th, east of North Creek – Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Growth Reserve Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning – Retain existing R 40,000 Plan designation and remove Growth Reserve; retain R 40,000 zoning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brightline issue – Canyon Creek Subarea, north of 228th, between 31st and 35th – Existence of R1 (R 40,000) Growth Reserve Plan designation and R 40,000 zoning – Change Plan from R1 to R 9,600; change zoning from R 40,000 to R 9,600</td>
<td>+ 347 (SC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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 – 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.</td>
<td>± 350 (KC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portion of City</th>
<th>Total capacity per 2002 Buildable Lands Report + 2002 Amendments</th>
<th>Adjustment for 2004 Plan and Code amendments</th>
<th>Total population capacity after 2004 amendments</th>
<th>2025 target, expressed as total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within King County</td>
<td>22,922</td>
<td>+350</td>
<td>23,272</td>
<td>20,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Snohomish County</td>
<td>20,663 – 21,578</td>
<td>+842</td>
<td>21,505 – 22,420</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>43,585 – 44,500</td>
<td>+1,192</td>
<td>44,774 – 46,692</td>
<td>42,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

* 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within King County</td>
<td>21,523</td>
<td>22,922</td>
<td>23,272</td>
<td>20,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Snohomish County</td>
<td>18,562 – 19,477</td>
<td>20,663 – 21,578</td>
<td>21,505 – 22,420</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>40,085 – 41,000</td>
<td>43,585 – 44,500</td>
<td>44,774 – 46,692</td>
<td>42,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table LU-14: Summary of employment capacities v. targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portion of City</th>
<th>Employment capacity based on Buildable Lands reports</th>
<th>Employment capacity based on Buildable Lands + 2002 Amendments</th>
<th>Employment capacity based on Buildable Lands + 2002 Amendments + 2004 Amendments</th>
<th>2025 Forecast expressed as total employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within King County</td>
<td>12,761</td>
<td>41,158*</td>
<td>41,158*</td>
<td>12,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Snohomish County</td>
<td>13,442−14,335</td>
<td>26,394</td>
<td>26,394</td>
<td>15,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26,203−27,096</td>
<td>67,552</td>
<td>67,552</td>
<td>28,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.

---

**Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)**

The following description of what TDR is and how it works is taken from the Cascade Land Conservancy’s *A Resource Guide to Designing Transfer of Development Rights Programs for Washington State*, which was produced for the Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development in 2009:

“TDR is a market-based land use tool for helping implement a jurisdiction’s growth policies. A transfer of development rights program contains several elements. A community identifies areas that it wants to conserve, known as “sending areas.” For conservation purposes, these can be privately owned farms, forestland, open space, or other types of property. Landowners in these sending areas may request certificates representing the land’s development potential be issued from their county or city, which they can choose to sell. These certificates are purchased by developers who wish to increase the development potential of projects in “receiving areas.” These areas are identified by the community as...”

---
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being better suited for locating additional growth, and are often located in urban cores or suburban cities. Receiving areas have the infrastructure capacity and services to meet the needs of increased growth.

By purchasing the development potential from a sending area, developers gain access to incentives for projects in receiving areas. In return for compensation from the sale of development potential, a sending site landowner places a conservation easement on the property that permanently prohibits development of the land. The landowner retains ownership of the land and may continue to use it for other purposes, such as forestry or agriculture.

A TDR program does not limit growth; rather, it allows communities to plan more effectively by directing that growth into areas most appropriate for it. In comprehensive plans and development regulations, communities can identify which areas are suitable to grow at higher intensities and how much additional development is desired.

From a policy point of view there are three key features of a TDR program:

• **It is voluntary.** In a TDR program transactions take place between willing buyers and sellers. If landowners in sending areas choose not to participate, they are entitled to develop as permitted by current zoning and development regulations. Likewise, in receiving areas, developers not participating in TDR are allowed to build to current zoning. To receive development incentives such as additional density or height, developers must purchase TDR credits.

• **It is market-based.** TDR programs create a marketplace that allows property owners to buy and sell development rights to one another. Individual property owners, developers, or other parties may freely negotiate prices for the purchase and sale of these rights.

• **It is flexible.** TDR programs can be designed to accommodate the needs of each community. Jurisdictions can customize the elements of the program to reflect their conservation and development objectives.

TDR in Washington State is permitted and codified through RCW 36.70A.090.

The incentive to the City for accepting increased development would be revenue from county Tax Increment Financing (TIF) payments (essentially the City would receive a portion of County taxes) as part of the Landscape Conservation and Local Infrastructure Program (LCLIP: adopted via Washington State ESSB 5253). The goal of LCLIP is to preserve rural farm and forest lands by transferring future development from rural areas into growth areas. The City would be required to use these funds to make investments in public infrastructure in the City’s designated Revenue Development Areas (RDA). RDAs can be set to include up to 25 percent of the city limits.

Development rights would be transferred via TDR “credits”. A TDR credit can be thought of as a tradable commodity representing one certified development right (for example, one single-family dwelling unit, or one multi-family dwelling unit). The number of TDR credits is limited: within the three LCLIP eligible counties (King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties) there are a total of 18,576. Of these, the City of Bothell has a total allocated share of 365 TDR credits as determined by the Puget Sound Regional Council growth targets.
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Bothell can choose to accept between 20 and 100 percent (73 to 365) of its PSRC allocation. The more credits the City accepts, the more tax revenue it would receive. Additionally, thresholds are set by agreement with the County. These thresholds are milestones towards the accepted number of credits and must be reached in order to receive TIF funds. TIF funds are provided to the City for 25 years.

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 LU-A-1 and LU-A-2 respectively.
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 flood prone 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.
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Staff 2/4/15 - the proposed new Goal below (LU-G11) has been added to reflect the staff recommendation to continue to explore adoption of a TDR program in order to help meet the GMA goals of reducing sprawl and preserving rural resource lands, as well as providing potential Tax Increment Financing (TIF) revenues for the City. A complimentary Policy and Action are included below as LU-P22 and LU-A6 respectively.

**LU-G11** To promote Growth Management Act goals of preventing sprawl and preserving rural resource lands by considering Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) as a land use development tool and potential source of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) for the City.

**Policies**

Staff 10/1/14 - The proposed revisions in LU-P1 below reflect the fact that Bothell completed annexation of all remaining unincorporated land within the King County Potential Annexation Areas (PAAs) in 2014. In addition, LU-P1 has been revised to recognize that Comprehensive Plan land use designations for land within the MUGAs were adopted by the City Council in 2011.

**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 in Snohomish County, 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 inter-local 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.

In 2010, the City undertook a planning effort within the MUGAs to establish pre-annexation Plan land use designations. Those Plan designations were adopted by the Bothell City Council in 2011.

**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.
Planning Commission Recommendation

Staff 10/1/14 - As Low Impact Development (LID) techniques for handling stormwater runoff become the required norm, as opposed to an alternative methodology, the amount of land area taken up by stormwater facilities has increased. Many jurisdictions allow credit for such facilities in land use density calculations (and some give credit for other items, such as critical areas buffers). Because LID uses up more land area than more conventional techniques, and to remove a potential disincentive to using the more effective LID surface water controls, staff believes it is reasonable to allow density credit for stormwater facilities in proposed developments. Thus, staff recommends striking reference to these facilities in LU-P4 below, as shown.

Staff 11/7/14 - The Planning Commission indicated support of the proposed amendment to LU-P4 at its October 15, 2014 public hearing.

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.
Planning Commission Recommendation

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.
Planning Commission Recommendation

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.
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a. **Downtown Core District (DC)**
The Downtown Core forms a “T” shaped area centered on connected segments of Main Street and Bothell Way NE 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 Bothell Way NE 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 195th 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
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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
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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-54.

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-65.

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
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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.
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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 Element 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.

Staff 10/1/14 - the revisions to LU-P12 below are proposed to ensure that the applicable regulatory documents / agencies are referenced.

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 flood prone areas and storm and flood waters of the City in accordance with the Critical Areas Ordinance, the City Shorelines Master Program, 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) and standards as promulgated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

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.
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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.

Staff 10/1/14 - RCW 36.70A.130(5)(a) stipulates that “counties and cities shall take action to review and, if needed, revise their comprehensive plans and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter as follows:

(a) On or before June 30, 2015, and every eight years thereafter, for King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within those counties;”

LU-P15 below has been revised to reflect this requirement. Similar revisions have been proposed to LU-A1 below as well.

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 eight 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.

**Staff 10/1/14 - The following new Policy is proposed to address the GMA requirement that the Land Use Element “consider utilizing urban planning approaches that promote physical activity” (RCW 36.70A.070[1]).**

**LU-P19** Incorporate consideration of physical health and well-being into local decision making by locating, designing and operating public facilities and services in a manner that uses sustainable building and development practices and that encourages walking and bicycling access to public facilities.

**Staff 10/1/14 - the following two Policies have been re-located from the Community Services Element, which is proposed to be deleted. In addition, two implementing Actions from the Community Services Element are included below as Land Use Actions LU-A4 and LU-A5.**

**LU-P20** Support Community activities which promote physical and mental health.

**LU-P21** Actively promote the adoption and maintenance of healthy lifestyles among the City’s own employees.

**Staff 2/4/15 - the proposed new Policy below (LU-P22) has been added to implement proposed new TDR Goal LU-G11.**

**LU-P22** Support state growth management principles by exploring the potential benefits to Bothell property owners and the City at large of a transfer of development rights program.
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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.

Staff 10/1/14 - All previous existing concomitant agreements resulting from the 1992 Canyon Park annexation have expired, with the last such agreement having "sunsetted" in 2007. For this reason LU-A4 below can be deleted.

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

LU-A4  Lend support to community activities such as running events, family bicycling programs, and other events by providing parking, traffic control and other services as warranted.

LU-A5  Through the City of Bothell Safety and Wellness Committees, provide exercise, nutrition, and other program opportunities to City employees to foster good health.

Staff 2/4/15 - the proposed new Action below (LU-A6) has been added to implement proposed new TDR Goal and Policy LU-G11 and LU-P22 respectively.

LU-A6  Explore adoption of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program as part of an urban design study for the Canyon Park Regional Growth Center. Such a program should not be limited to just the RGC however, but should consider other areas of the City as part of a
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potential Local Infrastructure Project Area (LIPA). Should an urban design study for the RGC not be funded as anticipated for 2016 - 2017, consideration of adoption of a TDR program should occur separately.
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Figure LU-1
Urban Growth Areas
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Figure LU-2
Bothell Planning Area
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Figure LU-4
Open Space Corridors
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Figure LU-5
Feathered Edge