

AGENDA

BOTHELL PLANNING COMMISSION

VIRTUAL MEETING

Bothell City Hall, 18415 101st Avenue NE
June 3, 2020, 6:00 PM

Public Notice: Pursuant to Governor Inslee's Stay Home, Stay Healthy Proclamation, and in effort to curtail the spread of the COVID-19 virus, this Planning Commission meeting will be conducted remotely. We encourage members of the public to also attend and participate in the meeting remotely, as described in more detail below.

To attend the meeting:

- [Watch the meeting LIVE](#) online (Planning Commission Only)
- Watch the meeting live on BCTV Cable Access Channels 21/26 (must have Frontier/Comcast Cable)
- Listen to the meeting live by phone: +1-510-338-9438 USA Toll / Access code: 624 834 507
- Submit your written comments before 3:00 PM (day of meeting) to: Michael.Kattermann@bothellwa.gov

Planning Commission meetings are also recorded and available the next day on the [City of Bothell YouTube Channel](#).

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- a. A chance for members of the audience to address the Commission on a topic NOT scheduled for a public hearing on this evening's agenda. Please limit comments to 3 minutes per speaker.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. March 4, 2020

4. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Introduction of new and continuing members
- b. Election of Officers (Chair and Vice-Chair)

5. PUBLIC HEARING

None

6. PUBLIC MEETING

None

7. STUDY SESSION

- a. Member orientation
- b. Downtown Public Space

8. OLD BUSINESS

9. REPORTS FROM STAFF

10. REPORTS FROM MEMBERS

11. ADJOURNMENT

Projected Schedule of Land Use Items as of

City Council (CC) meetings, shown in **bold**, start at 6 p.m. unless otherwise noted.
Planning Commission (PC) meetings, shown in *italics*, start at 6 p.m. unless otherwise noted.
 Other Board meetings shown in normal text, start at 6 p.m. unless otherwise noted.
 Meetings are held in the **City Hall building at 18415 101st Avenue NE** unless otherwise noted.
For planning purposes only: schedule subject to change without notice

June 2020

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	2	3	4	5
	<p>Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) critical areas regulations amendments Public Hearing</p> <p>Interim Ordinance temporarily suspending timelines for applications and permits Public Hearing</p> <p>Amendments to BMC updating procedures for annual Comp Plan amendments and SEPA Public Hearing</p>	<p><i>Briefing on Downtown Public Space Code Amendments</i></p>		
8	9	10	11	12
	<p>Canyon Park Subarea Plan Update Study Session</p>			
15	16	17	18	19
		<p><i>Canyon Park Subarea Plan Update Study Session</i></p>		
22	23	24	25	26
	<p>Landmark Preservation Board</p>			
29	30			

Minutes

BOTHELL PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING – March 4, 2020

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Patrick Cabe, Carston Curd, Jason Hampton, Kevin Kiernan, Amanda Dodd Olson, Brad Peistrup, David Vliet

COMMISSIONER ABSENT AND EXCUSED: None

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Michael Kattermann and Senior Planner Bruce Blackburn. Consultants Carmen Kwan with Fehr and Peers, Lisa Grueter with BERK Consultants and Rachel Miller with MAKERS Architecture.

CALL TO ORDER: The Regular Meeting of the Bothell Planning Commission was called to order by Chair David Vliet on March 4, 2020, at 6:22 p.m. in the Council Chambers at the Bothell Town Hall, 18415 101st Avenue NE.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

CURD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 19, 2020. HAMPTON SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

NEW BUSINESS: None

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chair Vliet opened the continued Public Hearing regarding Downtown Public Space Code Amendments.

OLSON MOVED TO CONTINUE THE DOWNTOWN PUBLIC SPACE HEARING UNTIL MARCH 18, 2020. PEISTRUP SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

Chair Vliet opened the Public Hearing regarding the Canyon Park Subarea Plan Preferred Alternative and introduced Director Kattermann who introduced Carmen Kwan with Fehr and Peers, Lisa Grueter with BERK Consultants and Rachel Miller with MAKERS Architecture.

Kattermann turned it over to Senior Planner Bruce Blackburn for a brief presentation on the preferred land use alternative for Canyon Park.

Discussion ensued.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

(See video recording on City of Bothell website for detailed testimony)

Paul Young – 21601 10th Ct SE

Mr. Young was there to comment on the safety and widening of 9th by the school.

Ginger Young – 21601 10th Ct SE

Ms. Young was there to comment on increasing density and affordable housing.

Roger Belanich – 22020 17th Ave SE

Mr. Belanich was there to request rezone of his property at 527/405 to high density so he can meet the stormwater and traffic requirements.

Carol Zada – 22624 9th Ave SE

Ms. Zada was there to comment on 217th to 9th Ave solve 2 problems by allowing access for Phillips and add a bike lane.

Galan Smith – 21321 9th Ave SE

Mr. Smith was there to comment on the increase in traffic and the impact to wildlife.

Jim Gao – 22605 9th Ave Se

Mr. Gao was there to agree with Mr. Belanich's statement and comment on making buildings higher for more affordable housing.

Sarah Gustafson

Ms. Gustafson was there to comment on network connections for bikes/pedestrians and environmental impact.

Andrea Jackson

Ms. Jackson was there to comment on her opposition to 9th Ave.

Discussion ensued

HAMPTON MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE CANYON PARK SUBAREA PLAN PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE. OLSON SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

HAMPTON MOVED TO RECOMMEND THE CANYON PARK SUBAREA PLAN PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE AS SHOWN ON PAGE 12 OF THE MARCH 4 MEMO TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION IN ORDER TO FURTHER EVALUATE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND CREATE THE CANYON PARK SUBAREA PLAN WITH THE CONSIDERATION OF THE LAND USE AROUND THE 500 FOOT BUFFER NEAR I-405. KIERNAN SECONDED. CURD OFFERED A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO COMMISSIONER HAMPTON'S MOTION TO CONSIDER OTHER AREAS OF THE SUB-AREA FOR ADDITIONAL HIGHER DENSITY. HAMPTON AND KIERNAN ACCEPTED THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. THE MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

CABE MOVED TO EXTEND THE MEETING TO 9:05 P.M. PEISTRUP SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

STUDY SESSION: None

OLD BUSINESS: Adoption of Planning commission Bylaws Amendments

CURD MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE COMMISSION BYLAWS AS AMENDED ON 2/6/2020 WITH ADDITIONAL CHANGES. KIERNAN SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

REPORTS FROM STAFF:

- Director Kattermann announced the new Planning Commissioners that were appointed by the Council on 3/3/2020 – Amanda Dodd Olson, Jeanie Alderks and Sarah Gustafson.
- Kattermann stated that the March 10 open house on Parcel D has been cancelled.
- Direct Deposit paperwork for Planning Commissioner stipend was provided and explained.

REPORTS FROM MEMBERS: None

ADJOURNMENT:

HAMPTON MOVED TO ADJOURN. OLSON SECONDED AND IT PASSED WITH ALL PRESENT IN FAVOR.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Downtown Public Space Code Amendments - Study Session

MEMORANDUM

Community Development Department



City of Bothell

DATE: June 3, 2020
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Dave Boyd, Senior Planner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dave Boyd".

SUBJECT: Downtown Public Space Code Amendments – Briefing

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

Purpose/Action

The purpose of this ***briefing is to recap progress made through the February 5, 2020, continued public hearing.*** The Commission will receive additional staff analysis, and have an opportunity to provide additional direction on potential revisions to the draft regulations, ***setting the stage for the continued public hearing and potential recommendation at the July 1 meeting.***

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

Background

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

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

In the 2018 Planning Docket, Council initiated amendments to the downtown public open space regulations to achieve better outcomes and to better clarify those requirements as independent of the separate citywide parks and open space impact fees. Planning Commission began review of the public open space regulations along with other downtown plan and code amendments. Due to the overall scope of these amendments, the initial effort was limited to a minor, technical amendment intended to distinguish the downtown public open space requirement from the citywide parks and open space impact fee. Thus, the general term which also includes private outdoor space is changed from “open space” to “outdoor space” and “public open space” will be referenced as “public space” from this point forward. More detailed examination of ways to assure better outcomes for the downtown designated public space requirements was deferred to 2019 ***and has carried forward into 2020.***

*Additional analysis was presented at the June 5 study session and July 17, September 18, November 6, December 4, January 8 and February 5 public hearings, and the Commission provided feedback that is addressed in the following section, along with additional staff analysis. **On February 5, the public hearing was continued to March 4, but at that meeting it was continued to March 18, which was subsequently cancelled due to COVID-19.***

Analysis

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

*The quality of public spaces was discussed in some depth at the initial Planning Commission meetings on this subject and addressed in proposed code amendments last presented in the November 6 packet, **along with one additional measure introduced at the February 5 public hearing. These amendments include a number of measures to ensure that the public spaces are more clearly open to the public and better serve a public benefit. Those measures include signage to mark these spaces as public, stronger measures to provide amenities like seating and public art where appropriate and to avoid or treat blank walls.***

The later meetings have focused on the amount of public space required. At the January 8 public hearing, staff presented analysis of a requirement based on the floor area of the building rather than per dwelling unit (the method currently applied to office buildings) in order to reduce the amount for apartment buildings that struggle to meet the requirement, while keeping roughly the amount for townhomes, which have been able to meet or exceed the requirement. The Commission was generally supportive of that approach, but wanted additional analysis, **which was provided at the February 5 hearing and is expanded upon below.**

Other proposals, like exempting smaller projects from the public space requirement, limiting the use of in lieu fees for larger projects and transferring required public space between downtown projects by the same developer have received general support from Commission.

Amount required

At the February 5 public hearing, staff presented an alternate method for calculating the public space requirement and there was a consensus of commissioners in favor of the floor area method for determining the public space requirement, and a percentage between the options shown (10 and 20 percent for apartments), with 15% being cited as an option to consider for Downtown Transition apartments, with at least one commissioner noting “no less than 15%.” A revised Attachment 1 shows the percentages adjusted to 15% for apartments and 9% for townhomes in the Downtown Transition and Corridor districts; and to 10% for apartments in Downtown Neighborhood. One new project is added, with revisions and additions shown in red text.

The current method of calculation for residential requires a specified amount of square footage per *dwelling unit*. For office uses the calculation is based on the *floor area* of the building. **Two options were presented** to apply the office methodology to residential uses as well, **one using the same percentages used for offices, another with higher percentages for apartment projects**. This approach would remove density (i.e. dwelling units/acre) from the equation and more directly link the calculation to the potential occupancy of the building. For example, an apartment building with all one-bedroom units would have a greater unit density than an equally sized apartment building with some two- and three-bedroom units. The latter building could have more residents but would be required to provide less public space based on the current method of calculation.

Attachment 1 provides an updated comparison of options for different amounts and methods for calculating public space requirements and how those would apply to different existing and proposed developments in **two groups of** downtown districts – Downtown Neighborhood **on one hand**, and Downtown Transition, SR 522 Corridor and General Downtown Corridor, **which all have the same public space requirements, on the other**.

The top table lists the current requirements in addition to the option for a reduction to 60% of the current level, as presented previously. Paired with this option is a previously discussed way to limit the public space requirement through a maximum cap on the amount of site area that would be provided to meet public space requirements. This could be applied in conjunction with any method for calculation or for any amount of requirement. The purpose of this cap would be to provide predictability to an applicant on the maximum amount of space that would be required. One possible cap is included for consideration at 20%. Attachment 1 indicates that only apartment projects would benefit from such a cap, and only if a per-unit requirement is retained. The 60% reduction of the per-unit requirement is retained in Attachment 1 for comparison, and to show that it would reduce the amount of public space required, and provided, by townhome projects built to date.

The fact that office projects in downtown have been able to meet or exceed the current requirement indicates that the requirements for office may not need to be amended, as previously proposed. It also raises the possibility of basing the requirement for residential on the same percentage of floor area used for office space, rather than adjusting the per unit requirement. This would have the effect of reducing the overall amount of required public space across the board, but requiring relatively more public space for projects with larger units, like townhomes, which have been able to meet the current requirements. One pair of columns in the bottom table of Attachment 1 shows the effect of such an approach on the completed projects. Another pair of columns in that table provides different percentages for townhomes and apartments to arrive at an amount in both cases that is closer to the current requirement.

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

a single unit would likely result in an inadequate public space requirement. Using a requirement based on project floor area would likely result in a more equitable result. This project is in Attachment 1, with figures for both the applicants' proposal to count residential suites as one unit and a more conservative approach that treats each rentable private room as a unit. The entry uses the applicants' proposal to provide public space in the form of courtyards in the three proposed buildings, and notes that they **would likely** not meet the requirements for public space.

Staff recommends a residential requirement based on floor area, and **at the February 4 hearing offered** two options for consideration. One would require apartments to provide twice the floor area percentage required for office, while requiring townhomes to provide the same amount as office. This, together with a 10% allowance for in lieu fees on larger projects would provide similar amounts as the current requirements. Some adjustments to the percentages and in lieu fee allowance may be warranted.

A second option would apply the 6% office requirement used in the Downtown Neighborhood district and 10% requirement used in the Downtown Transition, General Downtown Corridor and SR 522 Corridor districts to all residential uses. This would provide the following:

- Reduction in the amount of required open space for apartment style projects to levels comparable to what such developments have been able to provide to date.
- Reduced need to use in lieu fees to meet the requirement for apartment projects.
- Roughly the same amount of public space required for townhome developments, which have been able to meet the current requirements.
- Eliminates any need to provide a cap on the percent of lot area required for public space.

Both options would provide a requirement that can be applied to micro-apartments and other emerging trends without having to develop standards for how to define a dwelling unit. The enhanced requirements and guidelines for public space will help ensure that the public spaces provided are of higher quality and more clearly public.

In lieu fees

There was some discussion of allowing a higher percentage of in lieu fees, especially if the requirement was more than 10% of floor area. Three commissioners were open to considering a higher percentage, but at least one other was reluctant to do so, especially in Downtown Transition without more clarity on how in lieu fees would be used.

After each column in Attachment 1 indicating the revised required amount is a calculation for an additional 10% reduction that the developer could achieve by paying an in lieu fee on larger projects. This would be at the option of the developer and provide some flexibility in meeting the public space requirement, and removing the requirement that in lieu fees require director's approval eliminates some uncertainty. No other fee in lieu options, including at the director's discretion, would be allowed for larger projects.

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

Exemption for small projects

At the December and January public hearings Commissioners expressed support for an exemption for projects that have a requirement of less than 1,000 square feet.

Transfer of public space

There was general support at the February 5 hearing for allowing transfers, especially to limit the use of in lieu fees, and some discussion about whether a distance limit was needed, since transfers would be limited to the Downtown Subarea. There was also discussion about providing criteria for transfers to ensure that they don't leave parts of the Downtown Transition district devoid of public space or concentrate public space in particular areas.

At the January 8 public hearing the Commission discussed adding regulations to explicitly allow transfer of public space between downtown projects by the same developer, as has been allowed in one instance. A concern was raised regarding the proximity of the sites. The proposed code amendments requires that transfers must be within one half mile, which would permit the transfer that was allowed between The 104 and Six Oaks and the one proposed between the Ross Road Apartments and the Harbour Homes office project on 98th Ave NE, but would not allow a transfer from the Post Office site to Block A (former Bothell Bike and Ski), for example.

Credit for otherwise non-compliant and/or off-site connections:

At the February 5 hearing there was support for allowing credit for otherwise non-compliant and/or off-site connections, such as the walkway along the south side of the 98th Avenue Apartments that connects 96th and 98th Avenues NE via the private section of NE 183rd Street between Dawson Square and The Landing.

Quality of public spaces:

At the February 5 hearing, there was public comment to focus on the quality of public spaces, and Commission discussion about their accessibility and a desire to reduce the use of stairs.

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

Action

No action is requested at this time, but staff welcomes any additional feedback. The proposed code amendments considered to date are included as Attachment 2.

Attachment

1. Revised Downtown Bothell Public Space Comparisons

Downtown Bothell Public Space Comparisons – REVISED 5/26/20

Adjusting Current per-unit requirement

DT and 522 Projects* Projects (% site area)	Units/ Office Area	Total GFA ⁶	NFA ⁸	Amount provided or proposed	Current Requirement: 150sf/unit, 10% office	90sf/unit 10% office	-10% ILF	20% of site area
Ross Rd. Apartments (19%)	95	⁹ 62,498sf	⁹ 54,902sf	8,353sf proposed	14,250sf	8,550sf	7,695sf	7,403sf
Dawson Square (9%)	45	⁷ 93,330sf	⁷ 93,330sf	8,661sf provided	6,750sf	4,050sf	3,650sf	18,526sf
The Landing (9%)	58	⁷ 102,138sf	⁷ 102,138sf	8,827sf provided	8,700sf	5,220sf	4,698sf	18,730sf
10304 185 th Townhomes (5%)	13	¹⁰ 21,168sf	¹⁰ 21,168sf	740 proposed	¹ 1,950sf	1,170sf	¹ 1,053sf	3,204sf
10320 185 th Townhomes	5	¹⁰ 8,267sf	¹⁰ 8,267sf	0 proposed	¹ 750sf	450sf	¹ 405sf	1,439sf
Bothell Micros (¹¹ 11%)	¹¹ 64-119	¹⁰ 41251sf	¹⁰ 24,825sf	¹¹ 7,080 proposed	¹¹ 9,600-17,850sf	¹¹ 5,760-10,710sf	5,184- 9,639sf	13,318sf
Forest Ridge (33%)¹²	106	85,474sf	¹²64,106sf	¹²16,588sf proposed	15,900sf	9,540sf	8,586sf	9,568sf
DN Projects (% of site area)					Current Requirement: 100sf/unit, 6% office	60sf/unit 6% office	-10% ILF	20% of site area
The 104 (12%)	115	142,783sf	⁸ 88,141sf	6,959sf provided ²	11,500sf	6,900sf	6,210sf	11,612sf
The Pop (34%)	118 14,071sf	106,412sf	⁸ 92,341sf	15,629 provided ³	12,644sf	7,830sf	6,879sf	9,153sf
Edition Apartments (15%)	135	160,833sf	⁸ 120,552sf	6,110sf provided ⁴	13,500sf	8,100sf	7,290sf	8,201sf
98 th Ave Apartments (3%)	79	88,606sf	¹⁰ 57,953sf	1,467sf provided ⁵	7,900sf	4,740sf	4,266sf	11,164sf
Harbour Homes office (12%)	0 17,668sf	¹⁰ 17,768sf	¹⁰ 10,729sf	2,099sf proposed	¹ 1,066sf	711sf	¹ 640sf	3,584sf
Fir Street Flats (13%)	3 583sf	5,233sf	4,253sf	335sf proposed	¹ 335sf	203sf	¹ 183sf	528sf

Proposed options for a floor area based requirement

DT, GDC & 522 Projects* (% site area)	Units/ Office Area	Total GFA ⁶	NFA ⁸	Amount provided or proposed	Current Requirement: 150sf/unit, 10% office	15% NFA apts, 9% townhomes	-10% ILF	10% total NFA ⁶	-10% ILF
Ross Rd. Apartments (19%)	95	⁹ 62,498sf	⁹ 54,902sf	8,353sf proposed	14,250sf	8,235sf	7,763sf	5,490sf	4,941sf
Dawson Square (9%)	45	⁷ 93,330sf	⁷ 93,330sf	⁹ 8,661sf provided	⁷ 6,750sf	8,400sf	7,560sf	9,333sf	8,400sf
The Landing (9%)	58	⁷ 102,138sf	⁷ 102,138sf	⁹ 8,827sf provided	^{8.5} 8,700sf	9,192sf	8,273sf	10,214sf	9,192sf
10304 185 th Townhomes (5%)	13	¹⁰ 21,168sf	¹⁰ 21,168sf	740 proposed	¹ 1,950sf	1,905sf	1,715sf	¹² 1,117sf	1,905sf
10320 185 th Townhomes	5	¹⁰ 8,267sf	¹⁰ 8,267sf	0 proposed	¹ 750sf	¹743sf	¹669sf	¹ 827sf	744sf
Bothell Micros (¹¹ 11%)	¹¹ 64-119	¹¹ 41,251sf	¹¹ 24,825sf	¹¹ 7,080sf proposed	¹¹ 9,600-17,850sf	¹¹ 3,724sf	3,351sf	¹² 4,483sf	2,234sf
Forest Ridge (33%)	106	85,474sf	¹²64,106sf	¹²16,588sf proposed	15,900sf	9,616sf	8,654sf	6,411sf	5,769sf
DN Projects (% of site area)					Current Requirement: 100sf/unit, 6% office	10% NFA apts, 6% office+townhomes	-10% ILF	6% total NFA ⁸	10% ILF
The 104 (12%)	115	142,783sf	⁸ 88,141sf	6,959sf provided ²	11,500sf	8,814sf	7,933sf	5,288sf	4,760sf
The Pop (34%)	118 14,071sf	106,412sf	⁸ 92,341sf	15,629 provided ³	12,644sf	9,234sf	8,311sf	5,108sf	4,597sf
Edition Apartments (15%)	135	160,833sf	⁸ 120,552sf	6,110sf provided ⁴	13,500sf	12,055sf	10,850sf	7,233sf	6,510sf
98 th Ave Apartments (3%)	79	88,606sf	¹⁰ 57,953sf	1,467sf provided ⁵	7,900sf	5,795sf	5,216sf	¹³ 4,477sf	3,129sf
Harbour Homes office (12%)	0 17,668sf	¹⁰ 17,768sf	¹⁰ 10,729sf	2,099sf proposed	¹ 1,066sf	¹ 644sf	579sf	¹ 644sf	579sf
Fir Street Flats (13%)	3 583sf	5,233sf	4,253sf	335sf provided	¹ 335sf	¹425sf	¹383sf	¹ 255sf	¹ 230sf

DN = Downtown Neighborhood district

* DT = Downtown Transition district, GDC = General Downtown Corridor district, 522 = SR 522 Corridor district. All have same public space requirement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁷ Based on KCA average unit size.

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

⁹ Gross and net residential floor area per revised PreApp packet

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

¹¹ Proposal in 522 for a combination of micro-apartments (residential suites) and dormitory or small efficiency dwelling units, which do not fit into current definitions for dwelling units. Areas per Pre-application submittal. Public space proposed is in courtyards, which likely would not meet requirements.

¹² Proposal for apartments in GDC. Areas per revised submittal (original plan for townhomes). NFA based on average % of GFA (75%). Proposed public space includes significant area that cannot be counted.