July 19, 2019

Dear Reader:

The City of Mountlake Terrace invites you to comment on the update to the Town Center Plan Planned Action Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). The Draft SEIS analyzes the environmental impacts of a proposal to update the City’s Town Center Plan, which was originally adopted in 2007. Since that time, the economic climate in Mountlake Terrace, and in the Puget Sound region as a whole, has changed. The proposal would update the goals and vision of the Town Center Plan, document the current development trends and conditions in the Town Center, and expand the Town Center boundary to include the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center and surrounding properties in preparation for the arrival of light rail service in 2024. Associated amendments to the City’s development code would modify building heights in portions of the Town Center and would establish new design standards, including a new system of block frontage regulations to emphasize the Town Center Plan’s vision of a lively, pedestrian-oriented district with opportunities for employment, shopping, and residential uses that acts as a focal point for the community. As part of the legislative amendments, the City would also update the Economic Vitality Element of its Comprehensive Plan to include more recent data on economic conditions in the city.

This Draft SEIS supplements and builds upon the Planned Action EIS prepared in 2007. A Planned Action allows for more detailed environmental analysis during the planning stage, rather than at project permit review. Similar to the original EIS, this SEIS identifies specific environmental impacts and mitigation measures in advance of development in order to streamline the project-level permitting process. Specifically, this Draft SEIS analyzes impacts to land use patterns and policies, aesthetics, public services (fire protection, parks, and schools), transportation, and utilities (water, sewer, and telecommunications).

Alternatives reviewed in this Draft SEIS include the Proposed Action Alternative and a No Action Alternative. The Proposed Action would implement the proposed update to the Town Center Plan, allowing for building heights up to 12 stories near the transit center, with lower building heights of 4-8 stories in surrounding areas. Mixed-use development emphasizing residential and office uses would add approximately 3,000 new multifamily housing units and 625,000 new square feet of commercial space (215,000 square feet of retail and 410,000 square feet of office). This would result in approximately 6,600 new residents and 1,953 new jobs in the Town Center. The No Action Alternative represents the existing Town Center Plan and development regulations as reflected by the 2013 Town Center Plan Addendum. The No Action Alternative would include 1,126 new dwelling units and 478,499 square feet of new commercial space (287,800 square feet of retail and 190,699 square feet of office). This would result in approximately 2,477 new residents and 1,495 new jobs.

The public and interested agencies are invited to review and comment on the Draft SEIS. Copies of the document are available for review at the Mountlake Terrace Community and Economic Development
Department at the Interim City Hall (6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200). The document is also posted on the City’s website at https://www.cityofmlt.com/338/Town-Center.

The City has established a 30-day comment period for the Draft SEIS. Written comments may be submitted until **5:00 pm on Monday, August 19, 2019** to:

Christy Osborn  
Community and Economic Development Director  
City of Mountlake Terrace  
6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043  
Ph: 425-744-6207  
cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us

The City will hold a public hearing on the Town Center Plan Update and accept comments on the Draft SEIS at a joint session of the City Council and Planning Commission:

Monday, August 5, 2019 at 7:00 pm  
Mountlake Terrace Interim City Hall Council Chambers  
6100 219th Street SW #220  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

Written comments and public hearing testimony received during the comment period will be addressed in the Final SEIS, to be published in September 2019.

Thank you for your interest in this project. If you have any questions, please contact me at the email address listed above.

Sincerely,

Christy Osborn, Director  
Community and Economic Development Department  
City of Mountlake Terrace  
SEPA Responsible Official

\[7\cdot19\cdot19\]  
\[\text{Signature}\]
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1.0 Summary

1.1. PURPOSE OF PROPOSED ACTION

The City of Mountlake Terrace proposes updating its Town Center subarea plan, originally adopted in 2007. Since adoption of the original Town Center Plan, the City has updated its Comprehensive Plan (2017) and adopted transportation and parks impact fees. The City also issued a SEPA addendum to the original Planned Action EIS in 2013 that evaluated changes to the Town Center boundary and growth capacity.

The Town Center Plan update will document current development trends and conditions, update the Town Center Plan vision, goals, and policies and amend the Town Center boundary. Associated code amendments would potentially allow increased building heights in portions of the study. A Planned Action designation was adopted for the Town Center pursuant to RCW 43.21C.440, which facilitates development when it meets the City’s Town Center Plan provisions and mitigation measures. The Town Center Plan update will also amend the Planned Action Ordinance to reflect changes to the plan, including updated development thresholds. As part of the legislative amendments, the City also intends to update the Economic Vitality Element of its comprehensive plan.

1.2. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT PROCESS

1.2.1. Purpose of SEPA

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires government officials to consider the environmental consequences of actions they are about to take and whether there are better or less damaging ways to accomplish those proposed actions. The adoption of comprehensive plans, subarea plans, or other long-range planning activities, are classified by SEPA as non-project (i.e., programmatic) actions. A non-project action is defined as an action that is broader than a single site-specific project and involves decisions on policies, plans, or programs.

1.2.2. Prior SEPA Review

The City of Mountlake Terrace adopted the original Town Center Plan in 2007 and designated the subarea as a Planned Action pursuant to SEPA (RCW 43.21c.440 and WAC 197-11-164 to 172). The City issued a Draft Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for adoption of the Town Center Plan in June 2007, followed by a Final EIS in August 2007. The City issued a SEPA Addendum in 2013 that evaluated changes to the Town Center boundary and growth capacity. This Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) supplements the analysis contained in the 2007 Draft and Final EIS’s and the 2013 Addendum. Relevant information from the prior environmental documents was used as part of the current analysis, and the SEIS presents updated information where conditions have changed since the previous analyses.
1.2.3. What is a Planned Action?

A planned action provides more detailed environmental analysis during an areawide planning stage rather than at the project permit review stage. Designating a planned action streamlines environmental review for development proposals consistent with EIS mitigation measures that are adopted in a planned action ordinance. Planned actions would be allowed if they meet or exceed proposed land use and environmental performance standards. This tool has been used elsewhere by local governments in Washington State. The Proposed Action Alternative would amend the existing Planned Action to include increased housing and employment growth thresholds and additional mitigation measures to address any impacts identified in the SEIS.

1.3. ORGANIZATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Draft SEIS is organized in the following chapters:

▪ Chapter 1 – Summary presents an overview of the environmental analysis process, the alternatives analyzed, and a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified as part of the EIS analysis.

▪ Chapter 2 – Proposal and Alternatives describes the study area, the objectives of the proposal, the alternatives studied in the SEIS, and the SEPA and Planned Action framework.

▪ Chapter 3 – Environmental Analysis presents a description of existing conditions and analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with the alternatives, specifically for the topics of land use, aesthetics, public services, transportation, and utilities.

▪ Chapter 4 – References provides a list of background sources consulted as part of the preparation of the SEIS.

The SEIS also includes a series of appendices that contain supporting documentation for the SEIS analysis.

1.4. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The City of Mountlake Terrace initiated a scoping period for the SEIS process from April 12 – May 9, 2019 and invited comment from agencies, tribes, and interested members of the public on the topics to be studied by the SEIS. The City also hosted two scoping and Planned Action community meetings on April 22 and May 6, 2019. These meetings fulfill the requirement under RCW 43.21c.440 to hold a community meeting related to designation of a planned action. The Scoping Notice and SEPA Checklist are included in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

Comments received during the scoping period addressed the following environmental topics:

▪ Building Height Transitions and Compatibility: Chapter 3.2 – Aesthetics analyzes potential impacts related to changes in building heights within the Town Center, as well as potential visual impacts on surrounding lower-density residential areas.

▪ Traffic Impacts: Chapter 3.4 – Transportation analyzes projected increases in traffic associated with future development in the Town Center. The analysis evaluates the transportation network throughout most of the City of Mountlake Terrace, as well as a limited number of potentially affected intersections in the City of Shoreline.
Telecommunications Service: Chapter 3.5 – Utilities discusses potential impacts on telecommunication infrastructure in the Town Center due to increased building heights in the area.

The Draft SEIS was issued with a 30-day public comment period. After the comment period, the City will respond to comments and issue a Final Supplemental EIS.

1.5. PROPOSED ACTION, ALTERNATIVES, AND OBJECTIVES

1.5.1. Objectives

The proposal is, in part, the consolidation of the vision established for the Town Center in the original 2007 Town Center Plan and a revised vision contained in the updated Plan. In addition to the objectives of the original 2007 plan, the proposal would establish the following additional objectives:

- **Livability**
  - Guide and manage site development of new mixed-use buildings, open spaces and streetscapes to create a comfortable, safe, and welcoming environment where residents, employees and visitors can interact in vibrant and well-designed working, shopping and living neighborhoods.
  - The transformation of existing single family uses to higher density neighborhoods will occur with well-designed buildings, landscaping, a multi-modal circulation network and urban features, including public art that enhance Mountlake Terrace’s urban character and provide residents with a sense of pride in their city.
  - Promote housing choices and a range of densities to accommodate the City’s diverse population and an adequate supply of diverse housing to encourage employees to reside within proximity to transportation and employment centers.

- **Circulation**
  - Create multi-modal transportation options that connect living areas with employment, parks, open spaces, shopping areas and transit hubs.
  - Plan pedestrian and bicycle networks that promote community interaction and provide healthy options for pedestrian movements within and outside the Town Center.
  - Streetscapes will be designed for “people first” where a range of sidewalk widths with public plazas and open spaces are strategically located with street side landscaping, where appropriate.

- **Urban Design**
  - Create design standards that incorporate flexible zoning provisions to enable design creativity of buildings, streetscapes, landscaping and signage.
  - A range of building heights where the tallest buildings are located adjacent to I-5 and near the transit station and transition to lower buildings within the core and edges of the Town Center adjacent to existing single-family neighborhoods.
  - Building façades will have ample glazing and prominent pedestrian entries, especially at key...
intersections.

- Structure parking will service multi-storied residential and office buildings, and surface parking, where permitted, will be located behind buildings and screened from the pedestrian realm. On-street parking, where appropriate, will be separated from pedestrian sidewalk zones with street-side landscaping and low-impact stormwater facilities.

- Collaborate with utility providers to locate transmission facilities underground and ensure that infrastructure installation and placement is compatible with building architecture and pedestrian circulation patterns.

### Environmental Preservation and Economic Development

- Promote the City’s strong environmental ethic in preserving prominent vegetative and forested open spaces.

- Promote building design that incorporates alternative energy systems, such as solar energy, electric vehicular charging stations, and recycling facilities.

- Promote Town Center development opportunities to the private sector and attract and retain a diversity of local and regional retail establishments and employment opportunities in economic sectors that will enhance the Mountlake Terrace local economy.

#### 1.5.2. Proposed Action and Alternatives

The table below summarizes the growth levels of the two alternatives, as well as proposed policy and code amendments.

**Exhibit 1-1. Summary of Alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Thresholds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dwelling Units (multifamily)</td>
<td>1,126 units (2,477 residents)</td>
<td>3,000 units (6,600 residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial Space (total sq. ft.)</td>
<td>478,499 (1,495 jobs)</td>
<td>625,000 (1,953 jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>190,699 (596 jobs)</td>
<td>410,000 (1,367 jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>287,800 (899 jobs)</td>
<td>215,000 (586 jobs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies and Development Regulations</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Proposal Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Center Plan</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Update Town Center Plan description of existing conditions, goals, policies, and plan objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update Town Center Boundary</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Update Town Center Boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Plan</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>▪ Update Economic Vitality Element of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Action Ordinance</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>▪ Update development thresholds and mitigation measures based on SEPA analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Code</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>▪ Amend development code to allow a range of building heights from 4-12 stories in the Town Center core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Establish streetscape and block frontage standards, building design standards, and amend landscaping and off-street parking requirements to implement the goals of the updated Town Center Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Establish transition standards between Town Center districts and adjacent lower-intensity residential areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### 1.6.1. Land Use Patterns and Policies

**How did we analyze Land Use Patterns and Policies?**

Chapter 3.1 – Land Use Patterns and Policies evaluates the amount, type, and pattern of land uses proposed under each alternative and also reviews the changes in current land use and land use policies that have occurred since publication of the original 2007 Town Center Planned Action EIS. Chapter 3.1 also evaluates the consistency of the alternatives with adopted planning and policy frameworks, including the City of Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan, the Growth Management Act, and Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies.

**What outcomes or impacts did we identify?**

▪ Under all Alternatives, the Town Center would experience additional and more intensive growth compared to current conditions. Changes would include the gradual conversion of existing low-density properties to higher-density uses, including multifamily residences and multi-story commercial and mixed-use buildings. The types of uses allowed under both alternatives would be similar, but new development in the Town Center would be at a greater intensity than either the No Action Alternative or existing uses due to the greater heights allowed and the larger extent of the amended Town Center boundary.
Compared to the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would also add approximately 166% more residents and 115% more office space to the Town Center than the No Action Alternative.

Both Alternatives would be consistent with adopted land use plans and policies.

**What are some solutions or mitigation for the impacts?**

- The updated Town Center Plan would direct the most intense development and tallest building heights near the transit center and civic campus, with lower intensity and building height areas arranged to create step-down transitions to the low-intensity residential areas surrounding the Town Center.
- The Proposed Action includes amendments to the City’s zoning code, including use and development standards that govern streetscape design, building design, pedestrian amenities, and pedestrian-access corridors.
- The Proposed Action includes updated design standards that include side- and rear-yard setback requirements and special height transition provisions for sites abutting residential zones.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

Under both Alternatives, properties in the Town Center would gradually be redeveloped and converted from single-family residential and other low-intensity uses to higher density mixed-use development, in keeping with the long-established vision for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center. With implementation of mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to land use patterns or policies are anticipated, though some property owners and residents, particularly in single-family areas, may perceive these changes as adverse.

**1.6.2. Aesthetics**

**How did we analyze Aesthetics?**

Chapter 3.2 – Aesthetics evaluates the scale and visual quality of development that would potentially occur under each of the alternatives, including the effects of proposed building height increases on community character, views, and shading conditions.

**What outcomes or impacts did we identify?**

- The Proposed Action Alternative would expand the Town Center boundary and amend the City’s development code to allow greater building heights and an overall more intense level of development than either existing conditions or the No Action Alternative. These height increases would have the potential to introduce new building typologies that are taller and more visually massive than what is currently developed or allowed by existing development regulations. Introduction of these more intense typologies would gradually alter the architectural character and scale of the Town Center.
- Intensification of development under the Proposed Action Alternative would also have the potential to affect areas outside the Town Center. The Town Center is surrounded by predominantly single-
family residential areas and development of higher-intensity multifamily, commercial, and mixed-use development in close proximity could cause conflicts of scale that would generate adverse effects on these surrounding areas.

- Under both Alternatives, new development would result in additional street lights and exterior building illumination, increasing the overall level of ambient light and glare, both in daylight and evening hours.
- Under the Proposed Action Alternative, additional building height would have the potential to increase shading conditions in the analysis area, both within the Town Center and on surrounding properties. The primary areas of potential shading are on the northern and eastern boundaries of the Town Center Core, along 230th Street SW and 55th Avenue W. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, some shading of these streets could potentially occur in mid- to late-afternoon, and the effect would be most pronounced in the late fall through early spring.

What are some solutions or mitigation for the impacts?

The Proposed Action Alternative includes amendments to the City’s zoning code (Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 19.123), which include design standards the Town Center. These new regulations would include provisions to minimize and mitigate potential aesthetic impacts, including:

- **Special setback/building height standards for sites abutting residential zones:** For sites abutting a residential zone, the side- and rear-yard setback must be the same as the applicable residential zoning district, up to the maximum height limit of the applicable residential zoning district, above which the minimum side yard setback must increase at a 45-degree angle inward up to the maximum height of the applicable Town Center (TC) zoning district.

- **Light and air access and privacy near interior side and rear property lines:** Buildings or portions thereof containing multifamily dwelling units whose only solar access (windows) is from the applicable side or rear of the building (facing towards the side or rear property line) must be set back from the applicable side or rear property lines at least 15-feet.

- **Façade articulation and maximum façade width:** Buildings under eight stories in height must include façade articulation features at regular intervals to create a human-scaled pattern along building elevations facing streets, parks, access corridors, and residential zones. In addition, all façades longer than 140 feet facing a lower-intensity zone must include features to break up the massing of the building, such as vertical façade modulation, use of contrasting materials, or changes in material and window configuration.

- **Building frontage standards:** The Proposed Action Alternative would establish a system of block frontage designations along major streets in the Town Center. The updated design standards contain requirements for each block frontage class, guiding the architectural character of the Town Center.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

Under both Alternatives, properties in the Town Center would gradually be redeveloped and converted from single-family residential and other low-scale and low-intensity uses to higher density mixed-use development, in keeping with the long-established vision for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center. Both
Alternatives would represent a substantial increase in the intensity of development and height of buildings over current conditions and some short-term incompatibilities may occur as new development occurs in the Town Center adjacent to existing low-density properties. With implementation of mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts are anticipated, though some property owners and residents, particularly in single-family areas, may perceive these changes as adverse.

1.6.3. Public Services

How did we analyze Public Services?

Chapter 3.3 – Public Services evaluates the potential impacts of each of the alternatives on the City’s level of service for fire protection, parks, and schools and updates the analyses of each of these topics contained in the 2007 Town Center Planned Action EIS. The updated analyses incorporate changes to existing facilities, level of service standards, and impact fee structures since publication of the original EIS.

What outcomes or impacts did we identify?

Under both the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives, increased population and employment growth in the Town Center would generate additional demand for public services, including fire protection, emergency medical services, parks and recreation, and schools. Construction activities under both alternatives also have the potential to temporarily affect emergency vehicle response times, as would any long-term increase in vehicular traffic in the study area.

▪ **Parks:** Under both alternatives, projected population and employment growth would increase demand for parks beyond the City’s current supply of Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Natural Areas, and Special Use Areas. Growth under the Proposed Action Alternative would also create a need for additional Regional Park acreage.

▪ **Fire:** Growth under the Proposed Action Alternative increase demand for fire and emergency medical services, and Station 19, which is located within the proposed Town Center Core, would be the primary dispatch point for calls originating in the Town Center. South County Fire (SCF) does not currently meet its goal of 8-minute responses on 90% of calls, and additional development in the area could exacerbate this issue.

▪ **Schools:** Schools serving the Town Center have sufficient capacity to absorb new students from proposed residential growth. No significant adverse impacts to schools were identified.

What are some solutions or mitigation for the impacts?

▪ Chapter 18.30 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code establishes impact fees for parks. The City’s current impact fee schedule, effective January 1, 2019, charges a fee of $2,260 for each multifamily residential dwelling unit and $1,162 for every 1,000 square feet of commercial space.

▪ The City should continue coordination with SCF on planning efforts for the Town Center. The SCF Fire Marshal should be consulted regarding the design of streetscape improvements that could potentially impede emergency vehicle access, as well as potential staffing and equipment needs at nearby fire stations.
The City should consider amending the Town Center design standards to include provisions that would reduce demand for fire protection services or improve the ability of the fire district to effectively provide service. Such measures could include mandatory installation of fire sprinklers, water system improvements, or building access requirements that would provide improved access for emergency vehicles. The City could require applicants demonstrate consistency with Fire Marshal recommendations and any associated mitigation agreements.

**With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?**

With the implementation of adopted codes and regulations and the application of proposed mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to public services are anticipated.

### 1.6.4. Transportation

**How did we analyze Transportation?**

Chapter 3.4 - Transportation presents a multimodal transportation analysis that documents existing transportation conditions and models transportation outcomes under the two alternatives, based on potential changes to land use and zoning provisions and modifications to the transportation network. The analysis identifies significant impacts that could occur for the following modes: auto, freight, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle. Safety and parking impacts are also considered.

**What outcomes or impacts did we identify?**

The table below summarizes transportation impacts identified under the two alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Action Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto and Freight</td>
<td>No intersection impacts; queuing impacts along eastbound 220th Street SW and southbound 66th Avenue W</td>
<td>2 intersection impacts; no queuing impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>No intersection impacts; queuing impacts along eastbound 220th Street SW</td>
<td>2 intersection impacts; no queuing impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street Parking</td>
<td>New development could increase demand for on-street parking.</td>
<td>New development could increase demand for on-street parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are some solutions or mitigation for the impacts?**

- Implement capital improvements to increase vehicle capacity at impact intersections and along impact roadways, such as the construction of roundabouts at the two intersections projected to experience Level of Service (LOS) impacts under the Proposed Action Alternative.
- Implement Parking Management policies to moderate demand for the limited on-street parking
supply in the Town Center, such as time limits, paid on-street parking, or restricted parking zones.

- Pursue projects that increase the capacity of its existing infrastructure without building new infrastructure through transportation systems management and operations (TSMO). TSMO refers to operational improvements that can improve traffic flows without building new capacity, for example traffic signal coordination, intelligent transportation systems such as adaptive signals or transit signal priority, ramp management, and traffic incident management.

- Build upon existing Travel Demand Management (TDM) programs to explore additional demand management programs that encourage non-single-occupancy-vehicle travel to and from the Town Center. Examples include:
  - Requiring TDM programs for owners of newly constructed buildings to encourage tenants to reduce traffic and parking impacts on city facilities.
  - Working with property owners and transit agencies to promote transit ridership, including use of existing programs, such as regional transit pass subsidy programs.
  - Amending the City’s parking code to provide more flexibility for residents who choose not to own a vehicle.

**With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?**

With some combination of the potential mitigation measures identified in this SEIS, the magnitude of intersection LOS impacts could be mitigated to meet City standards. Likewise, it is also expected that parking impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of some combination of identified mitigation measures. While short-term impacts may occur as individual developments are completed, it is expected that over the long-term, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to parking would occur.

1.6.5. **Utilities**

**How did we analyze Utilities?**

Chapter 3.5 - Utilities evaluates the potential impacts of each of the alternatives on the level of service for utilities in the Town Center, including water, sewer, and telecommunication service. Projected water and sewer demand are analyzed based on the land use, population, and employment assumptions of the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives, and impacts were identified by comparing projected demand and system operating conditions to forecasted future conditions in the City’s recently updated Comprehensive Water System Plan and Comprehensive Sewer System Plan.

**What outcomes or impacts did we identify?**

- Development under the Proposed Action would increase demand for water service in the Town Center beyond the levels anticipated by the Comprehensive Water System Plan, and increased building heights in the Town Center may increase fire flow requirements.

- Development under both Alternatives would increase sewer flows from the Town Center and increase demand for wastewater treatment at the Edmonds Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), which
processes sewer flows from Mountlake Terrace under an interlocal agreement. The interlocal agreement currently allocates 2.108 million gallons of average annual daily flow to Mountlake Terrace. Without reduction of inflow and infiltration in the sewer collection system, long-term growth under both alternatives would generate flows greater than 85% of the City’s allocation, which triggers a requirement for coordination with the City of Edmonds to evaluate the need for future capacity improvements.

- Increased building heights in the Town Center would allow construction of new buildings that exceed the height of existing wireless transmission equipment located in the Town Center. Development at this height could interfere with signals from these existing wireless facilities, necessitating the relocation or redesign of affected infrastructure to maintain adequate service. This could include the replacement of the existing tower with a taller structure or the installation of relay sites to extend service coverage.

**What are some solutions or mitigation for the impacts?**

- Chapter 13.50.020.C of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code requires assurance of performance for public services associated with new construction. The code requires all applicants for building permits to provide assurance to the City that all water mains, sanitary sewers, storm drain systems, public roadways, and emergency vehicle access required by ordinance or development permit conditions will be installed.

- The City is required under the terms of its interlocal agreement with the City of Edmonds to provide written notice when anticipated sewer flows exceed 85% of their flow allotment to the Edmonds WWTP and coordinate with the City of Edmonds for future capacity planning in accordance with the City’s current agreement with Edmonds.

- Coordinate with wireless communication providers serving the Town Center on potential impacts to existing and proposed wireless communication facilities, including relocation and/or modification of existing facilities adversely affected by increased building heights in the Town Center. For example, include telecommunications providers with facilities at the police station in public notice of planned action projects to ascertain options for continuous service, such as the installation of relays or pole relocation.

**With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?**

Increased development in the Town Center under both alternatives would increase demand for utility services. With application of existing plans, policies, development regulations, and the mitigation measures recommended in this SEIS, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.
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2.0 Proposal and Alternatives

2.1. PURPOSE AND INTRODUCTION

The City of Mountlake Terrace adopted the Town Center Plan in 2007 to establish policies and development regulations that would promote a lively, pedestrian-friendly downtown area, including a mix of shopping, services, and residential options not available elsewhere in Mountlake Terrace. Since adoption of the original plan, the City issued a SEPA Addendum to the original Town Center Planned Action EIS in 2013 that evaluated changes to Town Center boundary and growth capacity. The City also updated its Comprehensive Plan (2015) and amended its development regulations to impose transportation and park impact fees (2016).

The proposed action that is the subject of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) would update the Town Center Plan, including:

- Documenting current development trends and conditions,
- Updating Town Center Plan vision, goals and policies, and
- Amending the Town Center boundary.

Associated code amendments, to help implement proposed plan changes, would also modify building height limits in the Town Center, allowing taller buildings in proximity to the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center. In addition, a new Chapter would be added to the code addressing design standards.

As part of the 2007 planning process, a Planned Action designation was adopted for the Town Center pursuant to RCW 43.21C.440, which facilitates development when it meets the City’s Town Center Plan provisions and mitigation measures; the Town Center Plan update will also amend the Planned Action Ordinance to reflect changes to the plan, including updated development thresholds.

As part of the proposed package of legislative amendments, the City also intends to update the Economic Vitality Element of its Comprehensive Plan.

This Chapter of the SEIS provides a summary of the proposed action and the required “no action” alternative that would retain current plans and regulations. The alternatives are further evaluated in Chapter 3 of the SEIS for a range of environmental topics.

2.2. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

The existing Town Center is roughly bounded by 228th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 244th Street SW on the south, and 58th Avenue W on the west. The proposed amended Town Center would create a Town Center Core roughly bounded by 230th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 237th Street SW on the south, and Interstate Highway 5 (I-5) on the west, as shown in Exhibit 2-1.
Exhibit 2-1. Town Center Study Area and Vicinity Map
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Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019
This SEIS studies the combined existing and proposed Town Center boundaries. Prominent features of the study area include:

- **The Mountlake Terrace Transit Center:** This park-and-ride facility provides local and express bus transit service between Mountlake Terrace and surrounding communities, including Seattle. The transit center is part of Sound Transit’s planned Lynnwood Link Extension; light rail service is anticipated to begin in 2024.

- **Veterans Memorial Park:** This nearly 9-acre park, located adjacent to the east side of the transit center and south of the Civic Center Campus, includes a mix of picnic facilities, play equipment, and walking paths that provide access to the transit center.

- **Civic Center Campus:** Located adjacent to the northeast corner of Veterans Memorial Park, the Civic Center Campus houses a police station, a fire station, and the community library. A new City Hall will be constructed on the site in 2019-2020, along with an expansion to the police station and Town Center Park/Plaza.

- **56th Avenue West Commercial Corridor:** The 56th Avenue West corridor contains a mix of retail, professional services, and multifamily residential uses, focused primarily around the intersections with 232nd Street SW and 244th Street SW.

Properties included in the 2007 Town Center boundary that are not located inside the updated Town Center Core boundary would be designated as part of the “Town Center Reserve” (see Exhibit 2-1) and would remain eligible to apply for streamlined SEPA review under the Planned Action. Additional details on the Planned Action process are included in Section 2.5.2.

In addition to the Town Center study area, several chapters of the SEIS analyze the potential for impacts on surrounding areas, as well. These chapters establish topic-specific analysis areas, as follows:

- **Transportation:** The transportation study area includes most of the city, except for west of 67th Place W or east of 42nd Avenue W. The study area also includes a portion of the City of Shoreline north of NE 198th Street and between I-5 and 37th Avenue NE, as illustrated in Exhibit 3-32.

- **Land Use:** The land use study area includes the Town Center Core and Town Center Reserve areas, as well as immediately adjacent properties.

- **Aesthetics:** The aesthetics study area includes all properties within 500 feet of the Town Center Core or Town Center Reserve that are east of I-5.

- **Public Services:** The Public Services analysis evaluates the effect of growth on parks, fire, and police services and facilities in the study area plus the effect on levels of service for the systems as they serve the city or special district more broadly.

- **Utilities:** The section addresses the effect of the alternatives on facilities inside the study area as well as standards of service across the city for water and sewer.
2.3. **OBJECTIVES AND ALTERNATIVES**

2.3.1. **Objectives**

The Town Center Plan objectives outline the priorities of future development in the subarea and establish a vision of what the Town Center will be when fully developed. The objectives of the original 2007 Town Center Plan are listed below:

- **Livability**
  - Encourage a mixture of land uses throughout the Town Center, including retail, office, residential, and civic projects.
  - Promote businesses that offer goods and services targeted to current and future City residents.
  - Create housing choices attractive to people from all walks of life.
  - Keep the City’s underlying character and identity.
  - Provide opportunities for medical services in proximity to the Town Center.

- **Transportation**
  - Create a multi-modal Town Center that encourages pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles, and public transportation.
  - Improve accessibility while planning for traffic growth and making traffic flow more smoothly.

- **Open Space and Environment**
  - Design open spaces, walkways, and gathering spaces that promote community interaction for people of all ages within the Town Center.
  - Create active uses outdoors in the Town Center, including a water feature.

- **Economy**
  - Encourage a mix of different sizes and types of businesses in the Town Center.
  - Provide incentives for local businesses, as opposed to retail chains.
  - Attract additional, quality jobs to the City.

- **Urban Design**
  - Design the Town Center so that height and density increase approaching the core of the Town Center.
  - Locate the Town Center’s utilities underground.
  - Create sidewalks that are wide and encourage pedestrian-friendly shopping.

- **Planned Action Designation**
  - Provide a streamlined SEPA review process for future site-specific development proposals.
  - Provide an incentive for development proposals that are consistent with the overall intent of the Town Center vision.
Provide greater certainty to potential developers, city decision-makers, and the general public regarding the future development pattern and likely impacts of future development in the Town Center area (i.e., Community Business Downtown District zone).

The updated Town Center Plan would establish the following additional objectives:

- **Livability**
  - Guide and manage site development of new mixed-use buildings, open spaces and streetscapes to create a comfortable, safe, and welcoming environment where residents, employees and visitors can interact in vibrant and well-designed working, shopping and living neighborhoods.
  - The transformation of existing single family uses to higher density neighborhoods will occur with well-designed buildings, landscaping, a multi-modal circulation network and urban features, including public art that enhance Mountlake Terrace’s urban character and provide residents with a sense of pride in their city.
  - Promote housing choices and a range of densities to accommodate the City’s diverse population and an adequate supply of diverse housing to encourage employees to reside within proximity to transportation and employment centers.

- **Circulation**
  - Create multi-modal transportation options that connect living areas with employment, parks, open spaces, shopping areas and transit hubs.
  - Plan pedestrian and bicycle networks that promote community interaction and provide healthy options for pedestrian movements within and outside the Town Center.
  - Streetscapes will be designed for “people first” where a range of sidewalk widths with public plazas and open spaces are strategically located with street side landscaping, where appropriate.

- **Urban Design**
  - Create design standards that incorporate flexible zoning provisions to enable design creativity of buildings, streetscapes, landscaping and signage.
  - A range of building heights where the tallest buildings are located adjacent to I-5 and near the transit station and transition to lower buildings within the core and edges of the Town Center adjacent to existing single-family neighborhoods.
  - Building façades will have ample glazing and prominent pedestrian entries, especially at key intersections.
  - Structure parking will service multi-storied residential and office buildings, and surface parking, where permitted, will be located behind buildings and screened from the pedestrian realm. On-street parking, where appropriate, will be separated from pedestrian sidewalk zones with street-side landscaping and low-impact stormwater facilities.
  - Collaborate with utility providers to locate transmission facilities underground and ensure that infrastructure installation and placement is compatible with building architecture and pedestrian
circulation patterns.

- Environmental Preservation and Economic Development
  - Promote the City’s strong environmental ethic in preserving prominent vegetative and forested open spaces.
  - Promote building design that incorporates alternative energy systems, such as solar energy, electric vehicular charging stations, and recycling facilities.
  - Promote Town Center development opportunities to the private sector and attract and retain a diversity of local and regional retail establishments and employment opportunities in economic sectors that will enhance the Mountlake Terrace local economy.

### 2.3.2. SEIS Alternatives and Relationship to Prior EIS

In 2007, the City of Mountlake Terrace issued a Planned Action Final EIS and adopted a subarea plan for the Town Center, establishing goals, policies, and development regulations to promote mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly development and streamline SEPA permitting for development projects that met the conditions of the Planned Action Ordinance. In 2013, the City issued a SEPA Addendum for the Planned Action EIS and adopted amendments to the Town Center Plan that expanded the subarea westward along 236th Street SW to incorporate properties south of Veterans Memorial Park and east of the transit center. The addendum also evaluated an increase in the previous Planned Action development thresholds for the Town Center by 389 dwelling units and 33,500 square feet of commercial space to accommodate future development on these added properties.

This Supplemental EIS (SEIS) expands upon the 2007 and 2013 SEPA analyses to evaluate a proposed update to the Town Center Plan. For purposes of this SEIS, the current plan that is reflected in the 2013 Addendum will serve as the No Action Alternative, which is required by SEPA, and represents the amount of change that could occur under current plans and regulations. The No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative are described in more detail in the following subsections.

**No Action Alternative**

The No Action Alternative assumes that no plan update or regulatory changes would be adopted, and the current Town Center Plan goals, policies, and development regulations, as reflected in the 2013 Town Center Plan Addendum, would be maintained. While the No Action Alternative would not increase development capacity in the study area or implement any specific development project, Planned Action development within the existing Town Center boundary could continue up to the development thresholds established in the 2013 Addendum and adopted Planned Action Ordinance. The No Action Alternative is therefore assumed to include approximately 1,126 new dwelling units and 478,499 square feet of new commercial space (287,800 square feet of retail and 190,699 square feet of office). This would result in approximately 2,477 new residents and 1,495 new employees in the study area by 2035 at building heights up to seven stories.
Proposed Action Alternative

Town Center Boundaries and Level of Growth

To address the goals of the Town Center Plan and the regional growth strategy of creating thriving and livable centers surrounding high-capacity transit, the Proposed Action Alternative could add approximately 3,000 new multifamily housing units and 625,000 new square feet of commercial space (215,000 square feet of retail and 410,000 square feet of office). This would result in approximately 6,600 new residents and 1,953 new jobs in the Town Center. The Proposed Action Alternative would also increase allowed building heights in the Town Center, authorizing a range of 4-12 stories in various zones, with the tallest buildings concentrated near the Transit Center and I-5. The Proposed Action Alternative would also modify the Town Center boundary to include the transit center, civic campus, and adjacent residential areas generally north of 235th Street SW and west of 58th Avenue West (see Exhibit 2-1).

Town Center Zoning and Design Standards

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the Town Center Plan Update would reduce the number of development districts within the Town Center Core from six to three, plus one Town Center Reserve district covering areas outside the proposed Town Center Core boundary that were included in the 2007 boundary. This reorganization would focus the greatest building height and intensity in the southwestern areas of the Town Center to support employment-oriented development near the transit center and I-5. These heights and intensities would transition to lower levels in the districts to the east and north, as shown in Exhibit 2-2.

The Proposed Action Alternative would also amend the City’s zoning regulations, including design standards for the Town Center, to address the following:

- Adoption of new zoning districts to implement the plan’s reorganized Town Center districts.
- Establishment of block frontage standards governing building access and façade design (see Exhibit 2-3).
- Amendment of design standards for building setbacks, on-site open space, and pedestrian access.
- Addition of dimensional standards to govern building height transitions between Town Center sites and lower-density residential zones outside the Town Center.
- Establishment of streetscape standards, including amenity and landscaping requirements and prototype cross-sections.
- Establishment of streetscape design standards for planned mid-block access corridors intended to promote circulation of pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles while breaking up building massing on large blocks.
- Amendment of off-street parking requirements for both the Town Center Core and Town Center Reserve areas.

Drafts of the proposed zoning regulations and design standards are included in Appendix D.
Exhibit 2-2. Town Center Districts – Proposed Action Alternative

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; BERK, 2019.

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019
AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC VITALITY ELEMENT

The Proposed Action Alternative also makes the following amendments to the Economic Vitality Element of the Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan:

- Updated information on the economic climate in Mountlake Terrace, including updated employment and business statistics, information on trends in retail sales, updated descriptions of the City’s commercial centers, and an updated discussion of the Town Center’s role in the Mountlake Terrace economy.
- Editorial changes to the goals and policies of the element and deletion of duplicative policy language.

Additional Alternatives Considered

In addition to the alternatives described above, the Mountlake Terrace Planning Commission has, as of July 16, 2019, recommended a modified version of the Proposed Action Alternative. The Planning Commission Recommendation would differ from the Proposed Action in the following ways:

- Expand the Town Center Core boundary to include an area adjacent to the southeastern corner of the Town Center Core, as shown in Exhibit 2-4, and designate this area as part of Town Center District 3 (TC-3).
- Remove the transition zone along the southern boundary of the Town Center Core between 60th Avenue W and 56th Avenue W, as shown in Exhibit 2-4.

The Planning Commission Recommendation would maintain the growth levels considered under the Proposed Action Alternative. While the DSEIS does not analyze this Planning Commission Recommendation as a distinct alternative, a conceptual review of environmental impacts is presented in Appendix F.

Potential Associated Future Actions

As described in Chapter 3.1 – Land Use Patterns and Policies, zoning surrounding the existing Town Center boundary includes the Single-Household Residential – Transitional (RS-T) zone, which provides a buffer area between the Town Center and surrounding low-density residential zones. The RS-T zone is intended to provide for townhomes and commercial parking. As the Proposed Action Alternative expands the Town Center boundary, some of this transitional zoning could potentially be converted to Town Center zoning districts by action of the City Council. While not part of the current proposal, in the future the City may consider the establishment of transitional zoning along the expanded Town Center boundary to provide a buffer between the Town Center and surrounding low-density residential uses.
Exhibit 2-4. Town Center Districts – Planning Commission Recommendation

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Alternative Summary Comparison

The table below summarizes the population and employment growth levels of the two alternatives, as well as the proposed policy and code amendments.

Exhibit 2-5. Alternative Features Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Thresholds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dwelling Units (multifamily)</td>
<td>1,126 units (2,477 residents)</td>
<td>3,000 units (6,600 residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial Space (total sq. ft.)</td>
<td>478,499 (1,495 jobs)</td>
<td>625,000 (1,953 jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>190,699 (596 jobs)</td>
<td>410,000 (1,367 jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>287,800 (899 jobs)</td>
<td>215,000 (586 jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies and Development Regulations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center Plan</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>▪ Update Town Center Plan description of existing conditions, goals, policies, and plan objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Update Town Center Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>▪ Update Economic Vitality Element of the Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Action Ordinance</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>▪ Update development thresholds and mitigation measures based on SEPA analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Code</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>▪ Amend development code to allow a range of building heights from 4-12 stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Establish streetscape and block frontage standards and amend landscaping and off-street parking requirements to implement the goals of the updated Town Center Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Establish transition standards between Town Center districts and adjacent lower-intensity residential areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. PURPOSE OF THIS DRAFT SEIS

This Draft SEIS provides a qualitative and quantitative analysis of environmental impacts associated with the Town Center Plan Update and associated development regulation amendments. The SEIS provides the public and local government decision makers with information to assist their consideration of future growth, infrastructure, and mitigation measures appropriate for the proposal.

2.5. SEPA PROCESS

2.5.1. Prior SEPA Documentation

SEPA allows the use of prior environmental documents (WAC 197-11-600), and the City may rely on part or all of these previous analyses. The City determined that, for the Town Center Plan update, a Supplemental EIS is appropriate, given the increased amount of housing and commercial space proposed, the additional analysis necessary to evaluate the impacts to properties being added to the Town Center, and the amount of time that has passed since adoption of the 2007 EIS. While the SEIS provides documentation of new information and new alternatives, it does not need to repeat analysis contained in the original EIS.

The Draft SEIS adopts and supplements the following SEPA documents:
- Mountlake Terrace Town Center Planned Action and Zoning Regulations Final EIS, August 2007
- City of Mountlake Terrace – Addendum to the Town Center Planned Action EIS, April 2013

2.5.2. Planned Action

The 2007 EIS supported designation of the Town Center as a Planned Action, as authorized under SEPA (RCW 43.21C.440 and WAC 197-11-164 through -172). Planned actions provide more detailed environmental analysis during the area-wide planning phase, rather than during the permit review process. Future projects in the Town Center that develop under the designated Planned Action will not require SEPA determinations at the time of permit application if they are certified as consistent with the type of development, traffic assumptions, and mitigation measures studied in the SEIS. Such projects are still required to comply with adopted laws and regulations and would undergo review pursuant to the City’s adopted land use and building permit procedures.

The existing Planned Action Ordinance will be amended to address new levels of development and to reference updated mitigation measures as necessary. See Appendix C for draft amendments. As described in Section 2.2, the proposal would also amend the Town Center boundary to create a Town Center Core that includes additional areas not currently included in the existing Town Center. The proposal would also create a Town Center Reserve consisting of all areas currently in the existing Town Center that do not fall within the proposed Town Center Core. The updated Planned Action Ordinance would establish a unified bank of housing units and commercial space for both the Town Center Core and Town Center Reserve areas. Properties in the Town Center Reserve would remain eligible to apply for streamlined SEPA review under the Planned Action, and approved Planned Action development would be counted toward the overall development thresholds. While still eligible for streamlined SEPA review, the Town Center Reserve areas’ building height and density amendments under the Proposed Action Alternative would result in development intensity within the Town Center Reserve at levels that are...
relatively comparable with the No Action Alternative.

2.5.3. Public Comment Process

The City has posted information about the Town Center Plan update on its website and a scoping period for the EIS was established from April 12 – May 9, 2019. The City also hosted two EIS scoping and Planned Action community meetings on April 22 and May 6, 2019. These meetings fulfill the requirement under RCW 43.21c.440 to hold a community meeting related to designation of a planned action. The Scoping Notice and SEPA Checklist are included in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

Comments received during the scoping period addressed the following environmental topics:

- **Building Height Transitions and Compatibility**: Chapter 3.2 – Aesthetics analyzes potential impacts related to changes in building heights within the Town Center, as well as potential visual impacts on surrounding lower-density residential areas.

- **Traffic Impacts**: Chapter 3.4 – Transportation analyzes projected increases in traffic associated with future development in the Town Center. The analysis evaluates the transportation network throughout most of the City of Mountlake Terrace, as well as a limited number of potentially affected intersections in the City of Shoreline.

- **Telecommunications Service**: Chapter 3.5 – Utilities discusses potential impacts on telecommunication infrastructure in the Town Center due to increased building heights in the area.

The Draft SEIS was issued with a 30-day public comment period. After the comment period, the City will respond to comments and issue a Final Supplemental EIS.

2.6. BENEFITS AND DISADVANTAGES OF DELAYING THE PROPOSED ACTION

Delaying the proposed action would limit the overall amount of development in the Town Center by not expanding the subarea boundary, increasing allowed building heights, or raising Planned Action development thresholds. Delaying the proposal would also delay any increased demand for public services or utilities associated with development. If the proposal is not adopted, the existing Town Center boundary and development thresholds would be maintained, as would the goals and policies of the adopted Town Center Plan. The area would continue to develop under the established mixed-use vision, though at a lower intensity than under the proposal. However, the higher-intensity development pattern anticipated under the Proposed Action would be more consistent with the planned extension of light rail service to the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center, as it would concentrate development near a major regional transportation facility, allowing for more efficient planning of future infrastructure improvements.
3.0 Environmental Analysis

3.1. LAND USE PATTERNS AND POLICIES

3.1.1. Overview

This section evaluates the amount, type, and pattern of land uses proposed under each alternative. The Affected Environment section reviews the changes in current land use and land use policies that have occurred since publication of the original 2007 Town Center Planned Action EIS. This section also evaluates consistency of the alternatives with the 2017 Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan policies and presents a discussion of the land capacity analysis contained in the updated 2018 Town Center Plan.

3.1.2. Affected Environment

Land Use Patterns

**Current Land Use**

Current land use in the Town Center planned action area has not changed dramatically since adoption of the 2007 Town Center Plan. The area remains predominantly single-family residential in character, with limited commercial and multifamily residential development concentrated along 56th Avenue W. As of 2018, approximately 67% of the existing Town Center is occupied by residential use, of which 87% is single-family (Community Attributes, 2018). Exhibit 3-1 summarizes existing land uses in the combined planned action area by subarea, which are mapped in Exhibit 3-2.

**Exhibit 3-1. Town Center Current Land Uses by Subarea**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Town Center Core (Acres)</th>
<th>Town Center Reserve (Acres)</th>
<th>Total (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>40.69</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>47.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residential</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retail</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Government Services</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>15.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/Recreation</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Snohomish County Assessor, 2019; City of Mountlake Terrace, 2018.
Exhibit 3-2. Town Center Current Land Use Map

Current Land Use

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Urban Growth Area
- Proposed Town Center Core
- Existing Town Center Boundary
- Light Rail Route
- Land Use Category:
  - Commercial/Retail
  - Professional Services
  - Public/Government
  - Open Space/Recreation
  - Single-Family Residential
  - Multi-Family Residential
  - Mixed-Use
  - Vacant/Undeveloped

Source: Snohomish County Assessor, 2019; City of Mountlake Terrace, 2018; BERK, 2019.
While little redevelopment has occurred in the Town Center since adoption of the 2007 Town Center Plan, several large multifamily housing projects have been developed in the area, primarily senior housing:

- SHAG Mountlake Senior Living on 244th Street SW (96 apartments and 7,911 square feet of commercial space);
- Arbor Village Apartments at the corner of 56th Avenue W and 236th Street SW (123 apartments and 10,000 square feet of commercial space); and
- Vineyard Park at Mountlake Terrace, an assisted living facility at 231st Street SW and 56th Avenue W (80 residential units, 29 memory care spaces, and 8,200 square feet of commercial space).

Several larger scale development projects in the planned action area, shown in Exhibit 3-3 are either under construction or in the process of being permitted:

- Sound Transit Link Light Rail station, an expansion of the existing Mountlake Terrace Transit Center;
- Terrace Station, a mixed-use development adjacent to the southwestern corner of the proposed Town Center boundary, which would include more than 600 multifamily residential units and 90,000 square feet of commercial space; and
- The Civic Campus Redevelopment project, which includes a new City Hall, an addition to the existing police station and Town Center Park Plaza.
- Atlas 236, a mixed-use development at the NE corner of 56th Avenue W and 236th Street SW (156 residential units and 13,961 square feet of commercial space).

As of June 2019, approximately 502 residential units and 79,385 square feet of commercial space were either under construction in Mountlake Terrace or recently completed. The majority of this new development consists of multifamily residential and mixed-use projects, resulting in the highest level of multifamily residential development in the city since the 1980’s and the highest level of retail development since the 1990’s.

**Population, Employment, and Redevelopment Potential**

The U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey estimates the 2016 population of the consolidated Town Center Core and Town Center Reserve areas at 1,106 persons in 508 housing units. Approximately 72 businesses operate in the combined Town Center area with 607 employees. Approximately half of these employees work in the services sector, with another 13% in retail and 12% in government. (ESRI, 2019)

A 2018 analysis by Community Attributes, Inc. (CAI) evaluated current market conditions in the Town Center, including property values, office and retail absorption rates, and real estate development potential. Based on Snohomish County Assessor data, the study found that overall improvement values in the Town Center area were relatively low (less than $10 per square foot), though clusters of higher-value properties (greater than $20 per square foot) occur in the following locations, as shown in Exhibit 3-4:

- The intersection of 56th Avenue W and 232nd Street SW;
- The intersection of 56th Avenue W and 236th Street SW;
The block immediately between 232\textsuperscript{nd} Street SW and 234\textsuperscript{th} Street SW and between 58\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W and 56\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W; and

The southern extreme of the Town Center Reserve Area, fronting on 244\textsuperscript{th} Street SW east of 56\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W.

The CAI analysis concluded that redevelopment is more likely to be economically viable on properties with low improvement value (less than $10 per square foot), and properties with improvement values below $0.10 per square foot would have the highest redevelopment potential. Property assembly is likely to be the primary challenge to redevelopment in the area, due to the existing pattern of small lots and single-family housing. However, substantial potential for redevelopment exists along portions of the 56\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W corridor and in the area along 236\textsuperscript{th} Street SW between Veterans Memorial Park and 56\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W, based on low improvement values.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE AND ZONING**

As shown in Exhibit 3-5, the area surrounding the Town Center is predominantly designated for low-density residential uses. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates properties in the existing Town Center boundary as Town Center (TC), and most of the area proposed for addition to the Town Center Core is designated Urban Low Residential (ULR). Veterans Memorial Park is designated Park and Open Space (POS), and the Civic Campus and Transit Center are both designated Public Facilities and Services (PFS).

Similarly, the existing Town Center is zoned entirely Community Business Downtown (BC/D), as shown in Exhibit 3-6. Veterans Memorial Park is zoned Recreation and Park District (REC), and the Civic Campus and Transit Center are zoned Public Facilities and Services (PFS). The northwestern portion of the planned action area (which is proposed to be added to the Town Center Core) is zoned Single-Household Residential with minimum lot sizes of 7,200 square feet (RS 7200). Areas east and south of the existing Town Center boundary are generally zoned Single-Household Residential with a minimum lot size of 4,800 square feet (RS 4800). A small area near the southeast corner of the Town Center Reserve is zoned for a mix of Mobile Home Park (MHP) and Low Density Multi-Household (RML).

Bordering portions of the existing Town Center boundary, the Single-Household Residential – Transitional zone (RS-T) provides a buffer area between the Town Center and surrounding low-density residential zones. The purpose of the zone is to create a transitional space by allowing for uses such as townhomes and commercial parking areas and applying transitional design standards.
Exhibit 3-3. Town Center Major Development Activity

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 3-4. Town Center Current Property Improvement Values

Assessed Improvement Value per Square Foot

- **County Boundary**
- **City Boundary**
- **Urban Growth Area**
- **Proposed Town Center Core**
- **Existing Town Center Boundary**
- **Water Body**

---

**Light Rail Route**

- **Improvement Value**
  - $0 - $0.10 per sq ft
  - $0.10 - $10 per sq ft
  - $10 - $20 per sq ft
  - $20 - $60 per sq ft
  - Over $60 per sq ft

---

Source: Snohomish County Assessor, 2019.
Exhibit 3-5. Town Center Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map

Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Designations

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Urban Growth Area
- Proposed Town Center Core
- Existing Town Center Boundary
- Water Body
- Light Rail Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Low Residential (ULR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Low Medium Residential (ULMR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Medium Residential (UMR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park (MHP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Open Space (POS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities and Services (PPS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center (TC)</td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway/Tourist (F/T)</td>
<td>Cyan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 3-6. Town Center Current Zoning

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Land Use Plans and Policies

State, regional, and local plans and policies that would guide growth in the Town Center study area include the following:

- **Growth Management Act**: The Growth Management Act guides planning by counties and cities to promote coordinated and planned growth, encourage conservation of sensitive lands, foster sustainable economic development, and promote healthy and safe lifestyles for residents. (RCW 36.70A.010) The goals that guide comprehensive plans and development regulations are described in the Impacts Analysis section.

- **Puget Sound Regional Council VISION 2040**: VISION 2040 is a regional plan that establishes a regional growth strategy and multicounty planning policies that guide development across the region toward common goals that address sustainable urban growth, orderly development, affordable housing, economic development, and transportation. Under this regional planning framework, PSRC and its member jurisdictions have designated 29 Regional Growth Centers and nine Manufacturing/Industrial Centers as focal points for future growth in the region.

- **Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies**: Countywide Planning Policies form a framework for the development of City and County comprehensive plans. The Countywide Planning Policies establish a set of common priorities across multiple jurisdictions within Snohomish County and promote coordinated planning. The policies also help ensure consistency of local plans with the provisions of the Growth Management Act and VISION 2040.

- **Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan**: The Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan, last updated in 2017, was developed consistent with the requirements of applicable state, regional, and county plans and includes nine elements: Community Livability; Environment; Economic Vitality; Housing; Land Use; Recreation, Parks, and Open Space; Transportation; Capital Facilities; and Utilities. The Impacts Analysis section identifies relevant goals and policies.

3.1.3. Impacts

**Impacts Common to All Alternatives**

**Land Use Patterns**

Under all Alternatives, the existing Town Center would experience additional and more intensive growth. Changes would include the gradual conversion of existing low-density properties to higher-density uses, including multifamily residences and multi-story commercial and mixed-use buildings. The location and intensity of future development and the associated impacts on land use patterns differ by alternative and are described in more detail in the following sections.

**Land Use Plans and Policies**

**Growth Management Act**

The Growth Management Act (GMA) establishes a set of planning goals that guide local jurisdictions in the development of comprehensive plans, subarea plans, and associated land use regulations:

- **Urban Growth.** Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and
services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.

- **Reduce Sprawl.** Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.

- **Transportation.** Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.

- **Housing.** Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

- **Economic Development.** Encourage economic development throughout the state that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, promote the retention and expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new businesses, recognize regional differences impacting economic development opportunities, and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the state’s natural resources, public services, and public facilities.

- **Property Rights.** Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners shall be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.

- **Permits.** Applications for both state and local government permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.

- **Natural Resource Industries.** Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands and discourage incompatible uses.

- **Open Space and Recreation.** Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks and recreation facilities.

- **Environment.** Protect the environment and enhance the state’s high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.

- **Citizen Participation and Coordination.** Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

- **Public Facilities and Services.** Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

- **Historic Preservation.** Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical or archaeological significance.

Both the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives would encourage mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented development and have the objective of concentrating future development in an established urban area in
proximity to high-capacity transit service. By concentrating future development in the Town Center, demand for the conversion of outlying, undeveloped land for development would potentially be reduced. In addition, the development of higher-density multifamily housing in the Town Center would provide housing options not widely available elsewhere in the community.

Under GMA, local jurisdictions are required to plan for anticipated growth and take measures to ensure the availability of adequate development capacity. According to the Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan, the city’s adopted 2035 growth target is 24,767, an increase of 3,237 from the 2018 population of 21,560. Growth under the No Action Alternative would account for 77% of the City’s growth target, and growth under the Proposed Action Alternative would more than double the adopted growth target. As such, both Alternatives would be consistent with the goals of GMA and allow the City to meet its obligation to plan for its share of regional growth. The City’s next major Comprehensive Plan update is scheduled for 2023, with a horizon year of 2043. Over the next two years, Snohomish County and its cities are reviewing buildable lands and growth target allocations for this upcoming update. The Proposed Action Alternative could allow the City to proactively address its growth needs for the new planning period.

VISION 2040

Mountlake Terrace is a PSRC member jurisdiction and updates to the City’s Comprehensive Plan are subject to review by PSRC for compliance with the VISION 2040 regional growth strategy. The existing Town Center Plan (No Action Alternative) is incorporated into the Land Use element of the City’s latest Comprehensive Plan, which was certified by PSRC in 2015 as consistent with the principles of VISION 2040.

Similar to the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action Alternative would concentrate future development in Mountlake Terrace in a pedestrian-oriented district organized around a multimodal transportation hub. The Proposed Action Alternative would not alter any of the Comprehensive Plan’s goals or policies regarding air quality or environmental conservation, and no changes to the City’s growth targets are proposed. Both Alternatives would therefore be consistent with the principles of VISION 2040.

Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies

Snohomish County last updated its Countywide Planning Policies in 2016. Exhibit 3-7 presents a summary of the consistency of the Alternatives with relevant Countywide Planning Policies.
### Exhibit 3-7. Consistency of Alternatives with Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countywide Planning Policy</th>
<th>Consistency Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DP-13:</strong> The County and cities should integrate the desirable qualities of existing residential neighborhoods when planning for urban centers and mixed-use developments. Jurisdictions should adopt design guidelines and standards for urban centers to provide for efficient site design that integrates building design, transportation facilities, and publicly accessible open spaces.</td>
<td>Development under both Alternatives would be subject to development regulations and design standards to promote high-quality design, good pedestrian access, development of usable public open space, and strong linkages to multimodal transit infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DP-14:</strong> The County and cities should promote and focus new compact urban growth in urban centers and transit emphasis corridors.</td>
<td>Under both Alternatives, the Town Center would develop as a compact, pedestrian-oriented center organized around a multimodal transit facility with regional access. The Town Center would offer multifamily housing options not widely available elsewhere in Mountlake Terrace and promote travel by modes other than driving alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DP-33:</strong> Jurisdictions should develop high quality, compact urban communities that impart a sense of place, preserve local character, provide for mixed uses and choices in housing types, and encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.</td>
<td>Both Alternatives would promote greater housing choice in Mountlake Terrace and greater levels of employment in the Town Center. The Proposed Action Alternative would promote a greater amount of office uses than the No Action Alternative, which has a greater focus on retail. Additional office space located near a major transit facility could draw new, higher-paying jobs to Mountlake Terrace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **HO-9:** In order to improve the jobs-to-housing balance in Snohomish County, jurisdictions shall adopt comprehensive plans that provide for the development of:  
  a. A variety of housing choices, including affordable housing, so that workers at all income levels may choose to live in proximity to existing and planned employment concentrations and transit service; and  
  b. Provide for employment opportunities in proximity to existing residential communities. | Both Alternatives would promote greater housing choice in Mountlake Terrace and greater levels of employment in the Town Center. The Proposed Action Alternative would promote a greater amount of office uses than the No Action Alternative, which has a greater focus on retail. Additional office space located near a major transit facility could draw new, higher-paying jobs to Mountlake Terrace. |
| **ED-14:** The County and cities should promote an appropriate balance of jobs-to-housing to:  
  a. Support economic activity;  
  b. Encourage local economic opportunities and housing choice;  
  c. Improve mobility; and  
  d. Respond to the challenge of climate change. | See response to HO-9 above. In addition, the location of high-density employment uses and housing in proximity to a regional transit center would offer residents and employees additional mobility options and promote greater use of transit services over driving. |

**Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan**

After publication of the 2013 Addendum to the Town Center Plan, the City of Mountlake Terrace performed a periodic update of its Comprehensive Plan in 2015 (amended 2017). The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan establishes the policy framework for governing land use patterns. Exhibit 3-8 presents an analysis of the Alternatives’ consistency with relevant goals and policies of the Land Use Element.
### Exhibit 3-8. Consistency of Alternatives with Land Use Element Goals and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Goal/Policy</th>
<th>Consistency Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal LU-1: Sense of Place and Connectedness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-1.1: Provide for a pattern of land uses that will complement the community’s physical characteristics, encourage pedestrian activity, revitalize the Town Center and give people opportunities to interact with each other in positive ways.</td>
<td>Both Alternatives would promote revitalization of the Town Center and foster pedestrian-oriented land use patterns featuring mixed retail, office, and residential development with connections to transit infrastructure and the City’s civic campus. Both Alternatives would implement development regulations and design standards, including streetscape and building frontage standards intended to promote high-quality urban design and an attractive pedestrian environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-1.3: Require development to achieve a high level of compatibility with pedestrian and transit use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-1.8: Encourage a mixture of land uses throughout the Town Center, including retail, office, residential, and civic projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-1.9: Promote design of open spaces, walkways, and gathering spaces, that facilitate community interaction for people of all ages, and abilities, within the Town Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-1.11: Design the Town Center so that, generally, height and density increase approaching the core of the Town Center.</td>
<td>Both Alternatives would concentrate the tallest development near the core or west/southwestern portion of the Town Center. The No Action Alternative would locate buildings up to seven stories in the “Town Square” block immediately east of the civic campus and buildings up to five stories around the intersection of 56th Avenue W and 236th Street SW. The Proposed Action would concentrate its tallest development (up to 12 stories) along 236th Street SW between 56th Avenue W and I-5 to connect higher-density employment uses to the transit center. Height limits would gradually step down in transition to surrounding neighborhoods. A detailed analysis of building heights is presented in Chapter 3.2 – Aesthetics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-1.13: Create sidewalks in the Town Center that are wide and encourage tree-lined, pedestrian-friendly shopping and gathering areas.</td>
<td>See response to LU-1.1, 1.3, 1.8, and 1.9 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal LU-3: Variety of Land Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-3.6: Create housing choices in the Town Center attractive to people from all walks of life.</td>
<td>Both Alternatives would promote development of multifamily housing options not widely available elsewhere in Mountlake Terrace, as well as additional commercial space for employment. The Proposed Action Alternative would offer a larger amount of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-3.7: Encourage a mix of different sizes and types of businesses in the Town Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Goal/Policy | Consistency Discussion
--- | ---
**Policy LU-3.8:** Attract additional, quality jobs to Mountlake Terrace’s Town Center. | Housing than the No Action Alternative and would have a greater focus on office space rather than retail, which would aid the recruitment of higher-paying, living wage jobs to the Town Center.

**Goal LU-5: High-Quality Infill Projects and Redevelopment**

**Policy LU-5.3:** Use design guidelines and standards to ensure that development is at an appropriate scale for the neighborhood, has landscaping, and that the façade shows variations in materials and in architectural features. | Both Alternatives include the implementation of design standards to ensure high-quality development that is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and fits into the overall Vision of the Town Center. The current Town Center design standards were adopted in 2008 after initial adoption of the Town Center Plan and include provisions for landscaping, façade articulation, and material variation. The Proposed Action Alternative would update and reorganize the Town Center design standards to implement a new system of block frontage classifications. Design requirements would apply based on property block frontage type, and each category includes standards for landscaping and façade design.

**Policy LU-5.6:** Encourage development to be pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly and convenient for transit. | See response to LU-1.1, 1.3, 1.8, and 1.9 above.

**Goal LU-6: Effective Public Services and Facilities**

**Policy LU-6.10:** Create a multi-modal Town Center that provides gathering and mobility for pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles, and public transportation. | See response to LU-1.1, 1.3, 1.8, and 1.9 above.

**Impacts of the No Action Alternative (2013 Addendum)**

**Land Use Patterns**

Under the No Action Alternative, land use patterns in the Town Center would gradually transition to include denser, mixed-use development, as described in the 2007 Planned Action EIS and the subsequent 2013 SEPA Addendum. Under the No Action Alternative, the Town Center boundary would not be expanded, and redevelopment under the planned action would be restricted to the current extents of the Town Center; while redevelopment would be anticipated throughout the Town Center, most development activity would be concentrated in the 56th Avenue W corridor south of 236th Street SW and near the "Town Square" site between 232nd Street SW, 234th Street SW, 56th Avenue W, and 58th Avenue W. The No Action Alternative would add approximately 1,126 new multifamily dwelling units (approximately 2,477 residents) and 478,499 square feet of commercial space, of which 60% would be retail and 40% would be devoted to office. This would represent a 124% increase in population over existing conditions and a 146% increase in employment.

As described in the 2007 Planned Action EIS and 2013 Addendum, new development in the Town Center would be at a greater intensity than the existing uses, which could lead to localized impacts to land use compatibility where more intense development adjoins lower-intensity uses. While some development has
occurred since publication of the 2007 EIS, most development in the Town Center remains single-story at relatively low intensity. Introduction of higher-intensity mixed-use development would likely increase vehicular and pedestrian traffic, as well. As documented in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, with the application of adopted development regulations and design standards, no significant impacts to land use patterns are anticipated.

**LAND USE PLANS AND POLICIES**

As described under *Impacts Common to All Alternatives*, the No Action Alternative is generally consistent with adopted policy frameworks.

*Impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative*

**LAND USE PATTERNS**

The types of uses allowed under the Proposed Action Alternative would be the same as under the No Action Alternative, but new development in the Town Center would be at a greater intensity than either the No Action Alternative or existing uses due to the greater heights allowed and the larger extent of the amended Town Center boundary. Like the No Action Alternative, land use patterns in the Town Center would gradually transition to include denser, mixed-use development. As described in Chapter 2, the Town Center Core would be divided into three sub-districts, based on development intensity, as shown in Exhibit 3-9.

- **District 1:** This district would be the location of the most intense development under the Proposed Action Alternative, allowing the gradual conversion of existing development to mixed-use buildings of 6-12 stories. Impacts associated with conversion of uses and land use compatibility would be most pronounced here because existing land uses within the district are almost entirely single-family residential and the district is adjacent to an established single-family neighborhood south of 237th Street SW, which creates a high potential for transitional impacts and land use incompatibilities.

- **District 2:** This district would include moderately intense development, allowing gradual conversion of existing development to mixed-use buildings of 4-8 stories. Impacts of land use conversion would be less pronounced in this area compared with District 1 because a large portion of the district is already occupied by multifamily and commercial properties, concentrated on both sides of 232nd Street SW between 58th and 56th Avenues W. Most of the single-family properties in District 2 are located on the north side of 232nd Street SW west of 58th Avenue W and in the block between 234th Street SW and 235th Street SW. Temporary, localized land use incompatibilities could occur as these properties gradually redevelop.

- **District 3:** This district would experience less intense development that Districts 1 or 2, allowing gradual conversion of existing development to mixed-use buildings of 4-6 stories. District 3 would serve as a transitional area, buffering the single-family areas north of 230th Street SW and east of 55th Avenue W from the more intense development proposed in Districts 1 and 2. District 3 contains a mix of multifamily and commercial properties near the intersection of 231st Street SW and 56th Avenue W, so land use conversion impacts would be most pronounced on the south side of 230th Street SW west of 58th Avenue W, where development is exclusively single-family residential. Land use conversion impacts may also occur in limited areas along 56th Avenue W where single-family residences are interspersed with other uses; temporary, localized land use incompatibilities could
occur as these properties gradually redevelop.

Areas outside the proposed Town Center Core that are currently included in the Town Center would be designated as Town Center Reserve, as shown in Exhibit 3-9. The Town Center Reserve is intended to allow for a smaller-scale mixture of multifamily, retail commercial, and professional office uses primarily centered on 56th Avenue W north and south of the Town Center Core. Primary uses would be similar to what is currently allowed (e.g., mixed uses such as residential, retail/commercial, and office. Building heights would range from 2-4 stories.

More detailed evaluation of impacts specifically related to increased building height, massing, and shading conditions is presented in Chapter 3.2 – Aesthetics.

The Proposed Action Alternative would add approximately 3,000 new multifamily housing units (approximately 6,600 residents) and 625,000 square feet of commercial space, of which 66% would be office and 33% would be devoted to retail. This would represent a 497% increase in population over existing conditions and a 222% increase in employment. Compared to the No Action Alternative, this represents an increase of 166% residents, 115% more office space, and 25% less retail space.

Similar to the No Action Alternative, introduction of higher-intensity mixed-use development would likely increase vehicular and pedestrian traffic. While locating new development in close proximity to a regional transit facility would help reduce vehicular trips, the increased residential and employee population would lead to a general increase in both daytime and nighttime activity in the Town Center compared to the No Action Alternative.

**LAND USE PLANS AND POLICIES**

As described under Impacts Common to All Alternatives, the Proposed Action Alternative is generally consistent with adopted policy frameworks. The Proposed Action Alternative would also amend the Economic Vitality Element of the Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan to include updated information on the economic climate in Mountlake Terrace, including updated employment and business statistics, information on trends in retail sales, updated descriptions of the city’s commercial centers, and an updated discussion of the Town Center’s role in the Mountlake Terrace economy. The Proposed Action Alternative would also make editorial changes to the goals and policies of the element and delete duplicative policy language. None of the proposed changes would be inconsistent with the goals of GMA or Snohomish County’s Countywide Planning Policies.

Adoption of the Proposed Action Alternative would also necessitate updates to the City’s Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to reflect the addition of areas currently designated as Urban Low Residential to the Town Center designation. The City’s official zoning map would also need to be amended to reflect the updated Town Center districts. Other Comprehensive Plan text amendments may be necessary to fully incorporate the changes to the Town Center Plan.
Exhibit 3-9. Town Center Districts – Proposed Action Alternative

Town Center Districts and Proposed Height Limits

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
3.1.4. Mitigation Measures

Incorporated Plan Features

- As described in Chapter 2, the updated Town Center Plan would establish a land use pattern that places the most intense development and tallest building heights (up to 12 stories in the Town Center 1 zone) near the transit center and civic campus, with lower intensity and building height areas (4-8 stories in the Town Center 2 zone and 4-6 stories in Town Center 3 zone) arranged to create step-down transitions to the low-intensity residential areas east of 55th Avenue W and north of 230th Street SW.

- Further transitions in development intensity would be established through the preservation of existing height limits in the Town Center Reserve areas, which would continue to allow mixed-use buildings of 2-4 stories.

- The Proposed Action Alternative includes amendments to the City’s zoning code (Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 19.50), which include use and development standards for the three proposed Town Center Districts and the Town Center Reserve. These amended zoning regulations include the following provisions to minimize and mitigate potential land use conflicts:
  - Streetscape standards for each of the established block frontage classifications to establish a safe, comfortable pedestrian environment with sidewalk amenities such as street trees, planting strips, and storefront weather protection.
  - Standards governing access corridors intended to promote mid-block pedestrian connections and break up massing of large buildings.

- The Proposed Action Alternative also includes updated design standards for the Town Center (Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 19.123), which include side and rear-yard setback requirements with special transitional requirements for sites abutting residential zones. See Chapter 3.2 – Aesthetics for a detailed discussion of potential impacts associated with building height, scale, and massing and applicable mitigation measures.

Regulations and Commitments

- Development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to adopted development regulations for the Downtown Community Business District and the existing Town Center Design Standards.

- Development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to provisions of the Mountlake Terrace Zoning Code, including landscaping and site buffering regulations (Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 19.130). The Proposed Action Alternative would be subject to the provisions contained in Chapter 19.123 Design Standards.

Other Proposed Mitigation Measures

- Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code amendments as necessary to fully integrate the updated Town Center Plan.
3.1.5. **Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Under both Alternatives, properties in the Town Center would gradually be redeveloped and converted from single-family residential and other low-intensity uses to higher density mixed-use development, in keeping with the long-established vision for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center. Both Alternatives would represent a substantial increase in population and employment over current conditions and some short-term land use incompatibilities may occur as new development occurs in the Town Center adjacent to existing low-density properties. The increased extent of development associated with the expansion of the Town Center boundary would also extend these changes to areas not previously included in the Town Center. With implementation of the mitigation measures described above, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to land use patterns or policies are anticipated, though some property owners and residents, particularly in single-family areas, may perceive these changes as adverse.
3.2. AESTHETICS

3.2.1. Overview
This section evaluates the scale and visual quality of development that would potentially occur under each of the alternatives, including the effects of proposed building height increases on community character, views, and shading conditions. The Affected Environment section documents major changes to the built environment since publication of the Town Center Planned Action EIS in 2007.

3.2.2. Affected Environment
The analysis area for the Aesthetics analysis is the combined Town Center Core and Reserve Areas, as well as all properties within 500 feet of these boundaries. The extent of the analysis area is shown in Exhibit 3-10.

Visual Character

TOWN CENTER
In the Town Center Core and Reserve Areas, buildings are typically 1-2 stories in height, though some recent multifamily and mixed-use development at 4-5 stories has occurred in the area since the original adoption of the Town Center Plan in 2007, as described in Chapter 3.1 – Land Use Patterns and Policies. Overall, existing development exhibits low visual bulk and the visual character of the area has not changed substantially since publication of the Town Center Planned Action EIS in 2007. Tree coverage along local streets is extensive, further reducing the perceived intensity of development. As described in the 2007 EIS, commercial development in the area exhibits no strong architectural theme and several businesses in the 56th Avenue W corridor are located in repurposed single-family homes. Commercial development intensity is greatest in the northern portion of the Town Center, near the intersections of 56th Avenue W with 232nd Street SW and 236th Street SW. South of 236th Street SW, 56th Avenue W becomes more residential, characterized by mostly single-story structures with open lawn areas. At the intersection of 56th Avenue W and 244th Street SW, visual character becomes commercial again, characterized by small strip malls, convenience stores, and auto repair shops. Structures in this area are generally commercial in character at heights of 1-2 stories, with little or no architectural unity, aside from prominent automobile access and parking.
Exhibit 3-10. Aesthetics Analysis Area

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; BERK, 2019.
As described in Chapter 3.1 – Land Use Patterns and Policies, outside the 56th Avenue W corridor, the Town Center contains mostly single-family residential uses. The portions of the Town Center Core north of 232nd Street SW and west of 58th Avenue, as well as both sides of 236th Street SW west of 56th Avenue W, consist of mostly small single-family homes on relatively small lots. These homes are generally one-story structures, and the extensive tree coverage reinforces the low-density character of these areas. The major exceptions to this are the civic campus near Veterans Memorial Park and the transit center on the western edge of the proposed Town Center Core area. While developed with larger buildings for the City Hall, police station, fire station, and library, the civic campus also maintains a relatively low-intensity character with widely spaced buildings and extensive tree cover. The existing transit center is characterized by extensive vehicle parking areas, including a multi-story garage and a flyover pedestrian walkway connecting to bus platforms located in the I-5 median.

**ADJACENT AREAS**

Areas adjacent to the Town Center Core and Reserve Areas primarily consist of single-family residential neighborhoods with single-story detached housing located on medium or small urban lots with some three-story townhome development. Visual character in these areas is similar to the single-family portions of the Town Center described above. The analysis area also contains a limited amount of other uses, including multifamily residences, shopping centers, and government/educational facilities.

**Light and Glare**

As described in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, light and glare in an urban setting can be produced from a variety of sources, including automobile headlights, exterior building illumination, street lights, and illuminated signage. The more intensely developed portions of the analysis area, where commercial and multifamily uses are already present, such as the northern portion of the 56th Avenue W corridor and the southern end of the Town Center Reserve Area, currently have the highest levels of ambient light and glare. The less intensely developed single-family portions of the analysis area have relatively low levels of light and glare, especially properties located on side streets with few or no street lights.

**Views**

The relatively flat terrain and extensive tree cover in the analysis area restrict sightlines and limit the views available from the analysis area. No public views of any major geographic features are available in the analysis area, though private views may be available from the upper stories of existing buildings, and future development envisioned under the Town Center Plan may create additional views.

**Shading Conditions**

As described in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, shading conditions vary by season and time of day. Shadows are shortest at mid-day during summer months, when sun angles are closest to directly overhead. They are longest in the morning and evening hours of the winter months, when sun angles are more extreme. As described in the Visual Character section above, the analysis area has extensive tree cover, which also contributes to a higher degree of shading, even where building heights are low, due to long shadows cast by large, mature trees. As a result, even though development intensity in the analysis area is generally low, shading effects are generally more pronounced in the predominantly single-family residential areas than in the commercial districts.
3.2.3. Impacts

Impacts Common to All Alternatives

Under both SEIS alternatives, the analysis area is anticipated to experience gradual growth, including the conversion of existing development to more intense uses with greater building heights. This redevelopment would result in changes to the current aesthetic conditions in the analysis area. The two alternatives differ with respect to the location and intensity of these changes and are discussed in detail in the following sections.

Impacts of the No Action Alternative (2013 Addendum)

The No Action Alternative represents the adopted Town Center Plan and its associated design standards and development regulations. As analyzed in the 2007 Planned Action EIS and 2013 SEPA Addendum, the No Action Alternative would result in increased building height and bulk and additional ambient light and glare and shading effects within the existing Town Center boundary compared to existing development conditions. However, with application of the adopted Town Center design standards and development regulations, no significant adverse aesthetic impacts are anticipated.

Visual Character

As described in Chapter 3.1 – Land Use Patterns and Policies, the most intense development under the No Action Alternative would be focused in the “Town Square” block between 56th Avenue W and 58th Avenue W and between 232nd Street SW and 234th Street SW, where building heights of up to seven stories could occur, consistent with the adopted Town Center Plan and adopted development regulations. Exhibit 3-11 shows the existing Town Center districts and their corresponding height limits. Exhibit 3-12 shows the building typologies that correspond to each of the districts; these building types and their associated dimensional standards are codified in Chapter 19.50.050 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code.

As noted in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, the primary effects of the No Action Alternative on the visual character of the analysis area would result from increased building heights. While the No Action Alternative would not change the City’s adopted height limits, design standards, or development regulations for the Town Center, development up to the adopted height limits of 4-7 stories that were analyzed in the 2007 Planned Action EIS would be a substantial increase in height over most existing development. Relatively little redevelopment has occurred in the Town Center since adoption of the 2007 Town Center Plan, due in part to the poor economic climate of the late 2000’s. In addition, the existing development regulations and design standards in the Town Center, including upper-level setback requirements, have not functioned as an effective incentive for development. As a result, future development under the No Action Alternative may occur at a slower pace than under the Proposed Action.
Exhibit 3-11. Town Center Building Heights – No Action Alternative

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2018.
Exhibit 3-12. Town Center Building Types – No Action Alternative

Type 1: Seven-Story Building

Type 2A: Six-Story Building

Type 2B: Five-Story Building

Type 3: Four-Story Building

Type 4: Three-Story Building

Type 5: Two-Story Building

Type 6: Single-Story Building

Type 7: Two- or Three-Story Live-Work Townhouse

**Light and Glare**

As noted in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, development under the adopted Town Center Plan would result in an increased level of ambient light and glare in the analysis area. Currently, most of the analysis area consists of residential properties or low-intensity commercial uses that operate primarily during daylight hours, generating relatively little ambient light. As properties in the existing Town Center gradually convert to mixed-use development under the No Action Alternative, ambient light and glare will increase as more businesses stay open into the evening hours and building illumination and signage lighting become more extensive.

**Views**

As described in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, no views of major geographic features are currently available in the analysis area, and development under the No Action Alternative would have no impacts on views.

**Shading Conditions**

As described in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, increased building heights in the Town Center would have the potential to increase shading effects; most notably, taller buildings in the “Town Square” could achieve sufficient height to shade nearby smaller buildings, as well as public spaces like sidewalks. Development in other areas of the Town Center would likely not achieve enough height to significantly increase shading effects.

**Impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative**

As described in Chapter 2, the Proposed Action Alternative would expand the Town Center boundary and amend the City’s development code to allow greater building heights and an overall more intense level of development than either existing conditions or the No Action Alternative. Specific impacts are described in the following sections.

**Visual Character**

Impacts to visual character in the analysis area would primarily result from increased building heights under the Proposed Action Alternative. These impacts can be divided into two categories: impacts related to increased height and development intensity within the Town Center and impacts on surrounding areas.

**Town Center**

As described in Chapter 3.1 – Land Use Patterns and Policies, the Proposed Action Alternative would reorganize the Town Center sub-districts and set new height limits as follows:

- **Town Center 1**: 6-12 stories, maximum 150 feet;
- **Town Center 2**: 4-8 stories, maximum 100 feet;
- **Town Center 3**: 4-6 stories, maximum 70 feet; and
- **Town Center Reserve**: 2-4 stories, maximum 45 feet.

The locations of these districts are illustrated in Exhibit 3-13.
Exhibit 3-13. Town Center Building Heights – Proposed Action Alternative

Town Center Districts and Proposed Height Limits

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Urban Growth Area
- Proposed Town Center Core
- Existing Town Center Boundary
- Water Body

Town Center Route

Town Center Districts
- Town Center 1 (6-12 stories)
- Town Center 2 (4-8 stories)
- Town Center 3 (4-6 stories)
- Town Center Reserve (2-4 stories)

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; BERK, 2019.
As described in Chapter 2, the Proposed Action Alternative would also establish a system of block frontage designations that govern ground-level building design and the relationship of buildings with the pedestrian environment. A summary of the proposed block frontage types is presented in Exhibit 3-14, and map of these proposed designations is presented in Exhibit 3-15.

The height increases under the Proposed Action Alternative have the potential to introduce new building typologies that are taller and more visually massive than what is currently developed or allowed by existing development regulations. Introduction of these more intense typologies would gradually alter the architectural character and scale of the Town Center. These visual character impacts would be primarily concentrated in seven “impact areas,” as illustrated in Exhibit 3-16. Areas of the Town Center not marked as part of a visual impact area would experience only incremental increases in allowed height under the Proposed Action Alternative. While future development would be more intense than existing conditions, new development would be subject to the updated Town Center design standards that include requirements for façade transparency; landscaping; setbacks; internal open space; pedestrian access and design; and building massing, articulation, and materials. No significant impacts to visual character are anticipated compared to currently allowed building heights and massing.

Exhibit 3-14. Summary of Block Frontage Types – Proposed Action Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Frontage</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storefront</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground-level parking must not be visible from the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special transparency, weather protection, and entry requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum commercial space height and depth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ground floor residential uses except for live/work units on select Storefront designated blocks where the storefront space meets height and depth standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Secondary**      |         |
| Storefront or Landscape Frontages allowed | Ground-level parking must not be visible from the street. |
|                    | Landscaping to soften façades of non-storefronts and buffer parking areas. |
|                    | Minimum façade transparency requirements per use and setback. |

| **Landscapeed**    |         |
| Ground-level parking must not be visible from the street. |
| Landscaping to soften façades and buffer parking areas. |
| Minimum façade transparency requirements per use and setback. |

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 3-15. Block Frontage Designations Map – Proposed Action Alternative

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 3-16. Visual Character Impact Areas and Height Transitions – Proposed Action Alternative

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; BERK, 2019
Impact Area 1

Located northwest of Veterans Memorial Park, this area is currently zoned for single-family residences (RS 7200) with a maximum height of 35 feet. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, it would be added to Town Center District 1, which allows buildings of 6-12 stories (up to 150 feet). An example of this level of development intensity is shown in Exhibit 3-17.

This would represent a fundamental shift in the development character of this portion of the analysis area, leading to the gradual replacement of the existing residences with much taller and more visually massive buildings. The Proposed Action would implement updated design standards requiring upper-level setbacks along rear and side property lines - above the sixth floor, the building must be at least 15 feet from the property line and above the eighth floor, 20 feet. This would reduce visual mass and help preserve access to light and air at ground level. Towers taller than seven stories would also be subject to special design standards requiring a minimum separation distance between towers to reduce visual mass and preserve privacy and sightlines.

While visual character would substantially change in this area under the Proposed Action Alternative, the street-level pedestrian experience would potentially improve. The sidewalk network in this portion of the analysis area is currently incomplete and development under the Proposed Action Alternative would be required to comply with updated design standards, which include provisions for building façade transparency, landscaping, and pedestrian access.

Exhibit 3-17. Development Example – Town Center 1

NOTE: Graphic is provided for illustrative purposes only and does not represent final development regulations under the Proposed Action Alternative.
Source: MAKERS Architecture, 2019
Impact Area 2

This area consists of the portion of Town Center District 2 not previously included in the Town Center, located north of 232nd Street SW and west of 58th Avenue W. Similar to Impact Area 1, this area is currently zoned for single family residences (RS 7200) at heights up to 35 feet. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, allowed building heights would increase to 4-8 stories (up to 100 feet). An example of this style of development is shown in Exhibit 3-18.

Visual character impacts in this area would be similar to those described for Impact Area 1, though to a slightly lesser degree because of the relatively lower building heights. Upper-story setback requirements would apply for buildings taller than six stories, and tower design standards would apply for any buildings above seven stories. However, tower-style development is unlikely to be widespread in the Town Center 2 district because of the eight-story height limit. Additionally, the western end of Impact Area 2 would be designated as a Landscaped block frontage, as shown in Exhibit 3-15. Design standards for Landscaped block frontages would require landscaped setbacks of 5-10 feet.

Impact Area 3

Located north of Impact Area 2 and separated from it by a proposed future extension of 231st Street SW, this area consists of the portion of Town Center District 3 not previously included in the Town Center, located west of 58th Avenue W. The area is currently zoned for single-family residential use (RS 7200) at heights up to 35 feet. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, allowed building heights would increase to 4-6 stories (up to 70 feet). Examples of this style of development are shown in Exhibit 3-19.

Allowed building heights in this area would double under the Proposed Action Alternative, resulting in an increase in the level of building intensity and a corresponding change in the predominant visual character as single-family residential development is gradually replaced with multifamily and mixed-use buildings. Compared to Impact Areas 1 and 2, increases in building height and intensity in Impact Area 3 would be less drastic, resulting in comparatively lower levels of impact to visual character, though still a substantial increase over existing conditions. As with other impact areas, development under the Proposed Action Alternative would be subject to updated building design standards. While upper-level setbacks would not be required at these building heights, all development would be required to comply with standards for façade transparency and materials, roofline form and modulation, and landscaping, which will help maintain visual compatibility and an aesthetically pleasing development environment.

Most of Impact Area 3 would also be designated for Landscaped block frontage, as shown in Exhibit 3-15. Design standards for Landscaped block frontages would require landscaped setbacks of 5-10 feet, further reducing visual impacts on the pedestrian environment. Similar to Impact Areas 1 and 2, application of new development standards under the Proposed Action Alternative should improve pedestrian connections and the quality of the street-level pedestrian environment.
Exhibit 3-18. Development Example – Town Center 2

NOTE: Graphic is provided for illustrative purposes only and does not represent final development regulations under the Proposed Action Alternative.
Impact Area 4

Impact Area 4 consists of a portion of the existing Town Center designated for lower-intensity development of 2-3 stories, including townhomes and mixed-use development. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, this area would be split between Town Center districts 2 and 3, which would increase maximum building height by 4-5 stories over existing regulations. The resulting visual character would be similar to Impact Area 3, and the same design standards would apply, except for areas designated for Secondary block frontages in Exhibit 3-15, where either Landscaped or Storefront frontages are allowed. Storefront frontages would allow building designs with a closer relationship to the street and smaller setbacks than Landscaped frontages.

Impact Area 5

Impact Area 5 consists of a portion of the original 2007 Town Center designated for lower-intensity development of 2-3 stories, including townhomes and mixed-use development. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, this area would be included in Town Center District 3, which would increase maximum building height to 4-6 stories, roughly double what is allowed under existing regulations. The resulting

NOTE: Graphics are provided for illustrative purposes only and do not represent final development regulations under the Proposed Action Alternative.
Source: MAKERS Architecture, 2019
visual character would be similar to Impact Area 3, and the same design standards would apply, except for areas designated for Secondary block frontages in Exhibit 3-15, where either Landscaped or Storefront frontages are allowed. Storefront frontages would allow building designs with a closer relationship to the street and smaller setbacks than Landscaped frontages.

Impact Area 6

Impact Area 6 consists of a portion of the original 2007 Town Center designated for medium-intensity development of 3-4 stories. Under the Proposed Action, this area would be included in Town Center District 2, which would increase maximum building height to 4-8 stories. Impact Area 6 is in the heart of the proposed Storefront block frontage area, as shown in Exhibit 3-15, and the resulting visual character would be focused on mixed-use buildings located close to the street with strong pedestrian engagement. However, design standards for Storefront block frontages would require provision of shared commercial open space for any non-residential development greater than 10,000 gross square feet. Examples of this mixed-use character are shown in Exhibit 3-20.

Exhibit 3-20. Development Examples - Storefront Block Frontage

Impact Area 7

Impact Area 7 consists of a portion of the original 2007 Town Center designated for medium-intensity development of 3-5 stories. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, this area would be included in Town Center District 1, which would increase building heights to 6-12 stories, including tower-style development. Impacts to visual character in this location would be similar to those identified for Impact Area 1, and design standards would apply based on block frontage designations, as shown in Exhibit 3-15.

Adjacent Areas

Intensification of development under the Proposed Action Alternative would also have the potential to affect areas outside the Town Center. The Town Center is surrounded by predominantly single-family residential areas and development of higher-intensity multifamily, commercial, and mixed-use development in close proximity could cause conflicts of scale that would generate adverse effects on these surrounding areas.

Exhibit 3-16 shows properties within 500 feet of the Town Center Core and Reserve boundaries that would be subject to potential height transition impacts, including the difference in allowed building height between the current zoning and the nearest adjacent Town Center District.

The greatest potential for height transition impacts would occur in the area south of Impact Area 7, between 237th and 239th Streets SW. These properties are zoned for single-family residences (RS 4800 and RS-T) at heights of 30-35 feet. The neighborhood is adjacent to Town Center District 1, separated by 237th Street SW. The Proposed Action would allow buildings up to 12 stories (up to 150 feet) in Town Center District 1, and without mitigation, this transition could cause significant visual impacts, though limited to a relatively small area. Areas along the north and east sides of the Town Center Core would have moderate potential for transition impacts; these areas are also zoned for heights of 30-35 feet and would adjoin Town Center District 3, which would allow heights up to six stories (70 feet). Without mitigation, this height transition would cause moderate visual impacts due to a smaller difference in heights, but the impacts would be spread over a large area, as shown in Exhibit 3-16. Areas adjoining the Town Center Reserve would have low potential for transitional impacts, as the height increases proposed in the Reserve district would be relatively small compared to the 30-35 feet allowed in surrounding areas, resulting in only minor visual impacts.

Town Center development under the Proposed Action Alternative would be subject to new transitional standards to reduce adverse effects on surrounding residential areas. On Town Center properties directly adjacent to any residential zoning district (not separated by a street right-of-way), rear and side building setbacks would be required to match those of the adjacent residential zone from ground level up to the maximum building height allowed by the residential zone. Above this height, the setback would increase at a 45-degree angle upward to the maximum height of the applicable Town Center zoning district. A more detailed description of this provision is provided in section 3.2.4 – Mitigation Measures.

**LIGHT AND GLARE**

Light and glare impacts under the Proposed Action Alternative would be similar in nature to those described under the No Action Alternative as properties convert to mixed-use development. Compared to the No Action Alternative, development under the Proposed Action Alternative would generate greater light and glare effects in the area around the civic campus and Veterans Memorial Park. Major arterials and pedestrian streetscapes, such as the 236th Street SW and 56th Avenue W corridors, would require
additional street lights and exterior building illumination, increasing the overall level of ambient light and glare, both in daylight and evening hours.

**VIEWS**

As described in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, no views of major geographic features are currently available in the analysis areas due to the relatively flat terrain and extensive tree cover. While development under the Proposed Action would not interfere with existing views, the increased height of buildings in the Town Center Core, particularly District 1 (6-12 stories), would be visible in portions of the analysis area outside the Town Center. Any clearing of mature vegetation as part of construction activities could potentially increase this effect, though the tree cover present in the surrounding single-family area would likely disrupt sightlines and continue to screen large portions of the Town Center from view.

**SHADING CONDITIONS**

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, additional building height would have the potential to increase shading conditions in the analysis area, both within the Town Center and on surrounding properties. Sun angles vary by latitude, growing more extreme farther from the equator. In Washington, the sun’s path passes to the south, reaching a maximum altitude of approximately 66 degrees above the horizon in summer (June 21) and approximately 19 degrees above the horizon in winter (December 21). As a result, shadows are shortest around mid-day in summer and longest in early morning and late evening during the winter.

Shading impacts within the Town Center would primarily result from increased building heights and lot coverage allowances, which would allow a greater density of tall buildings in close proximity. If buildings are not sufficiently spaced, they could block light at the ground level, creating adverse effects on public spaces and pedestrian paths. The development of buildings up to 12 stories in Town Center District 1 could cast mid-morning shadows on the southern portions of Veterans Memorial Park from late fall through early spring, but this portion of the park is undeveloped and heavily forested.

To limit the effects of shading in spaces between buildings, the Proposed Action Alternative would enact building design standards that require the preservation of solar access for multifamily residential buildings through increased side and rear setbacks from adjacent properties. Upper-level setback requirements for buildings taller than six stories and tower spacing standards would also minimize shading effects within the Town Center. Additional standards include open space, pedestrian access and design, and building massing and articulation.

The primary shading impacts associated with the Proposed Action Alternative would be shadows cast by Town Center development on adjacent, lower-intensity development. Exhibit 3-21 through Exhibit 3-24 illustrate potential shading effects of increased building heights in the Town Center Core for summer and fall mornings and afternoons. To provide a conservative estimate of effects, the shading model represents a theoretical maximum buildable envelope based on minimum setback requirements and maximum building height. The model does not represent a specific proposed building design.
Exhibit 3-21. Southeast-Facing Summer Morning Shading Analysis – Proposed Action Alternative

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; BERK, 2019.

Exhibit 3-22. Southwest-Facing Summer Afternoon Shading Analysis – Proposed Action Alternative

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; BERK, 2019.
Exhibit 3-23. Southeast-Facing Fall Morning Shading Analysis – Proposed Action Alternative

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; BERK, 2019.

Exhibit 3-24. Southwest-Facing Fall Afternoon Shading Analysis – Proposed Action Alternative

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; BERK, 2019.
As shown in the preceding illustrations, the primary areas of potential shading are on the northern and eastern boundaries of the Town Center Core, along 230th Street SW and 55th Avenue W. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, some shading of these streets could potentially occur in mid to late afternoon, and the effect would be most pronounced in the late fall through early spring. External shading would primarily be caused by development in Town Center District 3, which is the least intense of the core districts, limited in height to six stories, and which buffers surrounding development from the taller, more intense development anticipated in Districts 1 and 2.

As described in the discussion of Visual Character impacts, the Proposed Action Alternative would implement height transition design standards requiring development adjacent to residential zones to increase setbacks to match the adjacent residential zone and implement upper-level setbacks above the residential zone’s maximum height. Such requirements would be in force for District 3 development along 230th Street SW and 55th Avenue W, further reducing exterior shading effects. Given the temporary nature of these effects and the proposed mitigation, no significant shading effects are anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternative.

3.2.4. Mitigation Measures

Incorporated Plan Features

- As described in Chapter 2, the proposed Town Center Plan update would establish a land use pattern that places the most intense development and tallest building heights (up to 12 stories in the Town Center 1 district) near the transit center and civic campus, with lower intensity and building height areas (4-8 stories in the Town Center 2 district and 4-6 stories in Town Center 3 district) arranged to create step-down transitions to the low-intensity residential areas east of 55th Avenue W and north of 230th Street SW.

- Further transitions in development intensity would be established through the preservation of existing height limits in the Town Center Reserve Areas, which would continue to allow mixed-use buildings of 2-4 stories.

- The Proposed Action Alternative includes amendments to the City’s zoning code (Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 19.123), which include design standards for the three proposed Town Center districts and the Town Center Reserve. These new regulations would include the following provisions to minimize and mitigate potential aesthetic impacts:

  - **Special setback/building height standards for sites abutting residential zones**: For sites abutting a residential zone, the side- and rear-yard setback must be the same as the applicable residential zoning district, up to the maximum height limit of the applicable residential zoning district, above which the minimum side yard setback must increase at a 45-degree angle inward up to the maximum height of the applicable Town Center (TC) zoning district. See Exhibit 3-25.

  - **Light and air access and privacy near interior side and rear property lines**: Buildings or portions thereof containing multifamily dwelling units whose only solar access (windows) is from the applicable side or rear of the building (facing towards the side or rear property line) must be set back from the applicable side or rear property lines at least 15-feet. See Exhibit 3-26.

  - **Façade articulation and maximum façade width**: Buildings under eight stories in height must
include façade articulation features at regular intervals to create a human-scaled pattern along building elevations facing streets, parks, access corridors, and residential zones. In addition, all façades longer than 140 feet facing a lower-intensity zone must include features to break up the massing of the building, such as vertical façade modulation, use of contrasting materials, or changes in material and window configuration.

- **Building frontage standards based on Block Frontage classification**: As described in Chapter 3.1 – Land Use Patterns and Policies, the Proposed Action Alternative would establish a system of block frontage designations along major streets in the Town Center. The updated design standards contain requirements for each block frontage class, guiding the architectural character of the Town Center. The standards include provisions for the following:
  - façade transparency;
  - pedestrian amenities and access (weather protection, building access, landscaping);
  - building material, massing, and form;
  - setbacks and privacy standards;
  - open space (plazas, shared indoor recreation areas, balconies, porches); and
  - screening of mechanical and service areas.

**Exhibit 3-25. Side and Rear Setbacks for Town Center Development Abutting Residential Zones – Proposed Action Alternative**

---

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; MAKERS Architecture, 2019.

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; MAKERS Architecture, 2019.

**Regulations and Commitments**

- All development in the Town Center would be required to undergo the City’s established permit application and review process to ensure compliance with design standards and development regulations.

- Development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to adopted development regulations for the Downtown Community Business District and the existing Town Center Design Standards.

- The City’s Landscape Development and Site Buffering standards (Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 19.130) establish protocols for preservation, protection, and replacement of existing significant vegetation.
Other Proposed Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures are recommended.

3.2.5. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Under both Alternatives, properties in the Town Center would gradually be redeveloped and converted from single-family residential and other low-scale and low-intensity uses to higher density mixed-use development, in keeping with the long-established vision for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center. Both Alternatives would represent a substantial increase in the intensity of development and height of buildings over current conditions and some short-term incompatibilities may occur as new development occurs in the Town Center adjacent to existing low-density properties. Expansion of the Town Center boundary would also extend these changes to areas not previously included in the Town Center. These changes would be significant and unavoidable. With implementation of the mitigation measures described above, no significant unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts are anticipated, though some property owners and residents, particularly in single-family areas, may perceive these changes as adverse.
3.3. PUBLIC SERVICES

3.3.1. Overview

This section evaluates the potential impacts of each of the alternatives on the City’s level of service for fire protection, parks, and schools and updates the analyses of each of these topics contained in the 2007 Town Center Planned Action EIS. The updated analyses incorporate changes to existing facilities, level of service standards, and impact fee structures since publication of the original EIS.

3.3.2. Affected Environment

Fire Protection

Fire protection and emergency medical services in Mountlake Terrace are provided by South County Fire (SCF). In 2017, voters approved the consolidation of the Lynnwood Fire Department and Snohomish County Fire District 1 into a new regional fire authority. SCF is the largest fire authority in Snohomish County, covering 53 square miles and serving almost 250,000 residents in various unincorporated communities in southwest Snohomish County and the cities of Lynnwood, Brier, Edmonds, and Mountlake Terrace.

SCF responded to 29,014 calls in 2018, of which 85% were for emergency medical services and 11% were for fires. SCF operates one fire station in Mountlake Terrace, Station 19, located at the City of Mountlake Terrace Civic Campus, which is adjacent to the existing Town Center (and within the proposed Town Center Core). The station houses a fire engine and an EMS response unit. It is staffed 24 hours per day by one Fire Captain, one Firefighter/Paramedic, and one Firefighter/Emergency Medical Technician. District-wide, SCF maintains 14 fire stations and employs a total of 260 firefighters.

SCF has established a response time standard for responding to emergency incidents of 8 minutes from 911 dispatch to first personnel arrival, with a goal to achieve this level of response on at least 90% of emergency calls.

**Exhibit 3-27. Emergency Response Times, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Type</th>
<th>Percent of Calls Meeting 8-Minute Response Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMS – Basic Life Support</td>
<td>78.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS – Advanced Life Support</td>
<td>80.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>56.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Calls</td>
<td><strong>75.64%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: South Snohomish County Fire and Rescue 2018 Annual Report.

As shown in Exhibit 3-27, SCF is not currently meeting its established response time standard. SCF has not established a Level of Service (LOS) standard related to equipment or staffing, but based on current population and staffing levels, SCF currently provides the residents of its service area with 1.04 firefighters per 1,000 residents.
Parks

The City of Mountlake Terrace park and recreation system encompasses over 187 acres, including nine parks, six natural areas, one linear park, and one special use area. The City most recently updated its Recreation, Parks, and Open Space Master Plan (RPOS Plan) in 2015-16. City park and recreation properties are shown in Exhibit 3-28.

Veterans Memorial Park and its associated natural area are the only park properties in the Town Center study area. Facilities at the park include a playground area, picnic amenities (covered shelter and barbecue), and on-site trails.

Exhibit 3-28. Parks and Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Pavilion</td>
<td>5303 228th Street SW</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>9.24 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Fighters Memorial Park</td>
<td>228th Street SW &amp; 39th Avenue W</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>0.90 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Hirvela/Bicentennial Park</td>
<td>4105 222nd Street SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>4.72 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Long Park</td>
<td>22102 58th Avenue W</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>3.33 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Creek Park</td>
<td>23200 48th Avenue W</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>8.67 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Ridge Park</td>
<td>4600 242nd Street SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>6.11 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Memorial Park</td>
<td>23500 58th Avenue W</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>2.21 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Playfield</td>
<td>22205 56th Avenue W</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>13.89 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Crest Playfield</td>
<td>5006 236th Street SW</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>4.60 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Ballinger Island</td>
<td>Lake Ballinger</td>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td>7.84 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon Creek Greenway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td>44.68 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montesa Wetland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td>1.11 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Ridge Natural Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td>1.29 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Memorial Natural Area</td>
<td>23500 58th Avenue W</td>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td>6.06 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Public Natural Areas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td>2.06 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Urban Trail</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Linear Park</td>
<td>15.69 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinger Lake Park</td>
<td>236th Street SW &amp; Lakeview Drive</td>
<td>Regional Park</td>
<td>54.90 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace RPOS Plan, 2015.
The 2015 RPOS Plan, as amended in 2016, established Base and Target LOS acreage standards by park category, as shown in Exhibit 3-29. The Base LOS standard represents the actual level of service provided by the City’s park and recreation system at the time of adoption in 2016 and serves as the basis for the City’s parks capital improvement program and impact fee structure. The City’s 2016 Parks Impact Fee Rate Study calculated the Base LOS using a combination of 2015 resident population (21,090) and employees (7,384). The study determined that demand for park facilities generated by employees was approximately 40% of that generated by residents, and the Base LOS was calculated using a resident-equivalent population of 24,057 (21,090 residents and 2,967 employee resident-equivalents). The Target LOS standard is an aspirational standard that reflects the City’s ultimate goals for park and recreation service but is dependent on future land availability and funding sources.

Exhibit 3-29. Mountlake Terrace Park Level of Service – Park Land Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation/Park Type</th>
<th>2015 Acres</th>
<th>Base LOS Standard (Acres per 1,000 residents)</th>
<th>Target LOS Standard (Acres per 1,000 residents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>25.94</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>54.90</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Park</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Areas</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>187.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No LOS is established for Linear Parks.
2. The 2016 Parks Impact Fee Rate Study calculated Base LOS using a residential-equivalent population of 24,057.

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace RPOS Plan, 2016; BERK Consulting Parks Impact Fee Rate Study, 2016.

In addition to park acreage, the 2015 RPOS Plan inventory documents City recreation facilities, such as sports fields, golf courses, playgrounds, dog parks, and gyms. The City categorizes these facilities as either Active or Passive, depending on their use. Active facilities often require scheduling because a limited number of people can use the facility at any one time. Passive park facilities are generally less specialized and do not require detailed scheduling. Based on the average daily hours of use for Active facilities and total number of Passive facilities in the city, the 2016 RPOS Supplement established a LOS standard based on availability of facilities, as shown in Exhibit 3-30.
### Exhibit 3-30. Mountlake Terrace Park Level of Service – Park Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>2015 Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Base LOS</th>
<th>Target LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 Existing Conditions</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base LOS</td>
<td>Target LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Base LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.6 hours per capita</td>
<td>61,528 hours per year</td>
<td>2.3 hours per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>1 facility per 891 equivalent population</td>
<td>27 facilities</td>
<td>1 facility per 904 equivalent population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace RPOS Plan, 2016; BERK Consulting Parks Impact Fee Rate Study, 2016.

### Schools

The Town Center study area is located in the Edmonds School District, which serves large portions of southwest Snohomish County, including the cities of Edmonds, Lynnwood, and Mountlake Terrace, as well as the Alderwood Manor, Martha Lake, and Picnic Point areas north and east of Mountlake Terrace. The district operates 20 elementary schools (grades K-6), two schools serving grades K-8, four middle schools (grades 7-8), five high schools (grades 9-12), one resource center for K-12 home-schooled students, one e-learning program, and one program for students with disabilities. Total 2017-2018 enrollment was approximately 21,278 students. This represents a 1.5% increase in student enrollment since the preparation of the Town Center Planned Action EIS in 2007. Enrollment dropped by several hundred students between 2007 and 2010 before gradually rising throughout the 2010’s to its present level.

The Town Center Core lies within the service area of Terrace Park Elementary School, located a short distance northeast of the study at 5409 228th Street SW. The portion of the Town Center Reserve area south of 236th Street SW is served by Mountlake Terrace Elementary. Both of these elementary schools feed students to Brier Terrace Middle School and Mountlake Terrace High School. Exhibit 3-31 presents a summary of the characteristics of schools serving the study area.

### Exhibit 3-31. Study Area School Enrollment and Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Building Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Max Student Capacity</th>
<th>2017-2018 Enrollment¹</th>
<th>Available Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Park Elementary</td>
<td>71,664</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountlake Terrace Elementary</td>
<td>67,379</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brier Terrace Middle School</td>
<td>89,258</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountlake Terrace High School</td>
<td>211,950</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Edmonds School District determines maximum student capacity on a per-facility basis, using the district’s adopted standards for maximum class size, number of classrooms available, and potential use of portable structures. Where enrollment exceeds capacity, schools may be exceeding the preferred maximum class size or making extensive use of temporary classrooms. As shown in Exhibit 3-31, all four of the schools serving the study area currently have excess capacity; however, the district’s Capital Facilities Plan anticipates continued enrollment growth, leading to district-wide capacity challenges over the next 20 years.

The Edmonds School District has adopted the following Student Generation Rates to aid future system capacity planning within its service area:

- **Single-Family Residential:**
  - Elementary (Grades K-6): 0.197 student per household;
  - Middle School (Grades 7-8): 0.035 student per household; and
  - High School (Grades 9-12): 0.082 student per household.

- **Multifamily Residential:**
  - Elementary (Grades K-6): 0.048 student per household;
  - Middle School (Grades 7-8): 0.011 student per household; and
  - High School (Grades 9-12): 0.015 student per household.

### 3.3.3. Impacts

#### Impacts Common to All Alternatives

Under both the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives, increased population and employment growth in the Town Center would generate additional demand for public services, including fire protection, emergency medical services, parks and recreation, and schools. Construction activities under both alternatives also have the potential to temporarily affect emergency vehicle response times, as would any long-term increase in vehicular traffic in the study area.

Impacts specific to each of the alternatives are described in the following sections.

#### Impacts of the No Action Alternative (2013 Addendum)

Under the No Action Alternative, the Town Center Plan would not be updated, and population and employment growth in the study area would be limited to levels studied in the 2013 Addendum to the Planned Action EIS. Under the No Action Alternative, growth in the Town Center would include approximately 1,126 new multifamily dwelling units (2,477 new residents) and 478,499 square feet of new commercial space (1,495 new employees).

**Fire Protection**

As described in the 2013 Town Center Planned Action EIS Addendum, population and employment growth under the No Action Alternative would generate an incremental increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. The Planned Action EIS and Addendum each concluded that
this incremental increase in demand would not result in a significant adverse impact and the ability to meet the fire safety needs created by development of taller buildings in the Town Center (such as ladder trucks) was available within the fire district.

With the application of mitigation measures identified in the Planned Action EIS and Addendum, no significant adverse impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services are anticipated.

**PARKS**

As development occurs under the No Action Alternative, population and employment in the Town Center will increase, generating additional demand for parks and recreation facilities. Applying the park acreage Base LOS standards described in Exhibit 3-29 to the projected resident-equivalent population growth of 3,075 under the No Action Alternative would generate demand for the following amounts of park land:

- Neighborhood Parks: 3.3 acres;
- Community Parks: 2.4 acres;
- Regional Parks: 7.0 acres;
- Natural Areas: 8.1 acres; and
- Special Use Areas: 1.2 acre.

The City currently has a surplus of regional park space (14.8 acres) large enough to absorb the additional demand while still exceeding the adopted Target LOS, but growth anticipated under the No Action Alternative would create a need for additional Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Natural Areas, and Special Use Areas. While the City has not adopted a LOS standard for Linear Parks, population growth in the study area is likely to generate additional demand for these facilities, as well.

Population and employment growth under the No Action Alternative will also generate demand for usage of Active and Passive recreation facilities. Applying the facilities Base LOS standards identified in Exhibit 3-30 to the projected resident-equivalent population growth of 3,075 under the No Action Alternative would generate demand for the following:

- an additional 7,073 hours of active recreation facility usage annually; and
- 3.4 additional passive recreational facilities.

Chapter 18.30 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code establishes park impact fees on new development. The City's current impact fee schedule, effective January 1, 2019, establishes a fee of $2,260 for each multifamily residential dwelling unit and $1,162 for every 1,000 square feet of commercial space. Full development of the No Action Alternative would generate park impact fee revenue of approximately $3,100,776. These funds would be used to acquire or develop park facilities to meet the recreation needs of Town Center residents and employees.

**SCHOOLS**

Based on the adopted Student Generation Rates for the Edmonds School District, residential development under the No Action Alternative would result in approximately 83 additional students, spread across all grade levels:

- Elementary: 54 students;
- Middle School: 12 students; and
- High School: 17 students.

As shown in Exhibit 3-31, schools serving the Town Center study area have sufficient capacity to meet this additional demand, and no significant adverse impacts to school service are anticipated.

**Impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative**

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the updated Town Center Plan would allow for additional growth in the Town Center study area, which would generate increased demand for public services. Growth in the Town Center would include approximately 3,000 new multifamily dwelling units (6,600 new residents) and 625,000 square feet of new commercial space (1,953 new employees).

**Fire Protection**

Population and employment growth under the Proposed Action Alternative would generate increased demand for fire and emergency medical services in the study area. As described under Affected Environment, the majority of calls would be for emergency medical services. Station 19 is located within the proposed Town Center Core and would be the primary dispatch point for calls originating in the Town Center. While SCF has the capability to dispatch equipment and personnel from other parts of its service area to respond to emergency calls, dispatching from more distant stations would increase response times, and SCF does not currently meet its goal of 8-minute responses on 90% of calls (SCF, 2018).

Additional resources would be necessary to mitigate impacts associated with increased growth and density in the Town Center, including additional units to reduce response times. Development in the Town Center may also increase the need for staffing in the Fire Marshal’s Office (FMO) to meet the demands of the development process and ongoing FMO needs related to additional commercial development, density, and fire protection features. Amendments to the city’s fire code may be necessary to address issues related to increased development intensity in the Town Center, including the introduction of high-rise buildings, reduced setbacks, and underground parking.

As described in the Planned Action EIS, increases in allowed building heights could also increase the need for ladder trucks to fight fires on upper floors. However, as stated in the Planned Action EIS, modern fire codes for high-rise buildings require the use of fire sprinkler systems and fire-resistant construction systems, and SCF has ladder trucks available at other stations in its service area.

**Parks**

As development occurs under the Proposed Action Alternative, population and employment in the Town Center will increase, generating additional demand for parks and recreation facilities. Applying the park acreage Base LOS standards identified in Exhibit 3-29 to the projected resident-equivalent population growth of 7,381 under the Proposed Action Alternative would generate demand for the following amounts of park land:
- Neighborhood Parks: 8.0 acres;
- Community Parks: 5.7 acres;
- Regional Parks: 16.8 acres;
Natural Areas: 19.3 acres; and
Special Use Areas: 2.8 acres.

Growth anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternative would create a need for additional park facilities in all categories (Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Regional Parks, Natural Areas, and Special Use Areas). The estimated increase in demand for park and recreation facilities would be more than double the demand generated by the No Action Alternative. While the City has not adopted a LOS standard for Linear Parks, population growth in the study area is likely to generate additional demand for these facilities as well.

Population and employment growth under the Proposed Action Alternative will also generate demand for usage of Active and Passive recreation facilities. Applying the facilities Base LOS standards identified in Exhibit 3-30 to the projected resident-equivalent population growth of 7,381 under the Proposed Action Alternative would generate demand for the following:

- An additional 16,976 hours of active recreation facility usage annually; and
- 8.2 additional passive recreational facilities.

Chapter 18.30 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code establishes park impact fees on new development. The City’s current impact fee schedule, effective January 1, 2019, establishes a fee of $2,260 for each multifamily residential dwelling unit and $1,162 for every 1,000 square feet of commercial space. Full development of the Proposed Action Alternative would generate park impact fee revenue of approximately $7,506,250. These funds would be used to acquire or develop park facilities to meet the recreation needs of Town Center residents and employees.

**SCHOOLS**

Based on the adopted Student Generation Rates for the Edmonds School District, residential development under the Proposed Action Alternative would result in approximately 222 additional students, spread across all grade levels:

- Elementary: 144 students;
- Middle School: 33 students; and
- High School: 45 students.

As shown in Exhibit 3-31, the two elementary schools serving the Town Center study area have sufficient capacity between them to meet this additional demand. Most of the anticipated residential development would occur in the Town Center Core, which is served by Terrace Park Elementary; this school has the largest capacity surplus of the four schools serving the study area. Brier Terrace Middle School and Mountlake Terrace High School both have sufficient capacity to absorb the additional students generated under the Proposed Action Alternative.

### 3.3.4. Mitigation Measures

**Incorporated Plan Features**

- Under the Proposed Action Alternative, new design standards would be adopted for the Town Center, which would require multifamily residential development to provide 100-150 square feet of...
usable open space per residential unit (depending on unit type). This open space could be provided in the form of common outdoor space, outdoor space assigned to individual units, or common indoor recreation areas. While private open space does not count toward meeting the City’s LOS standard for parks, the provision of on-site recreational opportunities could reduce demand for public facilities.

**Regulations and Commitments**

- Chapter 19.35.080 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code requires multifamily residential development of more than eight units to provide outdoor common space for the recreational use of the residents.

- The adopted Planned Action Ordinance commits the City to the design and construction of a 20,000 square-foot plaza in the Town Center to provide a central gathering space and to partially address the recreation needs of new residents and employees. The Civic Campus Redevelopment project includes construction of the Town Center Park/Plaza at the corner of 232nd Street SW and 58th Avenue W and completion is anticipated in 2020.

- Chapter 18.30 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code establishes impact fees for parks. The City’s current impact fee schedule, effective January 1, 2019, charges a fee of $2,260 for each multifamily residential dwelling unit and $1,162 for every 1,000 square feet of commercial space.

**Other Proposed Mitigation Measures**

- The City should continue coordination with South County Fire on planning efforts for the Town Center. The SCF Fire Marshal should be consulted regarding the design of streetscape improvements that could potentially impede emergency vehicle access, as well as potential staffing and equipment needs at nearby fire stations.

- The City should consider amending the Town Center design standards to include provisions that would reduce demand for fire protection services or improve the ability of the fire district to effectively provide service. Such measures could include mandatory installation of fire sprinklers, water system improvements, or building access requirements that would provide improved access for emergency vehicles. The City could require applicants demonstrate consistency with Fire Marshal recommendations and any associated mitigation agreements.

**3.3.5. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

With the implementation of adopted codes and regulations and the application of proposed mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to public services are anticipated.
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3.4. TRANSPORTATION

3.4.1. Overview

This section presents a multimodal transportation analysis evaluating the potential impacts from enacting proposed zoning and transportation network changes in the Mountlake Terrace Town Center. Existing transportation conditions are documented, as well as future transportation conditions under two alternatives—the No Action Alternative that represents conditions if zoning remains the same (which includes the Town Center planned action adopted in 2007), and the Proposed Action Alternative that analyzes potential changes to zoning provisions and transportation network modifications. The analysis identifies significant impacts that could occur for the following modes: auto, freight, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle. Safety and parking impacts are also considered. Potential capital and programmatic mitigation measures are identified for the Proposed Action Alternative.

3.4.2. Affected Environment

Mountlake Terrace is a suburban city along the I-5 corridor roughly equidistant between Seattle and Everett. Regional connections are provided by highways, such as I-5, and transit agencies, including Community Transit and Sound Transit. The roadway network includes facilities for pedestrians, bicycles, vehicles, and transit. This section describes the existing types and locations of those transportation facilities. In addition, 28 existing intersections in the city were analyzed to understand how well those intersections serve existing traffic volumes. Results of a traffic safety analysis are also included in this chapter. Exhibit 3-32 shows both the existing Town Center and Town Center Core boundaries and a larger Transportation Study Area. The Town Center Reserve is comprised of those areas of the existing Town Center that fall outside the proposed Town Center Core. The planned action area encompasses the area in which land use changes would occur, but because transportation effects would extend beyond the Town Center, a larger Transportation Study Area has been identified for this evaluation.
Exhibit 3-32. Mountlake Terrace Town Center Transportation Study Area

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019; Fehr & Peers, 2019.
**Pedestrian Network**

An inventory of block faces within the Town Center Core and Reserve indicates that 66% have sidewalks that are classified by the City of Mountlake Terrace as complete, meaning a paved sidewalk with a curb. In the wider Transportation Study Area, 61% of block faces have completed sidewalks. Complete sidewalks generally have widths ranging from four to six feet, some of which have buffers while others are directly adjacent to vehicle traffic. Within the Town Center Core and Reserve, 31% of block faces have incomplete or missing sidewalks, which generally consist of a gravel pathway that could be used by pedestrians but are also often used for vehicle or waste receptacle storage (Exhibit 3-33). In the Transportation Study Area, 32% of block faces have incomplete or missing sidewalks.

**Exhibit 3-33. Example of incomplete sidewalk network (55th Ave at 240th St)**

![Image of incomplete sidewalk network](source: Fehr & Peers, 2019)

The remaining 3% of block faces within the Town Center Core and Reserve and 7% of block faces within the Transportation Study Area have no sidewalks but do have a curb. These blocks tend to have sufficient width between the curb and adjacent land uses to accommodate pedestrian travel, or a future sidewalk (Exhibit 3-34).
Exhibit 3-34. Example of a sidewalk gap with a curb present (240th Street SW at 55th Avenue W)


In general, areas that are more likely to have higher volumes of pedestrian activity, such as the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center and the commercial land uses along 232nd Street SW have complete sidewalks. Sidewalk gaps tend to be in more residential settings. Most major intersections have well-marked crossing facilities although some striping is faded.

Exhibit 3-35 shows the complete sidewalk inventory in the Mountlake Terrace Town Center Transportation Study Area.
Exhibit 3-35. Mountlake Terrace Town Center Sidewalk Network

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
**Bicycle Network**

Bicycle infrastructure is limited within the Transportation Study Area, as shown in Exhibit 3-36. The Transportation Study Area includes 5.4 miles of existing bike lanes and 4.7 miles of shared roadways. The City classifies facilities as shared roadways if they provide a comfortable bicycle riding experience, for example roadways with low speeds and low vehicle volumes; however, they do not necessarily have “sharrow” pavement markings or shared road signage. Bicycle facilities are either planned or in the process of being constructed for an additional seven miles of roadway.

Within the Town Center, striped, five-foot-wide bicycle lanes are present on portions of 230th Street SW and 236th Street SW. The 236th Street SW bike lanes are buffered on the north side of the street. The bike lane on 236th Street SW is in the process of being extended to the west. 58th Avenue SW between 236th Street SW and 220th Street SW is classified by the City as a shared roadway facility.

Striped bicycle lanes are proposed to cross the city from north to south on 66th Avenue W, 56th Avenue W between 220th Street SW to the north and 244th Street SW to the south, and on 44th Avenue W the bicycle lane is planned to extend north from its current terminus at 228th Street SW. East-west facilities are planned on segments of 212th Street SW, 220th Street SW, 236th Street SW, and 244th Street SW. In addition, Mountlake Terrace is conducting a joint study with the City of Shoreline to determine an appropriate bicycle facility type for 244th Street SW, west of Ballinger Way NE.
Exhibit 3-36. Mountlake Terrace Town Center Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Transit Network

Mountlake Terrace is served by Community Transit, King County Metro, and Sound Transit (see Exhibit 3-37 and Exhibit 3-38). The Transportation Study Area includes the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center, which serves 14 routes providing local and regional connections. The Transit Center also serves as a large park & ride facility with 878 parking stalls, all of which fill on a typical day. Routes 112, 119, 130, and 347 provide Saturday and Sunday service; all other routes run on weekdays only.

Exhibit 3-37. Existing Bus Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Destinations</th>
<th>Peak Headway</th>
<th>Off-Peak Headway</th>
<th>Corridors Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT 111</td>
<td>Brier and Mountlake Terrace</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>236th St SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 112</td>
<td>Mountlake Terrace Transit Center and Ash Way Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>236th St SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 119</td>
<td>Mountlake Terrace Transit Center and Ash Way Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>236th St SW, 56th Ave W, 230th St SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 130</td>
<td>Edmonds Station and the Lynnwood Transit Center</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>236th St SW, 56th Ave W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 410</td>
<td>Everett to Seattle</td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 413</td>
<td>Swamp Creek Park &amp; Ride to Seattle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 415</td>
<td>North Lynwood to Seattle</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 435</td>
<td>Mill Creek to Seattle</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 810</td>
<td>McCollum Park to University District</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>236th St SW, 56th Ave SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 871</td>
<td>Edmonds Park &amp; Ride to University District</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>236th St SW, 56th Ave SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCM 347</td>
<td>Northgate Transit Center</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30-60</td>
<td>236th St SW, 48th Ave W, 244th St SW, 15th Ave NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 511</td>
<td>Everett to Seattle</td>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 512</td>
<td>Everett to Seattle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 513</td>
<td>Everett to Seattle</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Community Transit, King County Metro, and Sound Transit, 2019.

Starting in 2024, the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center will become a light rail stop on Sound Transit’s Lynnwood Link Extension, which will provide connections north to Lynnwood, south to Seattle and Federal Way, and east to Bellevue and Redmond.
Exhibit 3-38. Mountlake Terrace Town Center Transit Service

Source: Community Transit, Sound Transit, and King County Metro, 2019.
Mode Share

According to 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year data, 74% of workers over the age of 16 living in the Transportation Study Area drive alone to work. In contrast, 10% carpool and 11% take public transit to work. Very few residents reported bicycling to work, 1% walk to work, and 4% work from home (Exhibit 3-39).

Exhibit 3-39. Mountlake Terrace Mode Share

Roadway Network

**FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF STREETS**

I-5 bisects Mountlake Terrace from north to south and provides regional mobility to destinations throughout the Puget Sound. The Town Center is located immediately east of I-5 with its street network predominantly made up of local streets that serve two-way traffic. Speed limits range from 20 mph to 35 mph. Within the Town Center, the main north-south roadways are 56th Avenue W, which is an arterial and 58th Avenue W, which is a collector. East-west connectivity across and accessing I-5 is provided by 220th Street SW, 236th Street SW, and 244th Street SW. 230th Street SW also has an overpass of I-5, providing access between the Town Center and land uses west of I-5.

The City designates a functional classification for all of its roadways. The classification of each roadway depends on the types of trips and amount of traffic it carries as well as the basic purpose for which the roadway is designed. The four functional classifications are described in Exhibit 3-40.
### Exhibit 3-40. Function Classification Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Traffic Volumes</th>
<th>Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>Provide mobility into, out of, and through the city; high mobility by limiting access and traffic control devices</td>
<td>Carry the highest amount of traffic volumes</td>
<td>Carry regional and inter-county bus routes, often have transfer centers and park-and-ride lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Connect densely populated areas with principal arterials and provide access to adjacent land uses</td>
<td>Lower traffic volumes than principal arterials</td>
<td>Carry local and inter-community bus routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>Provide mobility in neighborhoods and channel neighborhood trips onto the minor and principal arterial street system</td>
<td>Moderate traffic volumes and very little through traffic; accommodate shorter trips</td>
<td>Sometimes used by local routes for passenger pickup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access</td>
<td>Provide direct access to abutting properties</td>
<td>Low traffic volumes and speeds</td>
<td>Generally not designed to accommodate bus movements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Characteristics for key roadways are summarized in Exhibit 3-41 and Exhibit 3-42. Mountlake Terrace’s street functional classification map is shown in Exhibit 3-43.
### Exhibit 3-41. Transportation Study Area East-West Roadways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>Travel Lanes</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 66th Ave W/ 65th Pl W | Collector between 236th St SW and 220th St SW  
Minor arterial north of 220th St SW | One travel lane in each direction south of 220th St SW  
Two travel lanes in each direction north of 220th St SW | Signals at 216th St SW, 220th St SW, and 236th St SW  
Local street intersections are stop-controlled | Predominantly residential south of 220th St SW  
Commercial north of 220th St SW |
| 58th Ave W    | Collector                 | One travel lane in each direction          | No signalized intersections within the Study Area                                | Primarily residential with some commercial and civic uses within the Town Center Core |
| 56th Ave W    | Minor arterial south of 220th St SW | One travel lane in each direction  
Turn pockets at key intersections | Signals at 220th St SW, 232nd St SW, 236th St SW, and 244th St SW | Primarily residential  
Commercial uses within Town Center |
| 48th Ave W    | Collector                 | One travel lane in each direction          | No signalized intersections within the Study Area                                | Predominantly residential                   |
| Cedar Way/44th Ave W | Minor arterial            | One travel lane in each direction and center turn lane | Signals at 212th St SW, 214th St SW, Hawk Way  
(Mountlake Terrace High School), 223rd St SW, 228th St SW, and 236th St SW | Residential  
Shopping district at 228th St SW |

### Exhibit 3–42. Transportation Study Area North-South Roadways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>Travel Lanes</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212th St SW</td>
<td>Minor arterial</td>
<td>One to two travel lanes in each direction</td>
<td>Signals at 52nd Ave W and 44th Ave W</td>
<td>Predominantly residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Center turn lanes in some locations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial district east of 44th Ave W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220th St SW</td>
<td>Minor arterial between I-5 and 52nd Ave W Principal arterial west of I-5</td>
<td>One travel lane in each direction and center turn lane between I-5 and 52nd Ave W</td>
<td>Signals at SR 99, 70th Ave W, 66th Ave W, 64th Ave W, I-5 ramps, and 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Primarily residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two travel lanes in each direction and turn lanes at key intersections west of I-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230th St SW/228th St SW</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>One travel lane in each direction</td>
<td>No signalized intersections within the Study Area</td>
<td>Primarily residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turn pockets at key intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle lanes between I-5 and 56th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236th St SW</td>
<td>Minor arterial</td>
<td>One travel lane in each direction and turn lanes at key intersections</td>
<td>Signals at 66th Ave W, I-5 northbound off-ramp, 56th Ave W, and Cedar Way Signal under construction at new Gateway Blvd</td>
<td>Mix of residential and commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244th St SW</td>
<td>Minor arterial</td>
<td>One or two travel lanes in each direction and a center turn lane</td>
<td>Signals at Ballinger Way and 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Mix of residential and commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3-43. Mountlake Terrace Roadway Classifications

Roadway Classifications

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Freight Network

The Washington State Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS) classifies freight corridors based on the annual gross tonnage that is moved along the corridor. FGTS classifies freight corridors by five classifications, as shown in Exhibit 3-44 and Exhibit 3-45.

Exhibit 3-44. Freight and Goods Transportation System Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Amount of Freight Carried</th>
<th>Key Town Center Roadways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>More than 10 million tons per year</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2</td>
<td>4 million to 10 million tons per year</td>
<td>220th St SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>300,000 to 4 million tons per year</td>
<td>56th Ave W, 236th St SW, 244th St SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-4</td>
<td>100,000 to 300,000 tons per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>At least 20,000 tons in 60 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3-45. Roadways Designated for Freight Traffic in Mountlake Terrace

Parking

As discussed in the mode share section, much of the travel to and from the Town Center is currently made by vehicle. Providing adequate parking facilities for those vehicles is an important element of planning for the Town Center. The City strives to balance the need to accommodate those vehicles with the associated concerns of congestion, aesthetics, and impacts to other modes of travel and the environment.

The City’s on-site (or off-street) parking standards are established in the zoning code and on-street parking standards are established in the vehicle and traffic code. These two types of parking affect one another as too little off-street parking can result in too much demand and inappropriate use of on-street parking while too much off-street parking can disrupt the land use pattern and negatively affect other modes such as pedestrian travel by creating long distances between destinations.

Mountlake Terrace Town Center currently has a large amount of surface parking. As an example of a typical commercial block, the properties on the block bordered by 232nd Street SW to the north, 56th Avenue W to the east, 234th Street SW to the south, and 58th Avenue W to the west are each surrounded by individual parking areas (Exhibit 3-46). Observations of the Town Center indicate that ample parking supply is generally available within the Town Center.

On-street parking typically requires management through enforcement of parking restrictions. Currently, on-street parking is allowed on local streets in the Town Center with limited restrictions and all parking within the Town Center is free. As demand for on-street parking grows with increased land use density, the City may revise its parking regulations to include additional time restrictions or paid parking, the development and implementation of which are subject to state standards.

The current Town Center Design Standards include regulations related to parking, including stating that “every possible effort shall be made to provide shared parking facilities between development.” These shared parking regulations are outlined in Municipal Code 19.125.060. The Municipal Code also sets the current parking minimum standards for the Town Center area (19.50.070):

- Commercial uses: two spaces for each 1,000 square feet of gross, leasable area, except that the first 5,000 square feet of a retail use or an eating/drinking establishment within a building or on a single parcel shall be exempt from the minimum number of required parking spaces, so long as at least four on-street parking spaces are within 200 feet.
- Residential uses: 0.75 space for each studio or open bedroom studio unit; 1.25 spaces for each unit of one to two bedrooms; 1.5 spaces for each unit of three bedrooms; one space per two bedrooms beyond three bedrooms in any unit.
- Hotel: one space for each unit.

An evaluation of the parking regulations specific to the proposal for Town Center are described in a subsequent section.
Exhibit 3-46. Example of surface parking in Mountlake Terrace Town Center

Source: Google Earth Pro, 2019.

Intersection Level of Service

Level of service (LOS) is a concept used to describe traffic operations from the driver’s perspective. LOS is defined by intersection delay in seconds and ranges from LOS A with no congestion and little delay to LOS F with substantial congestion and delay. The City uses PM peak hour average delay to evaluate traffic operations LOS at its intersections. The City sets a level of service standard of LOS D for signalized intersections and LOS E for non-signalized intersections. There are exceptions for signalized intersections on 212th Street SW, 220th Street SW (between SR-99 and I-5), and 244th Street SW, which have a standard of LOS E. Two of the study intersections fall within the City of Shoreline which applies a LOS D standard.

Traffic operations were analyzed using the Synchro 10 software package and Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 6th Edition methodology. The Synchro network reflects the Transportation Study Area’s existing roadway network including segment and intersection geometry, and signal timings. The network
also includes existing traffic volumes, including passenger vehicles, heavy vehicles, and pedestrian and bicycle counts which were collected in April and May 2019. For signalized, roundabout, and all-way stop controlled intersections, the LOS is based on the average delay for all movements. For minor street stop-controlled intersections, the LOS is based on the movement with the highest delay. Exhibit 3-47 summarizes the LOS and delay thresholds specified in the Highway Capacity Manual, which is a standard methodology for measuring intersection performance.

Exhibit 3-47. LOS and Delay Thresholds for Signalized and Unsignalized Intersections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Signalized Intersections (Delay in Seconds)</th>
<th>Unsignalized Intersections (Delay in Seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 10 to 20</td>
<td>&gt; 10 to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 20 to 35</td>
<td>&gt; 15 to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 35 to 55</td>
<td>&gt; 25 to 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 55 to 80</td>
<td>&gt; 35 to 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 80</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This study considers 28 existing intersections, 16 of which are signalized. Exhibit 3-48 and Exhibit 3-49 summarize the existing intersection LOS at the study intersections. The level of service analysis indicates that vehicles move through the Transportation Study Area with relatively little delay during the PM peak hour. All of the intersections currently meet the City’s minimum LOS standards.

One intersection, 236th Street SW and 58th Avenue W, performs at LOS E with existing traffic volumes. The intersection has side-street stop control; vehicles on 58th Avenue W can experience lengthy delays as they wait for a gap in traffic along 236th Street SW. The City’s Transportation Master Plan identifies this intersection as meeting a warrant for a traffic signal; that planned improvement is assumed for future year evaluation. Most intersections operate at LOS C or higher, which represents stable conditions with moderate congestion levels for an urban area. Some intersections are affected by regional travel patterns, such as afternoon commute congestion stemming from I-5. In particular, queues can form along eastbound 220th Street SW and southbound 66th Avenue W stemming back from the I-5 ramps, delays which may not be fully captured in the Synchro analysis which considers each intersection independently.
### Exhibit 3-48. Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service and Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>LOS Threshold</th>
<th>LOS/Delay (seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>216th Street SW / 66th Avenue W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>220th Street SW / 66th Avenue W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>220th Street SW / I-5 SB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>220th Street SW / I-5 NB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>220th Street SW / 58th Avenue W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>220th Street SW / 56th Avenue W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>220th Street SW / 52nd Avenue W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>212th Street SW / 52nd Avenue W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>212th Street SW / 48th Avenue W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>212th Street SW / 44th Avenue W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>228th Street SW / 66th Avenue W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>230th Street SW / 58th Avenue W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>230th Street SW / 56th Avenue W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>232nd Street SW / 58th Avenue W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>232nd Street SW / 56th Avenue W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>234th Street SW / 58th Avenue W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>234th Street SW / 56th Avenue W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>236th Street SW / 65th Place W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>236th Street SW / I-5 SB On-Ramp</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>236th Street SW / I-5 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>236th Street SW / 58th Avenue W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>236th Street SW / 56th Avenue W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>236th Street SW / 48th Avenue W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>236th Street SW / Cedar Way</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>228th Street SW / 44th Avenue W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>244th Street SW / 56th Avenue W / 19th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15th Avenue NE / Ballinger Way / 244th Street SW</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>19th Avenue NE / Ballinger Way</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3-49. Intersection Level of Service - Existing

Level of Service - Existing

- County Boundary
- City Boundary
- Urban Growth Area
- Proposed Town Center Core
- Existing Town Center Boundary
- Transportation Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Signalized</th>
<th>Unsignalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - C</td>
<td>![Green Circle]</td>
<td>![Green Triangle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>![Orange Circle]</td>
<td>![Orange Triangle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>![Red Circle]</td>
<td>![Red Triangle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>![Red Circle]</td>
<td>![Red Triangle]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety

Collision rates were analyzed at 28 intersections and along 31 roadway segments, as shown in Exhibit 3-52. Three years of data (January 2016 through December 2018) were analyzed. Based on the 2017 Transportation Element and 2017 Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines, this EIS considers the following criteria to be classified as a high collision location:

- An intersection with at least five collisions per year or with a collision rate at or above 1.0 million entering vehicles; or
- A roadway segment with at least five collisions per year.

To allow comparisons among the study facilities, collision rates are calculated by normalizing against the number of entering vehicles for intersections and number of vehicle miles travelled for segments. Of these intersections, eight had at least five collisions per year or crash rates over one per million vehicles entering an intersection.

Exhibit 3-50. High Crash Rate Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Average Number of Crashes per Year</th>
<th>Crashes per Million Entering Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216th Street SW and 66th Avenue W</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220th Street SW and 66th Avenue W</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220th Street SW and I-5 Southbound Ramps</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220th Street SW and I-5 Northbound Ramps</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212th Street SW and 52nd Avenue W</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212th Street SW and 44th Avenue W</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Avenue NE and Ballinger Way</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Avenue NE and Ballinger Way</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Of the roadway segments analyzed, five experienced an average of at least 5 crashes per year. Those intersections are listed in Exhibit 3-51 along with crash rates per million vehicle miles travelled.
Exhibit 3-51. Segments with High Collision Rates in Mountlake Terrace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Crashes per Million VMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th Ave W between Ballinger Way and 244th Street SW</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220th Street SW between 66th Ave W and I-5 Southbound Ramp</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinger Way between 19th Ave W and 244th Ave W</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th Avenue W between 236th Street SW and 244th Street SW</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd Ave W between 212th Street SW and 220th Street SW</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There were 252 injuries resulting from 200 collisions in the Transportation Study Area during the three-year analysis period. Of the collisions resulting in injury, five resulted in seven serious injuries and one collision resulted in a fatality. There were 15 pedestrian-involved collisions that resulted in 16 pedestrian injuries, and five collisions involving bicyclists.

The City regularly monitors its roadways to identify high collision locations as well as potential safety measures that could address issues as they arise. For instance, the City’s Transportation Element recommends safety improvements along the 220th Street SW corridor between SR 99 and I-5 and at the intersection of 230th Street SW and 58th Avenue W. The City also considers transit, pedestrian, and bicycle safety as it programs its funding, for example sidewalk, bike facility, landscaping, and lighting improvements. Safety is also a key consideration as the City implements new street designs and sets design standards for future infrastructure improvements, such as the Town Center Zoning Regulations.
Exhibit 3-52. Existing Collision Rates

Mountlake Terrace Collision Rates

Relevant Studies

**Mountlake Terrace 2017 Comprehensive Plan – Transportation Element**

The 2017 Transportation Element of the Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan provides an update on the 2007 Transportation Master Plan effort with new traffic projections extended to 2035. The Transportation Element anticipates population and employment growth of 1% and 1.5% annually respectively and the Town Center is identified as an area more likely to experience commercial and mixed-use development. To achieve a multimodal community where all residents are able to travel easily, the Transportation Element is guided by 11 goals:

1. Public safety
2. Environmental Protection
3. Efficiency and cost-effectiveness
4. Mobility
5. Consistency with community and regional needs
6. Effective public transit
7. Walkability
8. Convenient bicycling
9. Well-managed parking
10. Sufficient funding
11. Traffic calming

**Mountlake Terrace 2017 Comprehensive Plan – Capital Facilities Element**

The 2017 Capital Facilities Element for the Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan details plans for 2016 through 2022 to add infrastructure that meets long-term public needs. Projects listed in the capital facilities element that specifically impact the Transportation Study Area include a new civic campus – to include a new City Hall, police station addition and Town Center Park/Plaza – located on a 4.09-acre Civic Campus at 58th Avenue W and 232nd Street SW.

For transportation, the Capital Facilities Element includes a review of sidewalks for compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines and developing a transition plan to remediate any deficiencies. Funding for sidewalk repair, retrofitting, and replacement is scheduled into the Capital Improvement Plan at approximately $200,000 annually. The Capital Facilities Element also includes improvements to recreation areas within the Transportation Study Area, like the Recreation Pavilion and Veterans Memorial Park.

**Mountlake Terrace Transportation Master Plan (2007)**

The 2007 Transportation Master Plan is divided into a roadway plan, sidewalk plan, bicycle plan, traffic calming plan, transit and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, maintenance and preservation plan, and a financial plan. The 2007 Transportation Master Plan called for improvements within the Transportation Study Area, some of which remain in the City’s more recent plans:

- A signal or roundabout at 220th Street SW and 58th Avenue W; and
Traffic signal at 236\textsuperscript{th} Street SW and 58\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W.

**Mountlake Terrace Electric Vehicle Strategy**

The 2011 Electric Vehicle Strategy outlines a vision for decreasing emissions from gas-powered vehicles by increasing use of electric vehicles. To do so, Mountlake Terrace seeks to encourage more electric vehicle charging infrastructure that is convenient to all users and to incorporate more electric vehicles into the City’s fleet. To meet these goals, the City plans to install charging facilities in key locations, e.g., Civic Campus which falls within the Transportation Study Area. Multiple charging stations are also planned to be retained as part of Sound Transit’s Mountlake Terrace Light Rail Station project. In addition, Mountlake Terrace plans to continue adding electric vehicle chargers through private development to ensure residences and commercial facilities offer charging opportunities.

**Mountlake Terrace Transit Service Strategy**

The 2010 Transit Service Strategy is a 15-year plan to provide better transit infrastructure, accommodate light rail at the transit center, continue creating effective partnerships with regional transit agencies, and support transit-oriented development.

To facilitate better transit service, Mountlake Terrace seeks to make sidewalks available on both sides of the street, consider transit signal priority when planning transportation projects, implement bus stop bulb-outs where appropriate, and consider Business Access and Transit (BAT) lanes. In addition, the strategy includes a focus on encouraging mixed-use, transit-oriented development in the Mountlake Terrace Town Center.

**Mountlake Terrace Transportation Demand Management Strategy**

The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategy from 2012 focuses on reducing driving trips by offering transportation alternatives. The TDM strategy stems from the Washington Commute Trip Reduction law (CTR), which requires employers with 100 or more employees and located in high-population Counties, to implement TDM programs. Mountlake Terrace has a CTR plan that seeks to reduce driving trips through initiatives like working with Community Transit to serve CTR employers, developing a parking cash-out program, and assisting CTR employers with implementing TDM strategies like telework policies.

**Mountlake Terrace 2018-2023 TIP Ordinance**

The Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance recommended the following relevant transportation infrastructure improvement expenditures for the six-year period between 2018 and 2023:

- Main Street Revitalization
- 244\textsuperscript{th} Street SW Reconstruction – add left turn lanes from 56\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W to Cedar Way
- Construct roundabout at 220\textsuperscript{th} Street SW & 58\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W
- Construct signal at 236\textsuperscript{th} Street SW & 58\textsuperscript{th} Avenue W
- Construct street connection between 236\textsuperscript{th} Street W and Gateway Place
- Install adaptive signal along 220\textsuperscript{th} Street SW corridor
- Construct street connection along 52\textsuperscript{nd}/53\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue W
**MOUNTLAKE TERRACE TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS GUIDELINES**

The City Traffic Engineer makes determinations on whether projects require a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA). The minimum threshold for a TIA is when a project generates 10 or more weekday PM peak hour trips, 40 weekday daily trips, or 50 weekend daily trips. The TIA Guidelines outline the key assumptions and methodology to be used when evaluating the impacts of a development project.

**MOUNTLAKE TERRACE TOWN CENTER PLANNED ACTION AND ZONING REGULATIONS DRAFT EIS (2007)**

The 2007 Mountlake Terrace Town Center EIS covered the Existing Town Center Boundary, as shown in Exhibit 3-32 (includes Town Center Reserve areas which may result from the 2019 Town Center Subarea Plan update). This EIS summarizes the evaluation completed as the basis for the current Town Center Planned Action Ordinance.

To mitigate anticipated impacts from both the Proposal and the No Action alternatives, the EIS included recommended improvements to the roadway network, some of which are already incorporated into the TIP projects summarized above. The only additional projects relevant to the Supplemental EIS study intersections are:

- **212th Street SW & 52nd Avenue W** – widen eastbound and westbound approaches for left turn lanes and provide protected eastbound and westbound left turn phases.
- **212th Street SW & 48th Avenue W** – install an actuated signal and restripe northbound approach to right and left turn lanes.
3.4.3. Impacts

Analysis Methodology-Planning Scenarios Evaluated

This section describes the planning scenarios that are evaluated as well as the methodology and assumptions used to analyze the alternatives. Two alternatives are evaluated under future year 2035 conditions: The No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative maintains the Town Center’s current zoning and modifies the transportation network only according to assumptions currently in City plans. The Proposed Action Alternative would increase the amount of growth and include additional transportation network changes. A full description of the land use assumptions may be found in Chapter 2.

Exhibit 3-53 summarizes the transportation network assumptions for the future year alternatives. All alternatives assume improvements included in current City plans. Transportation network changes that would be in place under both the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives include:

- Main Street Revitalization - build and widen sidewalks and bike lanes, install traffic signal at 236th Street & Gateway;
- Traffic signal at 236th Street SW & 58th Avenue W;
- Gateway Connector - new roadway between 236th Street SW and Gateway Place;
- Adaptive signal system on 220th Street SW between SR-99 and I-5;
- Roundabout at 220th Street SW & 58th Avenue W;
- New street connection on 233rd Street SW between 58th Avenue W and 56th Avenue W; and
- New street connection on 57th Avenue W between 232nd and 234th Streets SW.

In addition to these improvements, the Proposed Action Alternative would include new connections that would provide a finer street grid within the Town Center Core. Some connections would provide for vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle access while others may provide only pedestrian and bicycle access. The additional street network is shown in Exhibit 3-53.

New street connections including vehicle access include:

- 231st Street SW between 60th Avenue W and 57th Avenue W; and
- 57th Avenue W between 231st and 232nd Streets SW and 234th and 236th Streets SW.

New access corridors include:

- 231st Street SW between 61st Avenue W and 60th Avenue W and between 56th Avenue W and 55th Avenue W;
- 233rd Street SW between 56th Avenue W and 55th Avenue W;
- 235th Street SW between 56th Avenue W and 55th Avenue W;
- 59th Avenue W and 57th Avenue W between 236th Street SW and 237th Street SW; and
- 55th Avenue W between 236th Street SW and 238th Street SW.
Exhibit 3-53. Transportation Network Assumptions

Mountlake Terrace Town Center Planned Improvements

County Boundary
City Boundary
Urban Growth Area
Proposed Town Center Core
Existing Town Center Core
Transportation Study Area

Both Alternatives
- Light Rail Route
- New Signal
- New Roundabout
- Capacity Improvements

Proposed Action Only
- Shared Access Corridors
- Capacity Improvements

Source: Fehr & Peers 2019
**TRIP GENERATION**

The City developed 2035 traffic volume forecasts as part of its 2017 Comprehensive Plan update. These forecasts account for the current zoning of the Town Center, as well as the background growth assumed for the rest of the city. Therefore, these forecasts are used for the 2035 No Action Alternative analysis. A trip generation tool, called MainStreet, was applied to estimate the increase in vehicle trips that would occur under the Proposed Action Alternative. MainStreet takes into account the variation in land use type and density as well as the built environment.

Exhibit 3-54 summarizes the forecasted increase in vehicle trips for the PM peak hour period (the time period analyzed in this EIS). MainStreet estimated that the Proposed Action Alternative would result in approximately 930 more vehicle trips than the No Action Alternative during the PM peak hour.

**Exhibit 3-54. Vehicle Trips Generated by Proposed Action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Town Center Planned Action Trip Generation</strong></td>
<td>2,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in Vehicle Trips Generated by Proposed Action</strong></td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Action Trip Generation</strong></td>
<td>3,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TRIP DISTRIBUTION**

The Snohomish County travel demand model was used to estimate the trip distribution of the trips generated within the Town Center. Exhibit 3-55 displays the model’s general distribution pattern for vehicle trips to and from the Town Center during the PM peak period in 2035. These trips were assigned to the transportation network as turning movement volumes at each of the study intersections and then analyzed in the Synchro traffic operations model.
Exhibit 3-55. Trip Distribution

Traffic Operations Analysis

As with existing conditions, traffic operations were analyzed using Synchro 10 software. The existing Synchro network was updated to reflect roadway modifications planned to be in place by 2035 as well as the forecasted vehicle volumes under each alternative. Signal timings for 2035 (phase splits and offsets for coordinated signals) were optimized to maximize the efficiency of the system based upon the projected future year vehicle volumes. The signal timings were kept consistent between the 2035 No Action Alternative and 2035 Proposed Action Alternative.

Impacts of the No Action Alternative (2013 Addendum)

The No Action Alternative serves as the baseline for the impact analysis of the Proposed Action Alternative. It represents the operation of the transportation system if no zoning or network changes were made in the Town Center. However, growth would continue to occur under the No Action Alternative consistent with the existing Planned Action ordinance.

This section summarizes analysis results and environmental impacts of the No Action Alternative. Specifically, the following definitions are used to identify auto, freight, and transit impacts under the No Action Alternative:

- Vehicle level of service below the LOS standard at a study intersection;
- Queues from a downstream intersection expected to spill back to a study intersection.

Pedestrian, bicycle, parking, and safety impacts are discussed qualitatively. As defined above, this EIS identifies impacts if future transportation operations are not expected to meet the City’s adopted level of service standards.

Exhibit 3-56 and Exhibit 3-57 summarize the average vehicle delay for each study intersection compared to its LOS standard. By 2035, traffic volumes would increase due to the land use growth that would occur within the Town Center and other parts of the city as well as regional growth not associated with Mountlake Terrace. Therefore, delay at most intersections is expected to increase to some degree. However, all study intersections are expected to meet their LOS standards under the No Action Alternative.

Of the 29 study intersections, ten are expected to drop by one LOS grade compared to existing conditions. Two intersections would operate better than the existing condition because of planned improvements:

- 220th Street SW/58th Avenue W which will be converted from an all-way stop to a roundabout; and
- 236th Street SW/58th Avenue W which will be converted from a side street stop to a signal.

Synchro considers each intersection’s operations independently. As a supplemental evaluation, the simulation component of the software (SimTraffic) was reviewed to identify any potential queue spillback.

---

1 Applicable only to study intersections through which transit routes travel.
2 One new intersection is included in the 2035 analysis: 236th Street SW & Gateway Place.
issues between study intersections. A review of the simulation suggests that queues would form along eastbound 220th Street SW and southbound 66th Avenue W due to congestion at the I-5 ramps. These queues would impact the 66th Avenue W/216th Street SW, 66th Avenue W/220th Street SW, and I-5 Southbound Ramps/220th Street SW intersections. Therefore, although overall intersection LOS is expected to meet the City’s standards, queuing impacts are expected under the No Action Alternative.

Exhibit 3-56. 2035 No Action Alternative - PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service and Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>2035 LOS Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>2035 No Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>216th St SW / 66th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/8</td>
<td>A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>220th St SW / 66th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/24</td>
<td>D/47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>220th St SW / I-5 SB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/12</td>
<td>C/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>220th St SW / I-5 NB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/21</td>
<td>C/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>220th St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop in existing/ Roundabout in 2035</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/14</td>
<td>A/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>220th St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B/12</td>
<td>B/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>220th St SW / 52nd Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/20</td>
<td>C/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>212th St SW / 52nd Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/30</td>
<td>D/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>212th St SW / 48th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/24</td>
<td>D/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>212th St SW / 44th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/23</td>
<td>D/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>228th St SW / 66th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/11</td>
<td>B/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>230th St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/9</td>
<td>A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>230th St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/19</td>
<td>C/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>232nd St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/9</td>
<td>A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>232nd St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/10</td>
<td>A/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>234th St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/10</td>
<td>A/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>234th St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/16</td>
<td>C/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>236th St SW / 65th Place W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/6</td>
<td>B/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>236th St SW / I-5 SB On-Ramp</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/8</td>
<td>A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>236th St SW / I-5 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/7</td>
<td>B/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>236th St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop in existing/ Signal in 2035</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E/35</td>
<td>A/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>2035 LOS Standard</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>2035 No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>236th St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/24</td>
<td>C/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>236th St SW / 48th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/20</td>
<td>C/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>236th St SW / Cedar Way</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/21</td>
<td>C/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>228th St SW / 44th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/22</td>
<td>D/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>244th St SW / 56th Ave W / 19th Ave NE</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/19</td>
<td>B/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15th Avenue NE / Ballinger Way / 244th Street SW</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/33</td>
<td>D/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>19th Avenue NE / Ballinger Way</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/24</td>
<td>D/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>236th St SW / Gateway Boulevard (future only)</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>A/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3-57. Intersection Level of Service – No Action Alternative.

Level of Service - No Action Alternative

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE

Several planned improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle network are anticipated under the No Action Alternative. The principal change would occur through the Main Street revitalization project which will complete bike lanes and wider sidewalks along 236th Street SW in the near term, and 56th Avenue W in a later phase. In addition, the City’s comprehensive transportation element calls for two new street connections: 233rd Street SW between 58th and 56th Avenues W and 57th Avenue W between 232nd and 234th Streets SW. These connections would break up a large block to provide more direct and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle connections.

Because all development would occur under the City’s existing Town Center design standards, additional pedestrian features would be implemented contributing to the pedestrian-friendly nature of the Town Center. Because the No Action Alternative would result in an improved pedestrian and bicycle traveling experience, no significant adverse impacts to pedestrians or bicycles are identified under the No Action Alternative.

PARKING

An increased intensity of land use within the Town Center would generate an increase in vehicle trips, and therefore parking demand. Moreover, some existing surface parking lots would be redeveloped. The current Town Center design standards include regulations related to parking, including stating that “every possible effort shall be made to provide shared parking facilities between developments.” These shared parking regulations are outlined in Municipal Code 19.125.060; developers may complete a parking study for review by the City if there are special characteristics of the proposed use. Under the No Action Alternative, Municipal Code 19.50.070 would remain in place, continuing the current parking minimum standards for the Town Center area as follows:

- Commercial uses: two spaces for each 1,000 square feet of gross, leasable area, except that the first 5,000 square feet of a retail use or an eating/drinking establishment within a building or on a single parcel shall be exempt from the minimum number of required parking spaces, so long as at least four on-street parking spaces are within 200 feet.
- Residential uses: 0.75 space for each studio or open bedroom studio unit; 1.25 spaces for each unit of one to two bedrooms; 1.5 spaces for each unit of three bedrooms; one space per two bedrooms beyond three bedrooms in any unit.
- Hotel: one space for each unit.

The share of multifamily units by size and number of commercial parcels that may develop are unknown. However, a high-level evaluation of the minimum range of new on-site parking spaces that may be added under the No Action Alternative is estimated to be 2,200 to 2,600. This is a minimum number related to the City’s parking regulations; developers may choose to build more parking. Note this new development would replace some of the existing surface parking lots. This range is in line with the estimate of PM peak hour trips expected under the No Action Alternative (2,475).

While the City endeavors to limit the amount of parking spaces in Town Center such that there is not a substantial excess of supply, it is anticipated that developers would maintain or build adequate supply for their new needs and comply with City parking requirements. Despite the new supply of off-street parking spaces, it is likely that demand for on-street parking would also increase because many visitors prefer the convenience of an on-street space. Therefore, demand for on-street parking could exceed
supply resulting in a significant adverse impact to on-street parking.

**SAFETY**

Traffic volumes in the Transportation Study Area are projected to increase by 2035. With higher volumes, there is potential for an increased number of collisions. However, there is no indication that collision rates at intersections or along segments would increase. The planned signal at 236th Street SW/58th Avenue W and the planned roundabout at 220th Street SW/58th Avenue W could provide safety benefits at those locations. Moreover, planned improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle network as described above would also provide safety benefits along corridors and at new mid-block crossings and marked crossings. The City would also continue its current monitoring programs to identify locations in need of safety improvements and implement measures that address those concerns as they arise. Therefore, no safety impacts are identified under the No Action Alternative.

**Impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative**

This section summarizes analysis results and environmental impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative. Specifically, the following definitions are used to identify auto, freight, and transit\(^3\) impacts:

- Vehicle level of service below the facility’s LOS standard at a study intersection that operated acceptably under the No Action Alternative or an increase in delay of at least 5 seconds at a study intersection already expected to operate below its LOS standard under the No Action Alternative.
- Queues from a downstream intersection expected to spill back to a study intersection that would not experience queues under the No Action Alternative or queues substantially longer than those expected under the No Action Alternative.

Pedestrian, bicycle, parking, and safety impacts are discussed qualitatively in comparison to the No Action Alternative. An impact is defined if the Proposed Action Alternative would:

- preclude or fail to implement a City-identified bicycle or pedestrian improvement;
- result in on-street parking demand exceeding supply beyond the level anticipated under the No Action Alternative; or
- increase the collision rate along a study segment or at a study intersection compared to the No Action Alternative.

Exhibit 3-58 and Exhibit 3-59 summarize the average vehicle delay and LOS for each study intersection. The Proposed Action Alternative’s land use growth would result in increased vehicle volumes compared to the No Action Alternative. The Proposed Action Alternative would also include additional multimodal connections within the Town Center Core. As defined above, impacts are evaluated in comparison to the No Action Alternative. Two significant adverse traffic operations impacts are expected under the Proposed Action Alternative (and shown in bold in Exhibit 3-58):

---

\(^3\) Applicable only to study intersections through which transit routes travel.
- 230th St SW / 56th Ave W – falling from LOS C to LOS F
- 234th St SW / 56th Ave W – falling from LOS C to LOS F

Both of these intersections have side street stop control. With higher volumes along the main street of 56th Avenue W, it would become increasingly difficult for vehicles on the minor street approaches to find a gap in traffic which causes the high delay. Because autos, freight, and bus routes pass through both of the impacted intersections, these intersections are considered to have significant auto, freight, and transit impacts.

A review of the traffic simulation shows similar queue spillback along eastbound 220th Street SW and southbound 66th Avenue W, as was observed under the No Action Alternative. Because the Proposed Action Alternative is not expected to result in substantially longer queue lengths than the No Action Alternative, no significant queuing impacts are expected to result from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Potential measures to mitigate the impacts on the impacted intersections are presented in the Mitigation Measures section.

Exhibit 3-58. 2035 Proposed Action Alternative - PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service and Delay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>2035 LOS Standard</th>
<th>2035 No Action</th>
<th>2035 Action Alt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>216th St SW / 66th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/9</td>
<td>A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>220th St SW / 66th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D/47</td>
<td>D/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>220th St SW / I-5 SB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/31</td>
<td>D/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>220th St SW / I-5 NB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/31</td>
<td>C/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>220th St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop in existing/ Roundabout in 2035</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/6</td>
<td>A/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>220th St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B/12</td>
<td>D/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>220th St SW / 52nd Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/22</td>
<td>D/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>212th St SW / 52nd Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D/54</td>
<td>E/58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>212th St SW / 48th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D/35</td>
<td>E/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>212th St SW / 44th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D/40</td>
<td>D/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>228th St SW / 66th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/11</td>
<td>B/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>230th St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/9</td>
<td>B/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>230th St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/23</td>
<td>F/61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>232nd St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/9</td>
<td>B/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>232nd St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/10</td>
<td>B/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>234th St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/10</td>
<td>B/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>2035 LOS Standard</td>
<td>2035 No Action</td>
<td>2035 Action Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>234th St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/17</td>
<td>F/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>236th St SW / 65th Place W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B/12</td>
<td>B/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>236th St SW / I-5 SB On-Ramp</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A/9</td>
<td>A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>236th St SW / I-5 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B/17</td>
<td>B/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>236th St SW / 58th Ave W</td>
<td>Side-street stop in existing/ Signal in 2035</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/6</td>
<td>A/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>236th St SW / 56th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/27</td>
<td>D/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>236th St SW / 48th Ave W</td>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/24</td>
<td>E/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>236th St SW / Cedar Way</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C/31</td>
<td>C/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>228th St SW / 44th Ave W</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/40</td>
<td>D/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>244th St SW / 56th Ave W / 19th Ave NE</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B/20</td>
<td>C/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15th Avenue NE / Ballinger Way / 244th Street SW</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/36</td>
<td>D/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>19th Avenue NE / Ballinger Way</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/42</td>
<td>D/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>236th St SW / Gateway Boulevard (future only)</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A/7</td>
<td>A/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Bold indicates an impact.
Exhibit 3-59. Intersection Level of Service – Proposed Action Alternative

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE

As part of the Proposed Action Alternative, the proposed Zoning Regulations identify three streetscape classifications for planned new, extended, and improved streets and access corridors in the Town Center in addition to the Mainstreet primary streets already designated along 56th Avenue W and 236th Street SW. These designations are shown in Exhibit 3-60 and described below.

▪ Pedestrian Core Streets: Town Center’s primary pedestrian, retail and arts/cultural streets and would be extended in multiple phases. They would have a combined width of 15 feet for the sidewalk and planting strip, providing a comfortable walking experience with ample space and physical separation from vehicle traffic.

▪ Town Center Streets: This pedestrian-friendly street designation would cover most of the streets in the Town Center. They would have a combined width of 12 to 14 feet for the sidewalk and planting strip, which would provide ample space for a comfortable walking experience and physical separation from vehicle traffic.

▪ Access Corridors: These mid-block access corridors are intended to primarily serve pedestrians, but also provide an option for vehicular access to on-site parking for new development. Specific alignments would be determined during the development review process for applicable sites and the applicant would be required to provide such a mid-block connection as a public access easement if their lot contains a proposed access corridor within or along the edge of the property. Pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles would share the lane on these low-speed, low-volume streets.

The new, extended, and improved street connections in the Town Center would enhance the pedestrian and bicycle experience by providing more connectivity and different route options that may be more comfortable than traveling on higher speed or higher volume corridors. Moreover, all development within Town Center would be required to meet the City design standards related to bicycle and pedestrian facility accommodations. Therefore, the Proposed Action Alternative is expected to result in a benefit to pedestrian and bicycle travel so no significant adverse impacts are identified under the Proposed Action Alternative.

PARKING

The Proposed Action Alternative would result in an increase in vehicle trips compared to the No Action Alternative, and therefore an increase in parking demand. As with the No Action Alternative, developments within the Town Center would be expected to provide shared parking facilities to the extent possible and consistent with the shared parking regulations outlined in Municipal Code 19.125.060. In addition, the Proposed Alternative includes changes to the off-street parking standards for minimum number of spaces provided. Off-street parking standards in the Town Center would be based on tiered zones generally depending on the distance to the planned light rail station, as shown in Exhibit 3-61.
Exhibit 3-60. Town Center Streetscape Classifications

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 3-61. Town Center Parking Tiers

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 3-62 and Exhibit 3-63 summarize the minimum number of parking spaces required for residential uses and commercial uses, respectively.

**Exhibit 3-62. Off-street Parking Standards for Multi-household Residential Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Spaces per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bedroom</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-bedrooms or more</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.

**Exhibit 3-63. Off-street Parking Standards for Commercial Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Spaces per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial retail</td>
<td>2 per 1,000sf gross leasable area, except that the first 5,000sf of a retail use or an eating/drinking establishment within a building or on a single parcel shall be exempt from the minimum number of required parking spaces, so long as at least four on-street parking spaces are within 200 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care, adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating/drinking establishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/exercise club with &lt;10,000 sf gross leasable area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General service – excluding vehicle services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/motels</td>
<td>1 per unit or suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/health care, excluding hospitals and ambulance services</td>
<td>2 per 1,000sf gross leasable area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.

As with the No Action Alternative, the share of multifamily units by size and number of commercial parcels that may develop are unknown. However, a high-level evaluation of the minimum range of new on-site parking spaces that may be added under the Proposed Action Alternative was completed using the overall growth targets. Roughly 4,200 to 4,900 new spaces are expected to be built compared to the 2,200 to 2,600 spaces expected under the No Build Alternative (again, some existing surface lots would
be replaced by this new development). Given that the Proposed Alternative is expected to generate approximately 930 more PM peak hour trips than the No Action Alternative, this suggests that the Proposed Alternative would result in ample off-street parking spaces to accommodate the increase in trips compared to the No Action Alternative.

While the City endeavors to limit the amount of parking spaces in Town Center such that there is not a substantial excess of supply, it is anticipated that developers would maintain or build adequate supply for their new needs and comply with City parking requirements. Although off-street parking supply is expected to accommodate the Town Center’s demand, many travelers are still likely to prefer the convenience of an on-street parking space, the supply of which is not anticipated to increase. Because the increase in overall parking demand under the Proposed Action Alternative would likely be higher than that under the No Action Alternative, demand for on-street parking would likely also be higher. Therefore, the demand in excess of on-street supply would likely be higher than that under the No Action Alternative, resulting in a significant adverse impact to on-street parking.

**SAFETY**

Traffic volumes in the Transportation Study Area are projected to increase under the Proposed Action Alternative compared to the No Action Alternative. With higher volumes, there is potential for an increased number of collisions. However, there is no indication that collision rates at intersections or along segments would increase meaningfully compared to the No Action Alternative. In addition, the Proposed Action Alternative includes a plan for improved streetscapes that would enhance the safety of the existing roadways and provide new route options for pedestrian and bicycle travel. These improvements would also provide enhanced crossing opportunities through the provision of new mid-block crossings and marked crossings. The City would also continue its current monitoring programs to identify locations in need of safety improvements and implement measures that address those concerns as they arise. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to safety are identified under the Proposed Action Alternative.

**Summary of Impacts**

Exhibit 3-64 summarizes the significant impacts for each alternative.

**Exhibit 3-64. Summary of Transportation Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Action Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto and Freight</td>
<td>No intersection impacts; queuing impacts along eastbound 220th Street SW and southbound 66th Avenue W</td>
<td>2 intersection impacts; no queuing impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>No intersection impacts; queuing impacts along eastbound 220th Street SW</td>
<td>2 intersection impacts; no queuing impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street Parking</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.4. Mitigation Measures

This section identifies a range of potential mitigation strategies that could be implemented to help reduce the significance of the adverse impacts identified for the Proposed Action Alternative. These include significant impacts at two intersections affecting autos, freight, and transit, and an impact to on-street parking.

Incorporated Plan Features

All alternatives include improvements to multiple modes in the six-year TIP, and the Proposed Action Alternative offers additional transportation and circulation improvements.

Regulations and Commitments

TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Managing demand for auto travel is an important part of mitigating the auto, freight, and transit impacts identified in this EIS. The City’s Transportation Demand Management Strategy (2012) and Commute Trip Reduction Plan (2017) already work in coordination with the Washington Commute Trip Reduction law (CTR), which requires employers with 100 or more employees and located in high-population Counties, to implement TDM programs. The current CTR Plan applies to the three applicable “major” employers in the city. The Plan includes strategies such as preferential parking for high occupancy vehicles, subsidized transit fares, facilitation of vanpools and carpools, flex-work arrangements to avoid travel during peak periods, secure and sheltered bicycle parking, locker rooms, changing areas, and showers.

The City could build upon its existing TDM programs and coordination with local transit agencies, businesses, and multifamily buildings to explore additional demand management programs that encourage non-SOV travel to and from the Town Center. Potential strategies include:

▪ The City could require Transportation Management Programs (TMPs) for property owners of newly constructed buildings through its municipal code. TMPs are designed to encourage tenants to reduce their traffic and parking impacts on city facilities and could be geared toward both employers and residential buildings. The TMP would include specific strategies for the tenants of the building, for example subsidies or discounts for non-auto travel, free parking for carpools and vanpools, bike parking and on-site locker and shower facilities, travel options information displayed in the building, and assistance to help travelers identify non-auto commute options, rideshare, and ride match services.

▪ Work with property owners and transit agencies to encourage or require transit pass provision for employees and residents. King County Metro’s ORCA Business Passport and ORCA Business Choice programs offer ways for employers to provide transit passes to their employees; there are also small business subsidies available. King County Metro has a similar program called ORCA Multifamily Development Passport geared toward multifamily housing. The Multifamily Development Passport is an annual transportation pass that property owners can offer to residents; buildings must have a minimum of 20 residential units and the pass must be offered to every unit.

▪ The City could establish a Town Center transportation management association to provide programs, services, and strategies specific to the Town Center’s needs. Local Puget Sound examples include Choose Your Way Bellevue, Tacoma’s Downtown on the Go, Whatcom County’s Smart Trips, or the
University District’s U District, Let’s Go programs. These programs offer a central location for employees and residents to find information on how they can conveniently use non-auto or high occupancy modes. Some programs also offer travel tracking and rewards programs.

- The City could consider further changes to its parking code to influence travel behavior and provide more flexibility to residents who choose to forgo owning a private vehicle. For example, the City could implement any or all of the following: parking maximums to limit the number of parking spaces that can be built with new development; increased parking taxes/fees; or unbundling of parking costs from total property costs, allowing buyers or tenants to forgo buying or leasing a parking space.

**TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS**

The City can pursue projects that increase the capacity of its existing infrastructure without building new infrastructure through transportation systems management and operations (TSMO). TSMO refers to operational improvements that can improve traffic flows without building new capacity, for example traffic signal coordination, intelligent transportation systems such as adaptive signals or transit signal priority, ramp management, and traffic incident management. This suite of strategies can be considered as part of the City’s ongoing monitoring of Town Center’s traffic operations.

**PARKING MANAGEMENT**

The City could implement programs to manage its on-street parking supply such that demand does not routinely exceed the supply. There are multiple strategies the City could pursue, such as time limits, paid parking, and restricted parking zones. For example, many cities price their on-street parking spaces to aim for an average 85% occupancy, which equates to having one or two available spaces per block. The City could also use time limits to encourage short-term parking for visitors to local businesses on key blocks while allowing longer term parking in other locations. Restricted parking zones could be used to discourage spillover parking into adjacent residential neighborhoods.

**Other Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The City could implement policy changes related to LOS standards or make capital improvements to increase the capacity of impacted intersections and roadways in the Transportation Study Area. LOS policy can be set to align with the specific context and community objectives of an area. Given the City’s vision for Town Center to be an urban and transit-oriented neighborhood, the City could consider revising the LOS policy to allow LOS F operations within the Town Center. This policy revision would mitigate the significant impact at the 230th Street SW/56th Avenue W and 234th Street SW/56th Avenue W intersections.

Alternatively, the City could pursue capital improvements at the impacted intersections, both of which are currently side street stop controlled. Those side street approaches are expected to experience high delays as traffic along 56th Avenue W increases. To allow those movements to proceed with less delay, several options were considered at each location: all-way stop control, signals, and roundabouts.

A Synchro evaluation found that all-way stop control would not fully mitigate the impact. Signals would mitigate the impact at both locations; however, a signal warrant analysis indicates a warrant would not be met with the forecasted volumes and signals are not typically installed until a signal warrant is met. Roundabouts are expected to manage the traffic well – bringing the intersections’ LOS from F to A as
shown in Exhibit 3-65 – and provide safety benefits but would require some right-of-way acquisition. Implementation could occur through the Planned Action ordinance such that new development contributes its share of the cost for these projects. This evaluation considers only the traffic operations outcome; further study of intersection design would need to be completed to select the appropriate roundabout design for each intersection.

**Exhibit 3-65. Proposed Mitigation Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Proposed Action Alternative</th>
<th>Proposed Action Alternative MITIGATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>230th Street SW / 56th Avenue W</td>
<td>C/23</td>
<td>F/61</td>
<td>A/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234th Street SW / 56th Avenue W</td>
<td>C/17</td>
<td>F/91</td>
<td>A/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 3.4.5. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Significant adverse impacts to auto, freight, transit, and parking were identified under the Proposed Action Alternative. With some combination of the potential mitigation measures outlined in the previous section, the magnitude of the intersection LOS impacts could be mitigated to meet City standards. Therefore, no significant unavoidable impacts to auto, freight, or transit are expected.

It is also expected that the parking impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of some combination of the potential mitigation measures described above. While there may be short-term impacts as individual developments are completed, it is expected that over the long term with paid parking zones, time limits, and/or restricted parking zones, the on-street parking situation would reach a new equilibrium. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to parking are expected.
3.5. UTILITIES

3.5.1. Overview

This section evaluates the potential impacts of each of the alternatives on the level of service for utilities in the Town Center and includes information on changes to existing facilities and utility plans since adoption of the 2007 Town Center Planned Action EIS. This section also includes a discussion of potential effects of increased development intensity on local telecommunication infrastructure.

3.5.2. Affected Environment

Water

The City of Mountlake Terrace updated its Comprehensive Water System Plan in 2018. The following sections describe the City’s existing water system, as described in the plan.

Supply

The City of Everett is the regional supplier of water to Mountlake Terrace and several other water systems in south Snohomish County. Everett’s water is first supplied to Alderwood Water and Wastewater District (AWWD) and then supplied by AWWD to the City of Mountlake Terrace. The source of water is from Lake Chaplain, which is fed by the Sultan River. The water is treated at the Everett Water Filtration Plant and also receives chlorine disinfection within the AWWD system.

Storage

The City maintains three reservoirs with a combined storage capacity of approximately 6.43 million gallons (MG). All three reservoirs are located on a single site, along with the pump station for pressure zone 649, adjacent to 58th Avenue W at 222nd Street SW. Two of the reservoirs (2.13 MG and 1.8 MG storage each) serve the City’s 570 pressure zone, which also connects to pressure zones 494 and 530 through pressure reducing stations. One 2.5 MG reservoir is connected to the City’s 649 pressure zone via a pump station. The northeastern portions of the Town Center Core lie in the 649 pressure zone, and the remainder lies in the 570 pressure zone. The two northern portions of the Town Center Reserve are located in the 570 pressure zone, and the southern area along 56th Avenue W is located in the 530 pressure zone. The Town Center contains one pressure reducing valve station near the intersection of 56th Avenue W and 236th Street SW, where Zone 530 connects to Zone 570.

Distribution System

The City’s water distribution system consists of approximately 90 miles of water main in a variety of pipe sizes. Approximately 74% of the citywide water mains are 6-8 inches in diameter and most of the remainder consists of 12-inch pipe. Water mains in the Town Center mostly consist of 12-16-inch pipes along major arterials, such as 56th Avenue W, 232nd Street SW, 234th Street SW, and 236th Street SW, with smaller diameters (mostly 6-inch) on smaller side streets. Pipe materials are a mix of cast iron and ductile iron.
Sewer

**COLLECTION SYSTEM**

The Mountlake Terrace sewer collection system consists of more than 74 miles of piping and over 1,500 manholes across eight basins. The Town Center is located within the Meter A collection area, the largest of the sewer basins. Wastewater flows from the Meter A collection basin drain toward the Lake Ballinger Lift Station near the southwest corner of the city, which is owned and operated by King County. Wastewater flows at the Lake Ballinger Lift Station are pumped either to the King County wastewater system or the City of Edmonds wastewater system for treatment.

The sewer collection system in the Town Center consists entirely of gravity lines and no major structural or infiltration defects have been documented in the piping in the area. The City recently began construction on Phase 1 of the two-phase Main Street project, which includes street and sidewalk improvements and upgrades to sewer and other utility infrastructure in portions of the Town Center. Phase 1 along 236th Street SW between I-5 and 56th Avenue W is under construction as of March 2019, and similar improvements are planned for Phase 2 along 56th Avenue W between 230th Street SW and 236th Street SW.

**TREATMENT**

Wastewater flows from the Town Center are conveyed to the City of Edmonds wastewater system for treatment via the Lake Ballinger Lift Station. The City of Edmonds, in turn, maintains a flow swap agreement with King County that allows flows from the Lake Ballinger Lift Station to be diverted to the King County system. The Edmonds treatment plant serves multiple communities, including Mountlake Terrace, Shoreline, portions of Lynnwood and Edmonds, and portions of unincorporated King and Snohomish counties.

The City of Edmonds Comprehensive Sewer Plan (2013) states that the Edmonds Wastewater Treatment Plant is rated to treat up to 11.8 million gallons daily (MGD) of maximum month flow and is designed to treat up to 9.1 MGD average annual daily flow. Under a 1988 interlocal agreement, Mountlake Terrace is allocated 2.108 MGD average annual daily flow of the plant’s daily capacity. The agreement states that when flows reach 85% of the allocated capacity limit, notification must be provided to the City of Edmonds. Average annual wastewater flows from Mountlake Terrace equaled 1.56 MGD in 2017 and 1.4 MGD in 2018, approximately 74% and 66% respectively of the City’s flow allocation.

**Telecommunications**

As described in the 2007 Planned Action EIS, the Federal Communications Commission requires that each market be served by at least two cellular communication services to avoid the creation of a monopoly. All major wireless service providers (Verizon, AT&T, T-Mobile, and Sprint) provide service in the Town Center area, as well as several smaller providers. T-Mobile maintains a wireless communication antenna on a 60-foot tower adjacent to the Mountlake Terrace Police Department station in the Town Center.

### 3.5.3. Impacts

**Impacts Common to All Alternatives**

Commercial and residential growth would occur in the Town Center under both the No Action and
Proposed Action Alternatives, which would increase demand for utility services. Impacts of the two alternatives differ in location and magnitude and are described in the following sections.

**Impacts of the No Action Alternative (2013 Addendum)**

**WATER**

The City’s Comprehensive Water System Plan was updated in 2018 and reflects growth planned in the Town Center under the No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, water demand would increase as development occurs. Total average daily demand in 2035, without implementation of water conservation measures, would be approximately 1.98 MGD. The system analysis contained in the Comprehensive Water System Plan projects a system supply surplus of 1,452 gallons per minute (gpm) and total system storage surplus of 500,000 gallons in 2035.

The Comprehensive Water System Plan establishes fire flow requirements based on development type, as shown in Exhibit 3-66.

**Exhibit 3-66. General Fire Flow Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Fire Flow Requirement (gpm)</th>
<th>Flow Duration (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>1,000 – 1,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>1,500 – 3,000</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Office</td>
<td>2,500 – 4,000</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3,000 – 5,000</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>2,500 – 4,000</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>1,000 – 1,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2018

The ability of a water system to provide adequate fire flow depends on multiple factors, including the volume of water required, pipe sizing, and available pressure. As part of the Comprehensive Water System Plan update, hydraulic modeling was performed to test system capacity and fire flow availability. For each analysis point, the analysis compared the available fire flow in gallons per minute to the land use designation of surrounding properties to assess its ability to provide sufficient flow to future development at that location. Most of the existing water system in Town Center is capable of providing adequate fire flow for planned land uses with limited exceptions. The following areas within the Town Center study area contain minor fire flow deficiencies:

- The single-family area west of 60th Avenue W and immediately north of the transit center includes three points operating at 50-75% of required fire flow and two points operating below 50% of required fire flow.
- 58th Avenue W contains two points near the civic campus operating at 50-75% of fire flow requirements and a third in the same area operating under 50% of requirements.
- Points in the study area operating at 75-100% of required fire flow include the following:
- one point at the transit center;
- two points in 232nd Street SW between 58th Avenue W and 56th Avenue W;
- two points on the superblock site east of the civic campus; and
- one point at the intersection of 236th Street SW and 58th Avenue W.

All other modeled points in the study area currently have more than 100% of the required fire flow. The Comprehensive Water System plan identifies necessary water main improvements to maintain adequate fire flow for planned future development. With implementation of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) included in the Comprehensive Water System Plan, no significant impacts to water service are anticipated under the No Action Alternative.

**SEWER**

The City of Mountlake Terrace is in the process of updating its Sewer Comprehensive Plan. The draft plan, released in January 2019, documented 440 equivalent residential units (ERU’s) in the Town Center area with projected growth of 865 additional ERU’s in the area by 2038. Exhibit 3-67 shows projected sewer flows under the No Action Alternative. A full description of modeling assumptions is contained in Appendix E.

**Exhibit 3-67. Projected Sewer Flows – No Action Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>ERU’s</th>
<th>Domestic Average Day Flow (gpd)</th>
<th>Domestic Peak Hour Flow (gpm)</th>
<th>Peak Hour I/I Flow (gpm)</th>
<th>Total Peak Hour Flow (gpm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions (2018)</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>54,950</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>307.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout (2038) with 2-year I/I</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>163,132</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>412.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout (2038) with 10-year I/I</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>163,132</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>325.1</td>
<td>483.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based on a peaking factor of 1.4, as determined in the Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan.
2. The Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan models Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) for both 2-year and 10-year storm events. This analysis maintains the I/I values used in the draft plan, as increased density is not anticipated to affect I/I levels.
Source: Gray & Osborne, 2019.

This level of projected growth reflects the level of development anticipated under the existing Town Center Plan and planned for in the City’s Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan. The draft plan estimates that, under the No Action Alternative, citywide average annual daily flows would reach 1.93 MGD by 2036, triggering the need to coordinate with the City of Edmonds to determine if Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) capacity improvements are necessary, per the established interlocal agreement. However, the City’s Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan CIP includes projects that, when completed, would substantially reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration (I/I) in the collection system. This would effectively reduce average daily flows, potentially eliminating or delaying the need to coordinate with the City of Edmonds to purchase additional WWTP capacity.

With implementation of these measures and of the CIP included in the draft plan, the No Action Alternative would not increase demand beyond planned levels and would not result in any significant adverse impacts to sewer service.
TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Under the No Action Alternative, additional development would increase demand on local telecommunications infrastructure. Telecommunications facilities are privately owned and future expansions or improvements to provide additional capacity would be planned and constructed by individual providers. Under the No Action Alternative, future construction in the Town Center at seven stories maximum is not anticipated to disrupt existing telecommunications infrastructure or service and no significant impacts would occur.

Impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative

WATER

Development under the Proposed Action Alternative would result in population and employment growth in the Town Center beyond the levels studied in the City’s 2018 Comprehensive Water System Plan, which would increase demand on water supply and storage. The Comprehensive Water System Plan forecasts future water demand based on an assumed resident per capita rate of 80 gallons per day, which is assumed to decrease to 75 gallons per day by 2025 as a result of water conservation measures. Compared to the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action Alternative would include 4,123 more residents in the Town Center, resulting in an additional average daily water demand of 329,840 gallons compared to the No Action Alternative. This represents an average of approximately 229 additional gallons per minute of demand than the No Action Alternative.

The Comprehensive Water System Plan does not explicitly forecast future water demand specifically associated with commercial uses; water consumption is normalized to equivalent residential units (ERU’s), which represent the normal level of consumption associated with a single-family household, and the number of commercial ERU’s in the system is calculated based on actual water consumption by commercial uses. A precise estimate of water demand from commercial uses is therefore not available based on anticipated employee counts or commercial square footages. However, it is likely the substantial increase in employment anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternative would increase water demand in the Town Center beyond the levels planned in the Comprehensive Water System Plan. Commercial-related water demand would likely be highest during daytime business hours.

Development of concentrated multifamily and commercial uses in the Town Center at up to 12 stories under the Proposed Action Alternative would also increase potential demand for fire flow. Firefighting places a heavy demand on a water system because of the large amount of water needed in a short period of time. The introduction of taller commercial and mixed-use buildings would be likely to increase fire flow requirements beyond levels projected in the current Comprehensive Water System Plan.

SEWER

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, increased residential and commercial density in the Town Center area would create additional demand for sewer services. The population and employment levels of the Proposed Action Alternative are higher than those analyzed in the preparation of the City’s Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan. The City contracted with Gray & Osborne to prepare a supplemental analysis to the draft plan to analyze the effects on increased growth in the Town Center on City sewer facilities and service, which are presented in a technical memorandum in Appendix E. The analysis findings are summarized below.
As described in Chapter 2, the Proposed Action Alternative would add approximately 3,000 new residential units and 1,953 new employees to the Town Center by 2038. The Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan established a commercial ERU equivalency rate of 1.5 employees per ERU, which results in a total of 4,742 ERU’s in the Town Center by 2035 (440 existing ERU’s + 3,000 new residential ERU’s + 1,302 new commercial ERU’s). Exhibit 3-68 shows projected flows for both existing conditions and 2038 under the Proposed Action.

### Exhibit 3-68. Projected Sewer Flows – Proposed Action Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>ERU’s</th>
<th>Domestic Average Day Flow (gpd)</th>
<th>Domestic Peak Hour Flow (gpm)</th>
<th>Peak Hour I/I Flow (gpm)²</th>
<th>Total Peak Hour Flow (gpm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions (2018)</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>54,950</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>307.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout (2038) with 2-year I/I</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>592,700</td>
<td>576.2</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>830.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout (2038) with 10-year I/I</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>592,700</td>
<td>576.2</td>
<td>325.1</td>
<td>901.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based on a peaking factor of 1.4, as determined in the Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan.
2. The Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan models Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) for both 2-year and 10-year storm events. This analysis maintains the I/I values used in the draft plan, as increased density is not anticipated to affect I/I levels.
Source: Gray & Osborne, 2019.

The additional flows generated by population and employment growth under the Proposed Action Alternative would increase loading of the sewer collection system beyond the levels anticipated in the Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan. Under buildout conditions, the Proposed Action Alternative would result in an additional 429,568 gallons of average daily flow compared to the No Action Alternative. Assuming development elsewhere in the city conforms to the assumptions of the Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan, this additional flow would increase citywide average annual daily flows to approximately 2.36 MGD, which exceeds the current flow allocation to the Edmonds WWTP. This would trigger the need to coordinate with the City of Edmonds to determine if capacity improvements at the WWTP are necessary, per the established interlocal agreement. Similar to the No Action Alternative, the City’s Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan CIP includes projects that, when completed, would substantially reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration (I/I) in the collection system. This would effectively reduce average daily flows, potentially eliminating or delaying the need to coordinate with the City of Edmonds to purchase additional WWTP capacity.

The additional sewer flows produced by development under the Proposed Action Alternative would also result in localized surcharging conditions in the wastewater collection system. Compared to the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action Alternative is projected to cause five additional pipes to be over capacity, though each of the five is generally isolated and does not result in upstream or downstream capacity deficiencies. The projected over-capacity pipe locations are shown in Exhibit 3-69. These pipes would be included in future CIPs to eliminate localized surcharging.

All of the over-capacity pipes have a very shallow slope, connected to upstream and downstream pipes with much steeper slopes, allowing them to accommodate greater flows. Surcharging conditions in each of these pipes would also be less than one foot during peak hours, resulting in only minor impacts. No pipe replacements or capacity improvements would be necessary to maintain adequate service.
Exhibit 3-69. Sewer Modeling Results – Proposed Action

Legend

- Overcapacity Pipes
- Manholes
- Existing Gravity Sewer Main
- Town Center Boundary
- Parcels
- Streams

CITY OF MOUNTLAKE TERRACE
TOWN CENTER SEWER MODELING
FIGURE 1
VICINITY AND RESULTS

Source: Gray & Osborne, 2019
TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Similar to the No Action Alternative, additional development under the Proposed Action Alternative would increase demand on local telecommunications infrastructure. Telecommunications facilities are privately owned, and future expansions or improvements to provide additional capacity would be planned and constructed by individual providers.

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, building heights would be substantially increased in the Town Center, exceeding the height of existing wireless transmission equipment in the area. Development of large blocks of tall buildings planned in the area surrounding Veterans Memorial Park and the civic campus could interfere with signals from existing wireless communication facilities, necessitating the relocation or redesign of affected infrastructure to maintain adequate service, which could include the replacement of the existing tower with a taller structure or the installation of relay sites to extend service coverage.

3.5.4. Mitigation Measures

Incorporated Plan Features

- Both the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives would focus growth in the Town Center, promoting mixed-use development, which would improve the efficiency of providing water and sewer service and implementing necessary system improvements.

Regulations and Commitments

WATER

- Chapter 15.10.010 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code adopts the 2015 International Fire Code by reference, including associated fire flow requirements.

- Chapter 13.50.020.C of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code requires assurance of performance for public services associated with new construction. The code requires all applicants for building permits to provide assurance to the City that all water mains, sanitary sewers, storm drain systems, public roadways, and emergency vehicle access required by ordinance or development permit conditions will be installed.

- The City’s Comprehensive Water System Plan contains a schedule of system improvements to maintain adequate supply, storage, and fire flow to serve projected development. This CIP will guide the City’s future infrastructure investments.

SEWER

- The City is required under the terms of its interlocal agreement with the City of Edmonds to provide written notice when anticipated sewer flows exceed 85% of their flow allotment to the Edmonds WWTP and coordinate with the City of Edmonds for future capacity planning in accordance with the City’s current agreement with Edmonds.
Other Proposed Mitigation Measures

**WATER**
- Update the system analysis prepared for Comprehensive Water System Plan to address additional supply, storage, and fire flow needs associated with additional growth in the Town Center under the Proposed Action and identify necessary system improvements.
- The City may require extension, replacement, upgrade, or relocation of water mains to serve proposals to meet adopted standards of service.

**TELECOMMUNICATIONS**
- Coordinate with wireless communication providers serving the Town Center on potential impacts to existing and proposed wireless communication facilities, including relocation and/or modification of existing facilities adversely affected by increased building heights in the Town Center. For example, include telecommunications providers with facilities at the police station in public notice of planned action projects to ascertain options for continuous service, such as the installation of relays or pole relocation.

3.5.5. **Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Increased development in the Town Center under both alternatives would increase demand for utility services. With application of existing plans, policies, development regulations, and the mitigation measures recommended in this SEIS, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.
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Mountlake Terrace Town Center Plan
Update & Planned Action

Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposal includes adoption of an update to the Town Center Plan originally adopted in 2007. Since adoption of the original Town Center Plan, the City has updated its Comprehensive Plan (2017) and adopted transportation and parks impact fees. The City also issued a SEPA addendum to the original Planned Action EIS in 2013 that evaluated changes to the Town Center boundary and growth capacity.

The Town Center Plan update will document current development trends and conditions, update the Town Center Plan vision, goals and policies, and amend the Town Center boundary. Associated code amendments would potentially allow increased building heights in portions of the study. A Planned Action designation was adopted for the Town Center pursuant to RCW 43.21C.440, which facilitates development when it meets the City’s Town Center Plan provisions and mitigation measures; the Town Center Plan update will also amend the Planned Action Ordinance to reflect changes to the plan, including updated development thresholds. As part of the legislative amendments, the City also intends to update the Economic Vitality Element of its Comprehensive Plan.

PROPONEENT

City of Mountlake Terrace

LOCATION OF PROPOSAL

The existing Town Center is roughly bounded by 228th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 244th Street SW on the south, and 58th Avenue W on the west. The amended Town Center would be roughly bounded by 230th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 237th Street SE on the south, and Interstate Highway 5 on the west.

LEAD AGENCY

City of Mountlake Terrace

EIS REQUIRED

The lead agency has determined this proposal is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c) and will be prepared. An environmental checklist can be reviewed at our offices and the City website: https://www.cityofmlt.com/1936/Economic-Vitality-Town-Center-Task-Force
The Town Center Update Supplemental EIS will supplement the Mountlake Terrace Town Center Planned Action and Zoning Regulations Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS), published in August 2007, and the Town Center Planned Action Final EIS Addendum, published in April 2013.

The lead agency has identified the following areas for discussion in the EIS: land use patterns and policies, aesthetics, public services (e.g., fire protection, parks, and schools), and transportation. Two alternatives will be reviewed: No Action (representing the plan as of the 2013 Addendum) and the Proposed Action, which would reflect the updated Town Center Plan and associated development regulations.

**SCOPING**

Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public are invited to comment on the scope of the EIS. You may comment on alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts, and licenses or other approvals that may be required. The method and deadline for giving us your comments is:

Send written comments by **5:00 pm on Friday, May 3, 2019** to:

Christy Osborn  
Community and Economic Development Director  
City of Mountlake Terrace  
6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043  
Ph: 425-744-6207  
cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us

Per WAC 197-11-408 and RCW 43.21C.440(3)(b), the City invites the public, agencies, and tribes to a community meeting to discuss the EIS scoping and potential planned action:

Monday, April 22: 6:00-7:00 pm  
Mountlake Terrace Interim City Hall Council Chambers  
6100 219th Street SW #220  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL**

Christy Osborn  
Community and Economic Development Director  
City of Mountlake Terrace  
6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043  
Ph: 425-744-6281  
cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us

April 10, 2019

Date  
Date of Publication: April 12, 2019

Signature  
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Mountlake Terrace Town Center Plan
Update & Planned Action

Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL
The proposal includes adoption of an update to the Town Center Plan originally adopted in 2007. Since adoption of the original Town Center Plan, the City has updated its Comprehensive Plan (2017) and adopted transportation and parks impact fees. The City also issued a SEPA addendum to the original Planned Action EIS in 2013 that evaluated changes to the Town Center boundary and growth capacity.

The Town Center Plan update will document current development trends and conditions, update the Town Center Plan vision, goals and policies, and amend the Town Center boundary. Associated code amendments would potentially allow increased building heights in portions of the study. A Planned Action designation was adopted for the Town Center pursuant to RCW 43.21C.440, which facilitates development when it meets the City’s Town Center Plan provisions and mitigation measures; the Town Center Plan update will also amend the Planned Action Ordinance to reflect changes to the plan, including updated development thresholds. As part of the legislative amendments, the City also intends to update the Economic Vitality Element of its Comprehensive Plan.

PROPOLENT
City of Mountlake Terrace

LOCATION OF PROPOSAL
The existing Town Center is roughly bounded by 228th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 244th Street SW on the south, and 58th Avenue W on the west. The amended Town Center would be roughly bounded by 230th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 237th Street SE on the south, and Interstate Highway 5 on the west.

LEAD AGENCY
City of Mountlake Terrace

EIS REQUIRED
The lead agency has determined this proposal is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c) and will be prepared. An environmental checklist can be reviewed at our offices and the City website: https://www.cityofmlt.com/1936/Economic-Vitality-Town-Center-Task-Force

The Town Center Update Supplemental EIS will supplement the Mountlake Terrace Town Center Planned Action and Zoning Regulations Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS), published in August 2007, and the Town Center Planned Action Final EIS Addendum, published in April 2013.
The lead agency has identified the following areas for discussion in the EIS: land use patterns and policies, aesthetics, public services (e.g., fire protection, parks, and schools), and transportation. Two alternatives will be reviewed: No Action (representing the plan as of the 2013 Addendum) and the Proposed Action, which would reflect the updated Town Center Plan and associated development regulations.

**SCOPING**
Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public are invited to comment on the scope of the EIS. You may comment on alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts, and licenses or other approvals that may be required. The method and deadline for giving us your comments is:
Send written comments by **5:00 pm on Thursday, May 9, 2019** to:

Christy Osborn  
Community and Economic Development Director  
City of Mountlake Terrace  
6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043  
Ph: 425-744-6207  
[cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us](mailto:cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us)

Per WAC 197-11-408 and RCW 43.21C.440(3)(b), the City invites the public, agencies, and tribes to community meetings to discuss the EIS scoping and potential planned action:

**Monday, April 22: 6:00-7:00 pm**
Mountlake Terrace Interim City Hall Council Chambers  
6100 219th Street SW #220  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

**Monday, May 6: 6:00-7:00 pm**
Mountlake Terrace Interim City Hall Council Chambers  
6100 219th Street SW #220  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL**

Christy Osborn  
Community and Economic Development Director  
City of Mountlake Terrace  
6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043  
Ph: 425-744-6281  
[cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us](mailto:cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us)

Date of Publication: April 25, 2019
Introduction

The City of Mountlake Terrace is proposing to update its Town Center subarea plan, originally adopted in 2007. Since adoption of the original Town Center Plan, the City has updated its Comprehensive Plan (2017) and adopted transportation and parks impact fees. The City also issued a SEPA addendum to the original Planned Action EIS in 2013 that evaluated changes to the Town Center boundary and growth capacity.

The Town Center Plan update will document current development trends and conditions, update the Town Center Plan vision, goals and policies, and amend the Town Center boundary. Associated code amendments would potentially allow increased building heights in portions of the study. A Planned Action designation was adopted for the Town Center pursuant to RCW 43.21C.440, which facilitates development when it meets the City’s Town Center Plan provisions and mitigation measures; the Town Center Plan update will also amend the Planned Action Ordinance to reflect changes to the plan, including updated development thresholds. As part of the legislative amendments, the City also intends to update the Economic Vitality Element of its comprehensive plan.

Alternatives

The City has developed two land use alternatives for analysis:
**No Action Alternative:** This alternative assumes growth consistent with the existing Town Center Plan and Planned Action, including associated development regulations, as reflected in the 2013 Planned Action Addendum. The inclusion of a No Action Alternative is required by SEPA. The No Action Alternative assumes no changes to the Town Center boundary and that the current Planned Action would continue to apply. The No Action Alternative would include 1,126 new dwelling units and 478,499 square feet of new commercial space (287,800 square feet of retail and 190,699 square feet of office). This would result in approximately 2,477 new residents and 1,495 new employees.

**Proposed Action:** The Proposed Action alternative would add approximately 3,000 new multifamily housing units and 625,000 new square feet of commercial space (215,000 square feet of retail and 410,000 square feet of office). This would result in approximately 6,600 new residents and 1,953 new jobs in the Town Center. The Proposed Action would increase allowed building heights in the Town Center, including a range of 4-12 stories, with the tallest buildings concentrated near the Transit Center.

The EIS alternatives test a range of growth projections and plan and development standards amendments. The City may choose to implement an alternative under study, a combination of alternatives, or another alternative in the range of alternatives studied in this Supplemental EIS.

**Planned Action**

The City designated the Town Center as a Planned Action in 2007, pursuant to SEPA (RCW 43.21c.440 and WAC 197-11-164 to 172). A planned action provides more detailed environmental analysis during an areawide planning stage rather than at the project permit review stage. Designating a planned action streamlines environmental review for development proposals consistent with Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) mitigation measures that are adopted in a planned action ordinance. Planned actions would be allowed if they meet or exceed proposed land use and environmental performance standards. This tool has been used elsewhere by local governments in Washington State. The Proposed Action Alternative would amend the existing Planned Action to include increased housing and employment growth thresholds and additional mitigation measures to address any impacts identified in the Supplemental EIS.

A diagram of the Planned Action process is included below.

**Planned Action Process**

- **Prepare & Issue Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**
- **Consider Adoption of Planned Action Ordinance defining allowed development & required mitigation**
- **Review Future Permits for Consistency with Planned Action Ordinance**
Planned Action Ordinance Structure

A draft of the proposed amendments to the Planned Action Ordinance (PAO) will be included in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and will include the following sections:

- **Recitals:** The recitals identify facts and procedures the City followed in developing the PAO.
- **Purpose.** The overall purposes are to streamline and expedite the land use permit review process in the PAO and ensure that environmental analysis, land use plans, development regulations, City codes and ordinances together with the mitigation measures in the Planned Action EIS mitigate environmental impacts.
- **Findings:** The findings indicate the PAO meets the criteria in SEPA Rules.
- **Procedures and Criteria for Evaluating and Determining Planned Action Projects within Planned Action Area:** This section establishes thresholds for growth, land use, and transportation. This section also establishes criteria by which the City would review planned action applications.
- **Monitoring and Review:** Establishes a review process to monitor the progress of the Planned Action.
- **Exhibit A:** Identifies the boundary of the Planned Action Area.
- **Exhibit B:** Identifies Planned Action EIS Mitigation Measures that apply to new development. Mitigation addresses topics such as land use, aesthetics, public services, and transportation.

Upcoming Public Meetings

Two community meetings will be held to collect comments on the Alternatives and the scope of the Supplemental EIS.

- **Monday April 22, 2019, at 6:00 pm** at Mountlake Terrace City Hall.
- **Monday May 6, 2019, at 6:00 pm** at Mountlake Terrace City Hall.

All members of the public and agencies are welcome to provide oral or written comments. Future meetings and public hearings will be announced on the City's website. Written comments may also be submitted during the scoping period from **April 12 – May 9, 2019**.

For More Information


Contact Person:
Christy Osborn
Community and Economic Development Director
City of Mountlake Terrace
6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
Ph: 425-744-6207
[cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us](mailto:cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us)
Hi Lisa,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the environmental analysis for the Mountlake Center Town Center. Regarding traffic, City of Shoreline staff are interested in having the following intersections studied for potential multi modal traffic impacts:

- 15th Ave NE/Ballinger Way
- 19th Ave NE/205th NE
- 19th Ave NE/Ballinger Way

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Rachael Markle
City of Shoreline
Director, Planning and Community Development
206-801-2531

Good Afternoon,

With respect to the email sent earlier this week, the comment period has been extended to May 9th, 2019. There are now two scoping meetings scheduled for April 22nd and May 6. Both meetings will begin at 6:00pm.

If you have any questions, or if I can be of assistance, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Lisa Plancich
Hi Lisa:

I am reaching out to you on behalf of T-Mobile.

T-Mobile currently has a Wireless Communication Facility ("WCF") site located within the affected area by your proposed changes. After reviewing the attached SEPA Checklist, I am concerned that the allowance for taller buildings will interference with T-Mobile’s WCF, which is located on a 60’ tall tower behind the Mountlake Terrace Police Department.

Do you have further details with regards the proposed allowable height?

Thank you,

Sophie Geguchadze
Technology Associates EC INC.
Project Manager | sophiko.geguchadze@taec.net | 717-412-8998
650 South Orcas Street #R-103 | Seattle | WA 98108

Christy Osborn
Director, Community and Economic Development
Appendix B: SEPA Checklist
Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use “not applicable” or “does not apply” only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of Checklist for Non-project Proposals:

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements—that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.
A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
   Town Center Plan Update and Planned Action including associated development and design code changes. The city also intends to update the Economic Vitality Element of its Comprehensive Plan.

2. Name of applicant:
   City of Mountlake Terrace

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
   Christy Osborn
   Community and Economic Development Director
   City of Mountlake Terrace Interim City Hall
   6100 219th Street SW, Suite 200
   Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
   Ph: 425-744-6281
   cosborn@ci.mlt.wa.us

4. Date checklist prepared:
   April 12, 2019

5. Agency requesting checklist:
   City of Mountlake Terrace

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
   Planned Action adoption Fall 2019
   Development to occur over time. Primary planning horizon is 2035.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
   The plan may be updated periodically with the City’s periodic Comprehensive Plan review or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the City.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
   Town Center Planned Action and Zoning Regulations Environmental Impact Statement, 2007

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.
   This is a non-project action, and the proposed actions are legislative in nature. Private permits may be under review within the Town Center study area.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
    Mountlake Terrace City Council approval.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)
    The proposal includes adoption of an update to the Town Center Plan originally adopted in 2007. Since adoption of the original Town Center Plan, the City has updated its Comprehensive Plan (2016) and adopted transportation and parks impact fees. The City also issued a SEPA addendum to the original Planned Action EIS in 2013 that evaluated changes to the Town Center boundary and growth capacity.
    The Town Center Plan update will document current development trends and conditions, update the Town Center Plan vision, goals and policies, and amend the Town Center boundary. Associated code amendments would potentially allow increased building heights in portions of the study. A Planned
Action designation was adopted for the Town Center pursuant to RCW 43.21C.440, which facilitates development when it meets the City’s Town Center Plan provisions and mitigation measures; the Town Center Plan update will also amend the Planned Action Ordinance to reflect changes to the plan, including updated development thresholds. The proposal also includes an amendment to the Economic Vitality Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The existing Town Center is roughly bounded by 228th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 244th Street SW on the south, and 58th Avenue W on the west. The amended Town Center would be roughly bounded by 230th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 237th Street SE on the south, and Interstate Highway 5 on the west. Areas outside the proposed revised Town Center boundary designated on the graphic below in red are included as a proposed reserve area.
B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

   a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other....

   b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?
      Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soils maps indicate limited areas of Indianola loamy
      sand at 15-30% slopes in the southwestern corner of the study area near the Mountlake Terrace
      Transit Center and Interstate 5 right-of-way. The rest of the study area primarily consists of
      Alderwood-Urban complex soils at 2-8% slopes.

   c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you
      know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term
      commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.
      Soils in the study area consist primarily of sandy loam soils and are not classified as prime farmland
      soils.

   d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.
      The City’s Critical Areas maps indicate the presence of steep slope areas greater than 40% along the
      western edge of the study area, along the Interstate 5 right-of-way, as well as limited areas of
      moderately steep slopes (15-40% underlain by sand, gravel, or till) in and near Veterans Memorial
      Park.

   e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling,
      excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.
      Not applicable to this non-project action. Future development would be required to prepare
      appropriate geotechnical and soils studies where required by the International Building Code. With
      future development, there would be fill and grade proposals, and limited existing vegetation may be
      removed. However, all development is subject to City building, grading, and erosion control
      regulations.

   f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
      See “e” above.

   g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for
      example, asphalt or buildings)?
      Most of the study area would establish a range of lot coverage limits from 70% to 90%.

   h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:
      - **Town Center Plan:** The adopted Town Center plan establishes the study area as the primary
        urban center for Mountlake Terrace and includes design standards that require provision of
        minimum levels of landscaping.
      - **City of Mountlake Terrace Critical Areas Regulations:** Chapter 16.15 of the Mountlake Terrace
        Municipal Code would apply to all development in the study area. The code specifies required
        setbacks and buffers from geologic hazard areas and establishes requirements for Erosion and
        Sediment Control Plans, drainage plans, and monitoring and mitigation plans for development in
        and near mapped geologic hazards.
      - **Building Code:** Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 15.05.040 adopts the International
2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Private development proposals are anticipated to follow the adoption of the Town Center Plan update. Construction activities could result in short-term emissions from equipment exhaust and fugitive dust. Short-term emissions could also result from construction traffic on hauling routes and locals streets, though all such construction projects would be subject to the City’s erosion control regulations.

The purpose of the Town Center Plan is to create a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented district focused around a regional light-rail transit station. This reduces the need for daily vehicle trips and creates opportunities for living and working in close proximity or commuting via transit, reducing vehicle miles traveled per person and greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

There are no known off-site emissions sources that would affect the proposal.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Air Quality was studied in the 2007 EIS for adoption of the original Town Center Plan. As described in the Mitigation section of the Air Quality chapter, development in the study area is subject to the requirements of applicable federal, regional, and state air quality regulations. Washington State Department of Ecology air quality regulations that apply to the proposal are found in Chapter 173-400 WAC.

Other relevant air quality plans and regulations include the following:

- The City adopted a Sustainability Strategy in 2008. It includes goals that encourage energy efficient mobility, green spaces, and desirable mixed-use development patterns in the Town Center and elsewhere in the City.¹
- The City has adopted the International Energy Conservation Code. (MTMC 15.05.160).
- The City has landscape standards (MTMC Chapter 19.130). Promoting urban forestry and in particular evergreens is helpful in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.²
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations for minimizing dust emissions (Regulation I, Section 9.15) and implementing best available measures to reduce odor-bearing air contaminants from stationary construction equipment (Regulation I, Section 9.11).
- PSCAA regulations for registration of permanent pollutant-emitting equipment and implementation of Best Available Control Technology to minimize emissions (Regulations I and II).
- Transportation roadway projects must be included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) prior beginning construction to demonstrate conformity with the Puget Sound region’s Air Quality Maintenance Plans and show they would not cause or

contribute to regional exceedances of the federal standards. The projects must also meet all transportation conformity requirements and demonstrate regional conformity.

As part of future project-specific NEPA documentation for individual new roadway improvement projects, the City would be required to conduct CO hot-spot modeling (as required under WAC 173-420) to demonstrate that the projects would not cause localized impacts related to increased CO emissions from vehicle tailpipes at congested intersections.

3. Water
   a. Surface:
      1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
         As described in the SEPA Checklist for the 2007 EIS, a seasonal stream is present in Veterans Park, located between I-5 and 58th Ave W. The Town Center Plan Update does not propose any development in the park, but the update would expand the Town Center to include the park and properties surrounding the park.
      2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
         The proposal is a non-project action; no specific construction activities are proposed. Future development on properties surrounding Veterans Park will be subject to City critical areas regulations, but development activity within stream is unlikely.
      3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.
         The proposal is a non-project action; no specific construction activities are proposed. Future development on properties surrounding Veterans Park will be subject to City critical areas regulations.
      4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
         See “3” above.
      5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year flood plain? If so, note location on the site plan.
         No
      6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.
         The proposal is a non-project action; no specific discharge is proposed to any surface water feature. The City’s stormwater conveyance system for the Town Center area discharges partially to McAleer Creek and partially to the King County stormwater drainage basin, and discharges from the system are regulated by the Washington State Department of Ecology. Mountlake Terrace’s stormwater system operates under a Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit.
   b. Ground:
      1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well? Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
         The proposal is a non-project action; no specific construction activities or groundwater withdrawals are proposed.
2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals...; agricultural; etc.).
Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.
No groundwater discharges are proposed.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.
The City maintains a Comprehensive Stormwater Plan and associated implementation program, and development proposals are reviewed for compliance with the requirements of Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 16.20. As described under 3.a.6 above, surface water runoff from the study area would drain primarily to McAleer Creek, which ultimately drains to Lake Washington. Runoff from the southeastern portion of the study area would drain to the King County wastewater system.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.
See 3.a.6 and 3.c.1 above.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.
The proposal is an extension of the original 2007 Town Center Plan, which designated the Town Center as the primary urban center for Mountlake Terrace. The proposal would increase the amount of development in the Town Center, potentially including an increase in impervious surface coverage. As described in “c.1” above, the City reviews development proposals for compliance with the requirements of the City’s stormwater regulations prior to permitting.

Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

City of Mountlake Terrace Stormwater Regulations: Chapter 16.20 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code establishes regulations for the conveyance and treatment of stormwater, including the preferred use of Low Impact Development (LID) practices to reduce stormwater volumes and associated environmental impacts.

4. Plants

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

X Deciduous tree: Alder, maple, aspen, other
X Evergreen tree: Fir, cedar, pine, other
X Shrubs
X Grass
— Pasture
— Crop or grain
— Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
— Wet soil plants: Cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
— Water plants: Water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
X Other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?
The proposal is a non-project action; no specific construction activities are proposed. Future development under the plan update would be consistent with development regulations, critical areas regulations, and clearing and grading permit conditions.
c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
   **No threatened or endangered species have been identified in the study area.**

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:
   The proposal is a non-project action; individual development projects under the plan update would be required to comply with the City’s landscaping standards, tree retention requirements, and critical areas regulations.

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.
   Invasive plant species documented in Mountlake Terrace include English Ivy, English Holly, English Laurel, and Himalayan Blackberry. The presence of these species has not been confirmed in the study area. The City’s Urban Forestry program provides informational resources to property owners on planting of native plant species and proper removal of invasive species.

5. Animals
   a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site. Examples include:
      X Birds: Hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
      X Mammals: Deer, bear, elk, **beaver, other:** (rabbits, squirrels, opossum, coyote, raccoons, rodents)
      _ Fish: Bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:
   b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
      **No threatened or endangered species have been identified in the study area.**
   c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
      Mountlake Terrace is within the Pacific Flyway migratory bird route, and migratory birds have been reported to stop in Mountlake Terrace.
   d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:
      The City’s critical areas regulations (Chapter 16.15 Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code) establish protections for streams, wetland, and wildlife habitat areas, including buffers and mitigation requirements.
   e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.
      **No invasive animal species are known to be in the study area.**

6. Energy and natural resources
   a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project’s energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.
      **Future development in the Town Center will continue to use energy (primarily electricity and natural gas) for heating, cooking, lighting, and business needs (refrigeration, powering machinery, light manufacturing).**
   b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.
      The proposal would increase allowed building heights in the Town Center, which could cause increased shading on adjacent properties. Effects of increased building heights will be analyzed and addressed in the Supplemental EIS.
   c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:
      **The Environment Element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, updated in 2017, contains the following policies related to energy conservation:**
Policy EN-1.2: Promote the use of environmentally-friendly building materials and techniques.

Policy EN-1.4: Promote clean air and energy conservation by selecting and operating City vehicles and equipment to maximize fuel efficiency.

Policy EN-1.5: Ensure that City facilities are designed and operated to conserve energy and other natural resources.

Policy EN-1.6: Encourage convenient alternatives to automobile travel within the City and region.


7. Environmental health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

The proposal is a non-project action. New development of specific parcels will be subject to City zoning for allowable uses and activities, and City codes for handling hazardous materials, as well as State and Federal hazardous materials regulations.

1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

The Department of Ecology has recorded four contamination cleanup sites within the study area – three gas stations and a dry cleaning facility. Ecology records for all four sites indicate no further cleanup actions are required. As described in “a” above, new development would be subject to City development regulations regarding hazardous substances and contamination prevention.

2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

See “a.1” above.

3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project’s development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

The proposal is a non-project action. New development of specific parcels will be subject to City zoning for allowable uses and activities, and City codes for handling hazardous materials as well as State and Federal hazardous materials regulations.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Increased intensity of land use in the study area that may occur following adoption of the plan and associated development regulations may increase the overall demand for police and fire services.

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

The State Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) sets standards for cleanup of lower levels of contaminants that are incorporated into new development and redevelopment parcels noted to be potentially contaminated. The City applies relevant standards regarding hazardous materials handling in the International Fire Code and the International Fuel Gas Code.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

Noise levels in the study are typical for a suburban or urban area, primarily associated with vehicular traffic and residential activities.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.
The proposal would increase short-term noise levels during construction activities. However, City regulations limit permissible noise levels between the hours of 10:00 pm and 7:00 am. In the long-term, increased development under the proposal would increase the overall level of human activity in the study area, which would likely generate increased vehicular traffic noise and human noise from public spaces.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:
   - The City regulates nuisance noise under Chapter 8.20 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code.
   - Pedestrian- and transit-oriented design principles are intended to encourage residents and visitors to use transportation modes other than driving alone, which can moderate the increase in vehicle traffic and associated noise.

8. Land and shoreline use
   The Supplemental EIS will compare and evaluate the proposed amount, types, scale, and pattern of uses in comparison with the existing land use pattern and adjacent development. The SEIS will also describe the overall aesthetic character of the study area in terms of the quality of the urban environment, the design and character of existing buildings, and building height, bulk, and scale. The SEIS evaluation will consider the nature and magnitude of change envisioned by the Town Center Plan update compared to the original 2007 plan. The visual character analysis will rely primarily on narrative description, photographs of existing conditions, a map identifying areas where height is likely to change in comparison to adopted regulations, and the renderings and materials developed for the plan update. The SEIS will analyze the consistency of the subarea plan with the Comprehensive Plan and regional plans.
   a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.
      See 8 above.
   b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or non-forest use?
      See 8 above.
   c. Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:
      See 8 above.
   d. Describe any structures on the site.
      See 8 above.
   e. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?
      See 8 above.
   f. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
      See 8 above.
   g. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
      See 8 above.
   h. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
      See 8 above.
   i. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.
      See 8 above.
i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
   See 8 above.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
   See 8 above.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
   See 8 above.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:
   See 8 above.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:
   See 8 above.

9. Housing
   The Supplemental EIS will describe the current housing and employment mix in the study area and compare the effects of the alternatives on population, employment, and land capacity.

   a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
      See 9 above.

   b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
      See 9 above.

   c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:
      See 9 above.

10. Aesthetics
    The Supplemental EIS will describe existing and proposed building forms in the study area and illustrate differences in building height and massing between the alternatives. The SEIS will also evaluate the potential impacts on community character, views, light and glare, and shading conditions as a result of the proposed changes to building height and form.

    a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?
       See 10 above.

    b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
       See 10 above.

    c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:
       See 10 above.

11. Light and glare
    See response to 10 above.

    a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?
       See 10 above.

    b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?
       See 10 above.

    c. What existing offsite sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
       See 10 above.
d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:
   See 10 above.

12. Recreation
   The Supplemental EIS will describe existing recreation services and facilities in the study area and evaluate potential impacts on demand for parks and recreation as a result of the alternatives.
   a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
      See 12 above.
   b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
      See 12 above.
   c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:
      See 12 above.

13. Historic and cultural preservation
   a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers? If so, specifically describe.
      The study area does not contain any properties known to be listed on national, state, or local historic registers.
   b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation. This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.
      No historic landmarks or culturally significant properties are known to exist in the study area. The study area contains approximately 36 properties confirmed by the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) to not be eligible for historic register listing.
   c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.
      ▪ Review of National Register of Historic Places maps
      ▪ Review of Washington Information System for Architectural & Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD)
      ▪ Review of prior SEPA environmental documentation for the study area (2007 Town Center EIS and environmental checklist).
   d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.
      Washington State law establishes requirements for the protection and proper excavation of archaeological sites (RCW 27.53, WAC 25-48), human remains (RCW 27.44), and historic cemeteries or graves (RCW 68.60). The Governor’s Executive Order 05-05 requires state agencies to integrate DAHP, the Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs, and concerned tribes into their capital project planning process. This executive order affects any capital construction projects and any land acquisitions for purposes of capital construction not undergoing Section 106 review under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.
      Under RCW 27.53, DAHP regulates the treatment of archaeological sites on both public and private lands and has the authority to require specific treatment of archaeological resources. All precontact resources or sites are protected, regardless of their significance or eligibility for local, state, or national
registers. Historic archaeological resources or sites are protected unless DAHP has made a determination of “not-eligible” for listing on the state and national registers.

14. Transportation

The Supplemental EIS will document existing transportation conditions within the study area, including automobile and freight traffic, pedestrian, bicycle, safety, and parking conditions. The transportation analysis will update the original EIS discussion of the existing transportation network, existing traffic operations, available transit service, and existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The analysis will also evaluate changes in trip generation resulting from the proposed Town Center Plan update and develop appropriate mitigation measures.

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.
   See 14 above.

b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?
   See 14 above.

c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or nonproject proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?
   See 14 above.

d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).
   See 14 above.

e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.
   See 14 above.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?
   See 14 above.

g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.
   See 14 above.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:
   See 14 above.

15. Public services

The Supplemental EIS will describe the City’s existing levels of service for fire protection, parks, and schools and evaluate potential for increased demand for services as a result of increased development under the proposal. The SEIS will also describe service and facility improvements implemented since the 2007 EIS and future planned improvements. Where service impacts are identified, the SEIS will describe appropriate mitigation measures.

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: Fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.
   See 15 above.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.
   See 15 above.
16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: **Electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system**, other.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

The utilities that would be primarily affected by future development under the proposal would be water and sanitary sewer. The City recently updated both its Comprehensive Sewer System Plan (2019) and Comprehensive Water System Plan (2018) based on projected adopted 2035 comprehensive plan population and employment targets. The water system plan anticipates a water supply surplus of 1,142 equivalent residential units (ERU’s) in 2035, and the sewer plan anticipates no major surcharging or other system deficiencies in the Town Center area.

The Planned Action Ordinance will include conditions and mitigation measures, such as:

- Require the evaluation of water and sewer system capacity at the time of site-specific development application to ensure that adequate system capacity is available before granting a development permit.
C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: _____________________________________________
Date Submitted ______April 12, 2019____________________ ___

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?
   See Section B.2

   Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: See Section B.2

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?
   See Sections B.4 and B.5

   Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are: See Sections B.4 and B.5

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?
   See Section B.6

   Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: See Section B.6

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, flood plains, or prime farmlands?
   See Section B.8

   Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are: See Section B.8

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?
   See Section B.8

   Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are: See Section B.8

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?
   See Section B.14

   Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are: See Section B.14

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.
   Future development would comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws including environmental regulations.
Appendix C: Draft Planned Action Ordinance
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF MOUNTLAKE TERRACE MODIFYING THE TOWN CENTER PLANNED ACTION AREA TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND TOWN CENTER SUBAREA PLAN, AND MAKING ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PLANNED ACTION DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS AND MITIGATION MEASURES PURSUANT TO THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 2616 AND CHAPTER 19.90 OF TITLE 19 OF THE MOUNTLAKE TERRACE MUNICIPAL CODE AND REPLACING THIS CHAPTER WITH A NEW CHAPTER 19.90 “TOWN CENTER PLANNED ACTION”

WHEREAS, the State Environmental Policy Act (“SEPA”) and implementing rules provide for the integration of environmental review with land use planning and project review through designation of “Planned Actions” by jurisdictions planning under the Growth Management Act (“GMA”); and

WHEREAS, the City has adopted a Comprehensive Plan complying with the GMA, and previously designated the Town Center as a planned action in 2007, and amended the planned action area boundaries and development thresholds in 2013, consistent with changes adopted in the Comprehensive Plan and Town Center subarea plan; and

WHEREAS, in 2019, the City adopted a revised subarea plan for the Town Center which contemplated revising the designated “Planned Action” for the Town Center; and

WHEREAS, designation of a Planned Action expedites the permitting process for subsequent, implementing projects whose impacts have been previously addressed in a Planned Action environmental impact statement (“EIS”), and thereby encourages desired growth and economic development; and

WHEREAS, the City issued a Final Supplemental EIS for the Town Center Subarea Plan Update in 2019, which builds on the previously issued EIS and EIS Addendum for the Town Center subarea, and identifies impacts and mitigation measures associated with planned development in the Town Center; and

WHEREAS, the City has adopted development regulations which will help protect the environment, and has adopted zoning regulations specific to the Town Center which will guide the location, form, and quality of desired development.
WHEREAS, as part of the public process, community meetings were held on April 22, 2019 at 6:00 pm and May 6, 2019 at 6:00 pm, following notice to the state agencies with jurisdiction and the affected federally recognized tribal governments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, after public notice as required, held a public hearing on the Town Center Planned Action Ordinance on August 5, 2019, at 7:00 pm, reviewed the public record, and made a recommendation to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, after public notice as required, held a public hearing on the Town Center Planned Action Ordinance on August 5, 2019, reviewed the Planning Commission’s recommendation and other items of public record, and found that the proposed ordinance meets the criteria of MTMC 19.110.240.C for a zoning code text amendment and is consistent with state law;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MOUNTLAKE TERRACE, WASHINGTON, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Chapter 19.90 of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code and Ordinance Number 2616 are hereby repealed and a new chapter 19.90, “Town Center Planned Action,” is hereby added to Title 19, which shall read as follows:

Chapter 19.90
TOWN CENTER PLANNED ACTION

Sections:
19.90.010 Purpose
19.90.020 Definitions
19.90.030 Procedures and criteria for evaluation and determining projects as planned actions
19.90.040 Monitoring and review

Purpose. The purpose of this chapter is to:

A. Combine analysis of environmental impacts with the City’s development of plans and regulations;

B. Designate the Mountlake Terrace Town Center as a Planned Action for purposes of environmental review of subsequent, implementing projects pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), RCW 43.21C.440;

C. Establish criteria and procedures, consistent with state law, that will determine whether subsequent projects qualify as Planned Actions;

D. Provide the public with information about Planned Actions and how the City will process implementing projects;

E. Streamline and expedite the land use review and approval process by relying on the environmental impact statement (EIS) and EIS Addendum completed for the planned action; and
F. Apply the City’s development regulations together with the mitigation measures described in the EIS and this ordinance to address the impacts of future development contemplated by the Planned Action.

19.90.020 Definitions

“Comprehensive Plan” means the Comprehensive Plan, as identified in MTMC18.10.010.

“SEPA Responsible Official” means the Planning and Community Development Director or his or her designee.

“Town Center Subarea Plan” means the Town Center Subarea Plan, as identified in MTMC 19.90.030.

“Traffic Engineer” means the City’s Traffic Engineer, as designated by the City’s Engineering Services Director or his/her designee.

19.90.030 Procedures and criteria for evaluating and determining projects as planned actions

A. Planned Action Area. The Planned Action designation shall apply to the approximately 98-acre Town Center subarea, which is generally bounded by 230th Street SW on the north, 55th Avenue W on the east, 237th Street SW on the south, and Interstate Highway 5 on the west, and that is specifically shown in Exhibit A, “Planned Action Area,” which is attached hereto and adopted by reference as though fully set forth herein and which shall be available from the department.

B. Environmental document. A Planned Action determination for a site-specific implementing project application shall be based on the environmental analysis contained in the Town Center Planned Action Supplemental EIS issued by the City on July 19, 2019, the EIS Addendum published on April 10, 2013, and the Final Town Center Planned Action EIS published on August 10, 2007. The mitigation measures contained in Exhibit B, which are attached hereto and adopted by reference as though fully set forth herein and which shall be available from the department, are based upon the findings of the Town Center EIS, the EIS Addendum, and the Town Center Plan Update Supplemental EIS, and shall, along with adopted City regulations, provide the framework that the City will use to review and to impose appropriate conditions on qualifying Planned Action projects.

C. Planned Action designated. Land uses and activities described in the Town Center Plan Update Supplemental EIS, subject to the thresholds described in subsection D of this section and the mitigation measures contained in Exhibit B, are designated Planned Actions or Planned Action Projects pursuant to RCW 43.21C.440 and WAC 197-11-172. A development application for a site-specific Planned Action project
located within the Town Center Planned Action area shall be designated a Planned Action if it meets the criteria set forth in subsection D of this section and applicable laws, codes, development regulations and standards of the City.

D. Planned Action qualifications. The following thresholds shall be used to determine if a site-specific development proposed within the Town Center Planned Action area is contemplated by the Planned Action and has had its environmental impacts evaluated in the Town Center Plan Update Supplemental EIS, the Planned Action EIS and/or the EIS Addendum:

(1) Land Use. The following primary land uses and levels of development described in the Town Center Plan Update Supplemental EIS, along with conditional and accessory uses permitted in the Community Business Downtown District, are considered Planned Actions:
   (a) Commercial services;
   (b) Commercial retail;
   (c) Medical/health care, excluding hospitals and ambulance services;
   (d) Recreation/entertainment/cultural, excluding parks and plazas that are not part of an approved site plan for a permitted or conditional use;
   (e) Eating/drinking establishments;
   (f) Transportation facilities, limited to bus shelters;
   (g) Residential, including: motels/hotels, live-work units, attached single family, and multi-family units;
   (j) Manufacture, processing or assembly of items that are sold from or displayed in a show/sales room directly fronting the street;

(2) Development Thresholds.
   (a) The following amount of various land uses are contemplated by the Planned Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Development Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial:</td>
<td>625,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Office &amp; Services</td>
<td>410,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retail</td>
<td>215,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3,000 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (b) If future development proposals in the Town Center Planned Action area exceed the development thresholds specified in this chapter, further environmental review may be required pursuant to WAC 197-11-172. Further, if proposed development would alter the assumptions and analysis in the Town Center Plan Update Supplemental EIS, further environmental review may be required. Provided, that shifting the total build out between categories of uses may be permitted so long as the total build-out does not exceed the aggregate amount of development, trip generation and parking thresholds reviewed in the Supplemental EIS, and so long as the impacts of that development have
been identified in the Town Center Plan EIS, EIS Addendum or Supplemental EIS and are mitigated consistent with Exhibit B.

(3) **Building Heights.** Building heights shall be as identified in the applicable Town Center zoning designation(s).

(4) **Transportation.**
   (a) The maximum net new PM peak hour weekday vehicle trips analyzed in the Town Center Plan Update Supplemental EIS was 930.

**Vehicle Trips Generated by Proposed Action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Town Center Planned Action Trip Generation</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Vehicle Trips Generated by Proposed Action</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action Trip Generation</td>
<td>3,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(b) **Trip Threshold.** Uses or activities that would exceed the maximum trip levels shown above would not qualify as Planned Actions and would require additional environmental review.

(c) **City Engineer Discretion.** The City Engineer or his/her designee shall have discretion to determine incremental and total trip generation, consistent with the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (latest edition) or an alternative manual accepted by the City Engineer at his sole discretion, for each project permit application proposed under this Planned Action.

(d) **Traffic Impact Mitigation.** All Planned Action projects shall pay, as a condition of approval, their proportionate share of Town Center street and other transportation improvements that have been determined to be necessary to support planned development within the Town Center. Impact fees applicable to each Planned Action project are identified in the schedule, and will be determined according to the methodology contained in the ordinance adopting such impact fees. The City may adjust such fees from time to time.

(5) **Elements of the Environment and Degree of Impacts.** A proposed project that would result in a significant change in the type or degree of impacts to any of the elements of the environment analyzed in the Town Center Plan Planned Action EIS, EIS Addendum and/or Supplemental EIS, would not qualify as a Planned Action.

(6) **Changed Conditions.** Should environmental conditions change significantly from those analyzed in the Planned Action EIS and EIS Addendum, the City’s SEPA
Responsible Official may determine that the Planned Action designation is no longer applicable until supplemental environmental review is conducted.

(7) **Additional Mitigation Fees.** The City may adopt and apply such other fees as may be deemed necessary and appropriate to mitigate impacts to other capital facilities in the Town Center and to accommodate planned growth. Such fees, if adopted, shall be in addition to the fee required in item (4)(d) of this subsection, and shall apply only to required improvements that are not addressed in this subsection.

E. **Planned Action review criteria.**

(1) The City’s SEPA Responsible Official may designate as “planned actions”, pursuant to RCW 43.21C.030, applications that meet all of the following conditions:

(a) the proposal is located within the planned action area identified in Exhibit A, pursuant to subsection A of this section;
(b) the proposed uses and activities are consistent with those described in the Planned Action EIS and EIS Addendum, and subsection D of this section;
(c) the proposal is within the Planned Action thresholds and other criteria of subsection D of this section of this ordinance;
(d) the proposal is consistent with the City of Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan and the Town Center Subarea Plan;
(e) the proposal’s significant adverse environmental impacts have been identified in the Planned Action EIS, EIS Addendum and/or Supplemental EIS;
(f) the proposal’s significant impacts of the proposal have been mitigated by application of the measures identified in Exhibits B and C, and other applicable city regulations, together with any modifications or variances or special permits that may be required;
(g) the proposal complies with all applicable local, state and/or federal laws and regulations, and the Responsible Official determines that these constitute adequate mitigation; and
(h) the proposal is not an essential public facility as defined by RCW 36.70A.200, unless the essential public facility is part of or accessory to a residential, office, school, commercial, recreational, service or industrial development that is designated as a planned action.

(2) The City shall base its decision on designation on review of a SEPA checklist, or an alternative form developed consistent with applicable provisions of RCW 43.21C, and review of the application and supporting documentation.

(3) A proposal that meets the criteria of this section shall be considered to qualify and be designated as a planned action, consistent with the requirements or RCW 43.21C.440, WAC 197-11-164 et seq, and this ordinance.
F. Effect of Planned Action

(1) Designation as a planned action project means that a qualifying proposal has been reviewed in accordance with this ordinance and found to be consistent with its development parameters and thresholds, and with the environmental analysis contained in the Planned Action EIS, EIS Addendum and Supplemental EIS.

(2) Upon determination by the City’s SEPA Responsible Official that the proposal meets the criteria of Section 3.D and qualifies as a planned action, the proposal shall not require a SEPA threshold determination, preparation of an EIS, or be subject to further review pursuant to SEPA.

G. Planned Action permit process. Applications for planned actions shall be reviewed pursuant to the following process.

(1) Development applications shall meet the applicable requirements of Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code (MTMC) Titles 12 through 19. Applications for planned actions shall be made on forms provided by the City and shall include a SEPA checklist, or a Planned Action SEPA checklist.

(2) The City’s Planning and Community Development Director shall determine whether the application is complete as provided in MTMC 19.110.030.

(3) If the application is for a project within the Planned Action Area defined in Exhibit A, the application will be reviewed to determine if it is consistent with the criteria of this ordinance and thereby qualifies as a Planned Action project. The SEPA Responsible Official shall notify the applicant of his/her decision. If the project is determined to qualify as a Planned Action, it shall proceed in accordance with the applicable permit review procedures specified in MTMC 19.110.090, except that no SEPA threshold determination, EIS or additional SEPA review shall be required. The decision of the SEPA Responsible Official regarding qualification as a Planned Action shall be final.

(4) Public notice and review for projects that qualify as Planned Actions shall be provided pursuant to RCW 43.21C.440(3)(b) and MTMC 19.110.080 and 19.110.090.

(5) Development Agreement. To provide additional certainty, the City or an applicant may request consideration and execution of a development agreement for a qualifying Planned Action project. The development agreement may address review procedures applicable to a planned action project, permitted uses, mitigation measures, payment of impact fees, design standards, phasing, vesting of development rights, and any other topic that may properly be considered in a development agreement consistent with RCW 36.70B.170 et seq.
(6) If a project is determined to not qualify as a Planned Action, the SEPA Responsible Official shall so notify the applicant and prescribe a SEPA review procedure consistent with the City’s SEPA regulations and the requirements of state law. The notice shall describe the elements of the application that result in failure to qualify as a Planned Action.

(7) Projects that fail to qualify as Planned Actions may incorporate or otherwise use relevant elements of the Town Center Plan Update Supplemental EIS, as well as other relevant SEPA documents, to meet their SEPA requirements. The SEPA Responsible Official may limit the scope of SEPA review for the non-qualifying project to those issues and environmental impacts not previously addressed in the EIS, EIS Addendum and Supplemental EIS prepared for the Town Center Plan and Planned Action.

19.90.040 Monitoring and review

A. The City shall monitor the progress of development in the designated Planned Action area to ensure that it is consistent with the assumptions of this ordinance and the Planned Action EIS and EIS Addendum regarding the type and amount of development and associated impacts, and with the mitigation measures and improvements planned for the Town Center.

B. This Planned Action chapter and its underlying ordinance shall be reviewed no later than December 1, 2024 by the SEPA Responsible Official to determine the continuing relevance of its assumptions and findings with respect to environmental conditions in the Planned Action area, the impacts of development, and required mitigation measures. Based upon this review, the City may propose amendments to this ordinance and/or may supplement or revise the Town Center Supplemental EIS.

Section 2. Conflict. In the event of a conflict between this Ordinance or any mitigation measure imposed thereto, and any ordinance or regulation of the City, the provisions of this Ordinance shall control.

Section 3. Severability. Should any term or provision of this ordinance be found to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other term or provision of this Ordinance.

Section 4. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect five days after its adoption and publication as required by law.

Section 5. Expiration. This Ordinance shall expire ten (10) years from the date of adoption unless it is extended by the City Council following a report from the SEPA Responsible Official and a public hearing.
Section 6. Publication. This Ordinance or a summary thereof consisting of the title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City.

PASSED by the City Council of the City of Mountlake Terrace this _____ day of ___________ and signed into authentication of its passage this _____ day of ___________.

__________________________
MAYOR KYOKO MATSUMOTO WRIGHT

ATTEST: __________________________
CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM: Gregory G. Schrag, City Attorney
EXHIBIT A
PLANNED ACTION AREA

[Map to be provided before adoption]
EXHIBIT B
TOWN CENTER PLAN UPDATE
PLANNED ACTION MITIGATION MEASURES

The Planned Action EIS has identified significant beneficial and adverse impacts that are anticipated to occur with the future development of the Planned Action Area, together with a number of possible measures to mitigate those significant adverse impacts. Please see Final EIS Chapter 1 Summary for a description of impacts, mitigation measures, and significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

A Mitigation Document is provided in this Exhibit B to establish specific mitigation measures based upon significant adverse impacts identified in the Planned Action EIS. The mitigation measures in this Exhibit B shall apply to Planned Action Project applications that are consistent with the Proposed Action Alternative reviewed in the Planned Action EIS and which are located within the Planned Action Area (see Exhibit A). These mitigation measures are in addition to the application of City development regulations and requirements of City, state, and federal agencies.

Where a mitigation measure includes the words “shall” or “will,” inclusion of that measure in Planned Action Project application plans is mandatory in order to qualify as a Planned Action Project. Where “should” or “would” appear, the mitigation measure may be considered by the project applicant as a source of additional mitigation, as feasible or necessary, to ensure that a project qualifies as a Planned Action Project. Unless stated specifically otherwise, the mitigation measures that require preparation of plans, conduct of studies, construction of improvements, conduct of maintenance activities, etc., are the responsibility of the applicant or designee to fund and/or perform.

Any and all references to decisions to be made or actions to be taken by the City’s SEPA Responsible Official may also be performed by the City’s SEPA Responsible Official’s authorized designee.

Air Quality
Short Term
Construction activities related to development approved under the Planned Action could generate fugitive dust, which would be subject to Puget Sound Clean Air Authority (PSCAA) Regulation I. Applicants shall follow best management practices (BMPs) to control fugitive dust. These include, but are not limited to:

- Use water sprays or other non-toxic dust control methods on unpaved roadways.
- Minimize vehicle speed while traveling on unpaved surfaces.
- Prevent track out of mud onto public streets.
Cover soil piles when practical.

Minimize work during periods of high winds when practical.

Burning of slash or demolition debris shall not be permitted without express approval from PSCAA. No slash burning is anticipated for any construction projects in the City.

Mobile construction equipment and portable stationary engines would emit air pollutants including NOx, CO, and diesel particulate matter. These emissions would be temporary and localized. It is highly unlikely that the temporary emissions would cause ambient concentrations at adjoining parcels to approach the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) limits. However, applicants shall use the following measures to minimize air quality and odor issues caused by tailpipe emissions:

- Maintain the engines of construction equipment according to manufacturers’ specifications.
- Minimize idling of equipment while the equipment is not in use.

**Long Term**

Where applicable, all project-specific SEPA and NEPA documentation for individual new roadway improvement projects, are required to conduct CO hot spot modeling (as required under WAC 173-420) to demonstrate that the projects would not cause localized impacts related to increased CO emissions from vehicle tailpipes at congested intersections.

All stationary emission sources associated with new commercial facilities shall be required to register with PSCAA (Regulation I and Regulation II).

**Land Use Patterns and Policies**

No mitigation measures beyond compliance with Comprehensive Plan, Town Center Plan, and Zoning Code.

**Aesthetics**

No mitigation measures beyond compliance with Comprehensive Plan, Town Center Plan, Zoning Code, and development regulations.

**Public Services**

The City will construct a plaza in the Town Center of approximately 20,000 square feet. This is needed in part to provide a gathering space for the entire community an in part to meet recreational needs of additional residents and workers in the Planned Action area, thereby reducing impacts on existing parks. Park impact fees for the plaza, pursuant to Chapter 18.35 MTMC, shall be collected. Development of the plaza may be funded through a combination of grants, city funds, impact fees, and developer contributions.

All Planned Action Project Applications shall be distributed for comment by the City to the South Snohomish County Fire & Rescue Fire Marshall. Project applications shall be
conditioned to meet Fire Marshall recommendations and any associated mitigation agreements. Conditions may include, but are not limited to:

- Mandatory installation of fire sprinklers, water system improvements, or building access requirements that would provide improved access for emergency vehicles.
- Design of frontage streetscape improvements to avoid impeding emergency vehicle access
- Mitigation agreement addressing potential staffing and equipment needs at nearby fire stations.

**Transportation**
Consistent with 19.90.030 (D)(4) Planned Action Project Applications shall pay a fair share mitigation fee for capital improvements not otherwise addressed by the City’s transportation impact fee based on the share of PM peak hour trips generated and distributed to the following intersections:

- 230th Street SW / 56th Avenue W
- 234th Street SW / 56th Avenue W

**Utilities**

- **Water:** The City may require Planned Action Project Applications to extend, replace, upgrade, or relocate of water mains to serve proposals to meet adopted standards of service.
- **Sewer:** The City will prepare plans for use of its remaining sewer treatment capacity, as per the agreement with the City of Edmonds, when the 85% utilization rate is reached.
- **Power and Natural Gas:** Mitigation requirements for power and natural gas services will be determined by service providers in consultation with the City on a case-by-case basis as the Planned Action is implemented.
- **Telecommunications** All Planned Action Project Applications shall be distributed for comment by the City to the provider of telecommunication facilities that have existing wireless communication facilities in the Planned Action Area in Exhibit A. The City may condition Planned Action Project Applications that exceed XX stories to provide for continuous telecommunication service, such as through relays or pole relocation.
Appendix D: Planning Commission Recommended Zoning and Design Standards
Chapter 19.50 – TOWN CENTER ZONES
Planning Commission Recommended - July 16, 2019

The provisions herein are intended to entirely replace existing Chapter 19.50 provisions.
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19.50.010 Purpose.
The purpose of this chapter is to help implement the vision for the Town Center as provided in the adopted Town Center Subarea Plan. The vision statement recognizes the Town Center as the heart of the City and contains a blend of attractive transit-oriented mix of uses connected to the light rail transit station, civic campus, and surrounding neighborhoods. Town Center zones allow for a mixture of building types and retail, office, residential, entertainment, and civic uses. The zoning provisions also provide for attractive pedestrian-friendly streetscapes and open spaces to implement the goals and policies of the Town Center Subarea Plan.

19.50.020 Purpose of Town Center zoning districts.

A. Town Center 1 (TC-1). This zone is intended to emphasize transit-oriented employment development in those Town Center areas closest to the planned light rail station. Professional office is the primary envisioned use followed by multifamily and supportive and complementary retail commercial uses. Six to 12-story buildings are envisioned throughout the district.

B. Town Center 2 (TC-2). This zone is intended to function as the center for retail, cultural, dining and entertainment activity in Mountlake Terrace. Multifamily uses are envisioned to be the primary use on upper floors. Four to eight-story buildings are envisioned throughout the district.

C. Town Center 3 (TC-3). This zone is intended to emphasize multifamily residential uses and serve as buffer areas adjacent to the Town Center. Professional office and small-scale commercial/retail uses are envisioned as a secondary use. Four to six-story buildings are envisioned throughout the district.

D. Town Center-Reserve (TC-R). This zone, while outside the official Town Center boundary, is intended to allow for a smaller scale mixture of multifamily, retail commercial, and professional office uses primarily centered on 56th Avenue W north and south of the Town Center. Two to four-story buildings are envisioned throughout the district.

19.50.030 Interpretation of Town Center land use table.
The use tables in this chapter determine whether a use is allowed in the Town Center zones. The zoning district is represented in the vertical column and the specific use is represented in the horizontal row.

A. Permitted use (P).
Where the letter “P” appears in the box at the intersection of the column and the row, the use is allowed in that district subject to applicable conditions or other standards (if any) listed in the “conditions/reference” column to the right and the review procedures specified in MTMC Title 18, Land Use Planning and Development, and the general requirements of the code.

B. Conditional use (C).
Where the letter “C” appears in the box at the intersection of the column and the row, the use is allowed subject to applicable conditions or other standards (if any) listed in the “conditions/reference” column to the right and to the conditional use review procedures specified in MTMC Title 18, Land Use Planning and Development, and the general requirements of the code.

C. Use not permitted ( ).
Where no symbol appears in the box at the intersection of the column and the row, the use is not allowed in that district, except for certain temporary uses.
D. For uses containing a superscript number (X), refer to the applicable condition in the “conditions/reference” column to the right.

E. For unlisted uses, see the provisions of MTMC 19.20.050.

F. Additional requirements pursuant to this code, including but not exclusive to specific zoning districts, must apply. Such requirements must govern a use, whether or not such requirements are cross-referenced in this section.

19.50.040 Uses permitted in Town Center zones.

Table 19.50.040 below provides the list of permitted uses in Town Center zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>TC-1</th>
<th>TC-2</th>
<th>TC-3</th>
<th>TC-R</th>
<th>Additional Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Residential uses are not allowed on the ground floor facing a designated Storefront or Storefront Corner block frontage (see MTMC 19.123.060). Exceptions: (1) Live-work units (provided they meet applicable block frontage standards in MTMC 19.123.080-090); and (2) Lobbies for permitted multi-household residential uses, which are allowed on designed Storefront block frontages (provided the units meet the standards in MTMC 19.123.080).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached single-household dwellings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Use must be legally established prior to December 30, 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1. Use must be legally established prior to (INSERT ADOPTION DATE OF THIS ORDINANCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-household residential</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-work unit</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Use not allowed on 57th Avenue W and 233rd street SW ground-level blockfrontages where designated as a Storefront in MTMC 19.123.060. Such units must be integrated into a permitted residential use type; Permitted commercial uses are those allowed in the applicable district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group homes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted living facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1. Use must be legally established prior to June 30, 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **COMMERCIAL**                           |     |     |     |     |                                                                                     |
| Commercial uses are also subject to MTMC 19.50.110, Special regulations |
| Commercial retail                        | P    | P    | P    | P    |                                                                                     |
| Day care, adult                          | P    | P    | P    | C    | Use not allowed on ground-level blockfrontages or corners designated as Storefront in MTMC 19.123.060. |
| Day care centers                         | P    | P    | P    | C    | Use not allowed on ground-level blockfrontages or corners designated as Storefront in MTMC 19.123.060. |
| Eating/drinking establishments           | P    | P    | P    | P    |                                                                                     |
### Table 19.50.040
Uses permitted in Town Center zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>TC-1</th>
<th>TC-2</th>
<th>TC-3</th>
<th>TC-R</th>
<th>Additional Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment, commercial indoor</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial institutions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Use not allowed on 57th Avenue W and 233rd street SW ground-level block-frontages where designated as a Storefront in MTMC 19.123.060.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/exercise club with &lt;10,000sf gross floor area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General service – excluding vehicle services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Use not allowed on 57th Avenue W ground-level block-frontage where designated as a Storefront in MTMC 19.123.060.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/motels</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/health care, excluding hospitals and ambulance services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Use not allowed on ground-level block-frontages or corners designated as Storefront in MTMC 19.123.060.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal service</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional office</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Use not allowed on ground-level block-frontages or corners designated as Storefront in MTMC 19.123.060.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDUSTRIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan manufacturing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC, INSTITUTIONAL &amp; MISCELLANEOUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utility facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Subject to MTMC 19.50.110, Special regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSORY USES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools/hot tubs</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19.50.050 Dimensional standards for Town Center zones.

A. **Purpose.** To promote forms of development that reinforce and/or enhance the desired character of the Town Center zones.

B. **Key to the dimensional standards tables.**

1. The dimensional standards tables address the form and intensity of development specific to individual Town Center zones. The zone is located on the vertical columns and the form/intensity topic being addressed is located on the horizontal rows.

2. Where an MTMC reference appears after the dimensional measure, then the use or development is subject to standards in that section or chapter.

3. For standards containing an asterisk (*), refer to the code reference in the right column next to the asterisk.

C. **Dimensional standards table.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensional Standard</th>
<th>TC-1</th>
<th>TC-2</th>
<th>TC-3</th>
<th>TC-R</th>
<th>Additional Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING MASSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum building height (stories)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buildings may go up to the maximum height in feet provided they do not exceed the specified maximum number of stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum building height (stories)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum building height (feet)</td>
<td>150*</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>^An extra 10-feet in height may be allowed via Departure (MTTC 19.110.260) to provide extra floor to ceiling height for ground floor and/or penthouse floor(s) provided the design helps the building meet the goals and policies of the Town Center Subarea Plan and purposes of the site and building design provisions of MTTC Chapter 19.123 (Articles 3-4) while minimizing compatibility impacts to surrounding buildings and uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum floor area ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Building floor area and lot coverage is intended to be determined by a combination of height limits, site and building design standards (see MTMC Chapter 19.123, Articles 3 &amp; 4), real-estate market conditions, developer preference, and other applicable MTMC requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot coverage by structures (maximum)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOT DIMENSIONS (minimum)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>New lots must be sized to accommodate permitted uses and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width at building setback line</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width at street</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean lot depth</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19.50.050
Dimensional standards for Town Center zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensional Standard</th>
<th>TC-1</th>
<th>TC-2</th>
<th>TC-3</th>
<th>TC-R</th>
<th>Additional Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SETBACKS (minimum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* See MTMC Chapter 19.123 Article 2 for applicable setback/block-frontage standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard setback</td>
<td>0-15*</td>
<td>0-15*</td>
<td>0-15*</td>
<td>0-15*</td>
<td>* See MTMC 19.123.180 for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard setback</td>
<td>0-15*</td>
<td>0-15*</td>
<td>0-15*</td>
<td>0-15*</td>
<td>* See MTMC 19.123.180 for details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19.50.060 Driveway standards.
To provide maximum opportunities for street parking and to provide safe and effective ingress/egress to properties, driveways in the TC-1, TC-2, TC-3 and TC-R districts are subject to the following standards:

A. Maximum width. Driveways are limited to maximum widths, as measured at the “throat.”
   a. Two-way driveway: 24 feet.
   b. One-way driveway: 12 feet.

B. Maximum curb cuts. Each property is allowed one curb cut per parcel frontage or one cut per 240 feet, except that the City Engineer may approve additional curb cuts per frontage to facilitate one-way driveways if he or she finds that:
   a. A one-way traffic circulation is better suited to provide an efficient circulation pattern, both for on-site circulation and within the abutting street.
   b. There will be no diminishment of street parking as a result of the additional curb cuts.

19.50.070 Sidewalks and on-street parking standards.

A. A public sidewalk conforming to City standards for sidewalks along the abutting street must be provided between the on-street frontage parking and the on-site development consistent with the streetscape standards set forth in MTMC 19.50.080. The sidewalk must be designed as a continuation of, and an extension to, the existing or planned network of street sidewalks for the area and must accommodate all planned improvements for and along sidewalks, e.g., benches, lighting, landscaping. A public pedestrian and sidewalk improvement easement must be provided in a form acceptable to the City.

B. Cantilevered upper floors. Where applicable sidewalk improvements extend beyond the existing right-of-way, upper floors of the abutting structure may cantilever over the required sidewalk area up to the right-of-way edge as set forth in MTMC 19.50.080, provided all the following standards are met:
   1. The cantilevered portion is fully on site.
   2. At least 13-feet of clearance is provided beneath the cantilever.
   3. The cantilever is at least ten-feet from the center of any trees within the sidewalk/planting area.
4. The cantilever is at least three-feet from any light pole and its associated fixture.

C. On-street parking.

1. To enhance the appearance and function of street parking, on-street parking must be provided in accordance with the streetscape standards in MTMC 19.50.080 (unless otherwise directed by a City-adopted plan).

2. On-street parking located directly in front of a site must be counted toward on-site parking requirements.

19.50.080 Town Center streetscape classifications and standards - New, extended, and improved streets and access corridors.

Figure 19.50.080 below illustrates the configuration of four planned streetscape classifications for planned new, extended, and improved streets and access corridors in the Town Center. Subsections (A-D) below provide the standards for each streetscape type.
A. **Pedestrian Core Streets.** Pedestrian Core Streets are intended to function as the Town Center’s primary pedestrian, retail and arts/cultural streets. This designation includes the planned extension of 57th Avenue W between 232nd Street SW to 236th Street SW and the planned 233rd Street SW between 56th and 58th Avenues. It is recognized that these streets will be extended in multiple phases. Figure 19.50.080 below illustrates the required streetscape cross-section.

Figure 19.50.080(A) illustrates cross-section standard options for Pedestrian Core Streets.

**Figure 19.50.080(A)**

Cross-section for Pedestrian Core Streets.
B. **Town Center Streets.** This includes most other streets within the Town Center. These streets are intended to function as pedestrian-friendly streets. This includes a combination of existing streets to be improved and the planned extension of 231st Street SW, between 57th and 60th Avenues W.

Figure 19.50.080(B) illustrates the cross-section standard for Town Center Streets, depending on the chosen block-frontage design (see Article 2 of Chapter 19.123), unless otherwise directed by an adopted streetscape plan.

**Figure 19.50.080(B)(1)**

Cross-section of streetscape standards for Town Center Streets when featuring a Storefront block-frontage design.

**Figure 19.50.080(B)(2)**

Cross-section of streetscape standards for Town Center Streets when featuring a Landscaped block-frontage design.
C. **Planned Shared-Access-Corridors.** The Town Center Subarea Plan calls for several mid-block “Access-Corridors” intended to primarily enhance pedestrian circulation in the area, while also providing an option for vehicular access to on-site parking, functioning as a design amenity to new development, and breaking up the massing of buildings on long blocks. Specific alignments for the access-corridors will be developed during the development review process for applicable sites. If an applicant owns a lot containing a proposed access-corridor within it or along the edge of the property, the applicant must provide such mid-block connection in conjunction with their project development as a public access easement.

1. Shared-Access-Corridors are intended to provide shared access for pedestrians and vehicles (from driveways to internal parking facilities). Minimum standards:
   a. 40-foot minimum public access easement.
   b. 20-foot wide shared lane featuring concrete, unit paving, or other similar decorative and durable surface material. Asphalt is prohibited.
   c. Ten-foot minimum landscaping strips [with Type II – Ornamental Landscaping per MTMC 19.130.240(B)] on each side of the shared-lane. Curbs and/or raised planter walls may be included in the required landscaping area.

Figure 19.50.080(C)(1)(a) illustrates the cross-section for minimum standards for Shared-Access-Corridors.

![Cross-section of minimum standards for Shared-Access-Corridors](image)

Figure 19.50.080(C)(1)(b) illustrates standards for scenarios where a Shared-Access-Corridor is located on the edge of a site, where its development likely will be phased in as the adjacent properties redevelop.
Figure 19.50.080(C)(1)(b)
Cross-section of minimum standards for Shared-Access-Corridors – when developed along the edge of development site.

The top image illustrates a scenario where a new development includes a required access-corridor on the edge of the development site abutting an existing development. In this scenario, a minimum 20-foot easement must be required and include a shared lane. The shared-lane must be designed to allow a future connection to the adjacent site.

The bottom image illustrates a second phase where the adjacent property is redeveloped. An additional 20-foot easement will be required plus a connection must be added (where necessary to provide access for on-site parking), but the remaining area must be landscaped with Type II – Ornamental Landscaping [see MTMC 19.130.240(B)].
2. Pedestrian Access Corridor. If and when vehicular access to the site is provided elsewhere on the site, a pedestrian-access corridor may be utilized, subject to the following standards:
   a. 30-foot minimum public access easement.
   b. Eight-foot minimum walking path.
   c. Eleven-foot minimum landscaping strips [with Type II – Ornamental Landscaping per MTMC 19.130.240(B)] on each side of the walking path. Raised planter walls may be included in the required landscaping area.
   d. Where such pedestrian access corridor is integrated along the edge of a development, a minimum easement of 15-feet is required for the subject walking path and landscaping. Adjustments to the walking path and landscaping widths and configurations are allowed provided the design effectively balances the following objectives:
      (1) Create a safe and welcoming pedestrian route.
      (2) Provides an effective transition between the walking path and adjacent uses (e.g., enhances privacy to any adjacent ground-level residential units).
      (3) Functions as a design amenity to the development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 19.50.080(C)(2)(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-section of minimum standards for a Pedestrian Access Corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Adjustments to the access corridor standards in subsections (1-2) above may be approved by the City as a DEPARTURE provided the design:
   a. Retains the minimum easement width standards as specified in subsections (1-2) above.
   b. The corridor design mitigates any potential negative privacy impacts to adjacent residential units within the development.
   c. The corridor design creates an attractive and welcoming pedestrian connection.
   d. For the first phase of a corridor along an internal property line, the corridor is designed to accommodate future connection(s) to adjacent properties.

4. Building elevations abutting an access-corridor are subject to the frontage standards set forth in MTMC 19.123.130.
5. Buildings must not cantilever or project into minimum required easement areas.

19.50.090 Off-street parking standards. (New – completely updated from 19.50.070)
The provisions herein supplement the off-street parking provisions in MTMC Chapter 19.125. Where there is a conflict, the provisions herein must apply.

A. Off-street parking standards in the Town Center are based on two tiered zones generally depending on the distance to the planned light rail station:
   1. Tier One includes all properties south of 232nd Street SW and west of 58th Avenue W.
   2. Tier Two includes all lands north of 232nd Street SW and east of 58th Avenue W.
   3. Tier Three includes all lands within the TC-R zone.

B. Off-street parking standards for residential uses are set forth in Table 19.50.090(B) below.
Table 19.50.090(B)
Off-street parking standards for multi-household residential uses
(minimum number of spaces/dwelling unit).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bedroom</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-bedrooms or more</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Off-street parking standards for commercial uses are set forth in Table 19.50.090(C) below.

Table 19.50.090(C)
Off-street parking standards for commercial uses
(minimum number of parking spaces required).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Tiers 1 - 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care, adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating/drinking establishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/exercise club with &lt;10,000sf gross leasable area</td>
<td>2/1,000sf gross leasable area, except that the first 5,000sf of a retail use or an eating/drinking establishment within a building or on a single parcel shall be exempt from the minimum number of required parking spaces, so long as at least four on-street parking spaces are within 200 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General service – excluding vehicle services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/motels</td>
<td>1/unit or suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/health care, excluding hospitals and ambulance services</td>
<td>2/1,000sf gross leasable area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. On-street parking. In conjunction with required on-site parking, on-street parking must be provided in accordance with MTMC 19.50.070.

19.50.100 Special regulations. (Updated 19.50.070 – changes are tracked)
Special regulations, as specified below, must apply to certain uses and locations in the Town Center zones:
A. Sexually oriented adult businesses/adult entertainment establishments must not be permitted.
B. Casinos or social card rooms as defined in RCW 9.46.0217 and 9.46.0282 must not be permitted.
C. All uses must be conducted wholly within an entirely enclosed building except for the following:
   1. Public utility facilities.
2. Parking and loading areas; provided, that no area outside of an enclosed building must be used for storage, repair or sale of vehicles.

3. Outdoor advertising structures.

4. Sale or display of retail goods as part of a permitted farmers’ market, street vendor cart/stand or seasonal event, or sale or display of fresh market produce, including cut flowers, in conjunction with an adjacent business; provided, that no combination of awnings or tents that comprise more than a total of 200 square feet anywhere on the lot must remain outdoors on site for more than 72 consecutive hours unless the structures are specifically permitted as a temporary use or part of an approved building in compliance with applicable building and fire code standards.

5. Outdoor dining, outdoor entertainment, and similar pedestrian leisure activities that are part of specified permitted uses, conditional uses, or accessory uses defined in this chapter.

D. Nuisances and Safety. Uses that create a nuisance by reason of smoke, fumes, odor, steam, gases, vibration, hazard or noise must be prohibited. Any use that includes emergency vehicles as part of its operation must be designed for emergency vehicle egress that is as safe as possible for pedestrians and traffic.

E. Special Provisions for Existing Single-Household Dwellings. An existing detached single-household dwelling and its associated improvements such as garages, carports, storage sheds and fences may be rebuilt, repaired, and otherwise changed for human occupancy, provided the use was legally established prior to December 30, 2006. Any such improvements must comply with the development regulations specified for the RS 7200 zoning district for single-household dwellings and accessory structures.

F. Conditional uses must be evaluated or conditioned in part based on all the following:

1. Impacts on the envisioned pedestrian orientation (per the adopted Town Center Subarea Plan).

2. Compatibility with the envisioned mix of uses (per the adopted Town Center Subarea Plan).

3. Avoidance of shading effect on public plazas and single-household zones.

4. Provision for transition between intense uses and single-household zones.

G. Chapter 19.126 MTMC regulates electric vehicle infrastructure.

H. Auto-Oriented Uses. Carwashes and auto-repair or maintenance facilities are not allowed on parcels abutting 56th Avenue or 236th Street SW. Gas stations are expressly prohibited anywhere in the Town Center zones pursuant to subsection D of this section.

I. Primary-Use Parking Prohibited. Parking in Town Center zoning districts is limited to parking associated with established uses in the Town Center zoning districts, and to parking provided by the City including both street parking and off-street parking. Primary use parking is otherwise expressly prohibited.

J. Street Improvements – When Required. Street improvements, including sidewalk, curb and gutter, lighting and landscaping will be required for any lot that is being developed where these are lacking or inconsistent with current standards. Improvements must be designed by the applicant and are subject to review by the City Engineer for conformance to adopted standards. (Ord. 2683 § 7, 2016; Ord. 2668 § 6, 2015; Ord. 2660 § 8, 2015; Ord. 2567 § 6, 2011; Ord. 2553 § 6, 2010; Ord. 2503 § 1, 2008).
19.50.110 Temporary parking lot. *(Continuation of existing 19.50.75 – no changes proposed)*

A. Purpose and Intent. To provide for parking options on a temporary and interim temporary basis for existing parking that is displaced during the construction of a public capital project, other public improvement, or similar. This type of temporary parking may be a standalone use, but is not intended to be or function as a commercial parking lot.

B. The following definitions apply to this chapter, as allowed and regulated by this chapter.

1. Temporary parking means replacement parking on a site different from the site the parking is currently provided on, for a period of time not to exceed four years.
2. Interim temporary parking means replacement parking on a site different from the site the parking is currently provided on, for up to 12-months.

C. Applicability and Criteria for Temporary and Interim Temporary Parking.

1. Entity benefiting from the use of, or utilizing, temporary parking, is a public agency providing parking for use by the general public.
2. The parking is needed to fulfill the purpose or function associated with public agency’s purpose on a temporary basis.
3. There is a valid public need to replace existing parking on a temporary basis.
4. The replacement parking is located as close as feasible to the displaced parking.
5. No fee will be assessed for use of parking (not a commercial lot).
6. No permanent facilities will be constructed.
7. The site can and will be restored to the pre-temporary parking condition or, at a minimum, all improvements, installed for purposes of creating temporary parking, removed.
8. The entity benefiting from the use of, or utilizing, temporary parking has notarized signatures from all underlying property owners, authorizing the development proposal.
9. Consistency with planned action, Chapter 19.90 MTMC.
10. The temporary parking site must be consolidated as a single parcel.

D. Temporary Parking Lot Development Standards.

1. Consistent with Chapter 19.125 MTMC parking lot standards.
2. Provides for the equivalent number of electric vehicle charging spaces in the displaced parking facility, or per Chapter 19.126 MTMC, whichever is greater.
3. Water quality provisions are made per DOE Manual, except the LID standards will not apply.
4. Adequate emergency services access and water.
5. Landscaping.
   a. No interior parking lot landscaping is required.
   b. On interior property lines abutting residential uses, a 10-foot wide, sight-obscuring landscape buffer together with a six-foot fence.
   c. Type I, street frontage landscaping, 10 feet in width, per Chapter 19.130 MTMC.
   d. All landscaped areas must be irrigated, as determined by the Director.
E. Review and Decision.

1. Temporary and interim temporary parking lots are an administrative review and approval process pursuant to the following, except as allowed in subsection (E)(2) of this section:
   a. MTMC 18.05.360, Preadministering meetings.
   b. MTMC 18.05.370, determination of complete application (per filing requirements set forth on application form available from the Department).
   c. Consistency with subsections C and D of this section.
   d. MTMC 18.05.400, Notice of development application.
   e. MTMC 18.05.410, Notice of administrative approval.

2. Interim temporary parking lots are exempt from compliance with subsections (D)(2) and (D)(5) of this section.

3. The maximum time limit for use of temporary parking may from first day of operation be established in the approval decision, not to exceed four years for a temporary parking lot and not to exceed 12 months for an interim parking lot.

4. The Director may add any conditions at his/her discretion.

F. Approvals and Expiration (Time Limits).

1. Removal of hardscape placed as part of the interim parking improvements must be removed within six months of termination of the permitted time period of the use.

2. Applications for the necessary construction permits must be made within 180 days of the administrative decision, pursuant to MTMC 13.50.020.

3. Time Extensions for Use of the Temporary Parking.
   a. Upon written request, a one-year time extension may be granted to extend the use of a temporary parking lot, for cause. Extemating circumstances may allow one additional one-year extension, or less.
   b. Upon written request, a six-month time may be granted to extend the use of an interim temporary parking lot, for cause. No further extensions shall be permitted.

4. Temporary and interim temporary parking lot approvals and/or improvements are not transferable (may not be transferred to another entity or reused).

5. The use of a site for temporary parking may only occur once on a site.

G. Appeal. The decision is subject to appeal pursuant to MTMC 18.05.550. (Ord. 2732 § 4, 2018).

19.50.120 Special use. (Continuation of existing 19.50.80 – no changes proposed)
Special use – wireless (SP-W): see Chapter 19.137 MTMC. (Ord. 2503 § 1, 2008).
Chapter 19.15 – DEFINITIONS

The provisions herein illustrate new definitions and proposed changes to existing terms.

19.15.020 “A”

“Articulation” means the giving of emphasis to architectural elements (like windows, balconies, entries, etc.) that create a complementary pattern or rhythm, dividing large buildings into smaller identifiable pieces. See MTMC 19.123.240 for articulation provisions.

“Articulation interval” means the measure of articulation, the distance before architectural elements repeat. See MTMC 19.123.240 for articulation provisions.

“Artisan manufacturing” means the production of goods by the use of hand tools or small-scale, light mechanical equipment occurring within a fully-enclosed building where such production requires no outdoor operations or storage, and where the production, operations, and storage of materials related to production occupy no more than 5,000 square feet of net floor area. Typical uses have negligible negative impact on surrounding properties and include woodworking and cabinet shops, ceramic studios, jewelry manufacturing and similar types of arts and crafts, production of alcohol, or food processing.

19.15.030 “B”

“Blank wall” means a ground floor wall or portion of a ground floor wall as described in MTMC 19.123.270 that does not include a transparent window or door.

“Block-frontage” refers to the area between a street and building façades and other portions of a lot close to the street property line. See MTMC Article 2 of Chapter 19.123 for applicable block-frontage standards.

19.15.040 “C”

“Cornice” means a horizontal molding projecting along the top of a wall, building, etc. See MTMC 19.123.250(D) for related standards.

19.15.050 “D”

“Departure” means a provision allowing for applicants to propose alternative means of compliance with a specific standard on a voluntary basis, provided they meet the purpose of the standard. See MTMC 19.110.260 for more information on departures.

19.15.060 “E”

“Entertainment, commercial indoor” refers to predominantly spectator uses conducted within an enclosed building. Typical uses include motion picture theaters and concert or music halls.

19.15.070 “F”

“Financial Institution” means a bank, savings and loan, credit union, mortgage office, or similar establishment allowing for walk-in services.
“Facade” means the entire street wall face of a building extending from the grade of the building to the top of the parapet or eaves and the entire width of the building elevation.

19.15.080 “G”
“General service” means a category of uses whose primary activity is the provision of service, rental, and/or repair to appliances, electronic equipment, machinery, tools, vehicles, and other similar products for personal, commercial, or civic use.

19.15.130 “L”
“Live-work unit” means a dwelling unit designed to accommodate a small commercial enterprise on the ground floor and a residential unit above and/or behind. A live-work unit may be designed as any type of household living dwelling unit permitted in the applicable zoning district and may be designed to be used for both single-occupant or dual-occupant usage (i.e., one occupant for the residence; another occupant for the commercial space).

“Landscaped block frontage” refers to a type of block frontage designation that emphasizes landscaped setbacks. See MTMC 19.123.100 for details.

19.15.140 “M”
“Modulation” means stepping forward or backwards a portion of the façade as a means to articulate or add visual interest to the façade.

19.15.170 “P”
“Pedestrian-oriented space” means publicly accessible spaces that enliven the pedestrian environment by providing opportunities for outdoor dining, socializing, relaxing and provide visual amenities that can contribute to the character of the neighborhood. See MTMC 19.123.190(D) for pedestrian-oriented space design criteria.

“Personal service” means an establishment which offers specialized services purchased frequently by the consumer. Included are barber shops, beauty salons and spas, repair shops, postal or courier services, laundromats, dry cleaning pickup, tailor shops, and other similar establishments. These uses may also include accessory retail sales of products related to the services provided.

“Professional office” refers to activities conducted in a room or suite of rooms and generally focusing on professional services.

19.15.190 “R”
“Roofline” means the highest edge of the roof or the top of a parapet, whichever establishes the top line of the structure when viewed in a horizontal plane.

19.15.200 “S”
“Secondary block frontage” refers to a type of block frontage designation that allows use of either the Storefront or Landscaped block frontage standards. See MTMC 19.123.100 for details.

“Storefront” means the ground floor façade of a commercial use adjacent to a sidewalk or internal pathway.
“Storefront block frontage” refers to a type of block frontage designation that emphasizes storefronts. See MTMC 19.123.080 for details.

19.15.210 “T”
“Transparency” means the degree to which rays of light may transmit through a substance. For storefronts and other ground level non-residential uses, transparency also refers to the ability to see through the window and into the building as clarified in MTMC 19.123.070.

19.15.230 “V”
“Vertical building modulation” means a stepping back or projecting forward vertical walls of a building face, within specified intervals of building width and depth, as a means of breaking up the apparent bulk of a structure’s continuous exterior walls. Vertical building modulation may be used to meet some of the building massing and articulation standards in MTMC 19.123.240.

19.15.240 “W”
“Weather protection” means a permanent horizontal structure above pedestrian areas such as sidewalks and building entries that protects pedestrians from inclement weather.
Chapter 19.123 – TOWN CENTER DESIGN STANDARDS
Planning Commission Recommended - July 16, 2019

This is a proposed new chapter that includes block-frontage, site design, and building design standards for the Town Center zones. However, it has been crafted so that it could apply to other commercial and multifamily development zones (which could be added/updated at a later date). Edits made since the last draft are highlighted in yellow.
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Article I: Introduction

19.123.010 - Purpose.
This chapter is authorized by the City Council as a major implementation tool of the Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan. Overall, this chapter intends to:

A. Provide clear objectives for the planning and design of development projects in the Town Center and other applicable mixed-use areas.
B. Preserve and protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Mountlake Terrace.
E. Ensure that new multifamily, mixed-use, and commercial development is of high quality and appropriate to Mountlake Terrace’s character and context.
F. Promote increased pedestrian, bicycling, and transit use in commercial and multifamily areas.
G. Enhance the livability of residential developments.
I. Increase awareness of design considerations among the citizens of Mountlake Terrace.
J. Maintain and enhance property values within Mountlake Terrace.

19.123.020 - Applicability and compliance.
A. The design provisions in this chapter apply to all new development within the Town Center and TC-R zone, including, but not limited to, building additions and site improvements. Exception: Additions to single-household dwellings are exempt from this chapter.
B. Relationship to other codes and documents. Where provisions of this chapter conflict with provisions in any other section of the Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code (MTMC), this chapter prevails unless otherwise noted.
C. For building additions, remodels, and site improvements, two different thresholds have been established to determine how the standards herein are applied to such projects.

1. Level I improvements include all exterior remodels, building additions, and/or site improvements that affect the exterior appearance of the building/site and/or cumulatively increase the gross floor area on a site by up to 50-percent within three years of the date of permit issuance. The requirement for such improvements is only that the proposed improvements meet the standards and do not lead to further nonconformance with the standards.
   For example, if a property owner decides to replace a building façade’s siding, then the siding must meet the applicable exterior building material standards, but elements such as building articulation would not be required.

2. Level II improvements include all improvements that cumulatively increase the gross floor area on a site by 50-percent or more within three years of the date of permit issuance. Such developments must conform to all applicable standards, except in a case where there are multiple buildings on one site, and only one building is being enlarged. In that scenario, improvements to the additional buildings are not required, but conformance with all other standards apply.
19.123.030 - How the provisions of this chapter are applied.

Most sections within this chapter herein include the following elements:

A. Purpose statements, which are overarching objectives.

B. Standards use words such as “must” and “is/are required,” signifying required actions.

C. Guidelines use words such as “should” or “is/are recommended,” signifying voluntary measures.

D. Departures are provided for specific standards. They allow alternative designs provided the reviewing authority determines the design meets the purpose of the standards and guidelines and other applicable criteria. See MTMC 19.110.260 for related procedures associated with departures.

E. This chapter contains some specific standards that are easily quantifiable, while others provide a level of discretion in how they are complied with. In the latter case, the applicant must demonstrate to the director, in writing, how the project meets the purpose of the standard or standards.

19.110.260 - Departures.

NOTE TO REVIEWERS – This is a suggested integration intended for Chapter 19.110 that will be critical in accommodating some flexibility in applying these standards. This is a provision that we’ve successfully used in many communities – where cities can be selective in what standards they choose to offer such departures – and they can craft the parameters and criteria that best fit the situation.

A. Overview and purpose. This title provides for a number of specific departure opportunities to development standards. The purpose is to provide applicants with the option of proposing alternative design treatments provided such departures meet the “purpose” of the particular standard and any additional departure criteria established for the particular departure opportunity.

B. Requests for departures are voluntary. This provision allows the flexibility for applicants to propose alternative designs on a voluntary basis, provided they meet the purpose of the standard and applicable departure criteria as noted above.

C. Applicability. Departure opportunities are available only where noted for specific standards.

D. Procedures. Permit applications that include departure requests go through the standard review procedures in this chapter depending on the application type.

E. Approval criteria. Project applicants must successfully demonstrate to the decision-maker how the proposed departure meets the purpose(s) of the standard and other applicable departure criteria that applies to the specific standard.

F. Documentation. The decision-maker must document the reasons for approving all departures (to be maintained with project application records) for the purpose of providing consistency in decision-making by the city.
Article 2 – Block-Frontage Standards

19.123.040 - Purpose.
A. To achieve the envisioned character of Mountlake Terrace Town Center as set forth in the goals and policies of the Town Center Subarea Plan and other applicable mixed-use areas.
B. To enhance pedestrian environments by emphasizing activated ground-level block-frontage designs for commercial, mixed-use, and multifamily developments.
C. To minimize potential negative impacts of driveways and off-street parking facilities on the streetscape.
D. To promote good visibility between buildings and the street for security for pedestrians and to create a more welcoming and interesting streetscape.

19.123.050 - How to use this chapter.
Site orientation standards for individual properties depend on the block-frontage designated for that location. The following steps will help in using this chapter:
A. Go to the map in MTMC 19.123.060 to find the property and the block-frontage type designation. For development that fronts onto multiple streets, see provisions in MTMC 19.123.140.
B. Go to the appropriate code section in this chapter for the standards for applicable block-frontage type designation. Table 19.123.060 includes a summary of key block-frontage types.
Table 19.123.050
Summary of key block-frontage types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Frontage</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Storefront         | • No new ground-level parking adjacent to the street.  
|                    | • Special transparency, weather protection, and entry requirements.  
|                    | • Minimum commercial space height and depth.  
|                    | • No ground floor residential uses except for live/work units on select Storefront designated blocks where the storefront space meets height and depth standards. |
| Secondary          | • Ground-level parking must not be visible from the street.  
|                    | • Landscaping to soften façades of non-storefronts and buffer parking areas.  
|                    | • Minimum façade transparency requirements per use and setback. |
| Landscape          | • Ground-level parking must not be visible from the street.  
|                    | • Landscaping to soften façades and buffer parking areas.  
|                    | • Minimum façade transparency requirements per use and setback. |

19.123.060 - Block-frontage designation maps.
The block-frontage designations established by this chapter are maintained under the direction of the director. All notations, references, and other information shown have the same force and effect as if fully described in this title.

Note that these block-frontage designation maps are different than the streetscape designation map in Figure 19.50.080. Block-frontage designations and standards regulate the development frontages, which includes the building and associated site development that occurs within the property boundary. The streetscape designations and standards set forth in MTTC 19.50.080 regulate the design of sidewalks and planting strips within the right-of-way. In some cases, the streetscape standards call for expanded sidewalks that extend beyond the property line. Also note that the streetscape standards sometimes vary on the type of block-frontage design.
Figure 19.123.060(A)
Map 1: Mountlake Terrace Town Center block-frontage designations map.
19.123.070 - About the transparency standards.
All block-frontage designations contain distinct minimum façade transparency standards. The purposes of these standards are to maintain “eyes on the street” for safety and create welcoming pedestrian environments. Table 19.123.070 below includes details in how they are measured.

| Table 19.123.070 |
| Transparency standards |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storefront</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The transparency area is on the ground floor between 30” and 10’ above sidewalk grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Transparency Provisions**

**Windows must be transparent**
Ground-level window area for storefronts and other non-residential uses that is covered, frosted, or perforated in any manner that obscures visibility into the building must not count as transparent window area. Also, mirrored glass and highly-reflective or darkly-tined windows must not be counted as transparent windows.

**Display windows & parking garages**
Display windows may be used for up to 25% of non-residential transparency requirements (except for ground-level Storefront-designated block-frontages on 57th Ave W and 233rd Street SW) provided they are at least 30” deep to allow changeable displays and the interior wall is non-structural so it can be

Covered windows

Perforated sign

Integrated display windows

Tack-on display cases
Table 19.123.070  
Transparency standards

| Removed if the windows are not used for display. Tack-on display cases as shown in the far right example do not qualify as transparent window area. For parking garages (where allowed by block frontage standards), the left image illustrates how such a structure can meet (and not meet) the applicable transparency standards. |
|---|---|---|
| Parking garage with windows | Parking garage without windows |
19.123.080 - Storefront block-frontage standards.

A. Purpose. Storefront block-frontages are the most vibrant and active shopping and dining areas within Mountlake Terrace. Blocks designated as Storefront block-frontages include continuous storefronts placed along the sidewalk edge with small scale shops and many business entries.

![Figure 19.123.080(A) Storefront vision and key standards.]

- **Weather protection:** At least 6’ minimum depth along 75% of facade
- **Height:** 13’ minimum floor to ceiling
- **Windows/transparency:** At least 70% of facade between 30” and 10’
- **Entry:** Facing street

Figure 19.123.080(A) Storefront vision and key standards.
B. Standards. All development on sites with a Storefront block-frontage designation must comply with the standards in Table 19.123.080(B) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Additional Provisions &amp; Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground-level Land use</td>
<td>MTMC 19.50.040 sets forth permitted ground-level uses permitted on Storefront block-frontages.</td>
<td>Lobbies and accessory-uses associated with upper-floor professional-office and multi-household residential uses are allowed provided they are limited to 20% of all Storefront block-frontages and other Storefront frontages. Exception: Such lobbies and accessory-uses associated with upper-floor professional-office and multi-household residential uses are not allowed on 57th Ave W and 233rd Street SW except where no other alternative is feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor to ceiling height</td>
<td>13’ minimum (applies to new buildings only).</td>
<td>Applies to the minimum retail space depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail space depth</td>
<td>50’ minimum on 57th Ave W and 233rd Street SW and 30’ minimum elsewhere (applies to new buildings only).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building placement</td>
<td>Buildings must be placed at the back edge of the required sidewalk. Additional setbacks are allowed for a widened sidewalk or pedestrian-oriented space [MTMC 19.123.190(D)].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building entrances</td>
<td>Primary building entrances must face the street. For corner buildings, primary entrances for ground-level building corner uses may face either street or the street corner.</td>
<td>Corner storefront building example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façade transparency (see MTMC 19.123.070)</td>
<td>At least 70% of the transparency area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19.123.080(B)
Storefront block-frontage standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Additional Provisions &amp; Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weather protection</td>
<td>Weather protection over the sidewalk is required along at least 75% of the storefront façade, and it must be a minimum of 6’ deep and have 10’ to 15’ of vertical clearance.</td>
<td>![Photo of storefront with weather protection]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weather protection must not interfere with street trees, street lights, street signs, or extend beyond the edge of the sidewalk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking location</td>
<td>New ground-level (surface or structured) parking adjacent to the street is prohibited. Parking may be placed below, above, and/or behind storefronts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. DEPARTURE criteria. Departures from the standards in Table 19.123.090(B) that feature the symbol will be considered per MTMC 19.110.260 provided the alternative proposal meets the purpose of the standards and the following criteria:

1. Retail space depth. Departures from this standard are not allowed for storefronts adjacent to 57th Street W and 233rd Street SW. Elsewhere, reduced depths on up to 25-percent of the applicable block-frontage will be considered where the applicant can successfully demonstrate the proposed alternative design and configuration of the space is viable for a variety of permitted retail uses.

2. Façade transparency. Departures for façade transparency in the transparency area may be reduced to a minimum of 40-percent for block-frontages other than 57th Avenue W and 233rd Street SW if the façade design between ground-level windows provides visual interest to the pedestrian and mitigates the impacts of blank walls.

3. Weather-protection. The reduced extent (to no less than 50-percent of block-frontages) or width weather-protection features (to no less than four-feet in width) will be considered provided the designs are proportional to architectural features of the building and building design trade-offs (elements that clearly go beyond minimum building design standards in this chapter) meet the purpose of the standards.
19.123.090 - Storefront corner block-frontage standards.
All development on sites with a Storefront corner block-frontage designation must comply with the standards in Table 19.123.090(B) above, except that the Storefront block-frontage standards must apply to storefront building elevations at least 30-feet (horizontally) from the corner of the building and the entire length of the building that’s sited up to the edge of the sidewalk (as a storefront).

Figure 19.123.090
Storefront corner block-frontage example.
19.123.100 - Landscaped block-frontage standards.

A. Purpose. Landscaped block-frontages emphasize landscaped street setbacks, clear pedestrian connections between the building and the sidewalk, and minimized surface parking lots along the frontages.

B. Standards. All development on sites containing a landscaped block-frontage designation must comply with the standards in Table 19.123.100(B) below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Additional Provisions &amp; Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>MTMC 19.50.040 sets forth permitted land uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building placement</td>
<td>10' minimum setbacks are required, or greater where specified for the applicable zone in MTMC Title 19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19.123.100(B)
Landscaped block-frontage standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Additional Provisions &amp; Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building entrances</td>
<td>Building entries must face the street or a pedestrian-oriented space [MTMC 19.123.190(D)] that is adjacent to the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Facade transparency (see MTMC 19.123.070) | For buildings with ground-level non-residential uses, at least 40% of the transparency area. 📋
For buildings with ground-level residential uses, at least 20% of the facade. 📋 | Landscaped frontage example meeting setback, entry, weather protection, and transparency standards. |
| Weather protection           | Weather protection at least 3’ deep must be provided over individual residential and commercial tenant entries and at least 5’ deep for shared residential and professional office entries. |                                  |
| Parking location             | Ground-level parking must not be visible from the street. Where parking is integrated at or near the ground-level, it must be set-back and completely screened by landscaped berms (upper right example). The lower right example illustrates a prohibited design. |                                  |
| Landscaping                  | All areas between the sidewalk and the building must be landscaped, except for pathways, porches, decks, and other areas meeting the definition of pedestrian-oriented space [MTMC 19.123.190(D)]. Landscaped areas must contain Types I, II, or IV Landscaping (as defined in MTMC 19.130.240) and may incorporate rain gardens and other forms of stormwater-management. |                                  |

C. DEPARTURE criteria. Departures to the landscaped block-frontage standards in Table 19.123.100(B) that feature the 📋 symbol will be considered per MTMC 19.110.260 provided the alternative proposal meets the purpose of the standards and the following criteria:
1. Building placement: Reduced setbacks (down to a minimum of eight-feet) will be considered where the ground floor is elevated a minimum average of 30-inches (required when the ground floor setback is less than ten-feet) and design treatments that create an effective transition between the public and private realm. For example, a stoop design or other similar treatments that utilize a low fence or retaining wall, and/or hedge along the sidewalk may provide an effective transition [see Figure 19.123.110(C) for examples].

2. Façade transparency: Façade transparency in the transparency area may be reduced from the minimum by 50-percent if the façade design between ground-level windows provides visual interest to the pedestrian and mitigates the impacts of blank-walls.

A. Purpose. Secondary block-frontages allow flexibility to integrate either a Storefront or a Landscaped frontage in a pedestrian-friendly configuration.

![Figure 19.123.110(A)
Secondary frontage vision.](image)

B. Standards. Development must conform to either Storefront or Landscaped block-frontage standards and associated departure options and departure criteria as established above, with only the following modifications in Table 19.123.110(B) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Additional Provisions &amp; Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building placement</td>
<td>Buildings may be placed up to the sidewalk edge provided they meet Storefront block-frontage standards in MTMC 19.123.080 (this includes standards for ground-level, building placement, building entrances, façade transparency, and weather protection elements).</td>
<td>The minimum setback for buildings that do not meet applicable Storefront block-frontage standards is 10’ or greater where specified for the applicable zone in MTMC Title 19. ☰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façade transparency</td>
<td>Storefront buildings are subject to Storefront block-frontage transparency standards above. For other building frontages, transparent windows must be provided along at least 15% of the entire building façade, plus: • Buildings designed with ground-floor non-residential uses within 10’ of sidewalk, must feature at least 40% transparency within the transparency area. ☰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19.123.110(B)
**Secondary block-frontage standards.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Additional Provisions &amp; Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Buildings designed with ground floor non-residential uses within 20’ of sidewalk, must feature at least 25% transparency within the transparency area. 💡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. DEPARTURE criteria.
Departures to the Secondary block-frontage standards in Table 19.123.110(B) that feature the 💡 symbol will be considered per MTMC 19.110.260 provided the alternative proposal meets the purpose of the standards and the following criteria:

1. **Building placement:** Reduced setbacks (down to a minimum of five-feet for buildings with ground floor residential uses and a minimum of two-feet for other buildings) will be considered where the ground floor is elevated a minimum average of 30-inches (required when the ground floor setback is less than ten-feet) and design treatments that create an effective transition between the public and private realm. For example, a stoop design or other similar treatments that utilize a low fence or retaining wall, and/or hedge along the sidewalk may provide an effective transition [see Figure 19.123.110(C) for examples].

2. **Façade transparency:** Façade transparency in the transparency area may be reduced from the minimum by 50-percent if the façade design between ground-level windows provides visual interest to the pedestrian and mitigates the impacts of blank walls.

#### Figure 19.123.110(C)
**Acceptable examples of possible setback departures.**

The apartment building (left image) includes a street setback of about 6-8-feet and features a landscape planter, an elevated ground-level, and generous window transparency. The elevated-stoop frontages (right image) is another acceptable reduced setback departure example. The combination of landscaping elements, façade transparency, low fencing, and façade materials and detailing help to create an effective transition between the public and private realm.
19.123.120 – Access Corridor frontage standards.

A. **Purpose.** Access Corridor frontage standards provide eyes-on-the-pathway to create a safe and welcoming through-block connection while preserving the privacy of adjacent ground-level residential units.

B. **Standards.**

1. Building elevations facing an access corridor must feature at least 10-percent window transparency.

2. Where ground-level residential uses are within five-feet of a shared-lane or pathway, at least one of the following design features must be integrated to enhance the safety and privacy of adjacent residential units:
   a. Windows must be placed at least six vertical-feet above the access corridor.
   b. A combination of landscaping, planter walls, and/or elevated ground floor (at least one-foot above access corridor grade) that meet the purpose of the standards.

3. Where non-residential ground-level uses abut an access corridor, at least 25-percent of the applicable building-elevation between four and eight-feet above the ground-floor surface elevation must be transparent.

---

**Figure 19.123.120(A)**

Access-corridor example illustrating shared pedestrian and vehicular access.
19.123.130 - Where properties front onto multiple streets.
Where a property fronts onto more than one street, each building frontage must comply with the standards for the block-frontage upon which it fronts, with the following clarifications:

A. Where a conflict exists between frontage standards, the director will apply the standards of a block-frontage pursuant to the following order of preference:

1. Storefront;
2. Secondary; then
3. Landscaped.

Subsections (B) through (E) below clarify how the order of preference works for particular frontage elements.

B. Building Location: For corner-sites with landscaped block-frontage on one street and storefront or Secondary on another, a storefront frontage may wrap around the corner (on the landscaped block-frontage side) for up to a half-block width or no more than 120-feet (whichever is less).

C. Entrances: For corner sites, entrances on both streets are encouraged, but only one entrance is required. For corner sites with frontage on a storefront block-frontage on one side, an entrance must be placed on the storefront block-frontage side or facing the corner. For corner sites with a mix of designations that do not include a storefront block-frontage, the entry must be placed on the order of preference identified above.

DEPARTURES may be considered provided the location and design of the entry and block-frontage treatments are compatible with the character of the area and enhance the character of the street.

D. Transparency: For corner-sites - at least one block-frontage must meet the applicable transparency standards (based on the order of preference above. For the second block-frontage, the director may approve a reduction in the minimum amount of transparency by 50-percent. For street corners with the same designations on both frontages, buildings must employ the full transparency on the dominant frontage (based on the frontage width or established neighborhood pattern). Exception: No reductions in the minimum required window transparency are allowed on 57th Ave W and 233rd Street SW where designated as Storefront.
Figure 19.123.130
Clarifying block-frontage standards on street corners.

In the left example, the entrance may be placed along the Storefront block frontage and/or directly on the corner.
19.123.140 - Where properties have multiple designations along one frontage.

Where an individual property has a frontage with multiple block-frontage designations, the following standards apply:

A. Storefront and any other block-frontage designation: Storefront block-frontage designation applies.
B. Secondary and Landscaped block-frontage designation: Secondary block-frontage designation applies.

19.123.150 – High-visibility street corners.

A. Description/purpose. The high visibility street-corner requirements apply to those sites designated as such on Figure 19.123.150(A). The purpose is to accentuate designated street-corners with high visibility to the public.

![Figure 19.123.150(A) High visibility street corners.](image)
B. **Standards.** At least one of the following special features must be included [Figure 19.123.150(B) below illustrates acceptable examples]:

1. Corner plaza.
2. Cropped building corner with a special entry feature.
3. Decorative use of building materials at the corner.
4. Distinctive façade articulation.
5. Sculptural architectural element.
6. Other decorative elements that meet the purpose of the standards.

![Figure 19.123.150(B)
Acceptable high visibility street corner examples.](image)

All of the buildings above integrate distinctive articulation features (4). The bottom left example also integrates a corner plaza (1).
Article 3 - Site Planning

19.123.170 - Purpose.
A. To promote thoughtful layout of buildings, parking areas, and circulation, service, landscaping, and amenity elements.
B. Enhance Mountlake Terrace’s visual character.
C. Promote compatibility between developments and uses.
D. Enhance the function of developments.

A. Purpose.
   1. To promote the functional and visual compatibility between developments, particularly between zones of different intensity.
   2. To protect the privacy of residents on adjacent properties.
B. Side and rear setback standards. Table 19.50.050 sets forth a range of minimum side and rear-yard setbacks in all TC and TC-R zones between 0-15-feet. The provisions below clarify specific setback requirements:
   1. Zero side and rear-yard setbacks are allowed up to six-stories in height, except within and adjacent to the TC-R zone, where developments integrated window-less fire-walls that meet the design provisions of MTTC 19.123.270(D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min. Setback</th>
<th>Applicability/Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0'</td>
<td>For window-less firewalls up to 6-stories in height. Provision does not apply to the development within or abutting the TC-R zone. All firewalls must meet the design provisions of MTTC 19.123.270(D).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>Minimum setback except:  * Where zero setbacks are allowed (window-less firewalls as described above)  * Where setbacks greater than 5’ are required per provisions below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5’</td>
<td>In all sites abutting residential zones – see subsection (C) below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15’-20’</td>
<td>When required per subsection (E) below for light and air access and privacy along side and rear property lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. **Special setback/building height standards for sites abutting residential zones.** For sites abutting a residential zone, the side- and rear-yard setback must be the same as the applicable residential zoning district, up to the maximum height limit of the applicable residential zoning district, above which the minimum side yard setback must increase at a 45-degree angle inward up to the maximum height of the applicable TC-zoning district. See Figure 19.123.180(C) for an illustration.

![Figure 19.123.180(C)](image)

**Figure 19.123.180(C)**

Illustrating minimum side- and rear-yard setbacks to an abutting Residential zoning district.
D. **Balconies near side and rear property lines** adjacent to property in any residential zone.

Balconies and rooftop decks above the ground floor within 15 horizontal-feet of a side property line abutting a residentially-zoned property must feature a railing system that is at least 50-percent opaque. Specifically, 50-percent of the area below the top edge of the railing must be a sight-obscuring structure.

DEPARTURES to this standard will be allowed if the balcony will not cause visual or privacy impacts due to its location, orientation, design or other consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 19.123.180(D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy standards for balconies within 15-feet of side or rear property lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balconies within 15’ feet of a side property line abutting a residential zone must be at least 50% opaque below the railing.
E. **Light and air access and privacy near interior side and rear property lines.** Buildings or portions thereof containing multifamily dwelling units whose only solar access (windows) is from the applicable side or rear of the building (facing towards the side or rear property line) must be set back from the applicable side or rear property lines at least 15-feet. See Figures 19.123.190(E). For such building elevations taller than four-stories, floors above the fourth-floor must be setback at least 20-feet from the applicable side or rear property lines. Note: These standards do not apply to side or rear property lines where adjacent to a street, access corridor, or easement where no building may be developed.

DEPARTURES will be allowed where it is determined that the proposed design will not create a compatibility problem in the near and long-term based on the unique site context.

---

**Figure 19.123.180(E)**
Light/air access and privacy standards for multifamily residential buildings along side and rear property lines.

![Diagram showing light and air access and privacy standards](image)

Note that the minimum setbacks noted above only apply to buildings (and portions thereof) featuring the stated characteristics.

---

F. **Upper-level setbacks.** Buildings over six-stories are subject to the following minimum side and rear-yard setbacks:

1. 15-feet for floors above the sixth-floor.
2. 20-feet for floors above the eighth-floor.

DEPARTURES will be allowed where it is determined that the proposed design will not create a compatibility problem in the near and long-term based on the unique site context.
19.123.190 - Internal open space.

A. Purpose.

1. To create usable space that is suitable for leisure or recreational activities for residents.
2. To create open space that contributes to the residential setting.
3. To provide plazas that attract shoppers to commercial areas.
4. To provide plazas and other pedestrian oriented spaces in commercial areas that enhance the employees’ and public’s opportunity for active and passive activities, such as dining, resting, people watching, and recreational activities.
5. To enhance the development character and attractiveness of commercial development.

B. Usable residential open space.

1. All multifamily development, including multifamily portions of mixed-use development, must provide minimum usable open space equal to 100-square-feet per dwelling unit for studio and one-bedroom dwellings and 150-square-feet per dwelling unit for dwellings with two or more bedrooms. The required open space may be provided in a combination of ways:
   a. Shared open space. All of the required open space may be in the form of shared open space available to all residents and meeting the requirements of subsection (B)(2) below.
   b. Ground-level individual outdoor space. All of the required open space may for a unit be provided by ground-level outdoor space that is adjacent and directly accessible to the subject unit. Such open spaces must be:
      i. Outdoor spaces may be located in the front, side, or rear yard provided they are generally level, feature no dimension less than ten-feet, and enclosed by a fence and/or hedge at least 32-inches in height to qualify.
      DEPARTURES will be considered for this provision.
      ii. Private porches may qualify as outdoor space provided they are at least 36-square-feet in area, with no dimension less than six-feet.
      Individual ground-level open space that is in excess of minimum requirements must not be used in the calculations for determining the minimum usable open space requirements for other units in the development.
   c. Balconies. Up to 25-percent of the required open space may be provided by private balconies provided such spaces are at least 32-square-feet in area, with no dimension less than four-feet (not including railings), to provide a space usable for human activity.
   d. Common indoor recreation-areas. For mixed-use buildings up to 50-percent of the required open space may be provided by common indoor recreation areas meeting the following conditions:
      i. The space must meet ADA standards and must be located in a visible area, such as near an entrance, lobby, or high traffic corridors.
      ii. The space must be designed specifically to serve interior recreational functions and not merely be leftover unrentable space used to meet the open space requirement. Such space must include amenities and design elements that will encourage use by residents.
   e. Shared roof-decks. For multifamily buildings, up to 50-percent of the required open space may be provided by shared roof-decks located on the top of buildings which are available to
all residents and meet the requirements below. For mixed-use buildings, 100-percent of the required open space may be provided by shared roof-decks. Design requirements:

i. Space must feature hard surfacing, provide amenities such as seating areas, landscaping, and/or other features that encourage use.

ii. Space must integrate landscaping elements that enhance the character of the space and encourage its use.

iii. Space must incorporate features that provide for the safety of residents, such as enclosures, railings, and appropriate lighting levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 19.123.200(B)(1)(e) Rooftop deck examples.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Shared open space design requirements. Shared open space can include landscaped courtyards or decks, entrance plazas, gardens with pathways, children’s play areas, pools, and water features provided they are accessible to all residents of the development. Accessible areas used for storm water retention, infiltration, or other multipurpose recreational and/or green spaces that meet the design criteria herein may qualify as shared open space.

Special requirements for shared open spaces include the following:

a. Shared open space must be located in centralized areas that are visible from units within the development.

b. Required setback areas must not count as shared open space unless the design of the space meets the standards herein.

c. Shared open space must feature no dimension less than 15-feet in order to provide functional leisure or recreational activity. Wider minimum dimensions are required perpendicular to building elevations containing windows of dwelling units whose only solar access is from the applicable building wall. Specifically:

i. 20-feet minimum for such elevations up to three-stories tall.

ii. 25-feet minimum for such elevations four-stories tall.

iii. 30-feet minimum for such elevations five or more stories tall.
Shared open space – minimum widths when adjacent to building elevations containing windows of dwelling units whose only solar access is from the applicable building wall.

d. Shared open space must feature paths or walkable lawns, landscaping, seating, lighting, and play structures, sports courts, or other pedestrian amenities to make the area more functional and enjoyable for a range of users.

e. Shared open space must be separated from ground-level windows, streets, service areas and parking lots with via landscaping, fencing, and/or other acceptable treatments that enhance safety and privacy for both the shared open space and dwelling units.
f. When possible, the space should be oriented to receive sunlight, facing east, west or preferably south.

g. Stairways and service elements located within or on the edge of shared open space must not be included in the open space calculations.

h. Shared porches may qualify as shared open space, provided they are at least eight-feet in depth and 96-square-feet in total area.

i. The space must be accessible to all residents of the development.

**Figure 19.123.190(B)(2)**
Shared open space examples.

The upper left example is a courtyard over a parking deck. Notice the transition elements between the courtyard and adjacent residential units. The upper right courtyard is shared by ground-level commercial uses and apartments above.

The left image above includes a covered gathering space with outdoor grills adjacent to a landscaped commons with a central pathway. The right image is an example of shared indoor recreation space.
C. Usable commercial open space. New developments on designated Storefront block-frontages and other developments with non-residential uses with more than 10,000-square-feet of gross floor area must provide 400-square-feet of pedestrian-oriented space for each 100-lineal-feet of block-frontage. Pedestrian-oriented space located adjacent to street corners may be counted for the frontages of both streets. Portions of sidewalks that are wider than the minimum required in MTMC 19.50.090 may be used to meet up to 50-percent of this requirement.

DEPARTURE: Pedestrian-oriented space area may be reduced by 50-percent if the director finds the project includes exceptional design features and elements that meet the purpose of the standards. This includes open spaces that feature a combination of design (site materials, amenities, and configuration) and location/context that clearly exceed typical plaza designs found in the region.

D. Pedestrian-oriented space design criteria. This subsection describes the requirements and desired characteristics of pedestrian oriented open space [which may be used to meet the requirements of subsection (C) above].

1. Required pedestrian-oriented open space features.
   a. Visual and pedestrian access into the site from a street, private access road, or non-vehicular courtyard.
   b. Paved walking surfaces of either concrete or approved unit paving. Form-in-place pervious concrete paving is allowed.
   c. Lighting must conform to MTMC 19.120.030.
   d. The spaces must be located in or adjacent to areas with significant pedestrian traffic to provide interest and security, such as adjacent to or visible from a building entry.
   e. At least two-feet of seating area (a bench or ledge at least 16-inches deep and appropriate seating height) or one individual seat per 60-square-feet of plaza area or open space.
   f. Landscaping components that add visual interest and do not act as a visual barrier. This could include planting beds, raised planters, and/or potted plants, or both.

2. Desirable pedestrian-oriented open space features:
   a. Pedestrian amenities, such as site furniture, artwork, drinking fountains, shade structures kiosks, or other similar features.
   b. Adjacent buildings with transparent windows and doors covering at least 50-percent of the façade between 30-inches and 10-feet above the ground-level.
   c. Pedestrian weather protection, alcoves, seating, or other features along building edges to allow for outdoor gathering.

3. Features prohibited within a pedestrian-oriented open space:
   a. Asphalt pavement.
   b. Adjacent service areas (e.g., trash areas, loading docks) that are not separated with landscaping, as required by MTMC 19.123.210.
   c. Adjacent chain-link fences.
   d. Adjacent “blank walls” without “blank wall treatment” (see MTMC 19.123.270).
   e. Outdoor storage.
Figure 19.123.190(D)
Example of site development integrating pedestrian-oriented space.
Figure 19.123.190(D)(1)
Example of a small pedestrian-oriented open space.

2 lineal feet of seating area, ledge, bench, etc. or 1 individual seat per 60 square feet of area

Spaces positioned adjacent to building entries and/or pedestrian-oriented facades are strongly encouraged

Sculpture, artwork, kiosk, and site furniture are encouraged

Pedestrian-scaled lighting

Landscaping components that add seasonal interest to the space

Avoid:
- Asphalt or gravel pavement
- Adjacent blank walls & chain linked fences

Concrete or unit paving

Visual access to site from street or primary internal access
19.123.200 - Internal pedestrian access and design.

A. Purpose.

1. To improve the pedestrian and bicycling environment by making it easier, safer, and more comfortable to walk or ride among residences, to businesses, to the street sidewalk, to transit stops, through parking lots, to adjacent properties, and connections throughout the city.

2. To enhance access to on- and off-site open space areas and pedestrian/bicycle paths.

B. Access to sidewalk. All buildings must feature pedestrian connections to a sidewalk per applicable block-frontage standards in Article 2.

C. Internal circulation.

1. For sites with multiple buildings, pedestrian paths connecting businesses and residential entries on the same development site must be provided. Routes that minimize walking distances must be utilized to the extent practical.

   DEPARTURES will be allowed where steep slopes prevent a direct connection or where an indirect route would enhance the design and/or use of a common usable open space. See subsection (D) below for pathway design standards.

2. Sites with residential units. Provide direct pedestrian access between all ground related unit entries and a public street or to a clearly marked pathway network or open space that has direct access to a public street. Residential developments must provide a pedestrian circulation network that connects all main entrances on the site to other areas of the site, such as:

   a. Parking areas.

   b. Recreational areas.

   c. Common outdoor areas.

   d. Any pedestrian amenities.

For townhouses or other residential units fronting the street, the sidewalk may be used to meet this standard.
19.123.210 - Service areas and mechanical equipment.

A. Purpose.

1. To minimize adverse visual, odor, and noise impacts of mechanical equipment, utility cabinets and service areas at ground and roof levels.
2. To provide adequate, durable, well-maintained, and accessible service and equipment areas.
3. To protect residential uses and adjacent properties from impacts due to location and utilization of service areas.

B. Location of ground related service areas and mechanical equipment.

1. Service areas (loading docks, trash dumpsters, compactors, recycling areas, electrical panels, and mechanical equipment areas) must be located for convenient service access while avoiding negative visual, auditory, olfactory, or physical impacts on the streetscape environment, pedestrian-oriented spaces, uses within the development, and adjacent residentially zoned properties.

   The director may require evidence that such elements will not significantly impact neighboring properties or public areas. (For example, the director may require noise damping specifications for fans near residential zones.)

2. Exterior loading areas. Exterior loading areas for commercial uses must not be located within 20-feet of a residentially zoned property. DEPARTURES may be allowed where such a restriction does not allow feasible development, and alternative design measures can successfully mitigate potential negative impacts. For example, areas and drives may be required by the reviewing authority to be separated from the residential lot by a masonry wall at least eight-feet high.

3. Service areas must not be visible from the sidewalk and adjacent properties. Where the director finds that the only option for locating a service area is an area visible from a street, internal pathway or pedestrian area, or from an adjacent property, the area must be screened with structural and or landscaping screening measures provided in subsection (C) below and MTMC Chapter 19.130.

4. Design for safety. Other provisions of this section notwithstanding, service areas used by residents must be located to avoid entrapment areas and other conditions where personal security is potentially a problem. The director may require pedestrian-scaled lighting or other measures to enhance security.

5. Locate and/or shield noise producing mechanical equipment such as fans, heat pumps, etc, to minimize sounds and reduce impacts to at property lines adjacent to residentially zoned properties.

6. Dumpster storage areas.
   a. Dumpster storage areas must be provided for all non-residential and multifamily development.
   b. Dumpster storage areas must be on-site and must not be located in the public right-of-way.
   c. Dumpster storage areas must be sized to accommodate the minimum dumpster sizes (as required by the applicable utility provider) for garbage, recycling, and composting.
C. **Screening of ground related service areas and mechanical equipment.** Service elements are encouraged to be integrated within the structure. Where they are not provided within the structure, the following standards apply:

1. Where screening of ground-level service areas is required [see subsection (B)(3) above], the following applies:
   a. A structural enclosure must be constructed of masonry, heavy-gauge metal, or decay-resistant material that is also used with the architecture of the main building. The reviewing authority may allow materials other than those used for the main building if the finishes are similar in color and texture or if the proposed enclosure materials are more durable than those for the main structure. The walls must be sufficient to provide full screening from the affected roadway, pedestrian areas or adjacent use. The enclosure may use overlapping walls to screen dumpsters and other materials [see Figure 19.62.070(C) below].
   b. Gates must be made of heavy-gauge, site-obscuring material. Chain link or chain link with slats is not an acceptable material for enclosures or gates.
   c. Where the interior of a service enclosures is visible from surrounding streets, pathways, and buildings, an opaque or semi-opaque horizontal cover or screen must be used to mitigate unsightly views. The horizontal screen/cover should be integrated into the enclosure design (in terms of materials and/or design).
   d. Collection points must be located and configured so that the enclosure gate swing does not obstruct pedestrian or vehicle vehicular traffic, or does not require that a hauling truck project into any public right-of-way. Ensure that screening elements allow for efficient service delivery and removal operations.
   e. The service area must be paved.

2. The sides and rear of service enclosures must be screened with landscaping at least five-feet wide in locations visible from the street, parking lots, and pathways to soften views of the screening element and add visual interest.

   **DEPARTURES** to the provisions of subsections (C)(1) and (2) will be considered per MTMC 19.110.260 provided the enclosure and landscaping treatment meet the purpose of the standards and add visual interest to site users.

3. Where loading docks are sited along block frontages (only allowed when no other reasonable options are available as determined by the director), they must be designed to minimize impacts on the pedestrian environment. Standards:
   a. Configure loading docks/bays to minimize their frontage length along blocks.
   b. Integrate architectural and/or landscaping design features to screen loading dock elements and add visual interest to pedestrians along adjacent sidewalks. See Blank Wall provisions of MTMC 19.123.270 for standards and examples.
D. **Utility meters, electrical conduit, and other service utility apparatus.**

These elements must be located and/or designed to minimize their visibility to the public. Project designers are strongly encouraged to coordinate with applicable service providers early in the design process to determine the best approach in meeting these standards. If such elements are mounted in a location visible from the street, pedestrian pathway, shared open space, or shared auto courtyards, they must be screened with vegetation and/or integrated into the building’s architecture.

![Utility meters, electrical conduit, and other service utility apparatus.](image)

**Figure 19.123.210(D)**

Utility meter location and screening - good and bad examples.

Place utility meters in less visible locations. The lower left example is successfully tucked away in a less visible location and screened by vegetation. The right image is poorly executed and would not be permitted in such visible locations (along the sidewalk). Such meters must be coordinated and better integrated with the architecture of the building.

E. **Location and screening of roof mounted mechanical equipment.**

1. All rooftop mechanical equipment, including air conditioners, heaters, vents, and similar equipment must be effectively screened from public view both at grade and from nearby higher buildings with the exception of solar panels and roof-mounted wind turbines. Screening must be located so as not to interfere with operation of the equipment.

2. Rooftop mechanical equipment and associated screening features must be setback from the exterior building walls by at least ten-feet. Exceptions may be made where the screening element is designed to help meet one or more building design standards of Article 4 of MTMC Chapter 19.123.

3. For rooftop equipment, all screening devices must be well integrated into the architectural design through such elements as parapet walls, false roofs, roof wells, clerestories, or equipment rooms. Screening walls or unit-mounted screening is allowed but less desirable. Wood must not be used for screens or enclosures. Louvered designs are acceptable if consistent with building design style. Perforated metal is not permitted.

4. The screening materials must be of material requiring minimal maintenance and must be as high as the equipment being screened.

5. Locate and/or shield noise producing mechanical equipment such as fans, heat pumps, etc. to minimize sounds and reduce impacts to not at property lines adjacent properties.

Also see MTMC 19.123.250(F) for design provisions for flat rooftops.
The left illustration shows how rooftop mechanical equipment can be located and screened effectively. The right images show effective location and screening, including side walls and a trellis to screen views from taller surrounding buildings.
Article 4 - Building Design

Sections:
19.123.220 - Purpose.
19.123.240 - Building massing and articulation.
19.123.250 - Building details.

19.123.220 - Purpose.
This section provides direction for the design of buildings consistent with the goals and policies of the Mountlake Terrace Comprehensive Plan. See the individual “purpose” statements for each section in this chapter.

Public buildings may be exempted from building massing and articulation standards (see MTMC 19.123.240), building details standards (see MTMC 19.123.250), building materials provisions (see MTMC 19.123.260), and blank wall treatment standards (see MTMC 19.123.270) provided design treatments are integrated to meet the following objectives:
A. Enliven the pedestrian environment along the adjacent sidewalks.
B. Incorporate a prominent and inviting entry visible from the street.
C. Building design and materials should evoke a sense of permanence.
D. Site and building design stands out from the surrounding context as a distinct landmark and provides visual interest from all observable scales.
19.123.240 - Building massing and articulation.

A. Purpose.
To employ façade articulation techniques that reduce the perceived scale of large buildings and add visual interest from all observable scales.

B. Tower design. The following standards apply to buildings over seven stories.

1. Tower separation standards. Towers (portions of buildings over seven stories) must maintain at least 40-feet of separation from other towers. DEPARTURES will be considered for towers constructed on the same site, provided the configuration and orientation of the towers maximize privacy and minimize skyline, skyview, and access to light impacts. Factors to consider in determining if a proposed departure meets the purpose include the extent of building area that doesn’t meet separation requirement, lot size and configuration, surrounding context, skyline views from a full range of observable views, and subject building uses.

2. Tower form. Towers must employ original and distinctive form, including horizontal and vertically articulated components that provide depth, richness, and interest to the building from multiple vantage points. Simple box design for towers is prohibited. Example design treatments:
   a. Round/sculpted forms.
   b. Layered building forms.
   c. Wall plane offsets and/or material changes that create shadows and relief.
   d. Creative fenestration pattern changes.

Figure 19.123.240(B)
Tower design examples.

Building 1 includes substantial podium with a curved tower that includes vertical articulation on one side. Building 2 includes a number of massing offsets with changes in fenestration that lend interest and depth to the façade. Building 3 also uses a number of massing offsets and material/fenestration changes to add visual interest. All buildings have a strong ground-level emphasis.
C. Façade-articulation. All buildings under eight-stories tall must include façade-articulation features at maximum-specified intervals to create a human-scaled pattern. These standards apply to building elevations facing streets, parks, access corridors, and residential zones.

1. Maximum façade-articulation intervals:
   a. 57th Avenue W and 233rd Street SW: 30-feet.
   b. Storefronts and other non-residential frontages: 40-feet.
   c. Residential-frontages: The width of the dwelling units inside the building (e.g., if the units are 25-feet wide, the façade-articulation must be 25-feet wide).

2. Articulation features. At least three of the following articulation features must be employed for all buildings in compliance with the maximum-specified façade-articulation intervals.
   a. Use of a window-fenestration pattern.
   b. Use of weather protection features.
   c. Use of vertical piers/columns (applies to all floors of the façade, excluding upper level stepbacks).
   d. Change in roofline per subsection (E) below.
   e. Change in building material and/or siding style (applies to all floors of the façade, excluding upper-level stepbacks).
   f. Vertical elements such as a trellis with plants, green wall, art element that meet the purpose of the standard.
   g. Providing vertical building modulation of at least 12-inches in depth if tied to a change in roofline per subsection (E) below or a change in building material, siding style, or color. Balconies may be used to qualify for this option if they are recessed or projected from the façade by at least 18-inches.
   h. Other design techniques that effectively reinforce a pattern of articulated facades compatible with the building’s surrounding context.

DEPARTURES will be considered provided they meet the purpose of the standards and the design criteria below. For example, a departure may propose a design with only two articulation features instead of three and/or the articulation features exceed the maximum articulation interval.
Figure 19.123.240(C)(2)  
Façade articulation examples.

Both buildings use a combination of window patterns, weather protection features, and vertical piers to effectively articulate the facade.

All three buildings above include a combination of window patterns and vertical building modulation. The left building uses recessed balconies, whereas the middle and right example use projecting balconies. The left and middle buildings also include weather protection features.

3. DEPARTURE criteria associated with articulation standards. Proposals must meet the purpose of the standards. The following criteria will be considered in determining whether the proposed articulation treatment meets the “purpose”.

   a. Consider the type and width of the proposed articulation treatment and how effective it is in meeting the purpose given the building’s current and desired context (per Mountlake Terrace’s Town Center Subarea Plan).

   b. Consider the applicable block-frontage designation. Secondary or Landscaped block-frontages warrant more flexibility than Storefront block-frontages.

   c. Consider the size and width of the building. Smaller buildings (less than 120-feet wide) warrant greater flexibility than larger buildings.

   d. Consider the quality of façade materials in concert with doors, windows, and other façade features and their ability to add visual interest to the street from a pedestrian scale and more distant observable scales.
D. **Maximum façade length.** Building facades and other building elevations facing lower intensity zone edge must include at least one of the following features to break up the massing of the building and add visual interest. This standard applies to applicable building elevations longer than 140-feet.

1. Provide vertical building modulation at least six-feet deep and 15-feet long. For multi-story buildings, the modulation must extend through at least one-half of the building floors.

2. Use of a contrasting vertical modulated design component featuring all of the following:
   a. Utilizes a change in building materials that effectively contrast from the rest of the façade.
   b. Component is modulated vertically from the rest of the façade by an average of six-inches.

3. Façade employs building walls with contrasting articulation that make it appear like multiple distinct buildings. To qualify for this option, these contrasting façades must employ all of the following:
   a. Different building materials and/or configuration of building materials.
   b. Contrasting window design (sizes or configurations).

4. DEPARTURES to subsections (D)(1-3) will be considered provided the design meets the purpose of the standards. Supplemental consideration for approving alternative designs:
   a. Width of the façade. The larger the façade, the more substantial articulation/ modulation features need to be.
   b. Block-frontage designation. Storefront designated block-frontages warrant the most scrutiny.
   c. The type of articulation treatment and how effective it is in meeting the purpose given the building’s context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 19.123.240(D)</th>
<th>Illustrating maximum façade length standards and good and bad examples.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Less than 140' long: Meets standard" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="More than 140' long: Does not meet standard" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. **Roofline modulation.** Roofline modulation is encouraged and it can be used as one of the façade articulation features in subsections (C) and (D) above. In order to qualify as an articulation feature, rooflines must employ one or more of the following:

1. For flat roofs or façades with horizontal eave, fascia, or parapet, the minimum vertical dimension of roofline modulation is the greater of two-feet or 0.1 multiplied by the wall height (finish grade to top of the wall) when combined with vertical building modulation techniques described in subsections above. Otherwise, the minimum vertical dimension of roofline modulation is the greater of four-feet or 0.2 multiplied by the wall height.

2. A pitched roofline or gabled roofline segment of at least 20-feet in width. Buildings with pitched roofs must include a minimum slope of 5:12 and feature modulated roofline components at the interval required per the applicable standard above.

3. A combination of the above.

**DEPARTURES** will be considered provided the roofline modulation design effectively reduces the perceived scale of the building and adds visual interest.
Figure 19.123.240(E)
Acceptable examples of roofline modulation.
19.123.250 - Building details.

A. Purpose.

1. To encourage the incorporation of design details and small-scale elements into building façades that are attractive at a pedestrian scale.

2. To integrate window design that adds depth, richness, and visual interest to the façade.

B. Façade details - non-residential and mixed-use buildings. All building façades and other building elevations facing parks, pedestrian-oriented spaces, and containing primary building entrances must be enhanced with appropriate details. All new buildings must employ at least one detail element from each of the three categories below for each façade articulation interval [see MTMC 19.123.240(B)].

1. Window and/or entry treatment, such as:
   a. Transom windows.
   b. Roll-up windows/doors.
   c. Recessed entry.
   d. Decorative door.
   e. Other decorative or specially designed window or entry treatment that meets the purpose of the standards.

![Figure 19.123.250(B)(1)
Examples of decorative or specially designed windows and entries.](image)
2. Building elements and façade details, such as:
   a. Custom-designed weather protection element such as a steel canopy, glass, or retractable awning. Custom-designed cloth awnings may be counted as a detail provided they are constructed of durable, high-quality material.
   b. Decorative building-mounted light fixtures.
   c. Bay windows, trellises, towers, and similar elements.
   d. Other details or elements that meet the purpose of these standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 19.123.250(B)(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of attached elements that enhance the visual intrigue of the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of attached elements that enhance the visual intrigue of the building. Upper left (a) = retractable awning. Top center (d) = custom hanging bike rack and repair station integrated as a storefront design element. Upper right (b) = decorative lighting fixtures. Lower left and middle (a) = custom decorative canopy. Lower right (c) = decorative tower.

3. Building materials and other façade elements, such as:
   a. Use of decorative building materials/use of building materials. Examples include decorative use of brick, tile, or stonework.
   b. Decorative kick-plate, pilaster, base panel, or other similar feature.
   c. Hand-crafted material, such as special wrought iron or carved wood.
   d. Other details that meet the purpose of the standards.
DEPARTURES for façade detail standards of subsection (B) will be considered provided the façade (at the overall scale and at the individual articulation scale) meets the purpose of the standards.

C. Window design standards.

1. All windows must be recessed by at least two-inches from the façade to add depth and richness to the building. Other design treatments to windows that add depth, richness, and visual interest to the façade will be considered. Exemptions:
   a. Storefront display windows.
   b. Windows on buildings over seven-stories in height provided such buildings comply with MTTC 19.123.240(B).

2. Highly reflective glass must not be used on more than ten-percent of a building façade or other building elevations facing parks and containing primary building entrances.
D. **Cornice/roofline design.** Buildings employing a flat roof must employ a distinctive roofline that effectively provides an identifiable “top” to the building. This could include a traditional cornice line or a contemporary interpretation of a traditional cornice line.

1. Such rooflines must be proportional to the size and scale of the building.
2. Understated cornice lines are permitted depending on the materials and design of the base and middle elements in reinforcing the base/middle/top configuration.

Figure 19.123.250(E) below illustrate acceptable and unacceptable examples.
E. Articulated building entries. The primary building entrance for an office building, hotel, apartment building, public or community-based facility or other multi-story commercial building must be designed as a clearly defined and demarcated standout architectural feature of the building. Such entrances must be easily distinguishable from regular storefront entrances on the building. Such entries must be scaled proportional to the building. See Figure 19.123.250(E) below for good examples.

Rooftop solar units are permitted, provided the placement and design of units visible from the surrounding streetscape are carefully integrated into the overall design concept of the building.
F. **Flat rooftop design.** All roofs must be designed as a fifth building elevation. This can be accomplished by exhibiting patterns of roofing colors and/or materials to add visual interest from surrounding development (current and future). Green roofs and rooftop decks are encouraged as a means to help comply with this standard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 19.123.250(F)</th>
<th>Flat rooftop design examples.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

![Flat rooftop design examples](image-url)

A. Purpose.

1. To encourage the use of durable, high quality, and urban building materials that minimize maintenance cost and provide visual interest from all observable vantage points.

2. To promote the use of a distinctive mix of materials that helps to articulate façades and lends a sense of depth and richness to the buildings.

3. To place the highest priority on the first floor in the quality and detailing of materials at the pedestrian scale.

B. Special conditions and limitations for the use of certain cladding materials.

1. Concrete block (a.k.a. Concrete Masonry Unit or CMU) may be used as a secondary cladding material (no more than 1/3 of total façade cladding) on all building façades and other building elevations facing parks, pedestrian-oriented spaces, and containing primary building entrances provided it is incorporated with other permitted materials.

DEPARTURES will be considered for alternative designs that use concrete block as the primary, but not the only, cladding material provided the design incorporates a combination of textures and/or colors to add visual interest. For example, combining split or rock-façade units with smooth blocks can create distinctive patterns. The figures below illustrate acceptable concrete block use/designs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 19.123.260(B)(1) Acceptable concrete block use/design.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Building 1 uses smooth-faced CMU as a contrasting feature that helps to highlight the main building entry. The simple design helps to add emphasis to the doors, canopy and decorative sconce lights.

Building 2 illustrates an acceptable departure example, as CMU is used as the primary cladding material. Note the use of beige split-façade CMU’s above each of the awnings and coupled with the use of smooth-faced gray CMU’s on the vertical columns (which employ black accent tiles for added interest).
2. Metal siding may be used on all street facing building elevations provided it complies with the following standards:
   
a. It must feature visible corner molding and trim and does not extend to the ground-level of non-residential and mixed-use buildings and no lower than two-feet above grade for residential buildings. Masonry, concrete, or other durable material must be incorporated between the metal siding and the ground plane.
   
b. Metal siding must be factory finished, with a matte, non-reflective surface.

DEPARTURES will be considered provided the material's integration and overall façade composition meets the purpose of the standards.

![Acceptable metal siding examples](image)

Buildings 1 and 2 successfully use metal siding more as an accent element to help articulate the façade. Metal siding is the primary material for Buildings 3 and 4, both of which integrate subtle changes in color to go with articulation features and design details.
3. Standards for the use of Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS). Such material/finishes may be used when it complies with the following:
   a. EIFS is limited to no more than 20-percent of the total façade area and may not be the primary cladding material on non-residential and mixed-use buildings.
   b. EIFS must feature a smooth or sand finish only.
   c. EIFS must be trimmed in wood, masonry, or other material and must be sheltered from weather by roof overhangs or other methods.
   d. EIFS must not be used on the ground floor of facades containing non-residential uses.

DEPARTURES will be considered provided the material's integration and overall façade composition meets the purpose of the standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 19.123.260(B)(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable and unacceptable EIFS examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buildings 1 and 2 mix EIFS with brick and other materials and integrate trim details around windows to add a sense of depth to the façade. Building 3 uses EIFS is between the window and sidewalk - this design is prohibited. Building 4 uses EIFS as the primary siding material, which is prohibited.
4. Cementitious wall board paneling/siding may be used provided it meets the following provisions:
   a. Cement board paneling/siding may not be used on ground-level facades containing non-residential uses.
   b. Where cement board paneling/siding is the dominant siding material, the design must integrate a mix of colors and/or textures that are articulated consistent with windows, balconies, and modulated building surfaces and are balanced with façade details that add visual interest from the ground-level and adjacent buildings.

DEPARTURES will be considered provided the material's integration and overall façade composition meets the purpose of the standards.

Figures 19.123.260(B)(4)
Acceptable and unacceptable cementitious wall board examples.

The above building uses cementitious wall board in different textures and colors to help articulate the façade. The white color replicates the board and batten style in the left image and green color in the right image effectively replicates horizontal wood siding.

The wall board panels covering a large area in a single color would not meet the purpose of the standards. The right image is a better example and combines larger panels (dark maroon color) with horizontal wall board siding (beige color) as effective articulation features. Below is a similar acceptable example.

A. Purpose.

1. To avoid untreated blank walls.
2. To retain and enhance the character of Mountlake Terrace’s streetscapes.

B. Blank wall definition. “Blank wall” means a ground floor wall or portion of a ground floor wall over 10-feet in height and a horizontal length greater than 15-feet and does not include a transparent window or door.

C. Blank wall treatment standards. Untreated blank walls adjacent to a public street, pedestrian-oriented space, common usable open space, or pedestrian pathway are prohibited. Methods to treat blank walls can include:

1. Display windows at least 16-inches of depth to allow for changeable displays. Tack-on display cases [see Figure 19.123.270(C) below] do not qualify as a blank wall treatment.
2. Landscape planting bed at least five-feet deep or a raised planter bed at least two-feet high and three-feet deep in front of the wall with planting materials that are sufficient to obscure or screen at least 60-percent of the wall’s surface within three years.
3. Installing a vertical trellis in front of the wall with climbing vines or plant materials.
4. Installing a mural as approved by the director and reviewed by the Arts Advisory Commission. Commercial advertisements are not permitted on such murals.
5. Special building detailing that adds visual interest at a pedestrian scale. Such detailing must use a variety of surfaces; monotonous designs will not meet the purpose of the standards.

For large visible blank walls, a variety of treatments may be required to meet the purpose of the standards.
Buildings 1-3 feature acceptable treatments including a combination of high quality materials and landscaping (1), decorative lighting/sculptural element (2), and decorative artwork. The display cases in Building 4 don’t meet the 16” depth requirement, nor do they meet the purpose of the standards.
D. **Firewalls.** Firewalls along property lines are exempt from the above standards, but where they are visible to the public (from the adjacent street), they must be designed to provide visual interest from all observable distances. Examples may include the use of varying materials, textures, and/or colors, the use of green or living walls, and/or the use of modulated building walls to form design patterns.

Murals are also encouraged as a firewall treatment. Murals are subject to review by the Arts Advisory Commission and approval by the director. Commercial advertisements are not permitted on such murals.

**Figure 19.123.270(D)**
Acceptable firewall design where visible to the public.

The left image uses a combination of paint bands and ivy to enhance the appearance of this large exposed firewall. The building in the right image uses simple scoring patterns and change in materials and color on part of the top floor to add visual interest.

Plain-gray concrete block firewalls such as this are not allowed when visible from the street.
Appendix E: Town Center Revised Sewer Modeling Technical Memorandum
INTRODUCTION

The City of Mountlake Terrace is planning to increase density in the Town Center area within the vicinity of the proposed Light Rail Station and Transit Center. The increased density includes additional housing and employment capacity. Berk Consulting has provided the boundary of the Town Center area that is proposed to be developed, as well as an estimate of the total number of new housing units and commercial space. The location is indicated on Figure 1 by a black outline.

Additionally, the City is in the process of developing an updated Sewer Comprehensive Plan (Plan), which includes projections for future development and recommended improvements to address system deficiencies. As part of this effort, a sewer model was developed using the InfoSewer software in ArcMap. The modeling conducted for the Plan includes projected flows for the 20-year development period, which is assumed to approximate buildout conditions. Given the revised growth projections for the Town Center area, the model was used to determine whether the increased density will cause capacity problems downstream.

This memo serves to document the revised flow calculations for the planned increased development, the modeling process, and the results of the revised modeling.

REVISED FLOWS

The existing (2018) scenario developed for the City’s Draft Sewer Comprehensive Plan (January 2019) included 440 ERUs within the Town Center area. The buildout (2038) scenario for the Draft Plan originally included an addition of 865 ERUs within the
Town Center area, resulting in a total of 1,305 ERUs at the end of the 20-year planning period.

The increased density within the Town Center is planned to add approximately 3,000 new housing units and 625,000 square feet of new commercial area by 2035. Assuming 1 employee per 320 square feet of commercial area (per email correspondence with Kevin Gifford of Berk Consulting, April 3, 2019), the estimated number of additional employees in the area is 1,953 (625,000 sf/320 sf per employee). The Draft Plan determined an average of 1.5 employees per ERU, so the resulting commercial ERU value is 1,302 (1,953 employees/1.5 employees per ERU). The revised projection therefore totals 4,302 new ERUs (3,000 residential ERUs + 1,302 commercial ERUs) within the Town Center area by 2035.

Modeled ERUs and flows are summarized in Table 1. It should be noted that the Draft Plan includes scenarios that include inflow and infiltration (I/I) from both a 2-year storm and a 10-year storm. These separate I/I scenarios are presented in the table below.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>ERUs</th>
<th>Domestic Average Day Flow (gpd)</th>
<th>Domestic Peak Hour Flow (gpm)</th>
<th>Peak Hour I/I Flow (gpm)</th>
<th>Total Peak Hour Flow (gpm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2018) w/2-year I/I</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>54,950</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>307.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout (2038) Draft Plan</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>163,132</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>412.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout (2038) Revised</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>592,700</td>
<td>576.2</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>830.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout (2038) Draft Plan</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>163,132</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>325.1</td>
<td>483.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout (2038) Revised</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>592,700</td>
<td>576.2</td>
<td>325.1</td>
<td>901.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Based on a peaking factor of approximately 1.4 as determined in the Draft Plan.
(2) I/I flow is not changed in the revised modeling. It is assumed that the increased density and development will not impact I/I.

The total additional flow in the area was divided by the number of loading manholes in the sanitary sewer model to develop flow loading on a per-manhole basis.

**RESULTS**

The revised domestic flow projections for 2038 cause five additional pipes to be overcapacity as compared with the previous 2038 flow projections included in the Draft Plan.
Plan. These five pipes are generally isolated such that the pipes both upstream and downstream are not overcapacity. Each of the pipes is also nearly flat, while the surrounding pipes have steeper slopes, and can therefore accommodate higher flows. Surcharging in the upstream manholes of the three pipes is less than 1 foot during the peak flow periods in both the 2- and 10-year I/I scenarios. The five pipes are indicated on Figure 1.

CONCLUSION

Due to the location and minimal surcharging in each of the five pipes, no improvements are recommended to address the capacity problems. The pipes upstream and downstream have sufficient capacity for the increased flows, so upsizing single sections of pipe would result in mismatched diameters. Because the surcharging during the peak hour flow in the model is less than 1 foot, the capacity problems are not considered to be severe enough to warrant pipe replacement.
Appendix F: Conceptual Review of Planning
Commission Recommended Changes to
Proposed Action Alternative
MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 18, 2019

TO: Christy Osborn – Director, Department of Community and Economic Development
Stephen Clifton – Assistant City Manager

FROM: Kevin Gifford – Senior Associate, BERK Consulting
Lisa Grueter – Principal, BERK Consulting

RE: Town Center Plan Update Supplemental EIS – Conceptual Review of Planning Commission Recommended Changes to Proposed Action Alternative

Introduction

On July 16, 2019, as part of its deliberations on proposed code amendments associated with the Town Center Plan Update, the Mountlake Terrace Planning Commission recommended several modifications to the Proposed Action Alternative, including expansion of the Town Center Core boundary to include approximately 3 additional acres adjacent to the southeastern corner of the Town Center Core area. The Planning Commission also recommended removal of transitional zoning along the southern boundary of the Town Center Core between 60th Avenue W and 56th Avenue W. A map of these recommended changes is presented in Exhibit 1 through Exhibit 4.

Though it would expand the boundary of the Town Center, the Planning Commission Recommendation would result in the same overall population and employment growth as the Proposed Action Alternative. While the Draft Supplemental Impact Statement (DSEIS) does not analyze this Planning Commission Recommendation as a distinct alternative, this memorandum provides a conceptual-level analysis of potential environmental impacts for the topics covered by the DSEIS, relative to the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives.

Review of Potential Environmental Impacts

Because the Planning Commission Recommendation would not change the overall level of population or employment growth, potential environmental impacts associated with relevant topics would be the same as the Proposed Action Alternative. Each topic area in the DSEIS is discussed specifically below.

LAND USE

The Planning Commission Recommendation would result in a gradual increase in land use intensity throughout the Town Center, similar to the Proposed Action Alternative. Unlike the rest of the Town Center
Core, the expansion area would form a “lobe” that extends eastward from the rest of the Core. Surrounded on three sides by low-density residential zoning, the expansion area could expose additional adjacent properties to land use transition impacts in the form of increased land use intensity, increased pedestrian and vehicle traffic, and changes to the local land use pattern. However, development in the expansion area would be subject to the same design standards as other properties in Town Center District 3, as well as applicable block frontage standards and streetscape designation standards.

AESTHETICS

Expansion of the Town Center Core would allow for increased building heights in the expansion area. As described in the DSEIS, the properties surrounding the current Town Center boundary are primarily zoned for single-family residential uses and townhomes with relatively low building heights. The expansion area is currently zoned to allow heights up to 30-35 feet, and inclusion in the Town Center Core would allow heights up to 70 feet. Development on these properties would also be required to comply with the same design standards as other properties in Town Center District 3, as well as applicable block frontage standards and streetscape designation standards.

Expansion of the Town Center boundary would also potentially result in transition impacts on more low-density residential properties in the areas east of 55th Avenue W, including height transition impacts and increased shading effects. Development in the expansion area would be subject to the same height transition design standards as other properties in Town Center District 3. However, removal of the transition zoning along the southern boundary of the Town Center Core under the Planning Commission Recommendation may make it more difficult to mitigate transitions between higher- and lower-intensity zones.

PUBLIC SERVICES

As described in the DSEIS, demand for public services such as parks, fire protection, and schools is primarily derived from population and employment growth. Though the Planning Commission Recommendation would expand the Town Center beyond the boundaries considered in the Proposed Action Alternative, it would entail the same level of future population and employment growth within that boundary, resulting in the same overall level of demand for these services as the Proposed Action Alternative. The Planning Commission Recommendation is not anticipated to result in any additional significant impacts to Public Services relative to the Proposed Action Alternative.

TRANSPORTATION

The Transportation analysis in the DSEIS established a study area that included most of the City of Mountlake Terrace and portions of the City of Shoreline. This study area included the additional properties recommended for inclusion by the Planning Commission, and the transportation analysis also assumed that growth under the Proposed Action Alternative was in addition to cumulative background growth that would occur regardless of the implementation of the updated Town Center Plan. As a result, the DSEIS already considers the effects of future vehicle trips from the expansion area on the city’s transportation infrastructure. While trip distribution may be slightly different under the Planning Commission Recommendation, the Town Center would be limited to the same vehicle trip bank as under the Proposed Action Alternative, and the same mitigation measures would apply.
UTILITIES

Similar to Public Services, overall demand for water and sewer services in the Town Center would be the same under the Planning Commission Recommendation and the Proposed Action Alternative because the projected level of population and employment growth is the same. Expansion of the Town Center Core would potentially lead to increased fire flow requirements in the expansion area, similar to other properties in Town Center District 3 under the Proposed Action Alternative. If added to the Town Center Core, properties in the expansion area would also be subject to mitigation measures to assure the availability of adequate water supply and fire flow prior to construction. No additional significant impacts to Utilities are anticipated for the Planning Commission Recommendation.

Conclusion

Expansion of the Town Center Core Boundary, as recommended by the Planning Commission, would be likely to result in environmental impacts similar in nature to the Proposed Action Alternative analyzed in the DSEIS, though the geographic extent of those impacts would be increased, specifically with regard to land use compatibility and aesthetic impacts (height, bulk, scale, shading).
Exhibits

Exhibit 1. Town Center Districts – Planning Commission Recommendation

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 2. Town Center Block Frontage Designations – Planning Commission Recommendation

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 3. Town Center Streetscape Designations – Planning Commission Recommendation

Roadway Classification / Sections

- **PEDESTRIAN CORE STREETS** (60’ ROW + 8’ SIDEWALK EASEMENT)
- **TOWN CENTER STREET** (60’ row / NO or + 4’ SIDEWALK EASEMENT)
- **MAINSTREET PRIMARY STREETS** (AS DESIGNATED)
- **ACCESS CORRIDORS** (30-40’ EASEMENT)

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.
Exhibit 4. Town Center Existing Land Uses – Planning Commission Recommendation

Source: City of Mountlake Terrace, 2019.