Many members of the public, as well as other city staff, also contributed to this process. Their efforts are very much appreciated.
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A Vision for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center

Why Plan for the Town Center?

A plan for a city or region is much more than just a nicely bound collection of words, photos and maps. Instead, it holds the potential for creating a new and better future. By adopting sound plans, Mountlake Terrace can take charge of its future – carefully keeping in place today’s positive features about the town while thoughtfully moving forward on implementing new strategies.

For Mountlake Terrace, like many communities, the primary purpose of a newly created town center plan lies in creating an economically healthy and revitalized downtown that will enhance the community’s quality of life. By “quality of life,” we mean being part of an attractive, prosperous community where residents enjoy where they live, work, shop and play.

How Can Redevelopment and Revitalization Be Beneficial?

City planning experts around the globe generally agree on several key principles, regardless of the size or circumstances of their city or metropolitan region. The most important of those key principles lies in the critical need for having a strong, healthy downtown. It has been said many times that a city is only as strong as its downtown core. Mountlake Terrace certainly is no exception; as a result, this plan focuses much of its efforts on strengthening that core of economic livability and vitality.

Ultimately the Mountlake Terrace Town Center Plan will be successful if it is based on sound economics, is feasible, benefits the community, and encourages quality development, a pedestrian-friendly environment, and healthy downtown businesses. So yes, a plan may be a collection of thoughts and visuals – but it represents the voice of the people who live in and care about their community as they look ahead to tomorrow.
Redeveloping and revitalizing the downtown core creates a host of community benefits, including:

1. Strengthening our business community and enhancing community services without undue tax burden on residents.
   a. The plan focuses on encouraging businesses (both new and existing) that will thrive and be consistent with the community’s downtown setting.
   b. Expanding the tax base in the commercial corridors will reduce the tax burden now being paid mostly by residents for needed community services, such as police, fire, parks and street maintenance.

2. Increasing quality of life for Mountlake Terrace residents by providing new choices locally and protecting residential neighborhoods.
   a. A revitalized town center will increase residents’ choices for nearby shopping, housing, work, and recreational activities – and generally reduce travel time.
   b. Expanded shopping and restaurants will create a town center that is a destination for all residents, providing desired products and services locally and creating a real sense of “place” in downtown Mountlake Terrace.
   c. Adding new opportunities for high-quality housing will help support downtown businesses and provide urban living and pedestrian-oriented streets.
   d. The residential character of nearby single-family neighborhoods can be protected by focusing new development in the town center and creating transition areas between commercial and single-family zones.

Key objectives that guide the Mountlake Terrace Town Center Plan include:

- Setting an attractive and achievable vision for the future.
- Creating a lively central business district in the town center core.
- Buffering single-household zones from more intense commercial development.
- Adding downtown households that will increase the customer base for downtown businesses.
- Creating an attractive destination to shop, eat, socialize, read, walk and more.
- Encouraging new compatible businesses to locate in the town center.
- Encouraging existing compatible businesses to remain in the town center.
- Providing development standards that balance community preferences with financial feasibility and allow all or most parcels in the town center to redevelop in a way that will achieve the overall vision.
- Adding attractive neighborhood stores, restaurants and coffee shops.
- Enhancing safety and security through urban design techniques.
- Creating an outdoor plaza where people will want to gather.
- Creating distinctive features (such as a clock tower, water fountain, plaza, street trees, and/or lighting) that enhance the special character of the town center.
- Ensuring good transportation and parking.
- Making safe and pleasant opportunities for people to walk.
- Promoting a friendly atmosphere for families and people of all ages.
- Reducing the portion of city revenues that come from taxes on residential properties by increasing revenues from commercial properties and sales.
- Maintaining or improving community services.
- Ensuring a strategy for future development to pay its share of any improvements needed to mitigate the development’s impacts on transportation, parks, and other city facilities (i.e., “growth to pay for growth”)
- Encouraging a healthy “green” environment that includes open spaces, landscaping and long-lasting, energy-efficient buildings.

This is a good example of a safe and pleasant streetscape for people to enjoy.
• Providing attractive gateways to the town center.
• Establishing development standards that will vary in different areas, based on unique conditions and opportunities.
• Ensuring that any new or upgraded civic buildings will maximize connectivity to town center businesses and inspire quality development.
• Emphasizing the importance of nearby amenities, especially Veterans Memorial Park and the Recreation Pavilion.
• Optimizing connectivity with I-5, 244th Street SW, 236th Street SW, and 220th Street SW.
• Using destinations, such as the city hall, recreation pavilion, post office, senior center and library to draw people downtown, enhance the sense of community, and encourage the use of retail businesses.
• Reinforcing the “main street” character of 56th Avenue W.
• Identifying priorities for public investment and steps the city should take to implement the town center plan.

Key Questions the Plan will answer

The Mountlake Terrace Town Center Plan should address many issues, including the following questions:

• What is the vision for the town center?
• What will make the area attractive as a gathering place for the community?
• What kinds of uses should be encouraged? (Restaurants and coffee shops? Auto repair yards? Casinos?)
• How can the town center become more amenable and inviting to pedestrians?
• What kinds of development will help the economy and enhance quality of life for the community?
• How can transportation and parking be managed to support the town center vision?
• What can the city do to attract or retain quality business and development?

Participants at the roundtable meetings helped to develop the objectives for the plan.

Current Land Use Map of the Town Center.
YESTERDAY, TODAY AND TOMORROW

A Brief History - Yesterday

Once Mountlake Terrace was a small suburban city with a “real” downtown where residents did most of their basic shopping. Downtown businesses included a department store, pharmacy, two grocery stores, dry cleaners, beauty shop and restaurants. In the 1970s, as happened in many cities and towns, the downtown began to decline. In fact, even though the surrounding area was growing rapidly, the downtown became emptier as businesses and customers went to outlying malls. This situation grew worse when two arson fires demolished existing key businesses in the historic heart of downtown Mountlake Terrace.

Today the downtown business zone consists of 72.8 acres, including about 65 businesses, more than 100 houses, and six churches or mosques. In this setting, retail shops and restaurants are scarce. No sit-down coffee shops exist. Between 2000 and 2006, three lots south of 236th Street SW have been or are being redeveloped for mixed use that combines commercial use on the ground floor and residential above. Development within the town center neighborhood north of 236th Street has been at low levels for the last 10-20 years.

Various attempts have been made to revitalize Mountlake Terrace’s downtown. For example, after a 1996 study, several improvements were made to the community’s “main street,” 56th Avenue West. However, until recently, downtown seemed a long way from becoming a vibrant area for neighborhood businesses, shopping, and a gathering place for the community.

Mountlake Terrace in Context - Today

Regional Setting

The city of Mountlake Terrace is located within the vibrant Puget Sound region, whose current population is estimated at about 3.5 million by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). Seattle continues to be the region’s dominant core, although recent decades have seen significant increases in population and employment in peripheral communities. Mountlake Terrace is in the southwest portion of Snohomish County, which contains many cities and towns that have contributed substantially to the region’s recent growth.

Physical Location

Mountlake Terrace sits astride Interstate 5 about 13 miles north of downtown Seattle. Surrounding jurisdictions include Edmonds, Lynnwood, Brier, Shoreline, Kenmore and Bothell. The analysis contained within this document focuses primarily on a north-south corridor running parallel to and immediately east of Interstate 5 that is envisioned as a vibrant town center. This focus area is largely concentrated along 56th Ave. W between 228th St. SW and 244th St. SW, although it extends westward toward Interstate 5 between 231st St. SW and 236th St. SW and slightly eastward between 241st St. SW and 244th St. SW. It covers about 75 acres and corresponds nearly identically to the existing community business downtown (BC/D) zone.

At present, the BC/D zone is characterized primarily by auto-oriented strip commercial development, with some office and residential uses intermingled. Not including those on the 8.4-acre super-block bounded by 56th and 58th avenues and 232nd and 234th streets, there are currently 59 parcels whose use is listed as “business.” In addition, there are 145 single-family homes and six religious facilities in the existing BC/D zone. City hall, along with its associated parking and grounds, covers 1.7 acres in the northwest portion of the town center study area adjacent to Veterans Memorial Park.
2006 Zoning Map
Part of a Growing Region

The Puget Sound region is growing, and is projected to continue growing in the coming decades. Regional forecasts conducted by PSRC point to an 11 percent average population growth rate per decade between 2000 and 2040, with the regional population estimated to have reached 5 million by 2040. For Snohomish County as a whole and SW Snohomish County, the same rate is nearly 16 percent. Additionally, from 2000-2005, the average annual population growth rate in Snohomish County outpaced those of the other four central Puget Sound counties. When employment figures are considered, a similar picture emerges. The average growth rate by decade in regional employment is projected at 12 percent, with the rate for Snohomish County at 17 percent and the rate for SW Snohomish County at nearly 19 percent.

The area within five miles of Mountlake Terrace is expected to have added about 85,000 jobs and 90,000 households by 2030; the area within 10 miles of Mountlake Terrace is projected to have added more than 230,000 jobs and more than 185,000 households within this same time period.

PSRC’s 2020 Vision Map.

New growth through 2030 within 5 Miles: 84,891 Jobs and 89,701 Households.

New growth through 2030 within 10 Miles: 231,084 Jobs and 185,400 Households.
Nearby Town Center Development

Many other cities in the Puget Sound region have embarked on programs to revitalize or create an active and economically thriving city or town center. Generally, the efforts include encouraging mixed uses and more intensity of development in a core area. Examples include Mill Creek, Lynnwood, Lake Forest Park, Burien, Renton, Everett, and Bothell.

Despite Mountlake Terrace’s favorable location and numerous advantages, it is important to actively take steps today that will allow a successful town center area to take root. A mix of housing, jobs, services and attractions is necessary to shape a vibrant and pedestrian-friendly downtown. Accomplishing such a mix will require identifying and putting into motion a series of catalytic measures, and this plan aims to do just that.

In terms of retail trade and services, Mountlake Terrace lags far behind nearby municipalities and Snohomish County.

Similar efforts have recently been undertaken in neighboring jurisdictions, including the cities of Lynnwood, Kenmore and Bothell. Lynnwood is conducting a number of studies, including a City Center Market Analysis and Absorption Study, as well as developing master plans for parks and streets in the city center. In Kenmore, a plan for 10 city-owned acres downtown calls for plazas, a signature public space, and significant mixed-use development including retail and housing. In Bothell, work is under way on a downtown plan that will seek to capitalize on opportunities related to the city’s approaching centennial.

Conceptual sketch of the planned development in Downtown Kenmore.
Demographic Overview

There are 20,390 people who live in Mountlake Terrace, according to data from the state Office of Financial Management. That population is evenly divided between men and women, with a median age of 33.5 years. The largest age groups present in the city are 35-44 and 25-34, with a senior population that is relatively small. While the city began as a bedroom community, nearly 7000 jobs are located here – meaning that the city is more of a complete community, with a wide range of homes, businesses and urban services. The jobs/housing ratio (meaning ratio of number of jobs to number of housing units) is 0.80. Largest employers are Premera Blue Cross and MILA.

Family income levels, as well as educational levels, in Mountlake Terrace continue to rise and are higher than some nearby cities, such as Lynnwood. (Mountlake Terrace Demographic Profile, p. 7)

In 2000, the percentage of multi-family residences as compared to all housing units was more similar to King County as a whole than Snohomish County as whole. However, Mountlake Terrace has a higher rate (23 percent) of owner-occupied multi-family units (e.g., condominiums) than either Snohomish or King counties (18 percent for each) [2000 Census].

During the past 35 years the city’s employment base has shifted from primarily manufacturing to professional services. Forecasts predict continued growth in retail (largest percentage gain) and professional services (largest numeric gain) during the next two decades, with little or negative growth in manufacturing and industrial sectors (Community Attributes, p. 14).

Economic and Market Trends Analysis

The Melody Hill Subarea Plan, adopted by the City Council in mid-2006, includes an Economic and Market Trends Analysis. Though targeted at the Melody Hill area, the analysis contains some Mountlake Terrace and regional information and notes that both the office and industrial markets in the Puget Sound region have shown moderate to strong demand during the past year.

Another recent report, Mountlake Terrace Town Center Project: Financial Analysis of Status Quo Scenario, was written by Property Councilors and was released in November 2006. This report includes a section entitled “Development Trends.” Page 7 of this section notes that under a status quo scenario (which includes keeping the existing regulations on downtown height), the “amount of office and retail development in the City is not likely to greatly exceed historical average levels.... While there is clearly potential for the City to increase its capture, it will require a major increase in the city’s competitive performance. Such a shift would require economic development efforts that are not part of any Status Quo scenario.”

The report also concludes that under a status quo scenario, the level of development in the Mountlake Terrace Town Center is likely to be very modest, averaging about 2,500 square feet per year. This contrasts with growth projections for the Puget Sound region, which is expected to be strong over the long-term.

Melody Hill Subarea Plan Map.
A New Direction - Tomorrow

In late 2004, the Mountlake Terrace City Council added a requirement in the city-wide comprehensive plan to create a town center plan by 2009. Following up in early 2006, the city council adopted a broad economic development goal and a work program that included developing a town center plan and evaluating options for a new city hall. Next, the council directed staff to:

1. Provide a planning process that would encourage and consider a broad range of public input;

2. Come back by the end of the year (2006) with an outstanding town center plan, including options for a new city hall, to spark significant town center revitalization.

MAKING THE CONNECTIONS

Mountlake Terrace is far from needing to start from scratch on its planning efforts. The city has laid the groundwork with a number of important plans and standards that have been under way for the past several years. Below is a description of each of those plans or standards, along with an explanation of how they all fit together – creating a strong foundation for moving forward on the new town center plan to shape future livability.

Relationship to Comprehensive Plan

Mountlake Terrace has a comprehensive plan, adopted in 2003, with minor amendments made in 2004 and 2005. The comprehensive plan contains general community information, broad goals, policies and a capital improvement plan. Comprehensive plans also may have “sub-area” plans that provide a more detailed vision, goals, and strategies for a specific neighborhood or district. Mountlake Terrace adopted its first sub-area plan, covering the Melody Hill Neighborhood, in early 2006. The town center plan is the city’s second sub-area plan.

The comprehensive plan contains several references to the town center, including this passage from the Community Livability Chapter:

“Imagine the Future:

At the heart of this neighborhood--and the community--is the town center (or “downtown,”) a central, pedestrian-oriented business district. “Town Center” is a thriving and vibrant area, where many businesses and combined business/residential buildings are located. New development is compact and walker-friendly, similar to a traditional downtown. Businesses include restaurants, coffee shops, and local services, as well as retail and offices. Parking is adequate but not visually dominant from the street. People can easily hop on transit to connect to other destinations. Attractive landscaping brings in greenery and helps absorb rainfall.
56th Avenue is the “Main Street” through the Town Center. It is lined with wide sidewalks and trees, leading to a mix of businesses, residences, and other uses. Banners and decorations announce holidays and community events.

Around the Town Center itself, a variety of homes (attached and detached) are located. They have small to medium-sized yards for open space and plants. In this neighborhood, a lot of residents know each other and participate in community events; they like being in the center of the city.

On the west side of the neighborhood, Veterans Park, the library, and public plazas encourage community-gathering. City Hall, a police station, and a fire station also provide for civic needs. City Hall serves as an attractive focal point that complements the downtown area. It features comfortable space for the public, including community meeting rooms, information displays, and a visitor center. A trail through Veterans Park connects the civic buildings to the 236th Street park-and-ride lot.

On the east side, public gathering spaces include the Recreation Pavilion, an elementary school, and Terrace Creek Park, with its tree-sheltered trail. At the Recreation Pavilion, people of all ages enjoy the indoor swimming pool and other sports facilities.”

Relationship to Development Standards

Development standards or regulations must implement and be consistent with the comprehensive plan, including any sub-area plans. Standards or regulations are more specific than plans and provide more detailed direction to guide project development. Examples of such development standards are the zoning code and the interim design standards.

The zoning code specifies the types of uses that are allowed in a given zone (e.g., public parks, offices, retail, single- or multi-family housing), requirements for parking, and requirements for building heights and setbacks. The design standards specify the types of architectural features, open space, and pedestrian connections that the development should provide.

The town center plan conflicts with certain development standards adopted prior to 2006, and especially parts of the zoning code that were adopted in the 1970s through the 1990s. To make the plan and standards consistent, a new zoning code chapter for the town center commercial area has been prepared (see Appendix 1).

Relationship to City Hall Planning

A civic center campus, located at 58th Avenue West and 232nd Street Southwest, contains city hall, a library, fire station, police station, and associated common areas and grounds. The campus is directly across the street from the “super block” that is often considered the “core” of downtown. The largest building on the campus is city hall, which was built in 1961 when Mountlake Terrace had about 1/4 of its current population. The aging building does not meet modern building and fire codes and is vulnerable to earthquake damage. It also has structural problems that are compounded by an unusual roof drainage system. A fuller description of the building’s deficiencies has been documented in previous reports, dating back since the 1980s. Engineering analysis showed that the building could not be cost-effectively
remodeled to meet new codes or significantly change space configurations. The building’s current condition is described in a 2006 report, *Synthesis of Past Reports and Assessments Concerning the Civic Center Building*. Given these factors – along with a desire to have the civic center meet more community needs – the City Council has been exploring possibilities for a new city hall.

In 2003, the city council directed that a master plan for the civic center campus be prepared to evaluate options for redeveloping part of the campus. In early 2004, the Civic Center Master Plan was completed. It recommended constructing a new fire station at a particular location on the campus (and subsequently, a fire station was built there). The Civic Center Master Plan also recommended two alternative concepts for replacing the old city hall with a new building on the existing campus. In one concept (the “treehouse”), a new two-story building would be built next to Veterans Memorial Park. It would be separated from the town center core by a parking lot and large plaza. In the other concept (the “cornerstone”), a two-story building complex would be located next to a key commercial area, forming a partial “L” at the corner of 58th Avenue West and 232nd Street Southwest. It would be separated from the town center core by a small plaza and landscaping. Vehicle parking would be in back.

Other locations have been suggested too, such as: (a) on 236th somewhere between the I-5 freeway and 56th Avenue; (b) somewhere in the town center core; (c) at a new site away from downtown, such as along 220th.

When the city council directed staff to prepare a town center plan, the assignment specifically included opportunities and possible locations for building a new city hall.

During the 2006 town center planning process, there was considerable discussion about the importance of having city hall complement and reinforce town center businesses and community activities. Clearly, city hall brings potential customers to the town center area. An interesting, well-designed new building – perhaps containing additional uses, such as a senior/community center that would draw more people to the town center core – could spur other property owners to redevelop and add businesses within the downtown core. The town center plan allows construction of a new city hall either on the existing campus or on a nearby site, such as within the town center core.

**Interim Steps**

To preserve commercial opportunities and ensure quality development while the town center plan and possible code amendments were being developed, the City Council took the following specific actions:

1. Adopted Interim Town Center Design Standards to guide architectural and pedestrian features for downtown redevelopment;

2. Adopted a moratorium on 38 types of conditional uses, including private clubs, religious facilities, and auto-oriented businesses, in the downtown business (“BC/D”) zone;

3. Adopted a moratorium on casinos in the BC/D zone; and

4. Adopted a moratorium on new telecommunications facilities in the BC/D zone.

The three moratoria cannot remain in place indefinitely. They will be removed once the town center plan is completed and all appropriate regulations have been adopted.
HOW THE TOWN CENTER PLAN WAS CREATED

The Mountlake Terrace Town Center Plan was developed through a rigorous process with a special emphasis on involving area citizens and business leaders. Below is a description of the process and the many mechanisms that were used to draw in citizens and elicit their opinions – making the town center plan truly a “voice of the people.”

Public Process for the Town Center Plan

The City of Mountlake Terrace sponsored 13 public events, including two public hearings in 2006, that focused on the town center plan. Both the Planning Commission and City Council held several additional public meetings in which the town center plan project was discussed and opportunity for public input was provided. City-sponsored outreach included six city-wide mailings about the project and a special city Web page.

Project Scope and Schedule

Development of a town center plan kicked off in earnest in the spring of 2006 after the city council approved a scope and schedule for the project. The scope covered development of: (1) a town center plan, along with any needed code amendments, to revitalize the area and (2) options for a new city hall. The schedule included gathering and synthesizing past reports, conducting a variety of public events, and developing the new plan and code by the end of 2006.

Public events in 2006

The following list outlines the 13 city-sponsored public events and hearings held in 2006 that focused on the town center plan. At each event and hearing, except for the developer/ business forum, opportunities for public comment were provided. In addition, there were many other public meetings in which the town center project was an agenda item and provided opportunities for public information and comment.

July 24  Community roundtable # 1
July 26  Community roundtable # 2
July 31  Community roundtable # 3
August 14  Developer forum
September 11  Design workshop
September 12  Open house (daytime)
September 12  Design workshop
September 13  Open house (daytime)
September 13  Design workshop
October 30  Open house on alternatives
November 8  Open house on alternatives
November 27  Planning Commission’s public hearing on plan and code
December 18  City Council’s public hearing on plan and code

Citizens worked together in groups to develop their own plans for the future of the Town Center.
Roundtable meetings – in detail

To kick off the plan development with community input, the city convened three community roundtable meetings in different neighborhoods across Mountlake Terrace. Each meeting had the same format, but the variety in dates and locations allowed flexibility for community members. The roundtable meetings gathered feedback from community members on the current situation in the town center and their vision for an ideal downtown. About 200 residents, property and business owners, and interested parties participated in the roundtable meetings. The mayor and other council members, as well as the planning commission, attended at least one meeting.

Participants began with a brief open house where they were able to browse previous downtown reports and maps, as well as regional examples of successful town center developments. To learn basic demographic information, participants also were asked to identify, on maps of Mountlake Terrace and the surrounding metropolitan area, where they work, live, and shop. Shortly afterward, there were introductions to the project purpose, scope and timeline from both the city manager and the planning and development director, explaining the meeting process and asking the participants to divide into small groups to discuss three key questions:

• What do you like most about the current downtown?
• What do you like least about the current downtown?
• What is your vision of the future for a town center, including city hall?
• What activities and uses would you like to have in the town center?
• If a new city hall is built, where should it be and what other uses (e.g. senior center) should it include?

After the small group discussions, the groups reported the highlights of their conversations to the rest of the community roundtable participants (see Appendix 2 for the Community Roundtable Meetings Summary).

Developer forum – in detail

As part of the project, the City of Mountlake Terrace hosted a developer/business forum at the Mountlake Terrace Library. The city invited members of the development community to get their candid perspectives on the development environment and needs in Mountlake Terrace and to hear about specific issues, constraints and opportunities related to the future town center. The meeting was hosted by the city council and open for public observation. Sixteen builders, businesses, architects, engineers, and developers participated on a panel. The city manager facilitated the program.

Three key themes emerged with consensus during the forum, based on input from the participants: (1) the need for flexibility in requirements, (2) the importance of predictability in the development, and (3) the critical nature of parking in every development (see Appendix 3 for the Developer Forum Summary).
The community design workshop – in detail

In September 2006, citizens had an opportunity to provide their feedback regarding the town center plan at a series of design workshops and open houses. These meetings, workshops and open houses were designed to engage residents in shaping the future of their community and their city. The workshops were interactive, hands-on exercises to create ideas about Mountlake Terraces’ future land development and transportation choices.

The community design workshops were beneficial to understanding what Mountlake Terrace residents value most in their communities and what aspects could be improved during the next 20 years. During the first design workshop, participants also were asked specifically how their ideal town center area would be within the next 20 years.

The workshop attendees were divided into tables of three to ten people; each group was given a large-scale map of the town center area. Participants were asked to place “chips” (small stickers that contained various types of buildings) on the map and draw the kinds of specific improvements they would like to see. In addition, the groups designed a street cross section for the area using a 60-foot right-of-way.

The ideas stemming from the community workshops directly shaped the alternatives and ultimately the master plan for the town center.

The goals of the public workshops were to:

- Maximize the community’s voice, provide information about the plan and the process and gain community consensus
- Include city and regional stakeholders in the planning process
- Consider the existing diversity of the community
- Provide specific and relevant information and answers to the public
- Provide community education
- Consider other issues and initiatives

Completed Workshop Map

Participants were asked to place “chips” on the map and draw the kinds of specific improvements they would like to see.
Mailings

Information on the town center project was mailed city wide in the following formats:

- Article in June City Happenings
- Article in August City Happenings
- Flyer announcing community roundtables (direct mail)
- Flyer announcing design workshops (direct mail)
- Flyer announcing open houses and other project news (insert in October City Happenings)
- Brochure showing three alternatives and other project information (insert in November/December City Happenings)

Specific information on the town center project was mailed directly to residents within the Community Downtown Business District (BC/D), including:

- Invitation to November 8 open house
- Brochure with three alternatives and other project information

Two notices of public hearings were published and posted on the proposed plan.

The Town Center Web Site

The city provided extensive information on the Internet about the town center project. In the early months of the project, information was provided on the prominent “Breaking News” link from the city’s home page (www.cityofmlt.com). In September 2006, a special town center Web page (www.cityofmlt.com/towncenter) was launched. The city’s home page announced the new page and maintained a highly visible link to it. Separate press releases and mailings also made note of it. The Web page included the following items:

- Visual Preference Survey (through November 1)
- Project overview, including:
  - Fact sheet
  - Project update alternatives
- Background documents, including:
  - Project fact sheet (2006)
  - City Highlights (“City with a View” brochure)

- Excerpt from Comprehensive Plan (2003)
- Economic Development Market Analysis Study (1999)
- ISTEA/56th Avenue West Beautification Project (1996)
- Downtown Revitalization Committee Report (1993)

- Current documents, including:
  - Synthesis of (Past)…Plans, Policies, and Reports
  - Town Center Schedule and Process Overview
  - Interim Design Standards
- Photos from various events
- Projects in other communities, including:
  - City of Sammamish Town Center
  - City of Bothell Downtown Plan
  - City of Snohomish Strategic Plan
  - City of Shoreline North City Revitalization
  - City of Burien Town Square
- Press releases
- Progress results, including:
  - Roundtable meetings summary
  - Developer/business forum summary
- Notices of public hearing on proposed plan
- Comment/question e-mail form
THE RESULTS: A FIRST LOOK

Overall results

The workshop results helped focus the approach used for the plan. Participants also helped identify a set of key values and visions to guide the town center toward becoming a more vital, active, and pedestrian-friendly mixed-use area.

Eight groups created plans, using chips on the workshop maps, for the future of the town center. The plans that were created by each group were digitized using a geographic information system (GIS) and aggregated to understand the commonalities and differences among each of the plans. These digitized maps were used to make a “virtual scenario” based on the ideas from each workshop table. The use of digital maps enabled the maps to be viewed both separately and in combination with other data so that the complexities of various growth scenarios could be identified. In addition to the digital maps, a database was created with a range of information, including the number of households and jobs for each scenario, the types of buildings expected, and the amount of land redevelopment that may occur at a given location.

Two Preliminary Options

Two preliminary options or alternatives emerged from the workshop. Similarities in the designs of the eight tables allowed the designs to be divided into two sub-groups. The maps from groups 3, 5, 6 and 8 were examined together and formed the basis for “Option A,” while the maps from groups 1, 2, 4 and 7. These two scenarios were then further refined and divided into the four alternatives that were used for analysis in this plan.
The Visual Preference Survey

A visual preference survey can be used to assist a community in determining the preferences for architectural style, signs, uses, building setbacks, landscaping, parking areas, size/scope of transportation facilities, surface finishes and other design elements.

The city conducted an online visual preference survey through its Web site and an interactive survey with slideshow during one community design workshop session. The combined results of these surveys showed that a few design elements strongly resonated from the community. Well-designed mixed-use buildings with a variety of scales were preferred over single-use developments. Buildings with brick and high-quality materials were chosen over others.

One of the most important findings from the survey was that citizens expressed preference for buildings with setbacks on the upper floors in larger buildings. Creating setbacks on the upper floors is a design technique used to make structures that are more visually interesting and less bulky. In this visual preference survey, buildings with a larger building footprint with smaller floors above the second level were preferred. In terms of architectural style, more traditional Northwest designs were preferred over modern architecture. Images that showed wide sidewalks, street trees and sidewalk cafes were ranked highly by all. Images that showed a compatible mix of active ground-level retail, office and residential uses also ranked well. The highest ranking photos were used to guide the design of the building prototypes that are described later in the plan.

These pictures represent some of the most highly ranked buildings from the Visual Survey.
Land Uses

Land uses can significantly guide an area’s character. “Land use” refers to literally what a piece of land is being used for – and are generally characterized by their development type – such as single-family residential, commercial, multi-family residential, public park, or school. As an extreme example of the impact of land uses, an area comprised mostly of taverns and casinos may have a dramatically different feel from an area comprised mostly of offices and coffee shops or an area of primarily large-lot single family homes.

In city centers and town centers today, many communities are aiming to create a mix of land uses, with an emphasis on retail, restaurants, and residential, and complemented with office space and select community services.

When the Mountlake Terrace Town Center planning process began this year, the City Council adopted a moratorium in the downtown zone that temporarily prohibits new development of certain land uses until a Town Center plan and any necessary code changes could be made in order to manage whether or how the uses would be compatible with the plan’s vision.

Community roundtables held in July 2006 indicated that many people wanted to see restaurants, coffee shops, neighborhood retail stores, and public gathering spaces in the Mountlake Terrace Town Center. The design workshops held in September 2006, along with an online visual preference survey, echoed this perspective and indicated support for “mixed uses.” Other types of specific uses that of the majority of the survey-takers wanted in the Town Center included a community theater (83%), farmers market (91%), outdoor concert area (81%), and movie theater (68%).

The workshops and online survey also showed what people did not want to see downtown. According to the survey, people were strongly opposed to casinos (89%), car and truck repair shops (79%), vehicle storage yards (92%), and car sales lots (98%). Other land uses that a majority of survey-takers did not want downtown included youth shelters, video arcades, gas stations, telecommunication facilities taller than 60 feet, and religious facilities.

Ultimately, the land uses in the Town Center will need to be compatible with the Plan’s vision and guiding principles. (See section on Guiding Principles.)

These mixed use buildings are good examples of what may be built within the Town Center in the near future.
Guiding Principles

Mountlake Terrace has great potential to create a thriving, successful town center. Mountlake Terrace residents and leaders can choose how the town center develops and grows. Whatever outcome is desired, it should be evaluated in terms of how it contributes to the long-range vision for the city.

Based in part on previous plans and work accomplished by the city – along with considerable public input from the project’s roundtables, workshops, and stakeholders – the following principles will help define the town center plan for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center:

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 Mountlake Terrace residents
• Create housing choices attractive to people from all walks of life
• Keep Mountlake Terrace’s underlying character and identity
• Provide opportunities for medical-related 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 Mountlake Terrace

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

Attracting additional, quality jobs to the Town Center will enhance the economy.

An active water feature would be a wonderful addition to the Town Center.
PLAN VISION

This Mountlake Terrace plan creates a vision for the future of the city’s town center area. Specifically addressed within this vision are circulation, key nodes, and land uses for the town center, including the business and civic realm.

Vision Summary

The vision creates a vital, highly connected area focusing on a “central anchor” or “core” area that is especially lively and distinctive. The town center, which includes tree-lined streetscapes and an active water feature, is envisioned to be thriving, with walkable areas conducive to shopping, eating at cafes and restaurants, and simply gathering with friends and neighbors. With this in mind, the plan includes five major district designations: Town Center District, Main Street District, Gateway District, Civic District, and Transitional/Live-Work District.

Town Center District: The most dense and pedestrian-friendly area of development, this district would be located along 56th Ave., primarily between 230th and 236th Streets. It would function as the “central anchor” for the entire town center – and even the entire city. The very heart of it, which would be characterized by relatively intensive mixed-use development, is located in the “super block” area bordered by 56th and 58th Avenues and 232nd and 234th Streets.

Pedestrian-friendly streets or service alleys could further divide this key site, creating more access and convenience. A public plaza would be ideal to locate here. Retail, coffeeshops, and restaurants would predominate at the street level.

Main Street District: This district, which would also include mostly mixed-use development albeit at a smaller scale, is situated along 56th Ave. between 236th and 244th streets. The Main Street District serves the purpose of connecting the southern Gateway District to the Town Center District. Medium and small mixed-use buildings would be the most likely form of development in this district.

Entry Way District: Located along 236th Street roughly between the I-5 Park and Ride and 58th Avenue, and at the southern boundary of the focus area along 244th Street, this district would provide visual and functional clues signifying entry into the larger Town Center district. This could be accomplished through some combination of signage and a gateway feature such as a fountain, sculpture, or decorative portal. This is an important function to the success of the area, as users and passersby should be immediately made aware that they are entering a distinct, “special” area.

Civic District: Directly to the west across 58th Ave. from the Town Center District and adjacent to Veterans Memorial Park is the existing civic center, which includes a fire station, police station, library and city hall. Whenever a new city hall is built, either within this district or nearby, it could also include other uses, such as a senior or community center. This area would be expected to remain as the civic district, although some civic functions could be located elsewhere within the town center. (In this case, parts of the civic district would have the flexibility to transition to another compatible use; potential redevelopment could include medium density residential.)

Transition/Live-Work District: The vision calls for focusing larger buildings at higher densities in the super-block at the heart of the town center, with smaller mixed-use buildings representing a “stepping down” of intensity extending outward from this core. Townhomes and live-work units, two dynamic development types that are discussed in greater detail later in this document, will provide a transition to the single-family residential neighborhoods surrounding the town center.
Circulation

This town center plan considers the importance of traffic circulation for several transportation methods, accounting for travel both within and external to the town center. Proximity to Interstate 5 is a critical element to consider, as 236th St. is a direct, two-block link between the freeway and the heart of the town center for motorists both entering the area from I-5’s northbound lanes and leaving it to access I-5 southbound toward Seattle. The I-5 and 236th St. exchange is recommended for adding a full diamond interchange and high occupancy vehicle (HOV) access. Additional freeway interchanges exist at 220th and 244th streets. These three streets (220th, 236th, and 244th) constitute the main east-west automobile paths connecting the two sides of Mountlake Terrace that are separated by the freeway. Opening 236th St. for an east-west connection with Brier should be encouraged. The principal north-south transportation corridor running through the Town Center is 56th Ave. All of the above-mentioned roadways should be designed to optimize automobile travel while also providing for the comfort and safety of pedestrians and bicyclists.

Another recommendation includes dividing the super-block into four smaller blocks, with pedestrian and limited automobile access possible between them. Vehicular circulation through the super-block would allow for access to underground parking as well as establishing loading/service areas for retail businesses. In addition, it would lead to greater accessibility for all transportation modes, as well as creating a block scale more amenable to a pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use district.

The plan’s provisions include establishing significant pedestrian connections. This includes recognizing the value of Veterans Memorial Park as a unique amenity by enhancing its existing northeast-southwest path, as well as strengthening its connection to the town center. At the same time, any trail through this park should provide the least disturbance possible while also providing a safe place for people to access and use the park. The plan also considers the needs of cyclists by calling for the implementation of bicycle lanes along major circulation routes. Finally, it is recommended that future connections to other trail systems throughout the city and the region be considered.

Key development/transportation areas

The town center plan identifies four major development areas. These areas, located at important intersections, are designed to be centers of development that are easily accessible to the surrounding areas. The largest area, at the intersection of 232nd St. and 56th Ave., is designated as the focus of new development in the town center. With this in mind, including civic open space in this area with a feature such as a fountain, will help cement the identity of this area as the core of the town center. Opportunities for smaller areas exist at the intersections of 244th St. and 56th Ave., 236th St. and 56th Ave., and 230th St. and 56th Ave.

Land uses

The land uses in this plan are primarily mixed, with the highest intensity focused at the town center core and with lower densities outside of this area. This mix includes retail, office, and residential uses at a range of scales. Additionally, some sites, particularly on the periphery of the town center, will be devoted to townhomes and/or live-work units. In order for them to effectively serve their purpose, it will be important that these transitional mixed-use elements be designed to fit within the character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Based on community input and the city’s desire to ensure a pedestrian-friendly downtown, certain uses, including casinos, should be discouraged in this area.

Scenarios are really stories about what might be. They are not forecasts and they are not predictions. The essential requirement of any scenario is that it be plausible, within the realm of what exists and what is now known.
Using scenario planning for Mountlake Terrace

What is scenario planning?

Given the complexity of the issues facing today’s cities – including the number of variables that have to be considered, as well as the 20- or 30-year timeframe – it is apparent that getting the perfect prediction really isn’t possible or even necessary. Instead, what is needed is a way to plan for multiple possible future scenarios. This type of scenario planning is not new. Some large businesses as well as the military have for years used this process. The key to scenario planning is that it does not try to predict a single outcome for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center. Instead, several possible outcomes are developed and tested. This process allows the final recommended plan to use the best elements from each tested scenario.

Developing the scenarios

Several effective land-use planning tools were used to develop realistic scenarios for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center Plan. Below is a description of those tools.

Building Prototypes

The purpose of this analysis was to determine the types of projects that could be built, or the financial gap a developer could expect, to achieve a 15 percent profit as a percentage of costs. For this analysis, five prototypes were developed: large mixed use with office; large mixed use with residential; medium mixed use; small mixed use; and townhome/live-work units. These designs were based on buildings preferred by citizens participating in the visual preference survey. Following is a general description of each of these prototypes.

Note: Floor Area Ratio (FAR) refers to the relationship between the floor area of a building (counting all floors) and the area of the entire lot. For example, if a two story building has 5,000 sf on each floor (10,000 sf total) and it sits on a 10,000 sf lot, it has a FAR of 1.0. If the same size lot has a four story building with 5,000 sf on each floor (20,000 sf total), it has a FAR of 2.0.

Large Mixed-Use (Retail/Office)

A 10-story mixed-use office building has the same format as the 10-story residential project, but instead it has nine stories of office space above the retail. This office space can allow the location of larger companies, or can be subdivided for many smaller companies.

This large mixed-use building with office is modeled with a usable FAR of 3.3 (the building steps back at the third level) and employs 399 people per acre. The total project value is about $31.3 million.
Large Mixed-Use (Retail/Residential)

A large mixed use building, while having many similar characteristics with the small and medium mixed use buildings, is built on a great scale. A 10 story mixed use building with a residential focus may have ground floor retail space, with nine stories of residential units above.

This large mixed use building, with a step-back at the third story, has a usable FAR of 3.84 and includes 111 households and 82 employees per acre. The total project value per acre is about $36.4 million.

Medium Mixed Use

A medium mixed-use building will consist of commercial on the ground floor with office and/or residential on the above ground levels. Parking in these mixed-use buildings generally is either sub-grade or structured parking, or some combination of both. Medium mixed-use buildings are able to accommodate a greater variety of uses and can be sited on thoroughfare and arterials.

On a one-acre site, this model is a four-story, mixed-use building (with a step back at the second story) with a usable FAR of 1.03, 29 units per acre at an average size of 1,020 square feet. Additionally, the prototype employs 27 people per acre. Total project value is approximately $9.7 million.
Small Mixed Use

Mixed-use buildings provide many advantages for urban business and living. In general a small mixed-use building consists of retail on the ground floor with office or residential on the second and third floors. Parking in these mixed use buildings is generally either sub-grade or structured, or some combination of both. Small mixed-use buildings can be designed to fit within urban residential neighborhoods.

The small mixed-use model, on a per acre basis, stands at three stories, with a usable FAR of 0.63 and 14 units per acre (average unit size of 1,020 square feet). The prototype employs 28 people per acre and has a total project value of about $6.2 million.

Townhome/Live-Work

Townhomes and live-work units represent an attached residential building type that has the benefits of an urban lifestyle, combined with many of the advantages of a single-family home. Townhomes typically have separate exterior entrances on the ground floor and are usually two to three stories in height. Live-work units will typically have workspace on the ground floor, with a separate exterior entrance, and residential space above. Live-work units are built to a commercial standard that allows businesses (with employees) to operate on the ground floor. Live-work units encourage small businesses and allow increased flexibility because they can be financed with a residential loan, rather than a commercial loan.

The prototype modeled for this project is three stories tall, has a usable FAR of 0.90, and has 17 units per acre at the average unit size of 2,200 square feet. In the model, the average unit costs $598,000 and the total project value for a one acre project is about $8.9 million.
After the prototypes were developed, a “tipping point” analysis was conducted to test the development feasibility of each of the models. The tipping point analysis focuses on the interaction between the regulatory system and the market. Prototypes are examined to determine if the rent, lease, or sales prices from a new project would outweigh the associated costs and risks and produce a return that is suitable for development. This model considers a range of factors including parking, height and use requirements, costs associated with construction, and fees.

Using a sensitivity analysis where zoning code inputs are isolated and tested to determine their single impact, several tipping points can be identified that show where optimizations could be made in order to best achieve the city’s vision. The tipping points can be used to determine if policy changes are necessary to create a regulatory environment that allows developers to build desirable projects that are beneficial to the community.

The tipping point model used for this project was recently enlarged to include detailed rental and for-sale developer pro formas. The new model expands the range of sensitivity tests that can be run using an increased number of inputs. Additionally, the pro forma component allows testing of the impact of both regulatory changes and market variables, ranging from required parking and residential density to developer fees and site development costs.

In addition, as part of this project several area developers were interviewed to confirm assumptions about construction costs, loan rates and timelines. The goal of these interviews was to confirm assumptions and inputs into the tipping point model – and provide another “real world” check to prototype analysis.

Three-dimensional scenario modeling involves using a video “fly-through” that travels down 56th Ave. W and stops at a key point in the town center where it transitions to show a potential urban park with a water feature and is surrounded by mixed-use buildings.

Photographs of actual buildings and streetscape improvements at key sites, including at 232nd St. and 56th Ave, have been superimposed onto photographs of selected locations. The buildings are representative of the type of structures that would be commercially viable. This imagery helps explain to the public and decision-makers how the policies and market forces have to be coordinated to achieve the goals of the project and the citizens’ vision. This imagery also informs people of what they can look forward to in the form of future development.

The physical modeling process has the added benefit of highlighting potential design conflicts. For example, on some of the smaller or oddly shaped lots, a developer may find it difficult to meet both the parking and open space requirements while also retaining enough land to make a reasonable return on investment.
DEVELOPING THE ALTERNATIVES

Using the building prototypes as a base, three alternatives were created that reflect varying build outs and building mixes. The alternatives range from current policy to a denser alternative assuming 50 percent redevelopment and two large mixed-use buildings.

Alternative 1: Current Policy (“No Action”)

One alternative assumes that current policies are maintained with little or no focus on encouraging redevelopment. This alternative is likely to result in limited development (approximately one parcel per year) one- to three-story development on scattered sites south of the historic town center. This would mean about 256 new jobs and 240 new housing units. It is likely that there would be no new retail or restaurants; most buildings and uses would remain the same or have minor remodels.

In this alternative, redevelopment would be minimal because land and construction costs, combined with the type of development that would be allowed, are greater than the return on investment for developing most parcels.

Alternative 2: Small to Medium Mixed-Use Buildings (“Edge Action”)

Another alternative maximizes development at four stories, providing a medium height scenario for the town center development. Under this scenario, the area would see approximately 700 residential units and 689 jobs. This scenario assumes that the city would make model public investments (e.g., improve the connection between 56th and 1-5/236th park & ride lot). In this alternative, redevelopment would be modest, mostly on the edge of downtown.

Some medium mixed use would be developed on the super-block site, and across 56th, as well as on 56th near 244th. (This is somewhat problematic since the Tipping Point Analysis reveals that at four stories, redevelopment is not economically feasible in some locations, especially on parts of the super-block site.) Along with this medium mixed use would be some small mixed use along 56th and parts of 234th and 235th. Overall, about 50 percent of the land area is assumed to be redeveloped.
Alternative 1: “No Action”

This map shows likely development based on the Tipping Point Analysis.
Shadow Analysis

An essential part of any planning endeavor is an accurate & realistic shadow/sunlight survey. Shadow studies of future developments illustrate their impact (if any) on the surrounding environment. These surveys can be carried out for any time of the day, within any day of the month throughout the entire year.
Alternative 2: “Edge Action”

This map shows likely development based on the Tipping Point Analysis and 50% build-out.
Alternative 2 Images

Shadow Analysis

Shadows shown on June 1st

Shadows shown on December 1st
Alternative 3: “Vitality”

This map shows likely development based on the Tipping Point Analysis and 50% build-out
Alternative 3 Images

Shadow Analysis

Shadows shown on June 1st

Shadows shown on December 1st
Alternative 3: Small to Larger Mixed Use
Buildings ("Vitality")

The third alternative is likely to have the most new restaurants and other commercial activities for the town center area. In this vision, about 50 percent of the downtown would be redeveloped by willing property owners. Significant redevelopment is likely because return on investment, given the type of development allowed, becomes greater than land and construction costs for most parcels. The super-block site serves as the catalyst for development throughout the town center. If this site were to redevelop it would spur many other mixed-use projects throughout the area. Development would be especially encouraged in the historic central business district, or “core” area on land bordered by 56th Ave., 232nd St., 58th Ave., and 230th St. Within part of that super-block, a public plaza and mixed-use buildings up to 7 stories, stepped back from the street, would be encouraged. A city hall combined with other community uses could potentially be included in this mix. An area at the intersection of 236th St. and 56th Ave. would also be a key location for five- or six-story mixed-use buildings. One of the larger mixed-use buildings is assumed to be office over retail, in order to increase the amount of employment (and daytime restaurant users) in the core.

Development under this alternative would be less intense (generally two or three stories) at the edge of the downtown zone. Townhomes and live-work units could provide a buffer between the commercial and single-family neighborhoods. (Live-work units are buildings with an office or studio for business use on the ground floor and a private home above.) Under Alternative 3, about 1,395 jobs and 790 more households in the town center are projected.

Alternative 3 projects 50 percent of the sites in the district would redevelop, with the majority of the development happening in the super-block and the surrounding blocks. The large mixed-use projects in the super-block would be neighbored across 56th by a set of medium mixed-use projects. In the surrounding areas are other small and medium mixed-use projects, transitioned from the surrounding neighborhoods by some townhomes and live-work units.

The focus of each of these alternatives is on the super-block bounded by 56th and 58th and 232nd and 234th. This block has the greatest potential as a catalyst development site because of its central location in the district, as well as the opportunity to create a smaller block grid within it that includes public space, sidewalks, and a road network that makes the block easily accessible and human-scaled. This alternative includes the city seeking public-private partnerships to fund improvements for sidewalks, streetscapes, and the underground placement of utilities.

Building Form Best Fit

Guided by the city’s vision map (created from public input), a tipping point analysis, and sound planning principles, a multi-step process was used to determine what type of development “best fits” each parcel within the study area. First, using a return on investment model, the maximum land costs that would still allow each prototype to be feasible was determined. This step is important because the cost of land is a major factor in determining the financial feasibility of a project for developers.

After calculating the value per acre of the parcels within the study area, the determination was made that a small mixed-use development is feasible on land that costs approximately $800,000 per acre, a medium mixed-use project is feasible on land that costs about $1.2 million per acre, and a large mixed-use development is feasible on land that costs about $1.6 million per acre. Each parcel was assigned a ratio that compared its land value to the land value necessary to make a feasible project.

Using these land value thresholds, nearly every parcel can achieve some type of profitable redevelopment under the “best fit” assignment of prototypes. Finalizing this best fit also takes into consideration that generally parcels along existing commercial streets or ones at busy intersections have a higher value, and thus require more intensive development to achieve profitability.

To translate the vision map into a plan that can be implemented, it is necessary to take the general land uses and look at the most feasible development types on the parcel level. In this analysis, the development or building types are represented by the prototypes, as previously described.
Building Types

First, using parcel size, land value and location, each parcel was assigned one of the prototypical developments. This step closely examines the full buildout potential for the district, although it is unlikely that the entire district would be redeveloped. However, this provides a maximum baseline for analysis.

The large mixed-use prototype (both office and residential) are focused on the super-block site (bounded by 56th, 58th, 232nd and 234th). It is unlikely that any other parcel in the district would be well suited for this type of more dense development. However, the central location and large size of the super-block makes it an optimal location for 7-story mixed-use buildings.

Medium mixed-use buildings, appropriate for mid-sized parcels on arterials near the planned development areas, are primarily projected along parts of 56th between 230th and 234th and along 236th west of 56th. There are additional parcels near the node at 244th and 56th that would support medium mixed use.

Small mixed-use buildings are planned for the areas surrounding each of the development areas that are not appropriate, or large enough, for medium or large mixed-use buildings. These small mixed-use projects would be located along 56th, with some others located on 235th, south of the super-block.

In order to provide a transition between the mixed-use areas and the surrounding residential neighborhoods, as well as to accommodate smaller parcel sizes, a street of townhomes and live-work units would be appropriate primarily to the east of the study area. These parcels, located primarily along 55th would serve as active uses that bridge the building types to the east and west.
Evaluation

The current height limit holds buildings to three stories. Increasing height alone does not “tip” a sample project in Mountlake Terrace toward financial feasibility without adjustments to other inputs. However, it is likely that height increases, combined with other regulatory changes, can lead to a more profitable and desirable project, particularly since the Puget Sound market appears to be strong for office, retail, and residential developments. With the region growing rapidly and its close proximity to Seattle, Mountlake Terrace is in good position to capture a segment of the regional market for office, retail and housing.
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Increasing the number of dwelling units, or the amount of office space, per acre improves developers’ return on investment significantly. This is important because return on investment modeling shows that some of the desired development types are barely financially feasible under existing regulations. There are opportunities for the city to spur critical public amenities, while also helping facilitate profitable development, by encouraging development of more residential units through increasing height or allowable lot coverage. If this combination of adjustments is made, it’s possible to create sufficiently profitable projects.

It is important to differentiate between parking standards for auto-oriented and pedestrian-oriented districts. While adequate parking is necessary in Mountlake Terrace’s town center, it must not be excessive because it would challenge the city’s ability to create a pedestrian-oriented district. The city can employ the shared parking strategies described further in the “Shared Parking” section of this report.
A PROGRESSION: THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Based on extensive analysis and public input, Alternative 3 is the preferred alternative. In order to be successful, the plan must bring jobs and people to the town center. As shown by the graphs in the previous section, Alternative 3 best achieves this for several reasons.

First, the 50 percent redevelopment percentage means that enough land is redeveloped to catalyze further development. Specifically, within this 50 percent of land that will be redeveloped, there also is a higher density of jobs and households than any of the other alternatives. The two large mixed-use buildings, which would serve as visual landmarks to the town center and are supplemented by a mix of smaller mixed-use and townhome options, would bring a significant employment and residential base to Mountlake Terrace. The addition of additional office uses increases the amount of employment and ensures that the Mountlake Terrace city center is a dynamic place for residents, the business community and a variety of services. This is crucial in achieving the critical mass needed to fuel the retail and other active uses that are included in this alternative.

The preferred alternative best addresses the values put forth in the community’s vision. It works with existing design standards to ensure that there is quality development and fits the market’s needs. Alternative 3 brings revitalization, while preserving community identity, through a recognizable town center that can be used by all residents. This alternative is designed to have an appropriate mix of businesses, housing and community services – all essential for a successful mixed-use district. Additionally, this design promotes a pedestrian-friendly area and a variety of transportation options. This scenario also uses Veterans Memorial Park as an amenity while preserving the existing single-family neighborhoods adjacent to the town center.

To implement this preferred alternative, the city should adopt modifications to the BC/D zone code, by adding a form-based overlay. The uses allowed in the district could be the same across the several building types, and the design standards the city has adopted will work well with a variety of building types. However, a simple addition of a building type map based on the “form best fit” will allow for the different varieties of buildings without unnecessarily complicating the city’s zoning code.
Concept for the “Central anchor” or “core” area, bounded by 56th, 58th, 232nd and 234th
STREETSCAPE PLAN

At the core of this plan is the need to develop ways for using downtown streets more effectively. Streets take up about 25 percent of the total acreage within the town center (calculated using the town center study area boundary). The streets are well designed for through traffic but can be used much more effectively for other uses. Urban streets should be viewed as multiple-use facilities, providing the following needs:

- Routes for through traffic
- Access to local businesses and residences
- Transit routes and stops
- On-street parking
- Pedestrian travel
- Sidewalk activities, including sidewalk seating for restaurants and a limited amount of advertising and merchandising.

The major streets in the town center are 56th, 58th, 232nd, 234th, 236th and 244th; 228th may become more traveled in the future. Each should be able to handle two lanes of traffic, on-street parallel or diagonal parking, sidewalks and bicycle lanes. It is important that the town center area develops an urban cross section, with wide sidewalks, street trees in tree wells, and appropriate pedestrian lighting.

There are four specific cross-section designs for the town center. Each of these cross section designs represent a concept that could vary depending on location:

- Two lane boulevard (56th, 236th)
- Two lane street with extra parking (diagonal on street parking)
- Narrow street (40 feet wide)
- Service alley

The two-lane boulevard designed for 56th and 236th will be slightly different from the current design seen on 56th, as sidewalk/pedestrian areas will be wider and a bike lane may be added. Awnings will be encouraged. Balcony projections, outdoor seating, limited display of merchandise, and small “A frame” signs will be considered. These streets will need a 60-foot right-of-way as well as an additional pedestrian activity area required to be developed fully. Because of the width, curb bump-outs will be used at each intersection, and where there is a narrow right-of-way an alternate cross section will be considered.
The second variation of the two-lane cross section includes diagonal parking on both sides of the street. By using diagonal parking along selected streets it can almost triple the amount of public on-street parking available. These streets are best constructed to accommodate two traffic lanes, two diagonal parking lanes, street trees and wide sidewalks.

Finally, service alleys are designed to benefit residential, live-work, and commercial users. These alleys provide access to parking, public utilities, deliveries, services and waste disposal. They also will be used by pedestrians and therefore should include an inverse crown cross section, but with a designated sidewalk (without curb).

Another streetscape design is required for the narrow right-of-way envisioned for the new streets within the super-block site. The 40-foot sections will contain narrower sidewalks, street trees in planters in the parking area, and on-street parking on one side. This street section will allow for circulation and internal access to properties and parking garages, as well as developing better pedestrian connections.

While it may take years for completion of the street improvements, this plan is intended to represent the ultimate policy decision and design of the streets. In order to achieve this, it is recommended that annual street improvements provide constant upgrades to the town center environment – which will also cause less disruption and expense than if the improvements occurred piecemeal. More specific implementation strategies may be included in the future Transportation Master Plan.
PARKING PLAN

Shared Parking Analysis

The Urban Land Institute (ULI) defines shared parking as “the use of a parking space to serve two or more individual land uses without conflict or encroachment.” The viability of this strategy rests in the underlying principle that the demand for parking associated with different land uses varies throughout the course of a day. For example, the peak demand for office uses falls in the middle of the day, while demand for restaurant parking is typically highest in the evening. When an appropriate mix of uses is present, these varying levels of demand can be exploited to make more efficient use of existing parking and to reduce the amount of parking required for new projects. Instituted properly, shared parking can have the effect of facilitating new development or redevelopment that would otherwise not occur in light of more rigid minimum parking requirements.

While parking should be maximized, it is impractical to provide sufficient parking for each store within a few feet of the front door. This leads to the unfortunate situation in which the parking area sits unoccupied for much of the day. Under the shared parking concept, one parking space easily can serve two or three businesses. For example, an office building may find its parking spaces nearly unused in the evenings or on weekends, which is the time an adjacent restaurant may be reaching its own peak need for customer parking spaces. Shared parking also makes good business sense as well, since people can park in one location and visit a range of nearby businesses.

Summing the total demand of uses on the block and measuring this at various times of day can help calculate shared parking by block. The time of day with the highest total parking demand is the block’s peak demand. With this in mind, the City is advised to develop a parking strategy that will establish the Town Center area as “park once” district. This approach would strive to create conditions whereby residents and visitors to the town center can reasonably conduct all of their desired business without the perception of needing a car to move between destinations. With this as the guiding principle, a revised parking strategy could go a long way toward stimulating both the type of development as well as the user experience desired by the City.

A shared parking analysis done on the recommended alternative, Alternative 3, illustrates the benefits that can be found by employing shared parking techniques. The graph below shows three parking scenarios for Alternative 3:

1. Maintain current parking policy
2. Reduce parking standards consistent with mixed use district
3. Reduce parking standards and utilize shared parking

The chart below shows the substantial parking savings that can be realized through a reduction in required parking and utilization of shared parking. The approximately 1,000 space savings between the current parking policy and reducing parking standards and using shared parking can be viewed as 340,000 square feet (almost 8 acres) of parking that does not need to be built in structures or take up otherwise buildable lot area.
Recommended Parking Requirement

In order to create a vibrant, mixed use district, it is important that the area is neither under or over parked. Using shared parking strategies, realistic parking requirements are two spaces per 1,000 square feet for most retail and office uses. For residential units, an average of one space per unit, plus an additional guest space to be shared between every four units, is optimal.

Recommended On-Street Parking Policies
Adequate on-street parking is important for mixed-use districts. There are several recommended strategies for designing and managing on-street parking in Mountlake Terrace Town Center. Some of these can be implemented sooner, others later, depending on the level of need:

- Use time limits to ensure that parking spaces have a proper customer turnover and that employees do not use the spaces.

- Reduce the number of driveways. As the area develops, do not encourage driveways, or instead require fewer and narrower ones.

- Consider allowing on-street parking on the outer lanes in some arterials going through retail areas during off-peak hours. On-street parking will be the best way to accommodate people driving to these areas.

- If streets are wide enough, encourage diagonal parking, including on the edges of the super-block. It holds more parking spaces per block and for many people it is easier to use. A drawback of diagonal parking is that cars have difficulty seeing oncoming traffic when backing up. This can be very dangerous to bicyclists. Therefore, do not allow bicycle lanes and diagonal parking on the same side of the street.

- Designate sufficient and conveniently located parking spaces for people with disabilities.

- Ensure that transit stops and loading zones do not take excessive parking space, especially in the most active areas.

- As demand for parking increases, install parking meters to control use and bring in revenue that can be used to further improve the area. Evaluate whether the parking fee will keep the downtown competitive relative to other commercial districts in the region. Additionally, adjust the rates accordingly to encourage optimal turnover and revenue.

- Create a permit program exempting residents and perhaps a certain number of employees from paid time limit spaces.

Recommended Off-Street Parking Policies

- Encourage private parking lots to be available to the public after hours or during off-peak times. Private parking lot owners can be encouraged to participate by having neighboring businesses provide liability insurance and cleanup services during off hours.

- Provide adequate parking to handle the shared parking demand. While Mountlake Terrace presently has adequate parking, as the downtown area grows, the supply for parking may be strained.

- Encourage sharing among businesses and devise mechanisms for addressing logistical issues. Some businesses could share parking at all times of day, while other businesses could share parking after their individual peak time of day. Also equity issues may need to be resolved between existing businesses that have either an oversupply or undersupply of parking.
• Encourage customers to use shared parking. A signage strategy may be needed to tell drivers that parking is shared among merchants and to point the way to large, common parking areas away from the town center.

• Establish municipal or cooperative parking facilities. Land owned by the city could be improved to provide parking, or new land could be acquired.

• Identify critical parking areas and encourage short-term parking there. The conflict between employee and customer parking downtown may need to be addressed in such areas, since employees tend to use spaces for longer periods that may discourage customer and visitor use.

Long-term policies may need to:

• Plan for the appropriate amount and location of necessary parking supply. These decisions will be based on the estimated evaluation of need but also will be based on site-by-site considerations. These include locating sites nearest to intense parking demand and the type and configuration of adjacent land uses.

• Determine the timing of parking need. When should land be purchased and parking structures developed?

• Encourage walking. An excellent way to encourage customers to use one parking space while visiting several businesses is to encourage walking. One way to do this is by improving site design, signage and architecture to make walking a pleasant, safe experience.

While public parking may not be needed currently, this is an opportunity to start planning for the eventual need. This planning could include dedicating a one-acre site for future parking. In the near term it could be used as surface parking and then could be converted to a parking structure as demand increases. This lot could be especially useful as the town center begins to attract peaking uses, such as restaurants, galleries or a theater. Creating a public-use parking garage is an important component of a parking management strategy. Large development on the super-block presents an opportunity to explore public parking as part of that development.
TAKING THE NEXT STEPS

Much of a successful town center’s development is the timing of public investment to stimulate private investment. This can occur in a number of areas but typically involves developing public infrastructure that supports mixed-use activities and that improves the area (sometimes strategically timed to occur near an upcoming development). To implement this town center plan, several steps should be completed in the near term.

Below are the recommended next steps:

1. **Adopt proposed zoning code (attached as Appendix 1)** *

   The proposed zoning code would serve to encourage the type of mixed-use development that the city is seeking for the Mountlake Terrace Town Center.

2. **Make minor modifications to parking code** *

   Adjust parking code consistent with recommendations from this plan.

3. **Develop a planned action ordinance (to address transportation and environmental impacts)** *

   The development of the planned action ordinance is included in the city’s 2007 budget.

4. **Develop a 2007 Development of Transportation Master Plan and Impact Fee Program**

   The development of the Transportation Master Plan and Impact Fee Program is included in the city’s 2007 budget.

5. **Develop a marketing strategy**

   A marketing strategy will help build a Mountlake Terrace Town Center “brand,” just as construction is beginning. This is a unique opportunity to provide residents and visitors with a new perspective about the exciting development and positive changes occurring in the town center.

   * To be considered concurrently

6. **Begin proposed capital improvements**

   The capital improvements reflect the first step that the city can take to spur private investment in the area. It is important that these capital improvements also be keyed into private sector developments, which maximizes the city’s return on investment.

7. **Upgrade streetscapes**

   The streetscape improvements are important, not only for improving the town center amenities, but also in providing on-street parking.

8. **Install diagonal parking**

   Diagonal parking can be installed, where appropriate, in conjunction with the streetscape improvements.

9. **Build plaza with fountain/water feature**

   The program would implement development of a central plaza or park with the fountain as a central attractor. This is a key improvement that provides a central public open space that would be an attractive landmark for the town center.

10. **Relocate utilities underground**

    Utilities can be relocated underground simultaneously with other construction projects, in order to reduce impact.

   * To be considered concurrently
Key Public/Private Partnerships

Creating public/private partnerships is essential to developing a successful mixed use town center. Public/private partnerships benefit both Mountlake Terrace and developers. The city is able to achieve goals that would not be possible through public funds alone, while developers benefit from increased certainty (decreased risk) and assistance in navigating regulations.

Local Infrastructure Financing Tool Program (LIFT)
While Washington does not have the tax increment finance (TIF) options of many other states, Washington does have a new local property tax increment finance option. Additionally, a new program approved in the 2006 legislature – called the Local Infrastructure Financing Tool (LIFT) – may provide a similar opportunity.

According to the bill’s House report:
The local infrastructure financing tool (LIFT) program is created to assist local governments and promote economic development. The LIFT will be available for selected public improvement projects designed to increase private development in the area and that will utilize increased property tax revenues, excess excise tax revenues and revenues generated through a sales and use tax credited against the state sales and use tax in the revenue development area (RDA) to finance the improvements. An RDA must be comprised of contiguous tracts, lots, pieces or parcels of land and have less than $1 billion in assessed value for the taxable real property within the RDA. The average assessed value per square foot of the taxable land within the RDA may not exceed $70 per square foot. In addition, an RDA may not comprise more than 25 percent of the total assessed value of the taxable real property within the boundaries of the local government creating the RDA.

It is likely that the average assessed value cap in the program will change. It is recommended that Mountlake Terrace further explore the feasibility of creating a revenue development area in the town center.

Other tools in which further exploration is recommended are available at the local, state and federal levels:

Local Funding Sources

These may include but are not limited to:

- Business Improvement District (BID): Property owners within a specific area fund a BID through a special assessment. BIDs are designed to deliver supplemental services including visitor services, maintenance, cleaning, events, marketing, and beautification within these designated commercial districts.

- Local Improvement District (LID): Funded through special assessments for property owners in a specific area, LIDs are used as a means of funding capital improvement projects over time.

- Impact fees: These fees are assessed by local governments against new developments to recoup the cost of providing the public facilities required to serve the new development. In Washington, impact fees can only be used to fund facilities (not services), such as schools, roads, and parks, that are directly associated with the new development.

- Transportation Benefit Districts: These are quasi-municipal corporations with independent taxing authority, including the authority to impose property taxes and impact fees for transportation purposes

- Real Estate Excise Tax: Is a levy on all sales of real estate, measured by the full selling price, including the amount of any liens, mortgages and other debts given to secure the purchase at a rate of 1.28 percent.
State Funding Sources

These may include but are not limited to:

• Washington Job Development Fund (JDF): The JDF is a Washington program that provides grants to assist with public infrastructure projects that support the creation of new jobs or the retention of existing jobs.

• Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP): The WWRP is a state grant program that funds, among other things, local parks in Washington.

• Washington State Department of Transportation Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program: These state grants are targeted at improving safety for pedestrians and cyclists and safe routes to school and transit.

• Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) funding: Several TIB programs, including the Urban Arterial Program and Sidewalk Program, provide transportation-related funding in urban areas.

• State Budget Earmark: Money specifically reserved in the state budget for a project.

• Public Works Trust Fund: A low-interest loan fund for certain infrastructure improvements.

Federal Funding Sources

These may include but are not limited to:

• Federal Transit Administration Rural and Small Urban Areas program: This federal program provides funding to the state which may then be used as part of project funding for transportation projects.

• Federal Budget Earmark: Money specifically reserved in the federal budget for a project.
Conclusion: Take Steps Now That Align with City’s Vision

In the early stages of the 21st century, a regional trend of strengthened town and city centers is gaining momentum in the Puget Sound Area. Mountlake Terrace is fortunate to be surrounded by communities that either have restored historic centers or are pursuing new centers. The market for these has been increasing steadily, and they are supported by regional and state policy.

This visioning and town center process has allowed Mountlake Terrace citizens to mold the general ideas for a town center into an achievable vision. The city is in the center of a dynamic and growing region, and the possibilities for creating a new town center are greater than they have ever been during the past half century. It is important the leaders, citizens and businesses of Mountlake Terrace work in tandem with that positive momentum.

This plan constitutes an ambitious vision and plan of action that will transform Mountlake Terrace Town Center into a center of economic growth and community pride. While this may seem daunting at first, it is important to both hold a determined vision and proceed deliberately. Even small changes can build confidence in the City’s investment potential, but nothing will build it as much as a long term commitment to the Town Center’s success by the City. The best way to sustain this is for repeated successful projects; this is best done by a measured approach, working in tandem with private investors and monitoring those ideas that work best for the City.

While a practical master plan must concentrate on the details of achieving this vision, it is important to remember, and remain true to, the community’s strong desire for a vital, dynamic center that enhances the city’s livability. The actions laid out in this plan can help to accomplish this – making Mountlake Terrace an even better city than it is today.
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Check with City for current adopted Downtown Community Business District (BC/D) Zoning Code Regulations

Chapter 19.50

**BC DOWNTOWN – DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT**

Sections:

19.50.010 Purpose

19.50.015 Definitions

19.50.020 Permitted uses

19.50.030 Conditional uses

19.50.040 Accessory uses

19.50.050 Building Type and Dimensional Requirements

19.50.060 Special regulations

19.50.070 Special use

19.50.080 Compliance with Building Type and Design Standards

**19.50.010 Purpose**

The purpose of this chapter is to provide for a vibrant downtown (or “Town Center”) area where businesses thrive and people of all ages enjoy gathering. A vibrant downtown is pedestrian-oriented, provides efficiently for multiple modes of transportation, and contains a mix of uses, including commercial and residential uses. This district is divided into subdistricts that regulate the kinds of building forms permitted, while keeping the use regulations generally constant.

**19.50.015 Definitions**

A. “Assisted living” means a supportive housing facility designed for those who need extra help in their day-to-day lives but do not require the skilled nursing care found in traditional nursing homes.

B. “Cultural facilities” means uses which provide cultural enrichment services to the public, including but not limited to museums, performing arts centers, aquariums and libraries that are operated by public non-profit organizations.

C. “Floor Area Ratio” means that number resulting when floor area is divided by lot area.

D. “Live-work unit” (or “live and work”) means a building with an office or studio for business use on the ground floor with a private home above.

E. “Transition” means sequential change or modulation.
19.50.020 Permitted uses

Permitted uses in the BC Downtown district are limited to the following and subject to other regulations:

A. Commercial Services

B. Commercial Retail

C. Medical/Health care, excluding hospitals and ambulance services

D. Recreation/Entertainment/Cultural Facilities, excluding:
   a. 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

G. Residential, namely:
   1. Motels, hotels
   2. Detached single-household residential legally established prior to December 30, 2006
   3. Live-work units
   4. Attached single-household residential
   5. Multi-household residential

H. Public Utility Facilities

I. Public Service Facilities

J. Manufacture, processing, or assembly of items that are sold from or displayed in a show/sales room directly fronting the street
19.50.030 Conditional uses

Conditional uses shall be limited to the following and subject to other regulations:
A. Residential, namely:
   1. Adult care households
   2. Group homes subject to the Fair Housing Act
   3. Residential care facilities
   4. Assisted living facilities
B. School/Day Care, namely:
   1. Adult day care
   2. Day care centers
   3. Higher education facilities
C. Recreation Facilities, namely:
   1. Parks
   2. Plazas
D. Medical/Health Care, namely:
   1. Ambulance services
   2. Hospitals

19.50.040 Accessory uses

Accessory uses shall be limited to the following and subject to other regulations:

1. Caretaker residences
2. Hazardous waste treatment and storage
3. Storage buildings
4. Swimming pools/hot tubs
5. Parking
6. Plaza
19.50.050 Building Type and Dimensional Requirements

A. Building Type Defined

The following are the general building types, based on the number of stories that are allowed within the BC/D district, subject to subsection B of this section:

1. Type 1: 7 story building

2. Type 2: 5 story building

3. Type 3: 4 Story building

4. Type 4: 3 Story Building
5. Type 5: 2 Story mixed or single use building

6. Type 6: Single Story building

7. Type 7: Live & Work 2 or 3 Story Townhouse

8. Type 8: No Building (open lot)
B. Building Type District

1. Map 19.50.050 (A) identifies sub districts in the BC-D Zone. In each sub district, only the following building types will be permitted, subject to the exceptions in this paragraph:

   a. District A: Building Type 1, 2, 3, or 4
   b. District B: Building Type 2, 3, or 4
   c. District C: Building Type 3, 4, or 5
   d. District D: Building Type 4, 5, 6, or 7
   e. District E: Building Type 7
   f. Building Type 8 may be permitted by conditional use in any building type district.
2. The dimensional requirements for each building located in the BC-D District are listed in Table 19.50.050 (B) below, except as otherwise stated in the MTMC 19.50.070, Special regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B: Dimensional Requirements by Building Type</th>
<th>Building Type 1</th>
<th>Building Type 2</th>
<th>Building Type 3</th>
<th>Building Type 4</th>
<th>Building Type 5</th>
<th>Building Type 6</th>
<th>Building Type 7</th>
<th>Building Type 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>80,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>5,000 sq ft.</td>
<td>2,500 sq ft.</td>
<td>2,500 sq ft.</td>
<td>1,500 sq ft.</td>
<td>10,000 sq ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot width</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot depth</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>75 ft.</td>
<td>75 ft.</td>
<td>75 ft.</td>
<td>60 ft.</td>
<td>75 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum front yard</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side yard</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side yard, adjacent to street</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
<td>None *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Setback</td>
<td>At least 5 feet setback above 30 feet in height: building footprint above second story to be 80% of the ground floor footprint.</td>
<td>At least 5 feet setback above 30 feet in height: building footprint above second story to be 80% of the ground floor footprint.</td>
<td>At least 5 feet setback above 30 feet in height: building footprint above second story to be 80% of the ground floor footprint.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum yard when abutting residential zone</td>
<td>10 feet, plus one foot for each foot of building height above 30 feet.</td>
<td>10 feet, plus one foot for each foot of building height above 30 feet.</td>
<td>10 feet, plus one foot for each foot of building height above 30 feet.</td>
<td>10 feet, plus one foot for each foot of building height above 30 feet.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum FAR</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum FAR</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage for building and parking</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>85 feet</td>
<td>65 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>40 feet</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Stories</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum landscaping requirement</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Except to provide a pedestrian activity area as required.

C. The development must comply with MTMC 19.50.070(I) and with Town Center design standards adopted in MTMC 19.50.070(J).
19.50.060 Landscaping and Open Space Requirements

Landscaping and shared open space must be provided consistent with this subsection.

A. The percentages in Table 19.50.050 (B) are the minimum portion of landscaping required. At times, to meet other requirements of this and other codes, more landscaped areas will be required. Landscaping should be appropriate to urban areas, and will include decorative hardscape such as pavers, brick walkways, etc. It may also include screening of parking areas, landscaping of setback areas, and providing usable outdoor space. In general, all areas, which are not used for building or parking areas, are required to be landscaped.

B. Shared Open Space

At least 50% of the required landscape area, or 5% or the net residential square footage (whichever is larger) shall be developed as shared open space. Shared open spaces should provide for both active and passive activities. Shared open spaces areas should be as level as Mountlake Terrace’s topography will allow. Shared open spaces shall include plazas and small pocket parks. They should include places to sit, areas of both shade and sun, and may include a feature such as a fountain or art piece. Where the open space is adjacent to a public walkway, street or plaza, provision should be made for direct access from the shared open space to the public open space, and may include provision to secure the shared open space from public entry at appropriate times. Shared open spaces can be placed on a level that is above ground level and is not part of the surface landscaped area, but in this case it will not be counted as meeting the landscaping requirement. Shared open spaces may be limited to use by residents of the building in which they are located.

C. Required trees planted in the street right of way or other areas shall be a minimum 4 inch caliper measured 6 inches above ground level.
19.50.070 Special regulations

Special regulations, as specified below, shall apply to certain uses and locations in the area zoned as BC Downtown:

A. Sexually oriented adult businesses/adult entertainment establishments shall not be permitted;

B. Multiple-household residential development shall be allowed, provided, that commercial uses are located on the ground floor in building types 1 through 5 and that in building type 1 and 2, at least 60% of the ground floor shall be for commercial retail or commercial eating/drinking establishment uses. Residential uses are permitted in building type 7 without commercial uses, except that the ground floor of any type 7 building facing 56th Avenue West shall be designed and built to accommodate commercial uses;

C. Casinos or social card rooms as defined in RCW 9.46.0217 and RCW 9.46.0282 shall not be permitted.

D. All uses shall 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 shall be used for storage, repair or sale of vehicles;

   3. Outdoor advertising structures;

E. Manufacture or assembly shall be limited to containers or supplies and final packaged products that do not exceed 12 feet in any dimension;

F. Nuisances and safety. Uses that create a nuisance by reason of smoke, fumes, odor, steam, gases, vibration, hazard or noise, shall be prohibited. Any use that includes emergency vehicles as part of its operation shall be designed for emergency vehicle egress that is as safe as possible for pedestrians and traffic.

G. Special Provisions for Existing Single-Household Dwellings. An existing single-household dwelling may be rebuilt, repaired, expanded, and otherwise changed for human occupancy to an extent not to exceed 50 percent of the assessed value of the building in any twelve-month period. Accessory uses for an existing single-household dwelling such as garages, carports, storage sheds, and fences may be constructed subject to the same limits. In addition to the above provision, any such improvements shall comply with the development regulations specified for the RS 7200 zoning district for single-household dwellings and accessory structures.

H. Parking Standards for BC Downtown

Within the BC Downtown zone, a minimum number of vehicle parking spaces shall be provided on-site as follows:

   1. Commercial uses: two spaces for each 1,000 square feet of gross leasable area, except that the first 5000 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;

   2. Residential uses: 1.25 spaces for each unit of two bedrooms or less; 1.5 spaces for each unit of three bedrooms; one space per 2 bedrooms beyond three bedrooms in any unit. Hotel: One space for each unit.
I. Commercial Frontage Requirements and Features. For commercial frontages in the BC Downtown district, no setback requirements shall be required from the right-of-way as long as the sight triangle at corners and sight distances are adequate and pedestrian activity areas of at least 15 feet, as measured between face of curb and face of building excluding sidewalk bulbs which extend into the street to direct traffic and minimize crosswalk distances, are provided pursuant to design standards referenced in subsection J of this section. Street improvements, including sidewalk, curb, and gutter, will be required for any lot that is being developed where these are lacking or inconsistent with current standards. Improvements shall be designed by the applicant and may be constructed through private project funding, public-private partnership or with other downtown business and property owners.

J. Design Standards. To assure an attractive, pedestrian-friendly environment, all development occurring within the BC Downtown district upon the effective date of the ordinance codified in this section, unless otherwise exempted by this chapter, shall comply with Town Center Design Standards which are attached hereto and adopted by reference as though fully set forth herein and which shall be available from the department. If said design standards appear to conflict with another provision of this title, the design standards shall prevail.

K. Landscaping, Pedestrian and Bicyclist Features. Pedestrian areas, benches, bicycle stands, refuse and recycle containers may be located within required landscape areas and pedestrian activity areas as long as a minimum eight-foot-wide area is available for pedestrian and wheelchair use between intersections; provided, that the placement of such features is consistent with the design standards referenced in subsection J of this section and with the applicable requirements of Chapter 19.125 MTMC, et al., for parking and Chapter 19.130 MTMC, et al., for landscaping.

L. Conditional uses shall be evaluated in part based on:
   1. Pedestrian-orientation
   2. Multi-modal transportation safety
   3. Avoidance of large truck traffic
   4. Avoidance of shading effect on public plazas and single-household zones
   5. Provision for transition between intense uses and single-household zones

M. Garages. The regulations of this subsection apply to garages that are accessory to single dwelling houses and Type 7 Buildings. On corner lots, only one street-facing garage wall must meet the standards of this subsection. The length of the garage wall facing the street may be up to 40 percent of the length of the street-facing building façade, as shown in the following diagram:
19.50.080 Special use.

Special use – wireless (SP-W): see Chapter 19.137 MTMC.

19.50.090 Compliance with Building Design and Type Standards.

For expansion, reconstruction, and conversion of legal non-conforming uses existing prior to January 2, 2007, building design and type standards will be applied using the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building Type Standards</th>
<th>Building Design Standards *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family expansion within</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permitted lot coverage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family expansion of 10% of the</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES, applied to new units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of units or 10 units, whichever</td>
<td></td>
<td>with exterior walls up to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is less.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a 50% increase in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>number of units; then, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increases greater than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%, to all units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential expansion (based on</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES, applied to new floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floor area) of 1,000 sf or 25%,</td>
<td></td>
<td>area with exterior walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whichever is greater [BUT NOT EXCEEDING</td>
<td></td>
<td>up to a 50% increase in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 SF].</td>
<td></td>
<td>floor area; then, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increases greater than 50%,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to all buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualty loss replacements (for all</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES, applied to the new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses) that exceed the above-defined</td>
<td></td>
<td>units or new floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thresholds.</td>
<td></td>
<td>with exterior walls up to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a 50% increase in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>units or floor area; then,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for increases greater than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%, to all units/buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N/A to single-family).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction after any voluntary</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES, applied to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition of all or substantially all</td>
<td></td>
<td>improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements on a site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot expansion (excluding re-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>striping) of six spaces or more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of a residential structure to</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a non-residential use where no site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements are required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “Building Design Standards” refer to the building design standards contained in the Town Center Design Standards adopted per MTMC 19.50.070.J.
Appendix 2. Detailed Description of Prototypes
A townhome is an attached residential building type that allows many benefits of an urban lifestyle, combined with the advantages of a single family home. A live-work unit has a similar configuration, but has space designated for business or work activities, usually on the ground floor. Townhomes and live work units are typically two to three stories in height and have separate exterior entrances on the ground floor. The charts below show information about typical development for this prototype, assuming one acre of such development.

### Building Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (sf)</td>
<td>43,560 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (acres)</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable FAR</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential units/acre</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. unit sf</td>
<td>2,200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees/acre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average unit cost</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average unit rent</td>
<td>$3,036/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail rent (sf/year)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office rent (sf/year)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated land value</td>
<td>$20/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated land value</td>
<td>$850,000/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$8,851,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking and Open Space Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential parking/unit</td>
<td>n/a (garage parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail parking/ksf</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office parking/ksf</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parking spaces</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space (%)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mixed use buildings provide many advantages for urban business and living. In general a small mixed use building will be comprised of retail on the ground floor with office or residential on the second and third floors. Parking in these mixed use buildings is generally either sub-grade or structured, or some combination of both. Small mixed use buildings can be designed to fit within urban residential neighborhoods. The charts below show information about typical development for this prototype, assuming one acre of such development.

**Building Summary**

- Lot area (sf) 43,560 sf
- Lot area (acres) 1 acre
- Height 3 stories
- Usable FAR 0.63
- Residential units/acre 14
- Avg. unit sf 1,020 sf
- Employees/acre 28

**Financial Summary**

- Average unit cost $306,000
- Average unit rent $1,500/month
- Retail rent (sf/year) $23
- Office rent (sf/year) n/a
- Estimated land value $30/sf
- Estimated land value $1,312,000/acre
- Total project costs $6,197,000

**Parking and Open Space Summary**

- Residential parking/unit 1.5
- Retail parking/ksf 2
- Office parking/ksf n/a
- Total parking spaces 39
- Open space (%) 15%
Large mixed use building will be comprised of retail on the ground floor with office and/or residential on the above ground levels. Parking in these mixed use buildings are generally either sub grade or structured parking, or some combination of both. Large mixed use buildings are able to accommodate a greater variety of uses and can be sited on certain thoroughfares and arterials. The charts below show information about typical development for this prototype, assuming one acre of such development.

**Building Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (sf)</td>
<td>43,560 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (acres)</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable FAR</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential units/acre</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. unit sf</td>
<td>1,020 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees/acre</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average unit cost</td>
<td>$276,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average unit rent</td>
<td>$1,621/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail rent (sf/year)</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office rent (sf/year)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated land value</td>
<td>$31/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated land value</td>
<td>$1,350,000/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$9,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking and Open Space Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential parking/unit</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail parking/ksf</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office parking/ksf</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parking spaces</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space (%)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A ten story large mixed use building will be comprised of retail on the ground floor with residential units on the upper levels. Parking in these buildings is generally either sub grade or structured parking, or some combination of both. Towers which include retail and housing are able to accommodate many services and residences on a single site and can be sited on a portion of the block bounded by 56th, 58th, 232nd and 234th. The charts below show typical information for this prototype, assuming one acre of such development.

---

**Building Summary**

- Lot area (sf): 43,560 sf
- Lot area (acres): 1 acre
- Height: 10 stories
- Usable FAR: 3.84
- Residential units/acre: 111
- Avg. unit sf: 1,020
- Employees/acre: 82

**Financial Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average unit cost</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average unit rent</td>
<td>$1,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail rent (sf/year)</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office rent (sf/year)</td>
<td>$n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated land value</td>
<td>$37/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated land value</td>
<td>$1,600,000/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$36,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Parking and Open Space Summary**

- Residential parking/unit: 1.5
- Retail parking/ksf: 2
- Office parking/ksf: n/a
- Total parking spaces: 224
- Open space (%): 15%

---
A ten story large mixed use building will be comprised of ground floor retail with offices on the upper levels. Parking in these buildings is generally either sub grade or structured parking, or some combination of both. Large mixed use buildings which include both retail and office components are able to accommodate many services and jobs on a single site and can be sited on a portion of the block bounded by 56th, 58th, 232nd and 234th. The charts below show typical information for this prototype, assuming one acre of such development.

### Building Summary

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (sf)</td>
<td>43,560 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (acres)</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>10 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable FAR</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential units/acre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. unit sf</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees/acre</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Summary

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average unit cost</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average unit rent</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail rent (sf/year)</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office rent (sf/year)</td>
<td>$17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated land value</td>
<td>$37/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated land value</td>
<td>$1,600,000/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$31,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking and Open Space Summary

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential parking/unit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail parking/ksf</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office parking/ksf</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parking spaces</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space (%)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking area next to building</th>
<th>Maximum building footprint</th>
<th>Landscaping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Total Lot Area</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3. Community Roundtable Meeting Summary
INTRODUCTION

The City of Mountlake Terrace City Council has identified the need for a new Town Center Plan that will spur economic development in downtown Mountlake Terrace, provide community quality of life, and include options for a new City Hall.

To kick off the Plan development with community input, the City convened three community roundtable meetings in different neighborhoods across Mountlake Terrace. Each meeting had the same format, but the variety in dates and locations allowed flexibility for community members. The roundtable meetings gathered feedback from the community on the current situation in the Town Center and their vision for an ideal downtown.

About 200 residents, property and business owners, and interested parties participated in the Roundtable meetings. The Mayor and other Councilmembers, as well as the Planning Commission, attended at least one meeting.

MEETING FORMAT

Participants arrived at 6:30 pm for a brief open house where they were able to browse previous downtown reports and maps, as well as regional examples of successful Town Center developments. To provide basic demographic information, participants were also asked to identify, on maps of Mountlake Terrace and the surrounding metropolitan area, where they work, live, and shop.

At 7:00 pm, after an introduction to the project purpose, scope and timeline from City Manager John Caulfield, Planning and Development Director Shane Hope explained the meeting process and asked the participants to divide into small groups to discuss three key questions:

- What do you like most about the current downtown?
- What do you like least about the current downtown?
- What is your vision of the future for a Town Center, including City Hall?
  - What activities and uses would you like to have in the Town Center?
  - If a new City Hall is built, where should it be and what other uses (e.g. Senior Center) should it include?

After the small group discussions, the groups reported the highlights of their conversations to the rest of the Community Roundtable participants. A complete summary of the Roundtable participants’ comments is attached and organized by meeting.

1 A new city hall is being considered by the city, based on building deficiencies that have been documented since the 1980s. Given its type of construction and current condition, the building would be expensive to remodel and bring up to modern safety standards.
GENERAL THEMES

Discussion themes and topics across the three meetings were consistent. Participants liked their town and were generally happy to be Mountlake Terrace residents. They liked the existing businesses, especially Roger’s Market and Double D Meats, both of which were mentioned in virtually every small group at each meeting. They were grateful for the proximity of civic and community services, specifically the Library, City Hall, the Fire and Police Departments, as well as the Pool and Pavilion. Participants appreciated the amount and quality of Mountlake Terrace parks and encourage further investment in green and open space. There was also general consensus that the Town Center is accessible both to residents and the region because of the proximity to Interstate-5.

Most participants felt that much of the downtown is “run down” and in need of general maintenance, physical improvements, code enforcement, and design standards. Some participants mentioned absentee and irresponsible landlords are part of the problem. Participants also felt the Town Center’s retail mix is lacking.

Vision for the Town Center. Roundtable participants visioned a Town Center that is an improved version of what already exists. Participants liked the sense of community and small town feel and would like to amplify that feeling through downtown design. They want the Town Center to have a united, cohesive feel; many suggested specific themes, such as more bear statues or paw prints to work with the statue already outside the library. Participants wanted the Town Center to be an active community, gathering space, possibly with Town Square, amphitheater, arts venue, or other cultural amenities. Participants also wanted the downtown to be a defined area, and thought that the City should consider appropriate signage. They did not want mini-casinos downtown.

There was a clear message that Mountlake Terrace youth needed to have more opportunities downtown, and participants suggested a skate park or basketball court. Participants also focused on senior needs, including a new senior center.

Participants wanted the ease of access and mobility to continue and be improved. With the possibility of more development, parking and traffic were voiced as a concern by some.

Height limits and zoning were discussed at each meeting. Many participants believed the height limits should be increased to allow cost-effective development, though there were some participants that would like to see height limits remain at 35 feet.

City Hall: Location and Possible Shared Activities. There was some disagreement about the location of City Hall. Some believed it should be moved to the Town Center, some thought it was simply easier to rebuild on the current site, and still others questioned why it needed to be rebuilt at all.

For those who felt it should be rebuilt, it was clear they wanted the space to be activated and welcoming and that precautions should be taken to build for future demand on City Hall. Many also suggested green building techniques. Possible uses discussed for City Hall included public meeting spaces, senior center, outdoor plaza and water fountain, and more.

For more detail, please see the summary sections of each meeting and the full text comments as recorded by the small groups.
COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE #1: JULY 24, 2006

On July 24, 2006, the City of Mountlake Terrace sponsored the first of three Community Roundtable Meetings for the Town Center Project. Held at the Mountlake Terrace High School, approximately 50 people participated in the forum. The Mayor, several other Council members, and the Planning Commission were also in attendance to hear community feedback.

Work, Shop, and Play

When participants entered the meeting they were asked to push pins where they live (purple), work (red), and shop (green).

Key Themes

Participants in the first community roundtable were pleased with the services that currently exist in the Town Center, such as Roger’s Market and Double D Meats, but generally would like the Town Center to have more services and be more of a community space: “a place where people want to be.” Participants want to see activities and amenities that attract people downtown, such as a town square surrounded by retail and restaurants where the community can come together. Participants felt there was no cohesiveness in design or services in Town Center businesses and that many of the parcels in downtown could be kept up better. Participants hoped that through the planning process the Town
Center could establish clear design guidelines, redevelop many of the properties, and develop and market the Town Center’s assets and uniqueness; specifically they would like to see an identifiable theme for downtown. Many residents would like to see an increase in the Town Center building height limit to 5-6 stories, while some would like the limit to remain at the existing 35 feet.

Participants disagreed about the location of a new City Hall. However, there was general agreement that whatever is built should be an aesthetically pleasing building on welcoming grounds, with expanded community accessible uses, including possible public meeting spaces, senior/community center, skate park, outdoor plaza and fountain, and more.

Small Group Discussion Summary

The following is a summary of each small group’s response to the discussion questions, as written by the volunteer recorder on flip charts provided to each group. All comments have been grouped into categories. When more than one small group reported the same comment it is noted in parenthesis.

What do you like most about the current downtown?

Existing Small Businesses & Services
- Roger’s Market (3)
  - Has good produce prices
- Double D Meats (3)
- Cousins
- Arctic Circle
- Archery shop
- City services centralized
- Civic center
- City campus – close proximity
  - Library (3)
  - Post office (3)
- Parks
  - Pool/pavilion
- Non-corporate entities – small businesses

Pedestrian-Friendly
- Walkable
- Size is walkable – good
- Walkable
- Walking distance
- ADA Accessible

Affordability
- Availability of property
- Affordability – residential & commercial property

New Construction
- New construction
- New building

Room for Improvement
- Clean slate
- Improvable/possibilities
- New style – design standards

Crime Control
- Good crime control
What do you like least about the current downtown?

Lack of Design Continuity & Theme
- No organization
- No theme; possibilities to consider:
  - Bears (decoration)
  - The Village of Mountlake Terrace
  - A City of Parks
  - The Gateway to Snohomish
- No consistent design
- Not pleasing to the eye
- No signs
- No continuity
- Hodgepodge, there is no plan
- Long blocks
- What downtown? Where?
- Have no unique identity
- There is no City center
  - Who pays for things we want?
- Lack of focus – Where is downtown?
- Commercial zone which break up blocks
- Broken up
- Design standards
- Permits and zoning

Underdeveloped; In Poor Repair
- Lack of business diversity
- Current restrictions include height
- Ghost town
- Nothing there
- Lack of restaurants
- Deterioration of parking, buildings, strip malls, grounds
- Closed stores
- Run down
- Underdeveloped
- More parking lots than shops
- Not enough corners for businesses
- Lacks variety
- Unkempt gardens
- Old and dirty
- Vacancies
- Rundown buildings
- Absentee owners

More Connections Needed
- Improve east to west access through downtown
- Need better connecting roads through Terrace – “can’t get there from here”

Limited Parking
- Limited parking
- Lower availability of parking

Better Mix of Businesses and Services Needed
- Too many churches
- City Hall is tucked away
- Business to residential transition
- Too many non-profits
- Desire to keep money in Mountlake Terrace
  - Restaurants, shops, destinations & supporting businesses
- Lack of community space – youth, family, seniors
What is your vision of the future for a Town Center, including City Hall?

New Development & Community Services that Attract the Community Downtown

- A place where people want to be
- New buildings
- Something people can use
- Activities that attract people
- Amenities, including water features
- Water feature
- Gathering place
- Mixed-use development
- Coffee shop and place for breakfast
- Senior, family & dog friendly
- Public restroom
  - Easy to clean & maintain
- Centralize services
- New City Hall
- Historical society and a museum
- Senior center
- Community center
- Ice cream shop
- Create a focal point in the town center such as a:
  - Fountain
  - City Center park
  - Open gathering place
  - Traffic circle
- Skate park
- There are enough churches
- Courtyard with comfortable business (ie. Café on terrace, barbershop, internet café, water feature, maintained plants)
- Community liaison, like the Friends of the Commons in Lake Forest Park
- Attraction magnets
- Places to eat and be entertained
- A real theatre
- Youth events
- Real community center
- Community to gather – music, discuss community issues
- Mural for gymnastics center
- Required/enforced landscaping and upkeep
- Stone & brick building

Cohesive, Aesthetically Pleasing Design

- Wedding cake heights
- Underground utilities
- Hanging baskets
- More green
- Underground parking
- Group use of real estate
  - Taller
  - Deeper
- Preserve trees!
- Eye-pleasing architecture
- General spiffing-up
- Incentives for property owners to maintain property
  - Raise safety

Support Appropriate Retail & Services

- Inviting to small to medium businesses
- One-stop shopping
- Overnight facilities
- Useful businesses
- Walk comfortably for shopping, eating, entertainment
- Community businesses offering gathering spots
- Business to draw young people
- No bingo, gambling
- No large businesses who take money out of Mountlake Terrace
- The “feel” of the inside of Third Place Books in Lake Forest Park
- Soda fountain
- A produce stand like we had on 244th Street a few years ago
Pedestrian Friendly
- Widen sidewalks
- Walkable shopping
- Pedestrian friendly
  - Bicycles – parking and lanes

Appropriate Zoning
- Limit height of buildings to 3 stories – some want higher not to exceed 10 stories
- Disagreement over height limits:
  - 3-story limit (6)
  - 4-story limit (3)
  - 5-story limit (1)
- Number of floors-7 total: 1-2 commercial, 5-6 residential
  - Lower noise
  - Raise land value
  - Attract businesses
  - Change flavor of city – lose small business?
- A couple more apartments/condos to replace some houses south of 236th Street
- Mixed use for 56th Avenue
  - Raise tax base and City revenue
  - Living space in higher stories

Manageable Traffic Flow & Multimodal Commute Options
- Control traffic flow
- Traffic mitigation
- 3 traffic lanes, including a center turn lane
- Encourage traffic and better traffic

Parking
- Parking
- Back-angle parking on 56th

A Place to Live, Work, and Shop
- Jobs
- Protection of single-family residences
- Subsidize siding packages for block houses and let the owners know
- Buffer single-family homes areas with optional commercial/residential

Consider Traffic Impacts
- Meets future needs of bus
- Terraced building

Look to Positive Examples
- Look at Mill Creek & Lynnwood Town center planning

Utilize Current Assets, When Possible
- Renovate current buildings

Preserve Parks: Town Center Needs
Green Space & Open Space
- Center lawn
- Preserve parks
- Bike trails
- Tree preservation
- Veterans Park
  - Raise accessibility

What activities and uses would you like to have in the Town Center?

Community Meeting & Recreation Space
- Public meeting places
  - Parks
  - Performing arts
  - Gathering Places
- Transition to recreation center
- Recreation area for volleyball
- Entertainment activities, both for youth and adults
- Outdoor activities such as concerts, summer outdoor movies, or community barbeques
- Water features
- Public benches
- Green space
- Bike trails
Pedestrian Friendly
- Facilities for 200-300 people to meet
- Pedestrian-friendly
  - Walkable
  - Lighting

Retail Space
- Shopping, should be welcoming to street
- More coffee shops and eateries
- Boutique shops

If a new City Hall is built, where should it be and what other uses (e.g. Senior Center) should it include?

CITY HALL LOCATION
- Move City Hall (6)
- Location – right where it is
- Same location (2)
- Use current foundation
- Same location
  - Already own land

ACTIVITIES AND USES

A Place for the Community
- Rental space for activities
- Underground parking
- Plaza
- Passage from park ‘n ride to downtown
- City Hall should be a “community” center
- Coordinate with the library
- Attract development
- Citizen-friendly
- Service-friendly
- Place for meetings
- Community center holding 400+
- Parking – (underground? 3-story? Straight-in/angle?)
- Senior center
- Senior center
- A big, big fun senior center
- Boys & Girls Club
- Skate park near recreation center
- More bicycle stands

Conference room availability
- Performance hall – plays, musicals, dance, art
- Community gardens – p-patches

Incorporate Existing Public Services
- Post office
- Should be built right where it is and should incorporate Fire, Police, Library, etc.
- Meeting room

Build for the Future
- Bigger than it needs to be

Aesthetically Pleasing Structure and Grounds
- Circular park in front
- Great style – classical, beautiful
- Tree house

Consider Traffic Impacts
- One-way streets
- Traffic concerns with buildings and changes

Consider Retail Opportunities
- Businesses build around hall
- A place for local artists to display and sell work – besides library
COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE #2: JULY 26, 2006

On July 26, 2006, the City of Mountlake Terrace sponsored the second of three Community Roundtable Meetings for the Town Center Project. Held at the Ballinger Lakes Golf Course Club House, approximately 60 people participated in the forum. The Mayor, several other Council members, and the Planning Commission were in attendance to hear community feedback.

Work, Shop, and Play

When participants entered the meeting they were asked to push pins where they live (purple), work (red), and shop (green).

Key Themes

Participants in the second Roundtable liked the convenience of downtown: the proximity of civic services, the ease of commuting, and the easy access to retail. However, they felt it needed maintenance and physically improvements and generally should be more identifiable, specifically that the Town Center does not have a unique identity or draw. While participants liked the existing businesses, they felt a greater retail mix would improve the Town Center.
As in the first community meeting, participants want the Town Center to be an active gathering place for all ages, targeting youth and seniors specifically. The Town Center should be accessible and feel open and welcome to the community. Moreover, any action taken by the City or developers should make this goal possible. Developments should include improvements to make travel easy for pedestrians, bikers, by adding bike lanes, or by car, and by ensuring adequate parking. Participants also discussed design and zoning changes. While there were some dissenters, most participants were interested in raising the height limit as long as the community feel was maintained. Participants also wanted Mountlake Terrace to be a place where community members could work and live affordably.

**Small Group Discussion Summary**

The following is a summary of each small group’s response to the discussion questions, as written by the volunteer recorder on flip charts provided to each group. All comments have been grouped into categories. When more than one small group reported the same comment it is noted in parenthesis.

*What do you like most about the current downtown?*

**Easy Access to Civic Services**
- Civic Center (2): Police Station, Fire Station, City Hall
- Library (4)
- Parks (4), close proximity
- Pavilion (3)
- Post Office (4) - central location
- Post office – hard location; mailbox in parking lot is bad
- Churches (Lutheran Church)

**Existing Commercial and Retail Services**
- Independent business owners
- American Legion
- Bank
- Cousins
- Double D Meats (3)
- Eye center (2) – new Betts office
- The grocery store and existing small business
- Roger’s Market (5), especially the produce
- Yen Ching/trophy shop & archery good business

**Convenient and Accessible, for Commuters and Pedestrians**
- Convenience (2)
- Easy to get around
- Easy access (2)
- Freeway access/accessibility!
- Good access
- No parking meters
- Good shortcut
- Bus routes – accessibility
- Great commuter town
- More walkers
- Pedestrian friendly
- Walkability

**Friendly Community Feel**
- People/Neighborly
- Friendly
- “Small town feel”
- Community spirit
- Nothing
- Quiet residential areas
- Dog/bike friendly
- Old growth Douglas Firs
- Little historic
- Trees
- Flowers at the entrances to the City!
- Mountlake Terrace Plaza – Assisted living
Development Potential
- Good development potential
- Easy to develop blank palate
- Not crowded (2)

Nothing
- Limited area
- Not much
- Nothing (2)

**What do you like least about the current downtown?**

**Lack of Identity, Character**
- Has no character
- Where is it? (2)
- No identity
- Where is downtown?
- No continuity (2)
- Lack of central downtown
- Hodgepodge look
- Ghost town look
- Town is like 3 different towns
- Not appealing
- Too spread out
- No sense of community!
- Just start all over
- Lack of community theme or focus
- Unsociable
- Destination-oriented
- What downtown?!
- Concrete

**Unsuitable Zoning, Design Standards for a Town Center**
- Need to segregate business from residences
- Singe family in commercial zone
- Businesses are in converted homes – “tacky”
- Not well-lit, not night friendly
- Bad lighting
- Better visibility in vegetation
- Better vegetation rules as a business owner – negotiate less rules/for what helps owner of each property
- More city flexibility – be easier on owners

**Maintenance, Physical Improvements Needed**
- Overhead utilities
- Rundown – not clean
- Landscaping – poor – need better
- Lack of maintained grounds
- Looks dated or in disrepair
- Poor maintenance
- Buildings need improvement
- More landlord pride of ownership
- Bit shabby
- Ugly/hideous
- Old
- Run down buildings
- Lack of beautification
- Absentee owners
- Road upkeep
- Deferred maintenance
- It’s dirty
- Messy/unkempt

**No Gathering, Community Space**
- No gathering place
- No concert/theatre place
- No place for people to meet
- Nothing for kids/teens

**Lack of Services**
- Lack of retail
- Not enough restaurants
- No senior center
- Lack of shopping
- Better local & business & downtown service needed
- Post office location
- No variety for shopping
Need: Trader Joe’s, etc, better restaurants – more family oriented, while managing growth

Potential Retail Properties Controlled by Churches, Non Profits
- Church ownership of retail buildings
- Too much commercial property owned/controlled by church
- Too many non-profits
- Non-profits

Traffic, Commute, Access Challenges
- Less bump-outs – or remove

What is your vision of the future for a Town Center, including City Hall?

Improved Commercial and Retail Services
- Add corners to encourage commercial developers in the city – add streets when feasible
- Pedestrian mall – city buy residential property as it becomes available for commercial development adjacent to existing commercial development
- Nice restaurant
- Wine shop, art gallery, ice cream shop, bookstore/shops/city square/water feature, outdoor art, fountain to play in
- Nice restaurants – varied pricing
- Restaurants, coffee shops
- More shopping conveniences, such as a drug store
- More restaurants
- Bookstore
- Ice cream/yogurt store
- Small businesses
- Retain existing stores
- Covered retail area
- Service businesses
- Dance hall

Less on street parking on 56\textsuperscript{th} – time related – 1 hour, etc.
- Traffic flow – terrible
- Need northbound I-5 access at park ‘n ride – would reduce traffic flow into downtown
- Lack of benches (for bus riders)

East-West Access is a Challenge
- Lack of east-west traffic
- No east access from every citizens’ home

General Physical Improvements, Beautification
- Beautify what we have – traffic circles, hanging baskets, murals on buildings
- Decorative street lights
- Parking underground
- Utilities underground
- Water feature
- Aesthetically appealing
- Appealing

Livable, Cohesive, Friendly Place to Be
- Friendly, serene
- Greenery – with water features
- Maintain small town look/feel
- Parks
- Landscaping
- Well-lit
- Safe & drug-free
- Theme (2)
- Focal point (2)

Community Gathering, Activity Place, Senior Center
- Senior center with grounds – picnics/walking paths
- All-age specific
- Community center – multiple use, i.e. meeting space for groups: seniors, youth, Lions…
- Youth activities – place for kids to go (12 to 16 years)
  - Skate park
  - Videos/activity center – pool tables, teen-oriented
- Fitness center with basketball court and running track
- Open school gyms for public use when school not in session
- Indoor soccer arena
- Rock climbing wall
- Community center/senior center (2)
- Skate park
- Sports facilities
- Family friendly, kids too
- Community & senior center(s)
- People doing daily life in downtown

**Zoning Changes: Mixed Use Development, Increase Height Limits, Increased Lot Coverage**
- Terraced buildings
- Multiple story buildings, 3-4 stories
- Multiple use
- Increase lot coverage
- Buildings with more than 3 stories – 6 to 8
  - Mixed use – retail/condos
  - Common architecture
- Underground parking with buildings taller than 3 stories
- Condos that are not too tall, 5 stories
- Mixed use
- Mixed-use buildings
- Mid-rise development to draw developers, 3-10 stories
  - Lot coverage
  - Height
  - Setbacks
  - Parking
- Height restrictions
  - 4-story with trees saved – 5
  - 3-story – 3 people
  - 6-story – 1 person

**Retain Affordable Quality of Life, Attract Jobs**
- More professional offices - medical, legal
- Business friendly
- High tech business
- Professional
- Create housing & employment opportunities to diminish use of cars
- Affordable

**Possible Traffic Solutions**
- Wider major thoroughfares – 57th Street all the way through to 236th Avenue
- One way street in front of post office

**Pedestrian Friendly Development**
- Walkable
- Walkability
- Sidewalks
- Wider sidewalks

**Ensure Adequate Accessible Parking**
- Easy parking
- Adequate parking
- Adequate parking – what look like?

**No Casinos**
- No casinos of any size!
- No gambling in town center area (casinos)

**Maintain and Develop Cultural Assets**
- Art show
- Arts/crafts
- Keep library
- Museum – historical

**Town Center Area**
- Develop to the east – from I-5 to 55th & 230th/236th

**Other Suggestions**
- Market Mountlake Terrace as progressive community
- Memorial to fallen soldiers
What activities and uses would you like to have in the Town Center?

Quality Retail
- Everything but meat
- Florist shop
- Lots of parking
- Need more people to support small/medium businesses
- Need owners to consolidate – work together
- Restaurant
- Want to shop here – not Lynnwood or Edmonds
- Bookstore

Professional Services, Medical
- Doctor/walk in clinic
- Drugstore

Community Services
- Expand library to 3 floors
- Senior center/historical

Community Theme, Attributes
- More bear statues
- Bear prints in sidewalk
- Village of Mountlake Terrace
- Water fountain
- 232 nd Avenue and 56 th Street could have a plaza with less road

Development
- Want development but not 3 stories
- Working with impact to resident
- Developer costs lower – need more height within reason
- 50 acres – wedding cake heights
- Continue to protect residential area
- Blank slate
- Restrictions on development
If a new City Hall is built, where should it be and what other uses (e.g. Senior Center) should it include?

**Location**
- Leave it where it is, just take down old building and use existing foundation
- Remodel existing (historic value)
- Same place, on the land
- West of US Bank
- In downtown – integral to city center
- If multiple stories – could have retail space – revenue generating, post office, professional – doctors, CPAs, Senior center

**Possible Uses**
- Senior Center
- Meeting center
- Public meeting rooms
- Jail
- City court
- What’s in it? Senior center, community center, youth activities, better access to legal information
- Community Center – Historical
- Senior center

**Design Suggestions**
- Treehouse design
- Build for future – over build
- Energy conservative
- Encourage sense of community
- Build in phases – stage development

**Concerns**
- Do we need one?
- Cost to Mountlake Terrace residents
- Infrastructure capacity & costs
- Why do we need a new City Hall?
  - We don’t
  - Fix the problem
COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE #3: JULY 31, 2006

On July 31, 2006, the City of Mountlake Terrace sponsored the final Community Roundtable Meeting for the Town Center Project. Held at the Mountlake Terrace Library, approximately 90 people participated in the forum. The Mayor, several other Council members, the Planning Commission and State Representative Mark Ericks were in attendance to hear community feedback.

Work, Shop, and Play

When participants entered the meeting they were asked to push pins where they live (purple), work (red), and shop (green).

Key Themes

Participants in the third Roundtable were happy with the community and local retail in the Town Center, as well as the amount of green, open, and active space. They appreciated the sense of community and small town feel and felt that the Town Center had great development potential. Like the previous two meetings, they believed far greater business diversity and infrastructure and maintenance improvements in the Town Center are necessary. They also found permitting a challenge in Mountlake Terrace.
In visioning for the Town Center future, participants were vocal about retaining and defining the community character and expressing that character through signage and downtown design. Participants felt the Town Center should be an active family, youth, and senior friendly gathering place.

**Small Group Discussion Summary**

The following is a summary of each small group’s response to the discussion questions, as written by the volunteer recorder on flip charts provided to each group. All comments have been grouped into categories. When more than one small group reported the same comment it is noted in parenthesis.

**What do you like most about the current downtown?**

**Good Community Services**
- Good library
- Library (3)
- Great Post Office
- Post Office (2)
- Library, bank, and the Post Office are close
- Good fire and police department
- Fire department, police, post office
- Location of Civic Center
- Civic center
- Lots of churches
- 9 churches
- Mosque

**Strong Local Retail**
- Double D Meats (4)
- Roger’s
- Grocery store
- Grocery store, butcher, D/D Meats
- US Bank
- Independent businesses
- Independent small businesses
- Small/local businesses
- Businesses & services close together
- Eye doctor
- Veterinarian
- Café on terrace
- Café on the Terrace
- Chinese Restaurant
- Locally-owned businesses
- No casinos downtown

**Sense of Community, Small Town Feel**
- Senior center
- Quality of people/community
- Quiet
- Tour D’ Terrace
- Friendly
- Friendly atmosphere
- People friendly (down-to-earth)
- Single family homes
- Single family residence streets
- Small town feel (2)
- Clean, good maintenance
- Historic building
- It’s not Lynnwood
- It’s small & friendly
- Kids present
- Nice retirement center
- Low crime rate
- Mayor

**Convenient Access, Commuting**
- Park ‘n Ride (2)
- Bus service
- Bus stops
- Easy-on/-off to freeways
- I-5 access
- I-5 close
- Easy on/off I-5
- 1 stop light
- Few 1-way roads
- Entrances to the City have been upgraded and planted to welcome people to our city!
- Traffic flow
Low traffic
Parking okay
Not congested & plenty of parking
Not crowded

Lots of Open Green, Active Space
- Lots of green & trees
- Parks, playfields (5)
- Veteran’s park & terrace creek
- Veteran’s Park/location & existence of parks/open spaces
- Trees (2)
- Green space
- Open space is good
- Pavilion, pool, sports area
- Pool/pavilion
- Recreation center
- Recreational pavilion
- Sports program
- Bald eagles – construction will scare them

Pedestrian Friendly
- Sidewalks (2)
- Pedestrian friendly, except on trash day
- Walker-friendly
- Walking distance

Finished sidewalks

Low Height Limits, Lot Coverage
- Single-level, no high rises
- Absence of condos
- You can see the sky and trees because no tall buildings
- New (current) design standards
- Larger than average lots (residence)

Good Potential, Location
- Compact – small/central
- Location
- Nothing – lots of potential
- Central business district with possibilities – foundation
- Core business opportunity

Affordable
- It’s affordable here
- Mountlake Terrace stigma – keeps yuppies away

What do you like least about the current downtown?

Lack of Theme, Cohesiveness
- Haphazard, not organized, mish-mash
- No central theme, personality
- Businesses too far apart
- No uniformity
- Signs to promote Mountlake Terrace businesses
- Have signs to inform

Business Diversity Needed
- Business hours too short – no night life
- Business types
- Lack of business diversity
- Lack of mixed-use buildings
- Lack of tax base, too many churches
- 9 churches (no tax base)
- No clinics, medical

- No coffee, shop, gathering places, only one tavern
- No free community center
- No cultural centers, activities
- No good restaurants, clothing stores
- No nightlife – coffee shops, poetry reading
- No retail
- Not enough bars (gathering places, clubs)
- Lack of retail
- Few gas/service stations
- Not enough restaurants
- Ratty rentals
- Roger’s Market – dated facility, limited selection
- Stretch/strip malls
- Too many churches
- Too few medium-sized businesses
Not good mix of residential/commercial buildings

Lack of Public Gathering Space
- Not vibrant enough
- Nothing for kids, especially teens
- Provide reasons to draw families (fountain)
- Senior center inactive (change name – omit “senior”)
- Senior center too small/costly
- Very little public space/space to meet & gather
- Transition from residential to commercial is bad for residents

Maintenance and Aesthetic Improvements Needed
- Above ground electric wires = bad
- Above ground utilities
- Commercial property general maintenance (bad)
- Lack of landscaping
- Ugly buildings
- Unkempt/unattractive
- Landscaping not defined – attracts trash
- Looks dumpy, ugly
- Some homes aren’t maintained
- Obsolete/empty buildings
- Too many big boxy buildings

Park Facilities Upgrade Needed
- Park facilities need to be upgraded
- Parks not maintained – play equipment at Veteran’s Park
- Parks outdated & not maintained
- Taking down trees is bad

Infrastructure Improvements Needed
- Poor parking lot maintenance (puddles, pot holes)
- Poor sidewalks
- 56th Street is too narrow
- Main drag too narrow

Not enough crosswalks (marked)
Not enough parking
Higher standards for new construction – architecture

Height Restrictions, Mixed Use Desired
- Height restrictions, 37 feet
- Only single-story buildings
- Need better crosswalks
- Need to paint parking zones
- No bike lanes
- Not enough mixed-use
- Not enough multi-use buildings

Permitting is a Challenge
- Terrible permitting process
  - They control appearance/land use
- Difficult to add on to homes

Development Environment
- City Council keeps revising the same issues about downtown
- Concern over development of commercial property near residential

Increasing Traffic, Not Pedestrian Friendly
- Not walker-friendly
- Gilman Trail through Mountlake Terrace
- Manage traffic (pedestrian/auto) for pro-business (small)
- Traffic not managed (unless on 236th/56th)
- Traffic on 136th – need lights at 58th
- Traffic calming things on street
- Speeders on 56th
- Sidewalks – lacking, don’t go anywhere, too narrow
- Not enough public transit service
- Not enough street parking

Other
- Fireworks
What is your vision of the future for a Town Center, including City Hall?

Community Gathering Place, Cultural Assets

- Community Center – a la Third Place Books
- Community center at pool/pavilion
- Community center with library, etc. (senior)
- Expanded pavilions – community center; example: Seattle Center
- Family/friends gathering place
- Cultural area
- Farmers market
- Fountain
- Improve & maintain parks
- Improved landscaping & lighting (like Everett & North City)
- Open eating area (like 3rd Place Commons)
- Outdoor music in summer
- Outside seating/patios
- Peace sculpture in present park – to show diversity
- Place that promotes togetherness
- Place to gather community
- Public stage/square (concerts, events)
- Town-square concept
- Theater (for plays and performances)
- Bike lanes
- Parks & Trails, beach, boating

Retain, Define Community Character

- Maintain underlying character
- Keep small community personality
- Natural feel, environmental, cozy, cobblestone, street lights, glass roofs, etc.
- Downtown doesn’t attract other people from other cities
- Downtown doesn’t look alive
- Edmonds downtown is good
- Multi-cultural activities

Create an Identity for Mountlake Terrace:

Town Center Design, Signage, Upkeep

- Banners
- Better landscaping – consistent maintenance
- Better signage – city center
- Promote Frisbee golf tourney for Tour d’ Terrace
- More public art
- The city hasn’t changed for 30-53 years – has the 50s look
- State & promote city theme to attract businesses/traffic
- Needs to be clean (maintained)

Development Suggestions

- 3-story limit…or not…
- There’s always hope that they will rezone for larger buildings – won’t keep up maintenance on existing buildings
- All cinderblock houses on 56th should be bought out by Mountlake Terrace
- Taller & more multi-use buildings in town center
- Stories: 3 stories – 2 votes; 5 stories – 5 votes
- Keep buildings small – family-oriented
- Mixed-use is good, will bring general office/retail

A Place for Youth

- Focus on more youth activities
- Teen center
- Teen center – recreational space, programs
  - Neutral zone back in Mountlake Terrace
- Baseball field
- Better recreation center
- Skate park and amphitheater – behind Pavilion, plays music
- Skate park, teen center

- Skateboard park
- YMCA or youth center
Multi use buildings
More parking in multi-use buildings
For developers – enforce adherence to submitted plans
Underground utilities
Underground wiring

Pedestrian Friendly
Improve walkability
Walkable/safe

Keep Investing in Parks, Green Space
Retain parks and green areas
Keep the trees
Greenery/wood

Interesting, Quality Retail
3rd Place Books, bookstores
Actual business vs. single family residences
Be aware that small businesses have traditionally failed in Mountlake Terrace – people go to the mall
No chain store architecture, ex: Palace’s – no cookie cutter construction
No chains
No big box stores; yes to unique mom & pop
No Wal-mart, Walgreens
Something like Pike Place Market
More retail – specialty merchandising, locally owned, no oceans of parking
More small, compact retail shops (like Edmonds)
More banks
Restaurant/café
More art, books & community attractive businesses
Calvary Church converted to retail/commercial with fountain
Work with existing core, successfully businesses, keep up parking lots
Small businesses promoted
Municipal building and walk-about stores with theme

What is motivation for increased tax base?

No Casinos, Strip Clubs
No casinos downtown or card rooms
No casinos
No mini casinos, strip clubs

Manage Traffic Growth, Parking Challenges
Require buildings to include parking
Separate traffic flow to businesses/single family residences
Support/invest for growth now
Traffic: manage growth

Retain, Invest in Community Services
Keep Post Office, Library
Bigger library – meeting space
Expand library

Be Conscientious of Senior Needs
Senior Access – businesses, medical
Senior center on top of municipal buildings or library
Senior center usable for weddings/receptions
Senior housing
Newer, better senior center

Consider Alternative Funding Sources
Investigate possible foundations & grants for funding

Other Suggestions
Light industrial businesses
Redesignate golf course as a Community Center
More centralized (like Cedar Plaza)
Move downtown to Cedar Plaza
Move library to more central area (56th)
Underground parking
What activities and uses would you like to have in the Town Center?

Youth, Family, Senior Friendly
- Skatepark
- Pedestrian & family friendly
- Senior friendly – ADA bus stops
- Family friendly

Rezoning, Design Suggestions
- Move Evergreen Elementary & make that area commercial
- 237th Avenue and 58th Street should be commercial
- Keep height restrictions as is – 3 stories
- Allow single-use buildings on 55th or 58th street & limited height (current zoning or less)
- Go to 220th & build 7-story building there for City Hall
- Streetlights be non-light polluting
- Underground wiring

Attract, Develop Retail
- More small businesses – more restaurants, book & music stores, ice cream store
- Attract businesses that pay a higher % of taxes
- Dance club
- No casinos in Downtown
- Encourage citizen support for the independent businesses

Centralized Downtown Feeling
- City center should have a focal point (fountain – benches – small park)
- More gardens & nicer landscaping

Traffic
- Remove all freeway ramps to city
- Stoplights and signs on 58th or people coming to & from the Park ‘n Ride (236th & 220th)

If a new City Hall is built, where should it be and what other uses (e.g. Senior Center) should it include?

Location
- No new city hall
- Keep city hall where it is
- Split between central and where it currently is
- KEEP SAME
- Where it is
- Behind library, along edge of Veteran’s Park
- If new city hall should be composed of construction trailers, required setbacks next to residences
- Move Post Office close to new city hall
- Keep city hall in current location – just rebuild
- City Hall could be built where countertop store is now
- City Hall location already good

Design Suggestions
- Clean/decorated/bright flowers
- Don’t understand reason to build new one
- Expand city hall on same campus
- No city hall on the main drag
- Renovate/redesign city hall in fire department while doing rebuilding, with underground parking, in stages
- More functional
- Sky lights
- Weight room/gym (in Senior center?)
- Solar power
- Meeting rooms
- Environmentally friendly
- Retain trees/green
- Build to last, restructure
- Make City Hall a park/fountain
Possible Uses

- New City Hall should include Senior Center, rental facilities, police, fire
- Rental facilities
- Community bulletin board
- Clean public restrooms
- Youth activity
- Community center

- If built…
  - By fire station

Concerns

- People should vote for new City Hall referendum
- Need more info about current condition of city hall
Appendix 4. Developer Forum Summary
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INTRODUCTION

The Mountlake Terrace City Council has identified the need for a new Town Center Plan to encourage economic development and quality of life in the underutilized downtown area. As part of the project, the City of Mountlake Terrace hosted a Developer/Business Forum at the Mountlake Terrace Library on Monday, August 14, 2006 from 7:00 pm to 8:30 pm. The City invited members of the development community to obtain candid perspectives on the development environment and needs in Mountlake Terrace and to hear about specific issues, constraints and opportunities for realizing the vision for the Town Center.

The meeting was hosted by the City Council and open for public observation. Sixteen builders, businesses, architects, engineers, and developers participated on a panel. The City Manager, who facilitated the Forum, began by briefly introducing the project.

DEVELOPER FEEDBACK AND FEED FORWARD

The participants then discussed the following questions:

Key Question: What can the City of Mountlake Terrace do to improve the development environment for creating a vibrant Town Center?

1. How would you assess the development situation in Mountlake Terrace?
   a. What types of projects would be feasible in the Town Center?
   b. What are the impediments to development here?
   c. What are the advantages?
2. What types of investments in infrastructure would help facilitate development?
3. What zoning or parking requirements are needed for project feasibility?
4. What are the permitting process needs?
5. What public and/or civic services in the Town Center would facilitate development, such as city hall, parks, library, senior center and community center?
**Participant Comments**

**Retail and Commercial Development**

- Retail development is probably not feasible – yes, to office & residential or mixed use projects. There is not enough traffic to justify retail (without a destination place) other than neighborhood retail.
- We need to bring in more small businesses.
- Need higher density and heights to support those businesses.
- Other cities are building & developing…Lynnwood, Lake Forest Park, Shoreline. How close are they to taking some of our market?
- Part of the challenge in the city center is the tenants themselves, to get them to create new businesses!
- What will work here is retail with residential – combined.
- People want to walk to shops, but…not clear we can support a grocery, nevermind small retail. Many businesses close at 5 pm…
- There is only 1 hotel in Mountlake Terrace— that's another aspect to consider. Need to have hotel rooms for people to stay in. Hotel visibility is important – from the highway. Example: University Towers in U District – is visible. If 10 stories is feasible, why not allow it? Let the market decide.
- May see transition in future years, from veterinary and service businesses to retail.
- Also need to be careful about land costs. Homes are worth more than commercial property.
- Not sure there is tolerance for market rate leases with current tenants. Conduct interviews with them – that would provide information on market realities.

**Transportation Infrastructure and Access**

- The City’s advantage – relatively close to I-5.
- Proximity to I-5 is important. Do need to connect the transit-oriented development (TOD) development to I-5.
- Improve the streetscape and how I-5 connects with downtown.
- Be careful about TOD. In some developments now, office & residential is doing well – but retail is weak, weak. The concept wasn’t right.
- Investments in infrastructure needed – do something with 236th – to make it a full interchange. This would be a new gateway to town. The City needs another gateway.
- Likes roundabouts – they are an efficient way to move people (example at 236th Street).
- Community says it “doesn’t want more traffic,” but that’s what retailers want & need.
On the positive side: the Sound Transit Flyer Stop is a positive, so think about transit-oriented development. With transit, you could have higher density without more traffic. But, need to make a direct connection between the transit stop & downtown.

Make 236th the gateway – it’s better than 220th, if you can work out issues. 236th is our feeder – 220th is too far away.

Parking
- Parking – people (buyers) want more parking spaces.
- Parking: Even with a minimum parking requirement, projects can thrive, that’s been our experience! So it is worth trying to decrease parking to get denser, economically feasible projects.
- Parking requirement at 2 spaces is a hang-up now. Would like to see requirements at 1.5 per unit.
- Parking, parking, parking! Cost of structured parking is $60-80 – land cost is half that.
- Be careful with the parking issues, because I rely on driving (for my business).
- Consider opportunities for shared parking with transit garage. That could help.

Zoning
- Economics require 5 stories…Would like to see 5-10 stories; could be handled through transitional zoning (stair stepping height limits)
- Coupled with permits is inspection – make sure the inspectors can do a good job & expedite.
- Consider transitional zoning – 5-7 stories in core, then a 20-step back, with 3 stories to create a pedestrian-friendly feeling.
- 5-10 stories is a good idea. But doesn’t think we should limit heights.

Permitting
- The permitting process is probably too long in the City, although I don’t have direct experience here. Look to Renton, they have their act together.
- Consider a one-stop system/single person for permitting on each project.

Flexibility
- Flexibility is also important – flexibility regarding the number of parking spaces, flexible design guidelines, etc…
- “I am looking for flexibility.”
- Flexibility is good…

City Actions
- Could have a common area in the center of the Civic Center area. Puyallup is a successful example of that – have a thriving farmers market, etc.
• City has a lot going for it – the park system, etc.
• Incentives – What can the City do? What can it offer?
• B&O tax – would be a real impediment. Good thing the City doesn’t have it.

Other
• Suggestion – do a planned action ordinance/environmental impact statement for the area.
• Developers are looking for certainty & predictability.
• Safety is an issue; had business in Lynnwood – was burgled 2 times – feel safer in Mountlake Terrace.
• Need to go a bit faster so we aren’t left behind.

CITY COUNCIL DISCUSSION: COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

After developer discussion, the following points were made by Council members:
• Yes, we should allow the market to determine what should go here, in the downtown core.
• Not sure our road system could handle large development.
• Excellent suggestions, especially about the heights. One of the community’s main fears is height & shadows, potentially.
• Heard great ideas tonight.
• We don’t have transition areas from residential to businesses, and people are concerned about whether we can do this.
• We need to operate with mixed use, because we need more density to support the businesses.
• Many businesses (e.g. Bartells) are getting customers from outside Mountlake Terrace.
• Likes the idea of a hotel.
• City Center is something to be designed with public input.
• Mountlake Terrace is at a critical juncture now – we do not want a hodgepodge.
• Citizens had all these fantastic ideas! I learned a lot.
• We have a built-in clientele here.
3 Questions of Interest – For the future

1. Small irregular-shaped parcels – what to do with them? (We have a lot of them). Is it cost effective to do development on small parcels with homes on them?

2. What are the new trends on the horizon? Will it always be strip malls?

3. Understanding with the business association. Hope you can have an open dialogue – businesses success is important.

Answers: It depends on height & density. Regarding height – you can have too much. 75’ is a high rise code. At Northgate, we aren’t using all the height allowed (120’).

Parking is critical – if you can get required parking that drives feasibility.

Don’t mandate ground floor retail.

Home-office loft spaces may work.

Lot coverage is important – right now it’s at 35%. So it should be higher. There are other ways to get density, besides height.

Q: Do we have unrealistic expectations – if we make it easier to develop, are we pricing out existing businesses?

A: It will be fluid, transitional; different businesses will be there at different times.

Need the flexibility to accommodate change.

If housing can work in downtown Seattle (high density) it will work in Mountlake Terrace.

Go with your strengths – which are parks, especially in downtown. So put the high density residential near the parks.

The City should go ahead and do an EIS & traffic impact study for the downtown.

Development shouldn’t affect the quality of life of citizens.

I think certain retail can work! People will support their local businesses.

Mountlake Terrace has a history of a lack of marketing! We haven’t marketed ourselves.

Thank you for coming here! We want to extend an invitation: Mountlake Terrace is a very easy area to develop in.
BRIEF SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

John Caulfield thanked all the roundtable participants, and briefly summarized the key themes of the evening, noting that there was consensus around three major areas:

- The need for flexibility
- Predictability is important
- Parking is critical

He noted that there is additional work underway, and additional opportunities to participate in the planning project. Design workshops will be held September 11-13, and the City welcomes input. Information on the workshops is available on the City's website, which will have periodic updates on the project.
CITY OF MOUNTLAKE TERRACE
TOWN CENTER PROJECT

Developer/Business Forum Summary: August 14, 2006

ATTACHMENT A
MEETING AGENDA
DEVELOPER FORUM AGENDA

Mountlake Terrace Library: 23300 58th Avenue West
Monday, August 14, 2006
7:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Forum Purpose:
1. Obtain candid perspectives from the development community on the development environment and needs in Mountlake Terrace
2. Hear from developers about specific issues, constraints and opportunities for realizing the vision for the Town Center

7:00 Welcome and Overview  John Caulfield
- Introductions
- Objectives for tonight’s Forum
- What is the Town Center Planning Project and why is the City undertaking it?

7:15 Developer Feedback and Feed Forward  All
Key Question: What can the City of Mountlake Terrace do to improve the development environment for creating a vibrant Town Center?
1. How would you assess the development situation in Mountlake Terrace?
   a. What types of projects would be feasible in the Town Center?
   b. What are the impediments to development here?
   c. What are the advantages?
2. What types of investments in infrastructure would help facilitate development?
3. What zoning or parking requirements are needed for project feasibility?
4. What are the permitting process needs?
5. What public and/or civic services in the Town Center would facilitate development, such as city hall, parks, library, senior center and community center?

8:00 City Council Q&A  Council & Developers

8:20 Brief Summary: What We Heard Tonight  J. Caulfield

8:25 Next Steps and Project Milestones  J. Caulfield & Shane Hope
- Communication and ways to stay in touch

8:30 Adjourn
ATTACHMENT B
MEETING PARTICIPANTS

The follow developers and business representatives signed in at the forum to be available to speak to the City Council on vitalizing the Town Center:

Yuko Abe, Mountlake Properties LLC
Don Andrews, Mountlake Terrace Business Association
Steve Bolliger, Lorig Associates
Todd Brunner, South Snohomish Chamber of Commerce, Brunner Construction
Carl J. Colson, Carl J Colson Architect
Mike Echelbarger, Echelbarger Properties
Dave Ellis, John L. Scott
Jeff Foster, GGLO
Henry Goertzen, Goertzen Home
Jean Hales, South Snohomish Chamber of Commerce, Brunner Construction
Wendell Johnson, Reid Middleton, Inc.
Bruce Kramer, Murphy Building Company
Steve Lahti, NCF Coorporation
Bob Murphy, Murphy Building
Bill Niedermeyer, Distinctive Countertops
Darcy Niedermeyer, Distinctive Countertops
Dave Richardson, Electri-city Inc.
John Stipek, First Development Inc.
Tom Sakuma, Inter-Pacific
Bruce Selin, Selco Development
John Selin, Selco Development
Appendix 5. Interim Town Center Design Standards
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The provisions of this document apply to the Mountlake Terrace Town Center, currently classified as the BC/D zone. These standards shall apply to all development and redevelopment within the Town Center. The degree to which each standard applies to a development/redevelopment project shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in an effort to achieve an overall design that meets the purpose and intent of the Mountlake Terrace Town Center Interim Design Standards.

The design elements are intended to foster a cohesive pattern of development that supports pedestrian activity and transit-oriented development in the Town Center (BC/D). Each section of these design standards includes examples and illustrations of ways in which the intent of the standard can be achieved. The graphic images are meant to be examples, and are not the only acceptable means towards accomplishing the intent of the design standards. Applicants and project designers are encouraged to consider designs, styles and techniques not pictured in the examples that fulfill the intent of each of the Town Center design standards.
Pedestrian Connections

Intent
To create a network of safe, consistent, and convenient linkages for pedestrians, including locating building entrances adjacent to public sidewalks.

Standards
1. A comprehensive system of pedestrian activity areas shall link all site entrances, building entries, parking facilities, and common outdoor spaces with the public sidewalk.
2. Clearly defined pedestrian connections shall be provided:
   • between public sidewalks and building entrances when buildings are not located directly adjacent to the sidewalk, and
   • between parking lots and building entrances.
3. Pedestrian connections shall feature pedestrian scale lighting, bollard lighting, landscaping, accent lighting, signage, or a combination thereof to reinforce the location and use of the pedestrian connection.
4. The type and nature of all materials used for pedestrian walkways shall be consistent within a development.
5. Where transit stops occur in the public right-of-way, pedestrian walkways shall provide a clear and direct connection from the main building entrance to the transit stop.
6. Pedestrian connections shall occur between adjacent developments where feasible.
7. Pedestrian walkways within parking areas may be included as part of the minimum requirements for interior parking lot landscaping if landscape is provided on one side.
8. For parking lots that contain greater than 15 parking spaces, pedestrian connections through the parking lot shall be clearly defined in a combination of 2 or more of the following ways (except as walkways cross vehicular travel lanes):
   a) a raised walkway
   b) special railing, bollards, and/or other architectural features to accent the walkway between parking bays
   c) special paving, such as concrete or unit pavers in an asphalt area
   d) a continuous landscape area, a minimum of 3 feet wide along at least one side of the walkway
9. Pedestrian walkways within parking areas shall be a minimum 4 feet width of clear, unobstructed passage.
10. Chain link fencing shall not be used to separate pedestrians from
Parking Lot Lighting

Intent
To maintain a safe and secure pedestrian environment through the use of adequate lighting.

Standards
1. Parking lot lighting shall be appropriate to create adequate visibility at night and evenly distributed to increase security.
2. Night lighting shall be provided where stairs, curbs, ramps, abrupt changes in walk direction, and crossing vehicle lanes occur.
3. All lighting shall be energy-efficient, glare-free and shielded from the night sky and adjacent properties to reduce off-site spill-over.
Interior Parking Lot Landscaping

Intent
To reduce the visual impact of parking lots through the use of landscape areas, trellises and/or other architectural features.

Standards
1. Parking lot landscape shall be used to reinforce pedestrian and vehicular circulation, including:
   • parking lot entrances
   • ends of driving aisles
   • defining pedestrian walkways through parking lots

2. Landscape areas next to a pedestrian walkway shall be maintained or plant material chosen to maintain a clear zone between 3 and 8 feet from ground level.

3. A setback shall be provided that allows space for all trees and shrubs where vehicle overhang extends into landscape areas, except in landscape planting strips directly adjacent to internal pedestrian walkways within parking areas.

4. For parking lots that contain greater than 50 parking spaces, the location of interior landscape islands shall be allowed to be consolidated for planting of large stands of trees to break up the scale of the parking lot.

5. The number of trees required in the interior landscape area in parking lots shall be dependent upon the location of the parking lot in relation to the building and public right-of-way:
   • Where the parking lot is located between the building and the public right-of-way, one tree for every four spaces shall be provided (1:4).
   • Where the parking lot is located to the side of the building and partially abuts the public right-of-way, one tree for every six spaces shall be provided (1:6).
   • Where the parking lot is located behind the building and is not visible from the public right-of-way, one tree for every eight spaces shall be provided (1:8).
Parking Lot Screening

Intent
To reduce the visual impact of parking lots through the use of landscape buffers or architectural screening features.

Standards

1. Parking lots that abut the public right-of-way shall be screened with one or a combination of the following treatments:
   a) low walls made of concrete, masonry, or other similar material that reflects the building architecture in material, texture and color, and not exceeding a maximum height of 3 feet
   b) raised planter walls planted with a minimum of 80% evergreen plant materials not to exceed a total height of 3 feet, including the plant material planted on top
   c) landscape planting consisting of 80% evergreen trees, shrubs, and groundcovers

2. All walls and/or raised planters shall be designed to be viewed from all sides.

3. A minimum 5 foot wide landscape planting area shall be provided between parking lots and adjacent developments to include a year-round sight barrier except where parking lots have been consolidated.

4. Walls and raised planters shall not exceed a maximum height of 3 feet, unless all of the following are provided:
   • screen treatment does not create a safety hazard
   • portion of treatment that is above 3 feet in height is a minimum of 75% transparent (i.e. see-through metal railing or other similar treatment)

5. Chain link fencing shall not be permitted to screen or enclose parking. In addition, the use of razor ribbon or barbed wire shall be prohibited.
Screening of Site Service Elements

Intent
To reduce the visual impact and provide screening of trash, service, loading and storage areas, and at grade mechanical equipment.

Standards
1. On-site service facilities, such as loading docks, dumpsters, etc., shall be located in an area that is least visible from the public right-of-way or common outdoor spaces. If service areas are located in a significantly visible area due to site constraints, they shall be screened from public view using landscaping or screen walls to the extent possible.
2. When located next to a parking lot, service areas shall be placed in such a way as to be as visibly unobtrusive as possible from primary pedestrian walkways and the main parking area.
3. All service, loading, and trash collection areas shall be screened by a combination of masonry, wood, and/or planting areas. Full screening shall be at least six feet high or as necessary to screen site service element(s).
4. Loading and service areas shall not face any residential district, unless no other location is possible due to site constraints.
5. Landscape screening shall be used in combination with architectural features or landforms.
6. All screening shall reflect building architecture and shall include
Site Landscape Areas

Intent
To reinforce the character of Mountlake Terrace through site landscaping.

Standards
1. Perennials and/or annuals are encouraged to provide special interest and highlight pedestrian areas such as building and site entrances, public open space, plazas, and major pedestrian connections.

2. Rocks, pebbles, sand, and similar non-living materials shall not be used as groundcover substitutes, but may be used as accent features provided such features do not exceed a maximum 5% of the total landscape area.

3. All areas not otherwise devoted to landscape required by these standards, parking, structures, or other site improvements shall be planted or remain native, non-invasive vegetation.
Pedestrian Activity Areas

Intent
To provide continuous, safe, and consistent street frontage character within and adjacent to the street right-of-way.

Standards
1. A pedestrian activity area shall be 15 feet in width measured from the face of curb, even if part of the width is located on private property.

2. Pedestrian walkways or sidewalks 10 feet in width shall provide for continuity between developments.

3. Unless otherwise required or where larger plaza areas are provided, sidewalk paving material shall be consistent with street frontage improvements of adjacent developments.

4. Required sidewalks and pedestrian walkways in the pedestrian activity area shall be concrete on a 2 1/2 foot grid, standard Mountlake Terrace sidewalk color, and float finish.

5. A 5 foot wide landscape area between the curb and sidewalk shall be planted and maintained to provide a clear zone between 3 and 8 feet high from ground level, excluding the mature tree canopy.
Street Trees

Intent
To provide consistent street frontage character within the street right-of-way.

Standards
1. Street trees shall be planted in the right-of-way between the property line and street in pits with dimensions of 5 X 5 feet, approximately 25-30 feet on center.
2. Street trees shall be spaced to provide a full and connecting canopy above the roadway according to tree species type.
3. Street trees within the public right-of-way shall be located in tree pits with grates or in a continuous planting strip with other plant material.
4. If a street has a uniform planting of street trees or a distinctive species within the right-of-way, then new street trees should be of a similar height and form as the planting pattern and species.
5. Trees used adjacent to the public right-of-way should help create continuity within a neighborhood by displaying a strong repetitive form and/or seasonal interest with color, interesting bark, branching pattern, or flowers.
6. Where tree grates are required, they shall be ADA accessible and of a similar size and material as tree grates found in adjacent developments.
7. Street trees shall be installed in a planting bed or pit that provides a hospitable growing environment and be of a type and size approved by the Community Development Department for compatibility with the urban street system. (The Department may provide a list of compatible tree types, planter preparation and tree installation details.)
Elements of the Pedestrian Activity Area

Intent
To provide for the consolidation, enhancement, or maintenance of outdoor spaces for public use within the Town Center.

Standards
1. Site designs shall have a pedestrian activity area or areas at or near their main entrances.

2. Pedestrian activity areas shall include at least four of the following elements:
   a) special interest landscape
   b) pedestrian scale, bollard, or other accent lighting
   c) special paving, such as colored concrete, brick, or unit pavers
   d) public art
   e) seating, such as benches, tables, or low seating walls
   f) water feature

3. Pedestrian activity areas shall be highly visible from the street and shall be contiguous and concentrated in one or two locations rather than scattered in small, unusable portions.

4. Use of site furnishings, such as benches and planters, shall be provided at building entrances, plazas, open spaces, and/or other pedestrian gathering areas without blocking pedestrian access.

5. Opportunities for “stationary” activities such as standing or sitting shall be provided, where people choose to stay in a place to observe or participate in public outdoor activities. Seating can be primary (chairs and benches, such as that found at a café or a transit stop) or secondary (low walls, steps, fountain edges, where people spontaneously gather).

6. Pedestrian activity areas shall not be located adjacent to dumpster enclosures, loading/service areas.
Parking Lot Location

Intent
To locate parking lots behind or to the side of buildings and reduce overall need for parking space through the shared use of parking lots.

Standards
1. Parking shall not be located between a building and the street unless the reuse of a preexisting building precludes this and is accepted by the Community Development Department. Additional mitigating landscape area and planting shall be required.
2. Every possible effort shall be made to provide shared parking facilities between developments.
3. Rocks, pebbles, sand and similar non-living materials may not be used as groundcover substitutes, but may be allowed as accent features within landscape planting areas so long as the area covered by such features does not exceed 5% of the total landscape planting area.
Location of Driveways

Intent
To maintain a contiguous, uninterrupted sidewalk by minimizing, consolidating, and/or eliminating driveway access points.

Standards
1. All vehicular driveways are encouraged to be located off of arterials whenever possible.

2. Driveways shall not be located along 56th Ave W, except where no other vehicular access to the property is available. Properties that abut other streets should have driveways on those streets. When no other access is available, driveways along 56th Ave should be consolidated between developments for shared access.

3. Where a driveway is allowed on arterials, driveway entrances shall:
   • include an identifying feature, such as a trellis, monument, low wall/column or special landscape treatment, and
   • extend sidewalk paving material and grade across the driveway entrance.
Site Lighting

Intent
To provide pedestrian scale lighting, accent lighting, and festival lighting to accompany street lighting in the Town Center.

Standards
1. Pedestrian scale lighting and/or bollard lighting shall be used to define pedestrian walkways, crosswalks, connections and/or other pedestrian areas within a site development.
2. Site lighting shall complement other lighting elements used throughout the site, parking and/or adjacent developments and public right-of-way.
3. All lighting (except festival lighting) shall be shielded from the sky and adjacent properties either through exterior shields or through optics within the fixture.
4. Accent lighting should be used to highlight special focal points, building/site entrances, public art, and special landscape features.
5. Festival lighting is encouraged during holidays and festivals to reinforce the character and image of the Town Center.
General Standards

Intent
To ensure that the placement of buildings contributes to the liveliness of streets and emphasizes key intersections.

Standards

1. Buildings, along with trees and landscaping, shall be predominant rather than parking lots and free-standing signs.

2. Pedestrian access to the building shall be visually and functionally clear and should offer a convenient alternative to walking through driveway entrances and exits.

3. Storefronts, windows, merchandise, and other aspects of business activity shall be visible by people traveling along commercial streets.

4. Development at intersections shall provide two or more of the following:
   a) placement of the primary pedestrian entry
   b) tower form
   c) corner plaza
   d) other architectural feature, as approved by the City, to create a distinctive and welcoming appearance from the two adjacent rights-of-way
Prominent Pedestrian Entrances

Intent
To ensure that building entrances are welcoming to pedestrians, easily identifiable and accessible from streets and sidewalks.

Standards
1. Visual prominence - the principal entry to the building shall be marked by at least one element from each of the following groups:
   
   **Group A**
   a) recess
   b) overhang
   c) awning/canopy
   d) portico
   e) porch

   **Group B**
   a) clerestory
   b) sidelights flanking door
   c) ornamental lighting fixtures
   d) large textured entry door(s)

   **Group C**
   a) stone, masonry or patterned tile paving in entry
   b) ornamental building name or address
   c) pots or planters with flowers
   d) fixed seating

2. Weather protection - some form of weather protection (wind, sun, rain) shall be provided. This can be combined with the method used to achieve visual prominence.
Backsides and Blank Walls

Intent
To ensure that buildings do not display unembellished walls visible from the street, the public right-of-way, any pedestrian activity area, or from an abutting residential zoning district.

Standards
1. Any side of a building shall be given architectural treatment to meet the intent of this section by using two or more of the following:
   a) varying rooflines with one foot or greater changes of height at least every 20 feet
   b) transparent windows that comprise at least 30% of the visible façade
   c) secondary entrances that include glazing and landscape treatment
   d) balconies
   e) awning/canopy
   f) planted trellises
   g) textured surfaces
   h) projecting cornices at least 12 inches in height
   i) variation in form and materials

2. Where transparent windows are not provided on at least 30% of walls (or portions of walls) to meet the intent of this section, at least four of the following elements shall be incorporated:
   a) masonry (but not flat concrete block)
   b) concrete or masonry plinth at wall base
   c) belt courses of a different texture and color
   d) projecting cornice
   e) projecting awning/canopy
   f) decorative tilework
   g) trellis containing planting.
   h) medallions at intervals of 12 feet or less
   i) opaque or translucent glass windows
   j) artwork of a scale clearly visible from the associated right-of-way
   k) vertical articulation
   l) lighting fixtures
   m) recesses
   n) an architectural element not listed above that is approved as meeting the intent
Massing and Articulation

Intent
To ensure that the size and volume of buildings in the Town Center are at an appropriate pedestrian scale.

Standards
1. Buildings shall have a distinct “base” at the ground level, using two or more of the following:
   a) transparent windows and doors that comprise at least 50% of the ground level façade
   b) pedestrian-scaled architectural details (see ‘Ground Level Details’)
   c) awnings/canopies (see ‘Weather Protection’)
   d) overhangs of at least 12 inches
   e) masonry strips and cornice lines
   f) stone, masonry, or decorative concrete façade on the ground level

2. The “top” of the building shall emphasize a distinct profile or outline with elements such as a projecting parapet, cornice, upper level setback, or pitched roofline.

3. Façades longer than 30 feet shall be broken down into smaller units through the use of offsets, recesses, staggered walls, stepped walls, pitched or stepped rooflines, overhangs and other elements of the building’s mass. Simply changing materials or color is not sufficient to accomplish this goal.

4. Articulation shall be provided along façades visible from streets, right-of-ways and residential areas.
## Setbacks

### Intent

To ensure the visibility of retail businesses and establish active, lively uses along the sidewalk.

### Standards

1. Buildings located within the Town Center shall not be set back from the required pedestrian activity area, with the following exceptions:
   - A setback of up to four (4) feet can be used to highlight entrances and provide for wider sidewalks or plantings.
   - A setback of up to 10 feet may be allowed for the purpose of providing landscaped public space that includes seating.
Ground Level Details

Intent
To reinforce the character of the pedestrian-oriented streetscape by encouraging the greatest amount of visual interest along the ground level of buildings on Town Center streets.

Standards
1. Ground-floor, street-facing façades of commercial and mixed-used buildings shall incorporate at least six (6) of the following elements:
   a) lighting or hanging baskets supported by ornamental brackets
   b) medallions
   c) belt courses
   d) plinths for columns
   e) kickplate for storefront window
   f) projecting sills
   g) tilework
   h) pedestrian scale sign(s) painted on windows
   i) planter box
   j) an architectural element not listed above, that is approved as meeting the intent

2. The sides of buildings not facing a street shall incorporate at least four of the above mentioned items, unless the building side is less than 18 inches from another existing building or otherwise will not be visible.
Transparency

Intent
To provide visual connections between activities inside and outside of buildings.

Standards
1. A minimum of 50% of any ground floor façade facing the street shall be comprised of windows with transparent glass.
2. A minimum of 30% of any floor above the ground level façade facing the street shall be comprised of windows with transparent glass.
3. Reflective glass or film shall not be permitted on the ground floor façade.
Weather Protection

Intent
To provide weather protection for pedestrians.

Standards

1. Canopies or awnings shall be provided along the building façade facing the street. The minimum depth of any canopy or awning shall be 5 feet. The vertical dimension between the underside of a canopy or awning and the sidewalk shall be at least 8 feet and no more than 12 feet.

2. Weather protection can be combined with the method used to achieve visual prominence at entrances.

3. Plastic awning material is not allowed. All awnings/canopies shall have closed ends.
Roof Expression

Intent
To ensure that rooflines present a distinct profile and appearance for the building and express the neighborhood character.

Standards
1. Buildings shall include extended parapets and projecting cornices to create a prominent edge when viewed against the sky. Pitched roof elements are strongly encouraged.
2. Flat, unembellished parapets shall not be permitted.
Screening of Rooftop Equipment

Intent
To screen the view of any rooftop mechanical and communications equipment from the ground level of nearby streets and residential areas.

Standards

1. Mechanical equipment shall be screened by extended parapet walls or other roof forms that are integrated with the architecture of the building.

2. Painting rooftop mechanical equipment or erecting fences are not acceptable methods of screening rooftop equipment.

3. Any rooftop mounted voice/data transmission equipment shall be integrated with the design of the roof, rather than being simply
Integration with Site and Building

Intent
To ensure that signage is a part of the overall design approach of a project -- not an additive element or afterthought.

Standards
1. The design of buildings and sites shall identify locations and sizes for future signs. As tenants install signs, it is expected that such signs shall be in conformance with an overall sign program that allows for advertising which fits with the architectural character, proportions, and details of the development.
2. Monument signs may be up to 5 feet in height and shall incorporate art features or plantings around the base.
3. Signs shall not project above the roof, parapet, or exterior wall.
4. Pole signs are not allowed.
5. Rooftop signs are not allowed.
Creativity, Craft, and Artistic Intent
To encourage interesting, creative and unique approaches to the design of signs for both new buildings and old buildings with new tenants.

Standards
1. Signs should be expressive and individualized.
2. Signs should convey the product or service offered by the business in clear, graphic form.
3. Projecting signs, supported by ornamental brackets and oriented to pedestrians are strongly encouraged.
4. Internally illuminated boxes with formed or painted lettering are not permitted.
5. Neon may be used in an artful way in signs; however, simply outlining the roof or building in neon tubing shall not be allowed.
1. Visual Preference Survey

1. Mixed Use 2-3 Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>44% (33)</td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
<td>11% (8)</td>
<td>20% (15)</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9% (7)</td>
<td>12% (9)</td>
<td>33% (25)</td>
<td>45% (34)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19% (14)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>29% (22)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>36% (27)</td>
<td>16% (12)</td>
<td>20% (15)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents 75
(skipped this question) 0

2. Mixed Use 2-3 Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>33% (25)</td>
<td>19% (14)</td>
<td>20% (15)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12% (9)</td>
<td>19% (14)</td>
<td>32% (24)</td>
<td>37% (28)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Summary

**11/14/2006**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
<td>39% (29)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9% (7)</td>
<td>15% (11)</td>
<td>32% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><strong>51% (38)</strong></td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>7% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9% (7)</td>
<td>15% (11)</td>
<td>29% (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents** 75

(skipped this question) 0

---

### 3. Mixed Use 4-5 Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9% (7)</td>
<td>13% (10)</td>
<td>29% (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents** 75

(skipped this question) 0
### 4. Mixed Use 4-5 Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>41% (31)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>8% (6)</td>
<td>29% (22)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15% (11)</td>
<td>27% (20)</td>
<td>27% (20)</td>
<td>32% (24)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31% (23)</td>
<td>33% (25)</td>
<td>11% (8)</td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13% (10)</td>
<td>13% (10)</td>
<td>37% (28)</td>
<td>36% (27)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 75

(skipped this question) 0

### 5. Mixed Use 4-5 Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33% (25)</td>
<td>27% (20)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>19% (14)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7% (5)</td>
<td>11% (8)</td>
<td>27% (20)</td>
<td>56% (42)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
<td>27% (20)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Mixed Use 6-7 Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23% (17)</td>
<td>29% (22)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>17% (13)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>37% (28)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23% (17)</td>
<td>19% (14)</td>
<td>15% (11)</td>
<td>44% (33)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>37% (28)</td>
<td>16% (12)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>23% (17)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents 75
(skipped this question) 0

7. Mixed Use – Live / Work Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>51% (38)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>11% (8)</td>
<td>17% (13)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents 75
(skipped this question) 0
### 8. Townhomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>37% (28)</td>
<td>23% (17)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>16% (12)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
<td>39% (29)</td>
<td>19% (14)</td>
<td>17% (13)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>17% (13)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
<td>36% (27)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Relationship of Buildings and the Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>16% (12)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>35% (26)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16% (12)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>41% (31)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40% (30)</td>
<td>33% (25)</td>
<td>23% (17)</td>
<td>4% (3)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>32% (24)</td>
<td>31% (23)</td>
<td>16% (12)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 75
(skipped this question) 0

10. Commercial Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>29% (22)</td>
<td>41% (31)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>8% (6)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19% (14)</td>
<td>31% (23)</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>23% (17)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9% (7)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>32% (24)</td>
<td>35% (26)</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Civic Center Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13% (10)</td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36% (27)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>32% (24)</td>
<td>29% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>19% (14)</td>
<td>17% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Civic Center Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>33% (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Summary

11/14/2006


---

#### 13. Sidewalks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33% (25)</td>
<td>60% (45)</td>
<td>5% (4)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><strong>75% (56)</strong></td>
<td>17% (13)</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
<td>5% (4)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5% (4)</td>
<td>8% (6)</td>
<td><strong>64% (48)</strong></td>
<td>23% (17)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5% (4)</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
<td>12% (9)</td>
<td><strong>80% (60)</strong></td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Respondents 75 (skipped this question) 0*
### 14. Streetscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (%)</th>
<th>2 (%)</th>
<th>3 (%)</th>
<th>4 (%)</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7% (5)</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
<td>5% (4)</td>
<td>85% (64)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>33% (25)</td>
<td>40% (30)</td>
<td>20% (15)</td>
<td>7% (5)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>49% (37)</td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
<td>4% (3)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>27% (20)</td>
<td>41% (31)</td>
<td>8% (6)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents** 75

(skipped this question) 0

### 15. People Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (%)</th>
<th>2 (%)</th>
<th>3 (%)</th>
<th>4 (%)</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>35% (26)</td>
<td>41% (31)</td>
<td>13% (10)</td>
<td>11% (8)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents** 75

(skipped this question) 0
16. Public Fountains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32% (24)</td>
<td>23% (17)</td>
<td>17% (13)</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36% (27)</td>
<td>28% (21)</td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td>12% (9)</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24% (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25% (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Additional Visual Survey Questions

17. What types of uses would you like to see in the Town Center? Select as many as you want.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community theatre</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmers Market</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Concert Area (Band shell)</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinos</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing homes</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth shelters (overnight facilities)</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education facilities</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool through 12th grade facilities</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police stations</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video arcades</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stations</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car and truck repair shops</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Theater</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle storage yards</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication facilities taller</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 60 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious facilities</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private clubs</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car sales lots</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents** 69

(skipped this question) 6

18. What types of uses would you NOT like to see in the Town Center? Select as many as you want.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community theatre</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmers Market</strong></td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outdoor Concert Area (Band shell) | 1.5% 1
Casinos | 89.6% 60
Nursing homes | 32.8% 22
Youth shelters (overnight facilities) | 56.7% 38
Higher education facilities | 25.4% 17
Preschool through 12th grade facilities | 28.4% 19
Police stations | 9% 6
Video arcades | 58.2% 39
Hospitals | 37.3% 25
Gas stations | 50.7% 34
Car and truck repair shops | 79.1% 53
Movie Theater | 7.5% 5
Vehicle storage yards | 92.5% 62
Telecommunication facilities taller than 60 feet | 59.7% 40
Religious facilities | 56.7% 38
Private clubs | 35.8% 24
Car sales lots | 98.5% 66

Total Respondents 67
(skipped this question) 8

19. Name:

Total Respondents 65
(skipped this question) 10

20. Address:

Total Respondents 63
(skipped this question) 12

21. Gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents 67
(skipped this question) 8
22. Age:

- Response Total: 2808
- Response Average: 43.88

23. How long have you lived in Mountlake Terrace?

- Response Total: 804
- Response Average: 12.56

24. Have you participated in any public events about the Town Center?

- Yes: 46.3% (31)
- No: 53.7% (36)

25. Do you have any specific concerns for the area or any other comments?

- Total Respondents: 47
- (skipped this question) 28