



## Memorandum

**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Steve Bennett, Planning Director  
**Date:** June 4, 2020  
**Re:** June 9, 2020 Planning Commission Virtual Meeting  
**Attachments:**  
1. Kenmore Downtown Development materials  
2. Upper Town Center 'Test to Fit' Concepts A and B

---

At the June meeting, the objective is to have a discussion on density and open space in order to eventually arrive at a residential density limit and open space requirements that Commissioners think would be appropriate for the Town Center zone. If the City is going to require public open space be provided by the developer, the amount of density allowed will have a direct relationship to the quality and quantity of open or community space that can be acquired through development. There are certainly other factors that will play into these decisions as well.

One way to get a handle on the balance between density and open space is to analyze the outcomes of other development projects. The Kenmore Downtown (Kenmore Village) provides an example that may be helpful in developing an understanding of this balance. Attachment 1 is a set of slides that provide some background on the project.

### **Kenmore Downtown/Village Case Study (Attachment 1)**

One key difference between LFP Town Center and Kenmore Village is that the City of Kenmore owned the majority of the land that made up the entire project area (9.6 acres). Kenmore worked with Main Street Property Group, who purchased properties within the project site and developed them with multifamily and mixed use buildings.

The first multifamily project was the Spencer 68, which has a similar project area as the upper part of the LFP Town Center. The Spencer was built on a 4.7-acre site (upper TC is roughly 4 acres) and has 222 units (Phase 1 and 2) ranging from 565 sq.ft. studios to 1525 sq.ft. three-bedroom/three-bath townhomes. The Spencer was developed within Kenmore's base density limit of 48 units per acre.

The LINQ at Spencer Square is a mixed use building that includes 94 residential units, as well as, medical office space (20,000 sq. ft.). It is located on a 1.1-acre parcel, so the density is quite a bit higher. The Fly Way building, which was completed last year, has 27 units, 6000 sq. ft. of retail, and is built on a 0.9-acre parcel.

In terms of open space, the Spencer 68 has quite a few amenities that are dedicated to serving only the residents of the complex. The other two projects are denser and appear to only have private open space in the form of balconies, rooftop decks, and community rooms.

Public community/open space for the overall Kenmore Village site includes the Hanger community building and a plaza that is known as Town Square. The plaza's sense of place is enhanced by being framed on one end by the Hanger and by the Sea Plane restaurant on the other. The Town Square and the Hanger building only occupy about a half acre, however, the general consensus appears to be that the quality of the indoor/outdoor combined space is very high.

Another aspect of these Kenmore projects that quickly becomes apparent is that they have a lower level of parking per unit/sq.ft. than the LFP code currently requires. With 222 units, the Spencer only has 230 parking spaces (including single garages with town homes, surface parking, and tuck-under/below structure parking). The Fly Way building has 25 covered spaces to serve its 27 residential units (the commercial space may be served by adjacent surface parking) and the LINQ building has 46 secure spaces and 102 unsecured ones (148 total) to serve its 94 residential units and 20,000 sq.ft. of medical office space (according to County Assessor information). If the LINQ building were to be built in the LFP Town Center, it would be required to have 221 parking spaces (1.5 per MF residence + 1 per 250 sq.ft. of office) – almost 50% more (see the last few pages of Attachment 1 for information about Kenmore's parking requirements).

### **Test of Fit Concepts for the Upper Portion of Town Center (Attachment 2)**

There have been numerous references to a 300 unit (or less) residential density limit in the public comments received by the Commission. It seems appropriate to consider what that might look like as part of the discussion on Tuesday. Our Otak team has prepared the attached Concepts A and B to explore this level of density in a little more depth than previous studies have.

If the central and lower wings of the shopping center remain and the upper wing to the north is removed, approximately four (4) acres would be available to develop in the northern triangle area. Concepts A and B apply two different residential density levels to that area.

**Concept A:** This concept assumes multifamily residential buildings similar in mass/scale and height to Spencer 68 in Kenmore. The buildings are 4 or 5 levels above grade and could potentially have below grade structured parking as well as some surface parking.

Test of fit results:

- We could squeeze in 300 multifamily units, but it is tight (see “Key Challenges” below).
- The code requirement would be 450 (1.5 per unit x 300) spaces, but we find that you could only fit around 350 parking spaces, while still providing some open space.
- This concept assumes that there would be ongoing businesses in the hardware store and in the upper level of the shopping center that also would require parking.

#### **UNIT SIZES ASSUMED FOR CONCEPT A:**

Multifamily development was assumed to fit a formula of sizes typical of the market in more suburban areas. Referencing multiple sources of information and statistics (including

information supplied by Merlone Geier Partners), the following typical unit sizes in the Puget Sound regional market and percentages of unit sizes are assumed for Concept A:

- 10 percent studios at 450 to 550 SF
- 40 percent 1 BDR units at 650 to 750 SF
- 40 percent 2 BDR units at 850 to 950 SF
- 10 percent 3 BDR units at 1,000 to 1,200 SF

This calculates to an average unit size of approximately 800 square feet. A gross of 1,000 square feet per unit is assumed to provide additional space in buildings for circulation, mechanical systems, and other elements.

**Concept B:** This concept assumes three-story townhome buildings (25 units) and three, five-story, multifamily buildings. Parking is provided through a combination of surface parking, tuck-under (sheltered parking on the ground-level as seen in some Spencer 68 buildings) and individual single car garages for the townhomes.

Test of fit results:

- This concept yields 201 units (adding townhomes into the mix resulting in a lower yield of units).
- The number of parking spaces required would be 302 (1.5 per unit x 201), but we are showing that you could potentially fit around 275 parking spaces while providing some open space
- Concept B has a higher proportion of 3-bedroom units given the addition of the townhomes, which all are assumed to have 3 bedrooms.
- This concept also assumes that there would be ongoing businesses in the hardware store and in the upper level of the shopping center that also would require parking.

### ***Key Challenges of Concepts A and B***

- The triangle shape of that northern area creates inefficient site planning – difficult to fit rectangular buildings.
- While a central open space area can be provided in both Concept A and Concept B, it is not one-half acre minimum
- Both concepts are challenged in providing sufficient parking for the residential and commercial (hardware store; backside of shopping center), unless a shared use agreement is reached for shared use of the commuter parking structure.
- Given that parking is difficult to fit, two options could be considered:
  - Shared parking with the commuter structure - we anticipated that between 50 and 120 stalls would be needed in each concept for commercial uses in the northern triangle.
  - Reduce required parking ratios given access to bus rapid transit at the site.

### **Potential Discussion Questions**

Will the amount of open space that is attainable in the Town Center be affected by the minimum parking requirements?

Should Lake Forest Park could consider multifamily parking requirements for Town Center that vary based on unit size like Kenmore's (see Attachment 1)?

What other factors need to be considered to arrive at an appropriate maximum residential density for Town Center?