

# **APPENDIX A**

## **Recommendation Matrix**

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<b>PROPOSED MASTER PLAN FEATURE DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION</b>
<p><b>1. Road Access Improvements</b></p> <p>The projects shown below are either in construction or planned. Although these projects exist independently from the Master Plan, they are shown to address the question of how traffic will be addressed.</p> <p>(a) 131<sup>st</sup> Ave NE (202)/NE 177<sup>th</sup> Place Intersection Improvements (Project No. I-16) under construct.</p> <p>(b) NE 177<sup>th</sup> Place Corridor widening (project No. RM-16) under const.</p> <p>(c) 133<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE Grid Road; (Project GR 16) under const.</p> <p>(d) 175<sup>th</sup> St /131<sup>st</sup> Ave NE Intersection improvements (Project I-17)</p> <p>(e) 175<sup>th</sup> Street/131<sup>st</sup> Ave right turn pocket (Project I-14)</p> <p>(f) SR202/522 Interchange improvements (Project RM 25)</p> <p>(g) SR 202 (127<sup>th</sup> Pl NE to 131<sup>st</sup> Av) widening to add lanes, pedestrian improvements (Project RM-12)</p> <p>(h) SR 202 Corridor improvements (Project RO 27)</p> <p>(i) SR 522/NE 195<sup>th</sup> Interchange north ramps (Project RM 15A)</p> <p>(j) W/D road widening (Project RO-4)</p> <p>(K) 140<sup>th</sup> Ave NE improvements (RM-7).</p> <p>(L) New crossing of railroad tracks at 132<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE connects downtown to the Little Bear Creek Corridor.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <p>To meet the City's adopted level of service and provide significant congestion relief in the City's downtown and Little Bear Creek Corridor area.</p> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>T-3.1 Develop and implement a long-range Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) that ensures compliance with the City's adopted Transportation Infrastructure Standards and Specifications and supports growth envisioned by the City's Land Use Element.</i></p> <p><i>T-3.6 Allocate resources in the City's transportation capital investment program according to the priorities as indicated below:</i></p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Address public health and safety concerns.</i></p> <p><i>2<sup>nd</sup> Ensure adequate maintenance of existing facilities throughout the city.</i></p> <p><i>3<sup>rd</sup> Relieve circulation and congestion problems.</i></p> <p><i>4<sup>th</sup> Provide other growth-supporting improvements serving downtown.</i></p> <p><i>5<sup>th</sup> Give priority to multi-modal projects versus single mode projects.</i></p> <p><i>6<sup>th</sup> Give priority to transit and non-motorized projects downtown.</i></p> <p><i>7<sup>th</sup> Give priority to community development improvement not within the downtown which contribute to the City's economic vitality.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Transportation Goal</u></b></p> <p>Establish and maintain a transportation system that supports the land use plan and incorporates transportation/land use linkages.</p> <p>Objectives –</p> <p>Citywide traffic circulation planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Approach and methodology to City Council identifying tentative priority and schedule (2003, Public Works)</li> <li>▪ Begin prioritized list of sub-area plans (2004, long term, Public Works)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p>Agree with road access improvements Yes: 347 (90%) No: 39 (10%)</p>

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Alternatives Considered</u></b> <i>Because these projects are already on the City's adopted CIP, the Planning Commission did not consider other alternatives. The PC comments shown below.</i></p> <p><b>11-6-02 PC Comments:</b> <i>No action necessary by the Planning Commission. Current CIP projects that will benefit traffic circulation in the Downtown and LBCC are listed.</i></p> <p><b>4-23-03 PC Comments:</b> <i>Reconfirmed this feature is ok to leave in plan. Note in plan that these improvements are already on existing City plans. No PC decision necessary.</i></p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <p><i>Include the adopted road projects in the Master Plan to show these projects help implement the Plan. Indicate that these improvements are on existing City plans.</i></p>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>2. New Local Streets</b></p> <p>Recommended new streets are shown on the draft master plan graphic. The graphic also shows future streets already on the City's CIP. Other new streets are proposed for locations numbered on the graphic as "Traffic Circulation Improvement Areas". The alignment and type of these streets would be determined at the time of redevelopment.</p> <p>The possible locations and types of new streets are as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Downtown</u></b> Two-way streets with on-street parking on both sides, with wide sidewalks, street trees and well designed street amenities. Most future streets are envisioned to have features of the "Downtown" streets.</p> <p><b><u>Park Block</u></b> A one-way street with on-street parking and bike lane on the north and the south side of the park block, connecting 133<sup>rd</sup> St with the new extension of Garden Way.</p> <p><b><u>Parkway</u></b> Existing major arterials (175<sup>th</sup> St, 140<sup>th</sup> St, 177<sup>th</sup>, and 171<sup>st</sup> St) that could be beautified and made more pedestrian friendly with additional street trees, well designed facilities and amenities, and possibly landscaped center medians.</p> <p><b><u>Garden Lanes</u></b> Primarily pedestrian malls that would allow emergency vehicle access.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal summary of Feature</u></b></p> <p><i>New grid streets provide additional route choices for getting around downtown for vehicles and pedestrians. Adding on-street parking where possible, wide sidewalks, landscaping and well-designed features such as benches, street lights and waste receptacles make these streets inviting for business and pedestrians.</i></p> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>T-2.3 Require plan and approval of vehicle access, pedestrian access, and circulation schemes for major public or private developments.</i></p> <p><i>T-2.18 Reduce block size through the development of a grid road system.</i></p> <p><i>T-10.2 Where there is an identified need, require new local access streets or missing sections of existing ones to be provided on-site as part of the permit for development. Encourage circulation improvements to include non-motorized mobility, where appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>T-9.3.1(4) Implementation: Require joint driveway access and internal site circulation as a condition of new development for adjacent properties that have compatible land uses pursuant to adopted street standards and Design Guidelines.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p>Agree with new local streets Yes: 274 (75%) No: 93 (25%)</p> <p><b><u>Transportation Goal</u></b></p> <p>Establish and maintain a transportation system that supports the land use plan and incorporates transportation/land use linkages.</p> <p>Objectives –</p> <p>Citywide traffic circulation planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Approach and methodology to City Council identifying tentative priority and schedule (2003, Public Works)</li> <li>▪ Begin prioritized list of sub-area plans (2004, long term, Public Works)</li> </ul>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Alternatives Considered</u></b></p> <p><b>11-6-02 PC Comments:</b> No specific recommendation made. Planning Commission discussed grid road purpose and financing. Locations of the grid roads in relation to existing property lines should be clarified. Parking enforcement is an issue. Feature details require further discussion.</p> <p><b>11-20-02 PC Comments:</b> PW Director, Mick Monken, explained advantages of the proposed grid road configuration that include giving drivers circulation options, limiting access points from private property enhancing safety, and landscape median promoting traffic calming. He commented that grid relieves "super block" configuration. Mr. Monken also indicated tree should not be placed in the on-street parking lanes as shown for safety of cars and trees.</p> <p>Commissioners general comments were to create the right road grid now instead of after development/redevelopment starts to occur. The PC then began identifying their recommended road locations as shown in Attachment A of this document. The west extension of NE 173<sup>rd</sup> Street should be coordinated with the Civic Center Master Plan. PC discussed the criteria for when roads are required and what triggers installation of "optional" roads. Can criteria be "flexible"? Staff indicated incentives for building height can be one of the triggers of the "optional" roads. Commissioners expressed concern about the Park Blocks location and asked staff to bring back alternative locations such as shifting them to the south onto the Canterbury property, locating the Park Blocks using an exact 200-foot block scenario, or reducing the overall width.</p> <p><b>12-4-02 PC Comments:</b> The Planning Commission reviewed 3 options for grid road placement and Park Block location. The Planning Commission agreed to eliminate option 2 from consideration, as it didn't provide enough integrated usable space. The Planning Commission asked for a 1.1 option that would be similar to option 1 with an extension of NE 172<sup>nd</sup> to 140<sup>th</sup> as a recommended street. Planning Commission will review Park Blocks location with Parks and Recreation Commission on 12-18-02. The grid road locations will generally be contingent on Park Blocks location.</p> <p>The Planning Commission agreed to use the Crandall Arambula points in their letter dated 12-4-02 as guiding principles in making their final decision about the Park Blocks location.</p> <p><b>12-18-02 Joint PC-PRC Meeting:</b> The Commissions discussed the Park Blocks location from both parks and grid road perspective. The consensus of the PC and PRC is to recommend the original location, directly east of City Hall, as the preferred location with conditions (See Feature #5 for Park Block detail). The Commissions also agreed that the extension of NE 173<sup>rd</sup> east of Garden Way should be eliminated from the Plan and eliminate westerly extension through Civic Center Campus.</p>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b>3-5-03 PC Comments:</b> <i>Remove graphic showing "optional streets" due to property owner concern regarding alignment of roads impacting developable area. However, include intent of optional streets to improve circulation.</i></p> <p><b>4-23-02 PC Comments:</b> PC reconfirmed this feature is ok to leave in the Plan. Add flexibility by including language that alignment of grid roads will be based on future development of property.</p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternatives</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Include the new street running east –west on the north side of the park block between 133<sup>rd</sup> Ave and the Garden Way extension.</li><li>2. Delete the easterly extension of 173<sup>rd</sup> St. between 133<sup>rd</sup> Ave and 131<sup>st</sup> Ave (thru the Civic Center).</li><li>3. The Plan graphic indicates numbered "Traffic Circulation Improvement Areas". These areas formerly showed alignments of "optional streets". In order to provide flexibility and allow street alignments to be determined at the time of development, do not show the optional streets on the Plan graphic. Instead, maintain the intent of additional point to point road connections as described in the above comp plan policies T-2.3, T-2.10, T-2.18, and T-9.3.1(4) to improve circulation as a part of redevelopment approval.</li><li>4. Include the "street types" concepts for improving the pedestrian safety and aesthetics of streets. However, defer decisions about street engineering standards to the Public Works Department and City Council, and decisions about the location of various street types shown on the Master Plan graphic as Traffic Circulation Improvement Areas to the development review process.</li></ol>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>3. 175th Street Beautification</b></p> <p>New street trees, plantings, decorative lighting, decorative paving, and pedestrian amenities, such as additional pedestrian crossings, benches, kiosks and potentially a landscaped median.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLE</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <p>Beautification would make the street more visually appealing and pedestrian-friendly for residents, visitors, and business. The landscaped median can improve traffic flow and safety by reducing the number of left turns across traffic.</p> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>T-2.21 Promote a "boulevard" concept on downtown streets using access control and pedestrian friendly design to promote pedestrian activity. A "boulevard" concept would incorporate street trees on both sides of the roadway and a center-landscaped median.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Community Design Goal</i></p> <p><i>Promote a visually cohesive community that preserves and enhances the Northwest Woodland character, the heritage of Woodinville, and creates a pedestrian friendly environment in its community design</i></p> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p>Agree with 175<sup>th</sup> Street beautification          Yes: 354 (79%)          No: 95 (21%)</p> <p><b><u>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</u></b></p> <p><b>11-6-02 PC Comments:</b> <i>No specific recommendation made. Planning Commission discussed the benefit of beautification (medians, plantings, etc) versus expense. Advantages of design should be clarified. Requires further discussion.</i></p> <p><b>11-7-02 PRC Comments:</b> <i>The Parks &amp; Recreation Commission looks forward to meeting with the Planning Commission and the Tree Board to discuss details of the 175<sup>th</sup> Street beautification if the element remains in the Master Plan.</i></p> <p><b>11-20-02 PC Comments:</b> <i>Mr. Monken explained that the NE 175<sup>th</sup> St. beautification elements of the Master Plan serve as enhancements to road circulation and safety along this street. As redevelopment occurs, driveways would be consolidated to encourage less direct access points onto NE 175<sup>th</sup> creating segments for medians while improving circulation and safety.</i></p> <p><b>4-23-03 PC Comments:</b> <i>Ensure beautification is doable and does not create a safety hazard. Coordinate with public works department.</i></p>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Preferred Alternatives</u></b></p> <p><i>1. Design details of any street beautification or median location to be coordinated with the Public Works Department, and subject to adopted street standards.</i></p> <p><i>2. Landscaping of a future median and any additional street trees or landscape standards should include input from the Parks and Recreation Commission and Tree Board.</i></p> <p><i>3. Beautification schemes should include design "themes" through Planning Commission and community review.</i></p> <p><i>4. Any plans for planted medians should be carefully reviewed to ensure adequate emergency access and access to businesses along the street.</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>4. Garden Way Retail Street</b></p> <p>The retail street design includes storefront access directly from the wide pedestrian-friendly sidewalks. On-street parking is provided along portions of the street. Garden Way will serve as intermediate grid road in the downtown, therefore, high usage/visibility.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Helps create a "...vibrant downtown Woodinville that is an inviting place to work, shop, live and socialize."</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Implements the City's TIP by construction of an adopted grid road.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Helps provide a "destination" at the eastern end of the park blocks and connection between this downtown commercial area and the civic center.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>LU-2.1 Provide a compatible mix of residential and commercial land uses downtown to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Make it possible for people to safely walk or bicycle to work and shopping;</i></li> <li><i>2. Reduce reliance on automobiles and reduce commuting time and distance.</i></li> <li><i>3. Make area transit service more viable;</i></li> <li><i>4. Provide greater convenience for residents.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>LU-2.2 Connect residential, open space, and recreation areas by an appropriately planned network of streets, walkways, bicycle paths, and utility corridors.</i></p> <p><i>LU-4.1 Create a vibrant downtown Woodinville that is an inviting place to work, shop, live, and socialize.</i></p> <p><i>CD-1.5 Enforce visual character through use of adopted design review for commercial...projects.</i></p> <p><i>CD-4 To create pedestrian friendly environments throughout Woodinville.</i></p> <p><i>CD-4.4 Accommodate pedestrian traffic in the design of streets and building facades.</i></p> <p><i>T-2.5 Require that parking facilities be designed to encourage transit use and pedestrian access.</i></p> <p><i>T-2.7 Require pedestrian amenities as part of all new public and private development in the City...</i></p>
---	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Community Design Goal</i></p> <p><i>Promote a visually cohesive community that preserves and enhances the Northwest Woodland character, the heritage of Woodinville, and creates a pedestrian friendly environment in its community design</i></p> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with Garden Way Retail Street</i> Yes: 262 (73%) No: 98 (27%)</p> <p><b><u>Alternatives Considered</u></b></p> <p><i>12-4-02 PC Comments: Reviewed components of retail pedestrian-oriented streets. No additional action required for the Master Plan. Existing Design Guidelines would need to be revised to reflect all components as outlines in the Master Plan.</i></p> <p><i>4-23-03 PC Comments: The Commission discussed making it clear that the Garden way retail street would have the same design and regulation standards as other downtown streets and not treated differently in a way that impacts flexible land use along the street.</i></p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternatives</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>1. New commercial development along downtown commercial streets should incorporate strong design guidelines or standards to make the development pedestrian-oriented.</i></li><li><i>2. The street standards should follow the "downtown street" design with pedestrian-oriented features such as on-street parking, wide sidewalks, corner bulb-outs with special pavement or markings for pedestrian crossings.</i></li></ol>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**5. Central Park Blocks**

The Central Park Blocks would provide a new downtown park connecting the civic campus both east and west from the Wilmot Park to the proposed new extension of Garden Way. The Park Blocks would have a total ROW of 176 feet and an estimate useable green space of 108 feet wide and contain an off-street pedestrian-bicycle path, as well as trees and open lawn area. (Approximately 5.69 total acres)

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

**Goal Summary of Feature**

- Helps the civic campus become the “hub” of civic life by providing public access to and from civic campus.
- Implements Comp Plan Strategy 1.1, shown below.
- Provides an attractive public space downtown for public gatherings, passive recreation and an amenity for nearby businesses and residents.
- Provides an important link in the proposed non-motorized trail system throughout the city, the streets on either side of the Park Blocks would provide motorized access and on-street parking.
- Enhances the quality of life downtown for residents and helps downtown become a destination, supporting local businesses.
- Provides a desirable amenity for development (developer comment (4-2-03 PC meeting)).
- Promotes a vibrant downtown Woodinville.
- Provides a connection between the civic center campus, Wilmot Park and to downtown residents and businesses.

**Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies**

Implementation Strategy 1.1 for the Downtown Master Plan, includes as two of the items to address:

- 1) Development of a pedestrian boulevard parallel and south of NE 175<sup>th</sup> Street and extending east from the proposed civic campus.
- 2) Encourage open spaces and mini parks.

Pro-1.3 Use the Woodinville Zoning Code and a combination of creative financing alternatives, impact fees, developer mitigation, grants, and cooperative strategies with the private sector to pay for the acquisition and construction of parks and open space.

Pro-1.6 Provide parks within and adjacent to the City’s Central Business District to serve as focal points for downtown Woodinville.

**City Council Goals**

*Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Goal  
To provide quality parks, open space, plus adequate and enriching recreational activities for Woodinville’s citizens and visitors.*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><i>Objectives— Continue to investigate opportunities to land bank key parcels for future planned parks &amp; facilities (Ongoing, Parks &amp; Recreation)</i></p> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with Central Park Blocks Yes: 268 (72%) No: 105 (28%)</i></p> <p><b><u>Parks and Recreation Goals</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Park and Recreation Commission Goals, Objectives and Characteristics(4-23-03Staff Report)</u></b></p> <p><i>Goal –  To provide an aesthetically pleasing pedestrian boulevard that allows people to flow through the heart of the City from the regional trail system and the Civic Campus and Community Center toward the retail core or from the retail core toward the Community Center</i></p> <p><b><u>Primary Objectives:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The provision of open spaces for passive, multipurpose recreation.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The provision of gathering spaces for special events, fairs, picnics, lunch for employees, impromptu games, recreation, and music.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The provision of public art and water features.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Connectivity to non-motorized facilities throughout the City, with special emphasis on Little Bear Creek Lineal Park, Garden Way, and the Sammamish River Trail and to the neighborhoods.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Alignment with City Hall, and pedestrian and bicycle movement to and from the regional trail system, Wilmot Gateway Park, and the Civic Campus.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Primary Characteristics:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Inviting, beautifully landscaped areas that provide relief from urban setting.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Defined borders that provide a sense of separation and safety for park visitors.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Connectivity to adjacent uses and to destinations</i></li> </ul>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**Alternatives Considered**

**11-7-02 PRC Comments:** The Parks & Recreation Commission looks forward to meeting with the Planning Commission and the Tree Board to discuss details of the park in the Park Blocks if the element remains in the Master Plan.

**12-4-02 PC Comments:** The Planning Commission reviewed 3 options for grid road placement and Park Block location. The Planning Commission agreed to eliminate option 2 from consideration, as it didn't provide enough integrated usable space. The Planning Commission asked for a 1.1 option that would be similar to option 1 with an extension of NE 172<sup>nd</sup> to 140<sup>th</sup> as a recommended street. Planning Commission will review Park Blocks location with Parks and Recreation Commission on 12-18-02. The grid road locations will generally be contingent on Park Blocks location. See #2 Local Streets. The Planning Commission agreed to use the Crandall/Arambula points in their letter dated 12-4-02 as guiding principles in making their final decision about the Park Block locations. These principles include:

1. The Park Blocks provide an essential open space amenity required to attract adjacent residential and mixed-use development desired by the community.
2. The Park Blocks unify the downtown.
3. The Park Blocks provide an attractive, memorable landmark making Woodinville's downtown one-of-kind, different from any other city.

**12-18-02 Joint PC-PRC Meeting:** The Commissions discussed the Park Blocks location from both parks and grid road perspective. The consensus of the PC and PRC is to recommend the original location, directly east of City Hall, as the preferred location with conditions (See Feature #5 for Park Block detail). The Commissions also agreed that the extension of NE 173<sup>rd</sup> east of Garden Way should be eliminated from the Plan and eliminate westerly extension through Civic Center Campus.

General comments related to original option:

- The park area should be usable recreation space (specific uses may later be defined by the PRC at the time of design).
- The space should not look like a long pathway, rather a park space.
- Original location is a good centerpiece for the City.
- Provides direct physical and visual connection with City Hall & Wilnot Park.
- Original option meets Park Blocks guiding principles best.

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

- *Park Blocks should tie into Woodin Creek buffer at the end of NE 173<sup>rd</sup>.*
- *Original location provides green space frontage for residential on both sides.*

*Comments related to other options:*

*OPTION 1 – Usable space but Canterbury Square property will also have to give green space on the south property line.*

*OPTION 2 - Not under consideration as green space is not usable for recreation.*

*OPTION 3 – Takes advantage of green space abutting Woodin Creek. Keeps people away from road. Doesn't produce centerpiece.*

**3-19-03 PC Comments:** *The Planning and Parks & Recreation Commissioners discussed providing the Council options with regard to the location of the park blocks, moving the park blocks south, the future of Canterbury Square, classification of the stream of the south edge of Canterbury Square, the required stream buffer based on the stream classification, whether the park blocks implemented the City's vision the origin of the park blocks, the cost of the park blocks and how the park blocks would be funded.*

*Parks & Recreation Commission Chairman Aspen suggested the Parks & Recreation Commission's next meeting include discussion regarding what could be done within a 176 foot wide park block and, if that width was determined not to be adequate, what width would be needed. Discussion continued regarding the difference between a lineal park and boulevard and the rationale for reducing the width from 220 feet to 192 feet to 176 feet.*

**4-6-03 PRC Comments:** *The Parks and Recreation Commission considers the reduced width recommended by the Planning Commission to be beneficial from the standpoint of leaving more residual space in adjacent parcels to design and redevelop as functional land use, as that may be critical to funding the acquisition and development of the park blocks. However, they consider the park blocks as an essential feature of the Downtown Plan and are concerned that the width may be reduced in practice as the Plan evolves. The Parks and Recreation Commission cautioned the Planning Commission to avoid the reduction of the park blocks over time and urged them to consider crafting language to prevent the concept from being diluted and thus, making the park blocks a median strip rather than a functional space.*

**4-23-03 PC Comments:** *The Commission discussed a staff report from the Parks & Recreation Commission that indicated support for the reduced park block width but with a preference for a greater width. The Planning Commission consensus was to forward two alternatives to the City Council with the Master Plan. One alternative showing the original location and one alternative showing the alignment shifted to the south of 173<sup>rd</sup> street, with a rationale for each.*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**09-03-03 PC Comments:** Commissioners agreed that establishing a distance from the park blocks within which the height could be increased would be appropriate. Staff recommends establishing a distance limit from 175<sup>th</sup> and from the park blocks.

**09-17-03 PC Comments:** A majority of Commissioners supported a 200 foot dimension for the height increase area.

**10-22-03 PC Comments:** Commissioners suggested identifying the location of the park blocks as "Option 1".

**Preferred Alternatives**

Planning Commission

1<sup>st</sup> Choice:

- Maintain the original location (Option "0"), with a reduced total right-of-way width of 176 feet and park area width of 108 feet.

Rationale:

- Original location is a good centerpiece for the City.
- Provides direct physical and visual connection with City Hall & Wilnot Park.
- Original option meets Park Blocks guiding principles best.
- Park Blocks should tie into Woodin Creek buffer at the end of NE 173rd.
- Original location provides green space frontage for residential on both sides

2<sup>nd</sup> Choice:

- (Option 1): Park blocks are shifted to the south onto Canterbury Square property so that 173<sup>rd</sup> street is the north boundary.
- Defer to the Parks and Recreation Commission on any design of facilities or uses of the park blocks.

Rationale:

- Provides usable space.
- Takes property from one owner, instead of several.
- Provides better alignment with Woodin Creek buffer near future extension of Garden Way.

Parks and Recreation Commission (4-23-03 staff report)

The park blocks should consist of a multi-purpose passive recreation space that provides no less than 108 feet of open space with a preferred width of 120 feet.

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>6. Protect Little Bear Creek</b></p> <p>This feature blends the regional need to protect fish habitat and outdoor recreational/educational opportunities for people. The plan calls for restoring the stream banks to a natural/native condition with walkways and interpretive viewing areas along the creek.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides native vegetation (large conifer trees) screening for west residential area from commercial development in the creek side commercial properties.</li> <li>▪ Supports Endangered Species Act restoration efforts.</li> <li>▪ Preserves and enhances NW woodland Character.</li> <li>▪ Provides opportunities for public enjoyment of a natural amenity in the City.</li> <li>▪ Provides educational opportunities within the natural environment.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>ENV-3.2 Identify and ensure the protection of sensitive habitat areas, including wetlands, streams and shorelines.</i></p> <p><i>ENV-3.5 support watershed-based salmon recovery efforts and compliance with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA).</i></p> <p><i>PRO-3.5 Consider incentives to preserve valuable open space in new development.</i></p> <p><i>PRO-3.6 Utilize a variety of public and private tools in the preservation of open space including donations, land banking, mitigation, impact fees, grants, and partnerships, or transfer of development rights, regulatory restrictions, and tax relief programs.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Environment Goal</i></p> <p><i>Create a community that reduces waste stream, promotes energy conservation, preserves and enhances aquatic and wildlife habitat, protects and improves water quality, and protects the public from natural hazards.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives—</i></p> <p><i>Remain an active partner in the WRIA Region 8 effort to develop, fund and implement early action strategies (Ongoing, Community Development).</i></p> <p><i>Work collaboratively through WRIA 8 with NMFS, State, tri-county and other public and private partners to develop a recovery plan for Puget Sound Chinook salmon (Ongoing, Community Development).</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with Protect Little Bear Creek</i> Yes: 332 (86%) No: 53 (14%)</p> <p><b><u>Alternatives Considered</u></b></p> <p><b>11-6-02 PC Comments:</b> Chair DePolo recommends deferring recommendation to the Salmon Task Force/NMFS.</p> <p><b>12-4-02 PC Comments:</b> No Action Necessary</p> <p><b>4-23-03 PC Comments:</b> Reconfirmed this feature is ok to leave in the Plan. Include language that this feature is based on existing plans or other planning processes.</p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <p><i>Future development, and park and open space features along the creek should be done in a manner consistent with environmental protection and enhancement of Little Bear Creek habitat and salmon recovery, in compliance with the City's existing sensitive areas regulations, federal ESA requirements, and consider the draft vision goals of the Planning and Parks Commissions developed in Dec. 2001; as shown under feature No. 13. (LBCC Hybrid zone).</i></p>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>7. Restore Woodin Creek</b></p> <p>At the time of redevelopment along the creek, opportunities for native habitat and stream bank restoration and passive recreation will be sought.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supports Endangered Species Act restoration efforts. Preserves and enhances NW woodland character vegetation.</li> <li>▪ Direct, public access through buffer for a safe connection to larger walking/biking trails system.</li> <li>▪ Relief on traffic congestion and air pollution.</li> <li>▪ Separates motor vehicles from pedestrian/bicyclists for safer travel.</li> <li>▪ Non-motorized route connecting other residential neighborhoods to skate park and high school.</li> <li>▪ Provide passive recreation opportunity through public access to the open space along the creek buffer.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>ENV-3.2 Identify and ensure the protection of sensitive habitat areas, including wetlands, streams and shorelines.</i></p> <p><i>ENV-3.5 support watershed-based salmon recovery efforts and compliance with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA).</i></p> <p><i>PRO-3.5 Consider incentives to preserve valuable open space in new development.</i></p> <p><i>PRO-3.6 Utilize a variety of public and private tools in the preservation of open space including donations, land banking, mitigation, impact fees, grants, and partnerships, or transfer of development rights, regulatory restrictions, and tax relief programs.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Environment Goal</i></p> <p><i>Create a community that reduces waste stream, promotes energy conservation, preserves and enhances aquatic and wildlife habitat, protects and improves water quality, and protects the public from natural hazards.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives—</i></p> <p><i>Remain an active partner in the WRIA Region 8 effort to develop, fund and implement early action strategies (Ongoing, Community Development).</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><i>Work collaboratively through WRIA 8 with NMFS, State, tri-county and other public and private partners to develop a recovery plan for Puget Sound Chinook salmon (Ongoing, Community Development).</i></p> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with Restore Woodin Creek Yes: 314 (83%) No: 64 (17%)</i></p> <p><b><u>Alternative Considered</u></b></p> <p><i><b>11-6-02 PC Comments:</b> Chair DePolo recommends deferring recommendation to Salmon Task Force/MNFS.</i></p> <p><i><b>11-4-02 PC Comments:</b> No Action Necessary.</i></p> <p><i><b>4-23-03 PC Comments:</b> Reconfirmed this feature is ok to leave in the plan. Include language that this feature is based on existing plans.</i></p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <p><i>Future development and park and open space features along the creek should be done in a manner consistent with environmental protection in compliance with the City's existing sensitive areas regulations, enhancement of the Creek and providing public access and passive recreation opportunities.</i></p>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**8. Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge**

The pedestrian/bicycle exclusive overpass would be situated at an approved location that connects to the corner at 186<sup>th</sup> and 136<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE in the Wedge neighborhood and west of Little Bear Creek at approximately the 141<sup>st</sup> Block. The overpass is to provide an alternative non-motorized (no motor vehicles) route for people in this residential area to access the regional trail system, downtown, and employment centers other than over the two busy roadways at NE 195<sup>th</sup> and 131<sup>st</sup> Ave. NE. The overpass would be designed with vegetation and pedestrian features that are attractive and steer away from typical concrete utilitarian style.

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

**Goal Summary of Feature**

- *Direct, safe connection to larger walking/biking trails system.*
- *Alternative motor vehicle mode of transportation, if used, relief on traffic congestion and air pollution.*
- *Separates motor vehicles from pedestrians/bicyclists for safer travel.*
- *Non-motorized route connecting other residential neighborhoods to skate park and high school.*

**Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies**

*LU-10.2 Encourage linkage of paths and trails from the downtown to the rest of the Town Center Neighborhood and to the entire community.*

**City Council Goals**

*Transportation Goal*

*Establish and maintain a transportation system that supports the land use plan and incorporates transportation/land use linkages.*

*Objectives—*

*Develop a Non-motorized Transportation Plan. (2003, Public Works, Parks and Recreation)*

**Mailer Response**

*Agree with Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge*

*Yes: 193 (69%)*

*No: 86 (31%)*

**Alternatives Considered**

*11-6-02 PC Comments: Chair DePolo recommends deferring recommendation to Parks and Recreation Commission.*

*11-7-02 PRC Comments: Given the cost of the bridge and process for acquiring necessary easements, the bridge may take many years to become a reality. Important to provide linkage to corridor trails and skate park in advance of the bridge. Other sidewalks and pathways are needed in the Wedge Neighborhood to assure the linkage between the trail system, linear park, and skate park is complete. Also important to do some outreach in the Wedge Neighborhood to get input and support.*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b>12-4-02 PC Comments:</b> <i>The Planning Commission supported the concept of the pedestrian overpass connection. Discussed coordination with Wedge Neighborhood residents and completing the sidewalk system from the overpass north along 136<sup>th</sup> to the Skate Park. Planning Commission requested cost estimate for overpass construction. Ray Sturtz relayed Parks &amp; Recreation Commission comments indicated overpass is worthwhile given no other logical link. Planning Commission suggested that traffic-calming features be installed on 136<sup>th</sup> in conjunction with the overpass. Planning Commission also asked about overpass and underpass connections in relationship to the PRO Plan.</i></p> <p><b>12-18-02 PC/PRC Joint Meeting:</b> <i>In general, the Commissions favored the concept of the SR 522 overpass. This is the most logical solution for a non-motorized connection between the Downtown and Wedge neighborhood, the skate park, and other public areas. Both Commissions were concerned, however, about the Wedge neighborhood issues raised by the residents previously. Commissioners requested outreach to the neighborhood. The sidewalk system should be completed along 136<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. in conjunction with the overpass. The sidewalk and overpass are important to completing the pedestrian system.</i></p> <p><i>The overpass can be a visual gateway into the City. Design considerations include safety, access for emergency vehicles only, and ramps onto the overpass should be sensible.</i></p> <p><i>Since the overpass will be expensive and may take a long time to complete, a temporary alternate route should be established first.</i></p> <p><i>The Commissioners also discussed the overpass proposed over 140th and Woodinville-Snohomish Road to connect the Sirkin site to the Little Bear Creek trail system. Since there are crossable roads within the area, the Commissioners would rather see money spent to enhance or complete other amenities and connections.</i></p> <p><b>3-19-03 PC/PRC Joint Meeting Comments:</b> <i>Commissioners recapped citizen comments of the Wedge Neighborhood forum related to the pedestrian bridge. Commissioners commented that the concerns expressed at the forum could be addressed. Commissioners supported the pedestrian bridge element of the plan.</i></p> <p><b>3-4-03 Wedge Neighborhood Forum:</b> <i>Comments from the public were generally positive and supportive of the bridge:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Neighborhood needs safe trail north to Snohomish County.</li> <li>▪ Volunteers from neighborhood need to be involved in trail construction at park.</li> <li>▪ Overpass must be connected to street improvements, i.e.: sidewalks, trails on 136<sup>th</sup> Ave NE.</li> <li>▪ Traffic calming needed on 136<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Overpass will connect neighborhood to downtown – great!</li><li>▪ May need improvements at 195<sup>th</sup> street and 130<sup>th</sup> Ave.</li><li>▪ Need overpass for safe neighborhood to downtown access to downtown...will use it.</li><li>▪ Design should emphasize safety.</li><li>▪ Doesn't have to be fancy... just functional.</li><li>▪ Overpass is an amenity to neighborhood.</li></ul> <p><i>4-23-03 PC Comments: Reconfirmed this feature is ok to leave in the Plan.</i></p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The pedestrian overpass should be done using thoughtful design and quality materials that can serve as a symbolic “gateway” to the City.</li><li>2. The overpass should be done concurrently with sidewalk improvements along 136<sup>th</sup> Ave and incorporate concerns of the Wedge neighborhood residents.</li><li>3. Until the overpass can be accomplished, consider the feasibility of improvements to surface routes to improve pedestrian safety.</li><li>4. Siting of the overpass on the east side of Little Bear Creek will need to be done in cooperation with any affected private property owners.</li></ol>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>9. Trail Under SR202</b></p> <p>Routes pedestrian/bicycle traffic away from motor vehicles and provides direct connection toward the Sammamish River regional trail.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Separates pedestrians/bicyclists from motor vehicle traffic.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Potential employment travel alternative.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Keeps trail along the river instead of diverting around the creek.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Provides a more direct link with Sammamish River Trail.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>LU-10.2 Encourage linkage of paths and trails from the downtown to the rest of the Town Center Neighborhood and to the entire community</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Transportation Goal</i></p> <p><i>Establish and maintain a transportation system that supports the land use plan and incorporates transportation/land use linkages.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives—</i></p> <p><i>Develop a Non-motorized Transportation Plan. (2003, Public Works, Parks and Recreation)</i></p> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with Trail under 131<sup>st</sup> Avenue</i>  <i>Yes: 294 (75%)</i>  <i>No: 74 (25%)</i></p> <p><b><u>Alternatives Considered</u></b></p> <p><b><i>11-06-02 PC Comments:</i></b> <i>Chair DePolo recommends deferring recommendation to Parks and Recreation Commission.</i></p> <p><b><i>11-7-02 PRC Comments:</i></b> <i>Underpass is important in providing direct and convenient connection from linear park to the Sammamish River regional trail and Wilmot Gateway Park. The Underpass is a secondary priority to the Pedestrian Bridge. The design must assure safety and be as user friendly as possible. As with the overpass, the underpass will be a costly venture and may not be built for some time. Interim linkages must be provided to complete the non-motorized circulation to Downtown, Civic Center, Wilmot Gateway Park, and Sammamish River Trail.</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b>12-4-02 PC Comments:</b> Planning Commission expressed concern for safety in a tunnel configuration. They also indicated concern for cost of tunneling. Planning Commission would like to discuss possible alterations to trail linkage. Suggestion was made to check Chandler, AZ example and linking the trail segments via sidewalks along 131<sup>st</sup> and 177th.</p> <p><b>12-18-02 PC/PRC Joint Meeting:</b> <i>Both Commissions indicated concern for public safety in an underpass. Discussion points included:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Is cost worth the benefit?</i></li><li>▪ <i>Design features such as using a big archway (more like a bridge over the creek, using plexi-glass, and using cameras like the ones proposed for the skate park) could mitigate safety concerns.</i></li><li>▪ <i>Need alternative ground level routes for initial solution. Underpass solutions can be looked at in the future.</i></li><li>▪ <i>Leave in plan as possible future solution.</i></li></ul> <p><b>4-23-03 PC Comments:</b> <i>Due to the increased likelihood of a surface RR crossing at 132<sup>nd</sup> St NE, and the perceived difficulty of achieving this feature, the Commission prefers to delete it from the preferred plan, and recommend it for future study if warranted. Difficulties cited by the PC include the necessity to get approvals from WSDOT, ESA concerns, cost and safety concerns if the tunnel were built.</i></p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <p><i>Enhancement of 132<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE, including a new surface crossing of the Railroad tracks, is the preferred method of providing pedestrian/bicycle linkage between the Little Bear Creek Corridor, downtown and the regional trail.</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>10. Pedestrian/Bike Loop</b></p> <p>Internal and external alternative travel mode network. Off-street trails connect to sidewalks and streets for an integrated loop.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides Alternative transportation mode.</li> <li>▪ Encourages community interaction.</li> <li>▪ Helps make downtown a "destination" for visitors and support downtown business and "vitality".</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p>LU-10.2 Encourage linkage of paths and trails from the downtown to the rest of the Town Center Neighborhood and to the entire community.</p> <p><i>CD-4.5 Promote and plan for pedestrians/bicycle connections to and through residential neighborhoods...</i></p> <p><i>PRO-4.1 Plan bike paths, trails, and non-motorized transportation routes to improve access to parks, recreation facilities, open space, residential neighborhoods, employment centers, downtown, and other local and regional non-motorized systems.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Transportation Goal</i></p> <p><i>Establish and maintain a transportation system that supports the land use plan and incorporates transportation/land use linkages.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives—</i></p> <p><i>Develop a Non-motorized Transportation Plan. (2003, Public Works, Parks and Recreation)</i></p> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with Pedestrian/Bike Loop</i>  <i>Yes: 288 (77%)</i>  <i>No: 85 (23%)</i></p>
---	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**Alternatives Considered**

**11-6-02 PC Comments:** Chair DePolo recommends deferring recommendation to Parks and Recreation Commission.

**11-7-02 PRC Comments:** Overall proposal appear to provide good connection and loop for pedestrians and bicyclist in the downtown area. Opportunities to extend the system in the vicinity of the Sirkin property and Greenbrier site should be investigated as part of next year's non-motorized planning effort. Extending the loop system to include bikes along the South bypass along with the existing sidewalks should also be investigated in the non-motorized plan. Another possible future extension of the loop could include a pedestrian bridge across the river in the vicinity of Woodin Creek Park.

The staff should continue to investigate the possibility of using the railway right-of-ways for pedestrian/bike paths.

Consideration should be given to possible future use of the Loop System for such things as scooters & small carts by seniors or the use of new technology and inventions such as the Segway.

**12-18-02 PC/PRC Joint Meeting:** The overall consensus was that the loop was a good thing and provided the necessary links within the study area. The PRC wants to make sure that the non-motorized connections extend to outside the study area. Their work plan for 2003 includes developing an overall trail system. The Master Plan will be revised to reflect that the system will continue outside the study area and referenced to other future master plans and trail system plans

**4-23-03 PC Comments:** Confirmed this feature is ok to leave in the plan, with exception that the bridge overpass from the R48/O site to the Little Bear Creek Corridor area should be deleted due to concerns of cost, other higher priority features and the fact that there are existing surface crossings of 140<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, Woodinville-Snohomish Road and Little Bear Creek Parkway.

Staff Comment: Siting of the trail in certain areas such as the Little Bear Creek Corridor and R-48/O zone, will require cooperation with private property owners. The City will need to seek mutually beneficial agreements with property owners to acquire these public amenities.

**Preferred Alternative**

1. Show connection of master plan pedestrian loop to other neighborhoods and across the Sammamish River at a downtown location such as Woodin Creek Park.

2. Include the Master Plan loop in City's non-motorized plan, a separate plan that is being developed by the Parks and Recreation Commission.

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>11. Civic Campus Improvements</b></p> <p>Civic Campus improvements are being reviewed under the separate "Civic Center Master Plan" process. Although separate, it is identified in the DT/LBCC master plan due to its importance to the downtown area.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Creates the "hub" or "heart" of the City's civic life, where the community can gather for civic events, recreation and government meetings and services.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Adds to the vitality of downtown as the public focal point and identity of the downtown.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Maximizes efficient city service being adjacent to City Hall.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Connections to the non-motorized path system maximizes public access to the civic campus from all areas of the City.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>Goal LU-9: To maintain the downtown area as the center for commercial, civic, cultural, and recreational activities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Policy LU-9.1: Encourage uses that will support day and evening activities for all ages.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Policy LU-9.2: Encourage linkage of paths and trails from the downtown to the rest of the Town Center Neighborhood and to the entire community.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Policy LU-9.3: Purchase and develop the Sorenson School campus and adjacent properties as a civic center for use as a City Hall, as well as cultural, meeting, and recreational facilities for all groups.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Goal</i></p> <p><i>To provide quality parks, open space, plus adequate and enriching recreational activities for Woodinville's citizens and visitors.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives—</i></p> <p><i>Complete Civic Center Master Plan II (2002-2003, Parks &amp; Recreation)</i></p> <p><i>Present Civic Center Master Plan budget and phasing recommendations to City Council (2003, Parks &amp; Recreation)</i></p> <p><b><u>Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with Civic Campus Improvements</i>  <i>Yes: 257 (70%)</i>  <i>No: 108 (30%)</i></p>
---	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Alternatives Considered</u></b></p> <p><b>11-6-02 PC Comments:</b> Chair DePolo recommends deferring recommendation to Civic Center Master Plan Process</p> <p><b>3-19-03 PC Comments:</b> The Commission was presented an update of the Civic Center Master Plan by the Parks &amp; Rec Director. The Commission had general questions about the status of the old school house and the uses that might locate there.</p> <p><b>4-23-03 PC Comments:</b> Confirmed that this feature is ok to leave in the plan for reference – Specific features or actions are deferred to the Civic Center Master Plan process.</p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <p>Support the Civic Center Improvements defined in the Civic Center Master Plan.</p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>12. Downtown Residential</b></p> <p>Provide increased multi-family residential uses in the general area of the downtown that currently holds residential uses. This residential could be in stand-alone structures as well as within mixed use buildings.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Helps provide a range of housing types for different household sizes and income levels.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Focusing residential within the center of the City reduces pressure to up-zone and add density to low density residential neighborhoods</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Creates a vibrant "downtown neighborhood".</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Concentrates housing and population growth near shopping, government, and entertainment services, encouraging a pedestrian-oriented community.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Makes efficient use of existing infrastructure (roads, water, sewer lines) and emergency response (police and fire services).</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Reduced impervious surface and habitat loss as compared with undeveloped areas.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Produces fewer peak auto trips as compared with retail land uses.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Downtown residents can help the proposed community center to become reality by providing users and revenues to support the community center.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>LU-2.1 Provide a compatible mix of residential and commercial land uses downtown to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Make it possible for people to safely walk or bicycle to work and shopping;</i></li> <li><i>2. Reduce reliance on automobiles and reduce commuting time and distance.</i></li> <li><i>3. Make area transit service more viable;</i></li> <li><i>4. Provide greater convenience for residents.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>LU-3.6 Encourage medium and moderate density housing throughout the community where sufficient public facilities and services are available, where the land is capable of supporting such uses, and where compatible with adjacent land uses.</i></p> <p><i>LU-3.7 Permit a range of densities to encourage a variety of housing types that meet the housing needs of residents with a range of incomes.</i></p>
---	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

*LU-4.1 Create a vibrant compact downtown Woodinville that is an inviting place to work, shop, live, and socialize.*

*LU-4.2 Encourage mixed-use development that balances residential and business uses within commercial areas.*

*LU-7.1 Encourage a mix of commercial, office and residential land uses to locate in the downtown.*

*LU-8.1 Encourage a mix of housing types in and around downtown for all economic segments of the community.*

*H-1: To preserve existing housing and neighborhoods and provide a diversity of housing types that promotes housing opportunities for all economic segments of the City's population.*

**City Council Goals**

*Housing – Goal*

*Preserve existing housing and neighborhoods, and provide a diversity of housing types that promotes housing opportunities for all economic segments of the City's population.*

*Objectives –*

*Assure a variety of housing options and types are addressed in deliberations of the DTMP.*

*(2002-2003, Community Development)*

*Complete suitability study of Transit Oriented Housing Development for Woodinville.*

*(2002-2003, Community Development)*

**Fall 2002 Mailer Response**

*Agree with downtown residential.*

*Yes: 222 (60%)*

*No: 146 (40%)*

**Alternatives Considered**

***12-4-02 PC Comments:*** *Planning Commission discussed mixed use/residential density and how the City gets right combination. Requested Kirkland code re: height incentives tied to uses.*

***1-15-03 PC Comments:*** *See #14, Five Floor Maximum for integrated discussion notes.*

***2-5-03 PC Comments:*** *PC asked staff to research using a FAR as opposed to a maximum density CAP. Staff provided answers to the questions raised at the previous meeting related to infrastructure capacity. The basic answer is that no development can occur without mitigating the impacts. Staff offered to set up a PC round table*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

*discussion with residential developers to talk about the economics of downtown residential.*

**4-2-03 PC Comments:** *Developers present for discussion were Art Sullivan of ARCH, Bob Parks, Randy Kyte, and Brice Lorig. The discussion started out with a question to the developers, "Why is there no mixed use in Woodinville". Below are their answers:*

- *It is difficult to justify \$60-65 per sq for structured parking on \$30-35 sq foot land.*
- *The local rents are not high enough yet for that type of development cost.*
- *Allowing structured parking to be shared would make it more economically feasible.*
- *Rents drive development but don't let that drive the planning. Plan for the future and let the market catch up.*
- *Density is plan for the future and more important than height (allow use of FAR).*
- *Developers look at the parking first when evaluating a development opportunity...parking must be feasible.*
- *FAR is better and more flexible than units per acre.*
- *Units per acre encourage building bigger units so smaller, more affordable units don't get built.*
- *Make regulations flexible.*
- *Retail generates traffic, not residential.*
- *Developers look for good planning in a city.*
- *There is a lot of retail potential left.*
- *Horizontal versus vertical mixed use is more easily financed.*
- *Can't afford retail to be part of mixed use if there is no retail demand there.*
- *Public amenities are very important (like the park blocks).*
- *Housing should match the demographics profile to be successful. The trend is towards smaller households.*
- *Time, process, and soils are a developers biggest concerns.*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Make some roads the spines of your city. As you step back from the spines make a hierarchy of housing with more housing away from spines.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>People will walk 300 feet from their car to shopping but will walk 600 feet from their home to shopping</i></li> <li>▪ <i>How to get affordability there? Build smaller units.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Design review is a good thing. It allows developers to be flexible and inventive.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>4-9-03 PC Comments:</u></b> <i>Commissioners discussed the traffic impact as a result of the FAR method, the Flexibility FAR provided, number of units that could be achieved via FAR versus underlying density, the potential to apply FAR to districts within a zone (rather than the entire zone), the indication in the traffic analysis on the previous alternative that fewer trips were generated by residential compared to retail, and other goals achieved via FAR such as affordable housing.</i></p> <p><i>Commissioners discussed a potential FAR overlay in downtown along 175<sup>th</sup> north of the park blocks, in the TOHD, and on the Sirkin property. Mr. Smith advised traffic modeling would take time and additional funds, approximately \$20,000 - \$25,000. Once the funds were identified, the traffic modeling would take 3-4 months to complete. It was suggested the Commission develop 1-2 alternatives and determine a preferred alternative based on the results of the traffic modeling or have staff identify solutions if the traffic modeling indicates decisions in the Master Plan created problems. It was suggested staff confirm with the Council whether they wanted traffic modeling done before the Master Plan was submitted to them.</i></p> <p><i>Commissioners discussed a potential FAR overlay in downtown along 175<sup>th</sup> north of the park blocks, in the TOHD, and on the Sirkin property. Mr. Smith advised traffic modeling would take time and additional funds. Once the funds were identified, the traffic modeling would take 3-4 months to complete. It was suggested the Commission develop 1-2 alternatives and determine a preferred alternative based on the results of the traffic modeling or have staff identify solutions if the traffic modeling indicates decisions in the Master Plan created problems. It was suggested staff confirm with the Council whether they wanted traffic modeling done before the Master Plan was submitted to them.</i></p> <p><b><u>4-23-03 PC Comments:</u></b> <i>The Commission discussed various combinations of floors, heights, use of FAR and incentives and separating the downtown into three areas; Downtown Core, TOD Site and R48/0 Zone.</i></p> <p><b><u>08-20-03 PC Comments:</u></b> <i>The Commission suggested limiting the height increase incentive to 55 feet in the downtown core to property that abuts the park blocks, adding the development of design standards to Implementation Strategies, and determining an appropriate name for the GB zone such as Parkway Commercial General Business/Office, General Business, or Corridor.</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Height – 45’ as a base and up to 55’ with incentives such as structured/underground parking (WMC 21.12.040)</i></li><li>▪ <i>Floors – Option 1 (no change) WMC does not specify a maximum number of floors</i></li><li>▪ <i>Residential Density – Regulate by Floor Area Ratio. Staff to identify FAR ranges for traffic modeling</i></li><li>▪ <i>Design Guidelines/Standards – Option 3 (make design review more proscriptive by adopting “design standards” and recommend study possible new or revised design standards as an implementation strategy)</i></li><li>▪ <i>Permitted Uses – Option 3 (do not recommend adoption of Option 2 [implement provisions of WMC 21.38.050 – pedestrian oriented commercial development and WMC 21.38.080 mixed-use overlay] now but study for possible future recommendation as an implementation strategy)</i></li></ul>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**13. Little Bear Creek Corridor Parkway Commercial Hybrid of GB and O zones. (Formerly Office Park Land Use in the 1<sup>st</sup> draft Master Plan)**

A hybrid of uses that combine General Business and Office zone uses that provides greater land use flexibility. Improved design standards and design guidelines would be proposed to ensure compatibility with adjoining land uses and promote quality architectural design.

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

**Summary of Feature**

- *Increases office zoned property in Woodinville – currently a deficiency.*
- *The Office park development will allow and encourage high tech industries to locate in Woodinville in an attractive well-planned campus setting.*
- *This use will diversify employment and economic development opportunities.*
- *Provides for greater employment quantity.*
- *Located near regional motorized and non-motorized transportation corridors.*
- *Encourage uses that are compatible with Little Bear Creek protection, and improved aesthetics of development.*

**Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies**

- LU-4.4 *Provide an adequate supply of land zoned for employment to support 20-year employment projections*
- LU-7.1 *Encourage a mix of commercial, office and residential land uses to locate in the downtown.*
- ED4.3: *Development programs and projects that encourage a healthy, vibrant business community and set priorities for capital facilities, such as a downtown and Little Bear Creek corridor plan.*
- ED3.2: *Increase the intensity of commercial, and industrial area by encouraging redevelopment and infill development.*
- ENV5.2: *Include enhancement of shoreline and waterways with adjacent development activities.*
- ENV5.3: *Minimize imperious surface*

**City Council Goals**

*Land Use – Goal:*

*Establish land use patterns and guide population growth in a manner that maintains or improves Woodinville's quality of life, environmental attributes, and northwest woodland character.*

*Objectives – Continue to plan, refine, and define the development characteristics of Woodinville through master and sub-area planning.*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><i>Economic Development – Goal:</i></p> <p><i>Take a positive partnership role in retaining and enhancing the existing diverse and vital economic base in the City.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Assure that economic diversity and opportunity are addressed in the Downtown/Little Bear Creek Corridor integrated Master Plan, toward creating an economically balanced community. (2002-2003 Community Development)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Work with the Chamber of Commerce, wineries and tourism businesses to develop a common signage and mapping/guide system. (2003, Community Development)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Develop a citywide Economic Development Plan (prioritized above Industrial Sub area Master Plan). (2003 Community Development)</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fall 2002 Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with office land use. Yes: 262 (73%) No: 97 (27%)</i></p> <p><b><u>Joint PC/Parks &amp; Rec. Vision Goals (Dec. 2001)</u></b></p> <p><i>The following Goals were drafted based on input from the Parks &amp; Recreation and Planning Commissions in the fall of 2001. These Goals represent the City's desire to create a commercial corridor that takes advantage of all the valuable amenities and unique opportunities of Woodinville's natural and manmade environments.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>To promote a viable economic future for the corridor.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>To preserve, protect, and enhance environmentally sensitive areas with a focus on wildlife habitat and mature native vegetation within the corridor.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>To create a variety of recreational and public education opportunities within the corridor including Little Bear Creek Lineal Park.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>To define and develop the "gateways" of the corridor from the entrance to Woodinville at the west end to the transition between King and Snohomish County.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>To protect, enhance, and preserve valley vistas in and above the corridor area.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>To preserve and protect the mature trees that provide a visual and noise buffer along SR522.</i></li> </ul>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

- *To ensure infrastructure improvements meet the needs for development capacity.*
- *To create a dynamic and visually pleasing link between the corridor and adjacent areas.*

**Joint PC/PRC Corridor Features**

- *Large natural green spaces.*
- *Small-scale green spaces within built areas*
- *Trail system*
- *Mixed Land use (Com./office)*
- *Office space*
- *Pedestrian amenities.*
- *NW Woodland character*
- *Unified sign theme*
- *Com urban forestry enhancement*
- *Economic vitality*
- *Education component for natural areas.*
- *Bike and vehicular access to park and trail system.*
- *Enhanced stream function.*
- *Enhanced riparian habitat*

**Alternatives Considered**

**1-8-03 PC Comments:** *Planning Commissioners agreed with public comment that land uses should not be restricted to office only. PC requested staff to bring back a "hybrid" zone that would include office and other appropriate uses along the corridor. The "new zone" should eliminate some of the more intensive or industrial type uses. The Commission indicated that aesthetics could be addressed by using development standards and design guidelines. The Commission agreed to treat the entire corridor as one area for zoning and development standards.*

**2-19-03 PC Comments:** *PC review potential use changes to the GB zone in the corridor. In principle, the permitted uses were expanded to be flexible. PC supported a district referred to as Parkway Commercial with enhanced development standards and design guidelines to manage the aesthetics in the corridor.*

**4-9-03 PC Comments:** *(See Feature No. 14)*

**4-23-03 PC Comments:** *Planning Commission consensus to support the "hybrid" zone, including most GB uses and most office zone uses*

**Preferred Alternative**

*A "hybrid" zone known as Parkway Commercial to facilitate achieving the Master Plan goals for the LBC Corridor. Key features of this hybrid:*

- *Retain most of the uses currently permitted in the GB zone*
- *Include most uses currently permitted in the Office zone.*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Include additional uses characterized as "high-tech".</i></li><li>▪ <i>Mandatory existing and new design guidelines to control aesthetic impacts along LBC Parkway, and from the perspective of future LBC lineal trail users.</i></li><li>▪ <i>Mandatory existing and new design guidelines, and site regulations to control environmental impacts to LBC.</i></li><li>▪ <i>Development incentives such as height increase for uses such as office that have reduced environmental and aesthetic impacts.</i></li></ul>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>14. Five Floor Maximum</b></p> <p><b><u>Downtown</u></b></p> <p>The 1<sup>st</sup> draft plan proposed height increase is from the present maximum of 45' to 55' in the area south of 175<sup>th</sup> Street, (including one parcel deep on the north side of 175<sup>th</sup> Street and extending from the Civic Campus to 10<sup>th</sup> Ave. The rationale of this proposed increase is to promote the pedestrian-oriented, vibrant downtown with mixed uses the Comp Plan supports. Upon further analysis, the Planning Commission Recommended Draft proposes two height increase areas in the downtown – the Downtown “Core Area” with a potential maximum of four floors and maximum height of 51 feet; and the Park Blocks overlay area, with a potential maximum of five floors and height of 57 feet.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <p>To encourage a vibrant pedestrian-oriented mixed-use development pattern as supported by the Comp Plan vision, including increased housing, commercial, retail, public uses, and alternatives to surface parking.</p> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Downtown</u></b></p> <p><i>LU-2.1 Provide a compatible mix of residential and commercial land uses downtown to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ <i>Make it possible for people to safely walk or bicycle to work and shopping;</i></li> <li>♦ <i>Reduce reliance on automobiles and reduce commuting time and distance.</i></li> <li>♦ <i>Make area transit service more viable;</i></li> <li>♦ <i>Provide greater convenience for residents.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>LU-4.1 Create a vibrant compact downtown Woodinville that is an inviting place to work, shop, live and socialize.</i></p> <p><i>LU 4.2 Encourage mixed-use development that balances residential and business uses within commercial areas.</i></p> <p><i>LU-8.4 Encourage the development of underground or multistory parking structures in downtown as an alternative to surface parking.</i></p> <p><i>ED-1.3 Offer a menu of incentives for businesses to develop or expand in a manner consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.</i></p> <p><i>ED Implementation Strategies (13): Continue to review and update land uses design and zoning regulations to allow flexibility in development that encourages higher densities, mixed uses, innovative approaches to land assembly, utilization, redevelopment, in-fill development, and rehabilitation of significant or economically viable buildings.</i></p>
---	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b><u>Little Bear Creek Corridor</u></b></p> <p>The original proposed height increase is proposed to go from 45' to 67' for office park development. This height increase would cover approximately 50% of the present GB zone. The rationale for this increase is to allow the taller floors (15' ground floor, plus four 13' floors) desired for professional office development. Upon further analysis, the Planning Commission Recommended Draft proposes a potential maximum of five floors and a height of 60 feet.</p>	<p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ <i>Increases office zoned property in Woodinville – currently a deficiency.</i></li> <li>◇ <i>The Office park development will allow and encourage high tech industries to locate in Woodinville in an attractive well-planned campus setting.</i></li> <li>◇ <i>This use will diversify employment and economic development opportunities.</i></li> <li>◇ <i>Provides for greater employment quantity.</i></li> <li>◇ <i>Located near regional motorized and non-motorized transportation corridors.</i></li> <li>◇ <i>Encourage uses that are compatible with Little Bear Creek protection, and improved aesthetics of development.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p>LU-4.4 <i>Provide an adequate supply of land zoned for employment to support 20-year employment projections</i></p> <p>LU-7.1 <i>Encourage a mix of commercial, office and residential land uses to locate in the downtown.</i></p> <p>ED4.3: <i>Development programs and projects that encourage a healthy, vibrant business community and set priorities for capital facilities, such as a downtown and Little Bear Creek corridor plan.</i></p> <p>ED3.2: <i>Increase the intensity of commercial, and industrial area by encouraging redevelopment and infill development.</i></p> <p>ENV5.2: <i>Include enhancement of shoreline and waterways with adjacent development activities.</i></p> <p>ENV5.3: <i>Minimize imperious surface</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Economic Development – Goal</i></p> <p><i>Take a positive partnership role in retaining and enhancing the existing diverse and vital economic base in the City.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Assure that economic diversity and opportunity are addressed in the Downtown/Little Bear Creek Corridor integrated Master Plan, toward creating an economically balanced community.</i></li> </ul> <p align="right"><i>(2002-2003 Community Development)</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**Fall 2002 Mailer Response**

Agree with five floor-maximum building heights.

Yes: 214 (57%)

No: 161 (43%)

**Alternatives Considered**

**12-4-02 PC Comments:** Requested Kirkland code re: height incentives tied to uses.

**1-8-03 LBCC PC Comments:** Height issue tabled until after land use discussion.

**1-15-03 PC Comments:** Staff presented building height perspective material to Commission. Planning Commissioner's comments included:

- Does 55-feet preserve Woodinville's quality of life and character.
- Do we address density before traffic.
- 55-feet is not cozy.
- How will the water table affect building heights with respect to underground parking.
- Mixed use in other areas not completely successful.
- What is impact on schools with additional residential density
- Small businesses will be impacted

Commissioners concurred that 5 stories could be done in a way that was aesthetically pleasing and not impact views through development standards and design guidelines. The question still remaining for the Commission is whether or not the City can absorb and mitigate the impacts to traffic and other infrastructure. For continued discussion. Public Comment included asking the Commission to look at other alternatives to the proposed Master Plan concepts.

**2-5-02 PC Comments:** Commission discussed a height increase requested for the Sirkin site. The Commission indicated that they will consider the request and group this site in with the TOHD and other potential downtown housing. Drawings of 5-story buildings were shown that depicted awnings on the bottom floor building and floor setbacks. Commissioners indicated that floor setbacks should be used probably at the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> story.

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b>4-9-03 PC Comments:</b> Planning Commission discussed limiting buildings by stories and then a not to exceed height limit. The general height distribution by land use type is Office at 13', Retail at 15, and Residential at 10'. Discussion for downtown height included a limit of 4 stories not to exceed 54' feet. A possible 5<sup>th</sup> story may be considered for underground or understructure parking. Additionally, the height increase may be limited to specific areas including properties along the park blocks and retail streets. The TOHD and Sirkin sites may be considered for the height increase. The Little Bear Creek Corridor discussion also included a 4-story maximum with a not to exceed 54'. The building configuration could include 1 floor of retail and 3 floors of office.</p> <p>Commissioners discussed allowable uses, whether to establish a maximum height, the importance of design standards, and four-sided building facades in the Little Bear Creek Corridor.</p> <p>It was the consensus of the Commission to limit the number of stories to four with a not to exceed height of 54 feet, to regulate bulk in addition to height, and to use design standards to a greater extent than guidelines.</p> <p><b>4-23-03 PC Comments:</b> The commission discussed various combinations of floors, heights, use of FAR and incentives. Decided to support five floor maximum building height.</p> <p><b>5-21-03 PC Comments:</b> Downtown Core: Planning Commissioners discussed and agreed as shown under Preferred Alternative: General Business: Planning Commissioners discussed and agreed on the following:</p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternative (05-21-03)</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Downtown Core Area</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Height – 45' as a base and 55' with incentives such as structured/underground parking</li> <li>▪ Floors – Option 1 (no change) WMC does not specify a maximum number of floors</li> <li>▪ Residential Density – staff identify FAR ranges for traffic modeling</li> <li>▪ Design Guidelines/Standards – Option 3 (make design review more proscriptive by adopting "design standards" and recommend study possible new or revised design standards as an implementation strategy)</li> <li>▪ Permitted Uses – Option 3 (do not recommend adoption of Option 2 [implement provisions of WMC 21.38.050 – pedestrian oriented commercial development and WMC 21.38.080 mixed-use overlay] now but study for possible future recommendation as an implementation strategy)</li> </ul>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><i>General Business: Planning Commissioners discussed and agreed as shown under Preferred Alternative</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Height – Option 3 (base height of 45’ and establish a new maximum height of up to 55’ in compliance with the conditions specified in WMC 21.12.040)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Floors – Option 1 (no change) – WMC does not specify a maximum number of floors</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Residential Density – remove residential as a use in General Business</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Design Guidelines/Standards – Design Guidelines/Standards – Option 3 (make design review more proscriptive by adopting “design standards” and recommend study possible new or revised design standards as an implementation strategy)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Incentives – Same as for Downtown</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Permitted Uses – Option 2: Recommend revisions to permitted uses based on Planning Commission preferred alternative “hybrid” zone of General Business and Office.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~ <i>No change now, but study for possible change as an implementation strategy.</i></li> <li>~ <i>See Feature #13 – page 34.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ <i>Preferred Alternative - A “hybrid” zone known as Parkway Commercial to facilitate achieving the Master Plan goals for the LBC Corridor. Key features of this hybrid:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~ <i>Retain most of the uses currently permitted in the GB zone</i></li> <li>~ <i>Include most uses currently permitted in the Office zone.</i></li> <li>~ <i>Include additional uses characterized as “high-tech”.</i></li> <li>~ <i>Mandatory existing and new design guidelines to control aesthetic impacts along LBC Parkway, and from the perspective of future LBC lineal trail users.</i></li> <li>~ <i>Mandatory existing and new design guidelines, and site regulations to control environmental impacts to LBC.</i></li> <li>~ <i>Development incentives such as height increase for uses such as office that have reduced environmental and aesthetic impacts.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <p><b>10-22-03 PC Comments:</b> <i>In the CBD, there was a general consensus for a 10 foot stepback above a height not to exceed 25 feet on the street frontage, and allow for up to four floors not to exceed maximum building height such as 51 feet.</i></p> <p><b>11-05-03 PC Comments:</b> <i>Commissioners expressed their preference regarding base building height, stepback incentive, and additional incentive potential for each of the following areas:</i></p> <p><b>Downtown Core:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Base Height – increase from the present 35 feet to 39 feet not to exceed three floors.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Stepback Incentive – require a stepback on any building over two stories (not greater than 28 feet).</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Additional Incentive Potential – an additional floor (maximum of four with a height not to exceed 51 feet) can be obtained through the provision of one or more additional City approved incentives.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Downtown Park Block Overlay:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Base Height – increase from the present base height of 35 feet to 39 feet not to exceed three floors.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Stepback Incentive – require a stepback on any building over two stories (not to exceed 28 feet).</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Additional Incentive Potential – an additional floor (maximum of four with height not to exceed 51 feet) can be obtained through the provision of one or more additional City approved incentives. With the structured parking incentive, the building could be up to five floors in height, not to exceed 57 feet.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Parkway Corridor:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Base Height – increase from present base height of 35 feet to 39 feet not to exceed three floors.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Stepback Incentive – require a stepback on any building over two stories (not to exceed 30 feet).</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Additional Incentive Potential – an additional floor (maximum of four with a height not to exceed 51 feet) can be obtained through the provision of one or more additional City approved incentives. With the structured parking incentive, the building could be up to five floors in height not to exceed 60 feet.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>11-12-03 PC Comments:</b> <i>Commissioners agreed with staff's summary and indicated the stepback would be required on the street frontage only.</i></p> <p><b>01-14-04 PC Comments:</b> <i>What is the feasible limit for the height of building stories? It was the consensus of the Commission not to make any change to the Master Plan with regard to this issue. It was also the consensus of the Commission to include the TRF parcel and one other parcel that abuts 175<sup>th</sup> Street in the Downtown Core Area.</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>15. Transit Oriented Housing</b></p> <p>A Transit Oriented Housing Development (TOD) would add additional parking and some mix of senior, affordable and market rate housing units and perhaps some small retail spaces to the existing park &amp; Ride. Existing park &amp; ride functions would remain.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Helps accommodate population growth downtown instead of in existing residential neighborhoods.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Turns underutilized parking lot into a transit center that adds small retail and housing.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Provides affordable housing, including potential senior housing</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Supports transit service</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Reduces need for SOV use.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Adds vibrancy and 24-hour community downtown.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Offers downtown housing for downtown employees.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Reduced environmental impact by using existing impervious area and infrastructure.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Helps downtown traffic circulation by construction of extension of gridroad (178<sup>th</sup> Ave NE) from 140<sup>th</sup> to Woodinville-Duvall Rd.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>T-5.6 Explore potential for joint use of park-and-ride lots with the public and private sectors for commercial and residential use.</i></p> <p><i>LU-8.1 Encourage a mix of housing types in and around downtown for all economic segments of the community.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Housing – Goal</i> <i>Preserve existing housing and neighborhoods, and provide a diversity of housing types that promotes housing opportunities for all economic segments of the City’s population.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Assure a variety of housing options and types are addressed in deliberations of the DTMP. (2002-2003, Community Development)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Complete suitability study of Transit Oriented Housing Development for Woodinville. (2002-2003, Community Development)</i></li> </ul>
---	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**Fall 2002 Mailer Response**

Agree with Transit-Oriented Housing

Yes: 194 (53%)

No: 174 (47%)

**Alternatives Considered**

**1-5-03 PC Comments:** *Scott Kirkpatrick of Sound Transit and Art Sullivan of ARCH were on hand to answer questions about the potential project. Staff indicated that the project could be built under today's regulations except that a density modification (or FAR) is necessary.*

*Parking concerns-Sound Transit indicated current P&R is underutilized. TOHD project would provide as much or more parking than current configuration. Logistics include separate parking for residence. Should Have P&R clearly marked so people know they can park for the bus. Commissioners and attendees discussed financing of the project and the "affordability" aspects. Sound Transit expressed a strong desire to create a project that will be accepted by the community. Otherwise it was not a viable project for them. Commissioners agreed this type of project should have community involvement from the beginning.*

*Commissioners indicated their concern for added traffic and park need for residents. Council Member Brocha suggested changing the name of Transit Oriented Development to something more representative and attractive to the type of development. Mick Monken explained planned improvements that will contribute to reduce traffic impacts. The Planning Commission agreed to leave the concept in the Plan.*

**4-9-03 PC Comments:** *The Commission discussed a potential "FAR Overlay" for the TOHD, R48/0 and downtown core area (see comments for feature No. 12)*

**4-23-03 PC Comments:** *The Commission discussed issues related to traffic impacts, suitability for children and teens. More review of FAR requested.*

**5-7-03 PC Comments:** *Planning Commission discussed aspects of FAR versus units per acre.*

**5-21-03 PC Comments:**

*TOD (Transit Oriented Development): The PC discussed issues such as traffic, population served, and community input for the design of a TOD. They agreed to support investigation of FAR to determine the number of units at the TOD site.*

**6-4-03 PC Comments:** *The PC discussed and agreed as shown under Preferred Alternative*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Height: No change</i></li><li>▪ <i>Floors: No change</i></li><li>▪ <i>Residential density: Regulate by FAR</i></li><li>▪ <i>Design Guidelines: Recommend study for possible new or revised design standards.</i></li><li>▪ <i>Permitted uses: No change now, but study for possible change.</i></li></ul> <p><b><u>Implementation</u></b></p> <p><i>Future work on implementing a TOD project should consider the following issues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Community involvement in aesthetics and design</i></li><li>▪ <i>Adequate roadway capacity for added vehicle trips</i></li><li>▪ <i>On-site open space for residents</i></li><li>▪ <i>Remains a P&amp;R</i></li><li>▪ <i>Investigate density increase to allow TOD</i></li></ul>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>16. Train Station</b></p> <p>The train station would be a place to serve passengers for future commuter and leisure travel by train. It could incorporate historic Woodinville design elements.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal Summary of Feature</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ <i>Passenger train service for commuters would help to reduce auto traffic.</i></li> <li>♦ <i>Commuter train access could be an amenity that would be an incentive for businesses to locate here.</i></li> <li>♦ <i>Leisure travel could make downtown a destination for visitors, including the "dinner train." This could be beneficial to downtown businesses.</i></li> <li>♦ <i>Train service could also link downtown to the Tourist District and encourage tourism-related activity.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies</u></b></p> <p><i>T-2.20 Encourage transit services that are accessible to all users and provide a viable alternative within the City.</i></p> <p><b><u>Alternatives Considered</u></b></p> <p><b><i>1-15-03 PC Comments:</i></b> <i>Ryan O'Sullivan of Sound Transit explained that there is currently no light rail plans for this area. At this time, all resources are being directed to enhancing bus service along the I-405 corridor. In order to develop a commuter train along the BNSF RR, massive improvements to the rail would be necessary. May not be cost effective in the short term. The Commissioners agreed to leave the concept of a potential train station in the plan. A citizen commented that maybe an elevated monorail would make sense. Commissioners asked him to provide staff more information.</i></p> <p><b><i>4-23-03 PC Comments:</i></b> <i>The Commission consensus is that rail service has a low probability of happening in downtown, so this feature should be deleted from the Master Plan.</i></p> <p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <p><i>Do not include the Train Station in the draft Master Plan, but indicate it should be considered as a possible future addition to Downtown.</i></p>
---	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

<p><b>17. Extension of Plan to Entire Downtown Area (PC Added)</b></p>          <p><b>18. Extension of Office Zone to 195th (PC Added)</b></p>	<p><i>See #12, #14, &amp; #19. Residential Density Issue</i></p>          <p><i>1-8-03 PC Comments: Planning Commission agreed to treat the entire corridor as one area for zoning and development standards. See Office park zoning #13.</i></p>
--	---

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

**19. R48/O Zone Height  
Increase (PC Added)**

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

**Goal Summary of Feature**

To encourage high density housing near public transit facilities or along transit corridors, near commercial and employment areas, and near community facilities such as parks and community centers. This feature would also facilitate development that protects on-site sensitive areas.

**Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies**

*LU-2.1 Provide a compatible mix of residential and commercial land uses downtown to:*

- 1. Make it possible for people to safely walk or bicycle to work and shopping;*
- 2. Reduce reliance on automobiles and reduce commuting time and distance.*
- 5. Make area transit service more viable;*
- 6. Provide greater convenience for residents.*

*LU-3.6 Encourage medium and moderate density housing throughout the community where sufficient public facilities and services are available, where the land is capable of supporting such uses, and where compatible with adjacent land uses.*

*LU-3.7 Permit a range of densities to encourage a variety of housing types that meet the housing needs of residents with a range of incomes.*

*LU-4.1 Create a vibrant compact downtown Woodinville that is an inviting place to work, shop, live and socialize.*

*LU-4.2 Encourage mixed-use development that balances residential and business uses within commercial areas.*

*LU-7.1 Encourage a mix of commercial, office and residential land uses to locate in the downtown.*

*LU-8.1 Encourage a mix of housing types in and around downtown for all economic segments of the community.*

*H-1: To preserve existing housing and neighborhoods and provide a diversity of housing types that promotes housing opportunities for all economic segments of the City's population.*

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>City Council Goals</u></b></p> <p><i>Housing – Goal</i></p> <p><i>Preserve existing housing neighborhoods, and provide a diversity of housing types that promotes housing opportunities for all economic segments of the City's population.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Assure a variety of housing options and types are addressed in deliberations of the DTMP. (2002-2003, Community Development)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Complete suitability study of Transit Oriented Housing Development for Woodinville. (2002-2003, Community Development)</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fall 2002 Mailer Response</u></b></p> <p><i>Agree with five-floor maximum building heights. Yes: 214 (57%) No: 161 (43%)</i></p> <p><b><i>12-4-02 PC Comments:</i></b> <i>Planning Commission would like staff's opinion on request.</i></p> <p><b><i>2-5-03 PC Comments:</i></b> <i>See #14 – Five Story Maximum. Planning Commission will review request grouped with other downtown residential issues. The Commission was presented a staff report that found a height increase at the Sirkin site was consistent with the comp plan.</i></p> <p><b><i>4-9-03 PC Comments:</i></b> <i>(See comments for Feature No. 12)</i></p> <p><b><i>4-23-03 PC Comments:</i></b> <i>The Commission discussed issues related to traffic impacts and access. An additional motorized access from the Greenbrier site, if feasible. Staff is investigating. This issue is still under review.</i></p> <p><b><i>5-07-03 PC Comments:</i></b> <i>Planning Commission consensus is to allow up to five floors, not to exceed 55'.</i></p> <p><b><i>5-21-03: PC Comments:</i></b> <i>The Planning Commission discussed and agreed as shown under Preferred Alternative</i></p>
--	--

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN-LITTLE BEAR CREEK CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION MATRIX  
Updated January, 2004**

	<p><b><u>Preferred Alternative</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Height – Option 2 (recommended increase in height to 55')</i></li><li>▪ <i>Floors – Option 1 (no change)</i></li><li>▪ <i>Residential Density – Option 1 (no change)</i></li><li>▪ <i>Design Guidelines/Standards – Option 2: Make design review more proscriptive by adopting "Design Standards".</i></li><li>▪ <i>Incentives – Option 1: No change – residential incentives permitted (WMC 21.12.030)</i></li><li>▪ <i>Permitted Uses – No change (WMC 21.08).</i></li></ul>
--	--