



CITY OF LAKE FOREST PARK PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Tuesday, September 10, 2024 at 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: In Person and Virtual / Zoom

17425 Ballinger Way NE Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTENDING THIS MEETING VIRTUALLY:

Join Zoom Webinar: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82487151825>
Call into Webinar: 253-215-8782 | Webinar ID: 824 8715 1825

The Planning Commission is providing opportunities for public comment by submitting a written comment or by attending the meeting in person to provide oral public comment.

HOW TO PARTICIPATE WITH ORAL COMMENTS:

If you are attending the meeting in person, there is a sign-in sheet located near the entrance to the room. Fill out the form and the presiding officer will call your name at the appropriate time. Oral comments are limited to 3:00 minutes per speaker. Oral comments are not being accepted via Zoom.

The meeting is being recorded.

HOW TO SUBMIT WRITTEN COMMENTS:

Written comments for public hearings will be submitted to Planning Commission if received by 5:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting; otherwise, they will be provided to the Planning Commission the next day. Because the City has implemented oral comments, written comments are no longer being read under Public Comments.

For up-to-date information on agendas, please visit the City's website at www.cityofflp.gov.

AGENDA

1. **CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 P.M. (confirm recording start)**

2. **PLANNING COMMISSION'S LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

We'd like to acknowledge we are on the traditional land of a rich and diverse group of Native Peoples who have called this area home for more than 10,000 years. We honor, with gratitude, the land itself and the descendants of these Native Peoples who are still here today.

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

A. August 13th minutes

5. **MEETING DATES**

6. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

7. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The Commission is not accepting online public comments.** The Planning Commission accepts oral and written citizen comments during its regular meetings. Written comments are no longer being read during the meeting. **Comments are limited to three (3) minutes.

8. **REPORT FROM CITY COUNCIL LIAISON**

9. **OLD BUSINESS**

A. **2024 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update**

Final Discussion on a Recommendation Draft of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update

Planning Commission Motion for Recommendation to the City Council

Transmittal Cover Letter of Planning Commission Recommendation to the City Council

B. Middle Housing Development Regulations with SCJ Alliance

10. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. Discussion on items of Planning Commission interest or concern - preparation for future meetings

Climate Element with the Climate Policy Advisory Team

Economic Development, Business Assistance for Small Businesses and Mixed Use

Expand Commercial Base, Feedback from Business Representatives

Reasonable Use Exceptions (RUEs), Revisit and End User Guide

Housing in Southern Gateway, Incentives

Tree Canopy Report, Update

Parks, Recreations, Open Space, & Trails (PROST) Plan, Update

Education on/of Development Regulations

Perkins Way and 40th Place Impacts, Traffic Calming and Safety, Light Rail

11. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Planning Commission Vacancies and Recruitment

12. ADDITIONAL CITIZEN COMMENTS

13. AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

14. ADJOURN

Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact city hall at 206-368-5440 by 4:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting for more information.

1 City of Lake Forest Park – Planning Commission
2 Regular Meeting Minutes: August 13, 2024; 7:00-9:00pm
3 Hybrid Meeting Held in the Forest Room at City Hall and Virtually via Zoom
4

5 **Planning Commissioners present:** Chair Ashton Alvarez- McCartney, Vice Chair Janne Kaje,
6 Cherie Finazzo, Meredith LaBonte, David Kleweno, Lois Lee (via Zoom), and Melissa Cranmer (via
7 Zoom)
8

9 **Staff and others present:** Mark Hofman, Community Development Director; John Lebo, Council
10 Liaison; Cristina Haworth, SCJ Alliance (via Zoom)
11

12 **Members of the Public present:** Nigel Keifer, Joelene Jay
13

14 **Planning Commissioners absent:** Sam Castic and Madlyn Larson
15

16 **Call to order:** Chair Alvarez-McCartney called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM
17

18 **Land Acknowledgement:** Cmr. Kaje read the land acknowledgement.
19

20 **Approval of Agenda:** Cmr. Kaje made a motion to approve the agenda, Cmr. Finazzo seconded,
21 and the motion to approve the agenda was carried unanimously.
22

23 **Approval of Minutes:** Chair Alvarez-McCartney made a motion to approve the August 13, 2024,
24 Meeting Minutes, Cmr. Kaje seconded and the motion to approve the minutes was carried
25 unanimously.
26

27 **Public Hearing:** Nigel Keifer gave a comment in opposition to the Comprehensive Plan and
28 climate change element. Mr.Keifer stated that he does not believe in climate change and does not
29 believe it should be part of the Comprehensive Plan.
30

31 Joelene Jay gave a comment on the issue of a reasonable use of exceptions. Ms. Jay calls for a
32 moratorium on RUEs with the intent to work on changing the process of RUEs to better suit the
33 residents during the moratorium.
34

35 Cmr. Kaje made a motion to close the public hearing, Cmr. Finazzo seconded the motion.
36

37 **Next meeting:** The next meeting occurs on September 10, 2024.
38

39 **Public Comment:** No public comments.
40

41 **City Council Liaison Report:** Council liaison, Lebo, announced that Council is preparing for the
42 biannual budget. The goal of Council to pass the budget by November.
43

44 **Old Business:**
45

46 **Recap of Open House for update of Comprehensive Plan held on July 16, 2024**

47 Ms. Haworth shared a presentation on a recap of the Open House. The Open House consisted of
48 an estimated 45 to 50 attendees. For the transportation station, there was a strong desire for

1 investment in pedestrian safety improvements, more biking facilities, broader transit network, and
2 speed control. At the housing station, there was an interest in expanding housing options and
3 concerns about the tree canopy and traffic. At the economic development station, there was great
4 interest in developing the Ballinger way corridor for commercial use.

5
6 **Discussion on comments and revisions to prepare a recommended draft Comprehensive**
7 **Plan Update**

8 Ms. Haworth provided an update on the status of the Comprehensive Plan. Final comments were
9 received from the Tree Board, Park Board, and Police Department. SCJ is awaiting on some
10 comments from the Planning commission and looking to incorporate comments from the Open
11 House.

12
13 The Commission discussed the issue of equity and the different positions of commissioners. The
14 commission agreed to collectively work on drafting a comment letter instead of a special meeting to
15 work on a collective stance on the issue by the next meeting.

16
17 **New Business:**

18 **Items of Planning Commission interest or concern - preparation for September meeting**

19 Chair Alvarez-McCartney opened the meeting to discussion on key issues the Commission would
20 like to work on after the Comprehensive Plan. Cmr. Kleweno discussed the issue of development
21 and supporting small businesses. Cmr. LeBonte and Finazzo seconded the importance of helping
22 small businesses. Cmr. Lee discussed the issue of expanding commercial zones in the southern
23 gateway. Cmr. Kaje brought up the issue of expanding mixed-use zones in the City.

24
25 **Reports and Announcements:**

26 Mr. Hofman announced that a consultant was chosen for the Climate Element grant RFQ. A
27 contract is currently being negotiated.

28
29 **Citizen Comment:**

30 Nigel Keifer made a comment that he wants the focus of the Commission to shift to helping seniors
31 in the city and not expanding housing to not increase traffic.

32
33 **Agenda for Next Meeting:** Additional discussion on comprehensive plan amendments.

34
35 **Adjournment:**

36 Cmr. Kaje made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Cmr. Finazzo seconded, and the motion was
37 carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM.

38
39 APPROVED:

40
41 _____
42 Ashton Alvarez-McCartney, Planning Commission Chair

City of Lake Forest Park
Community Development Department

17425 Ballinger Way NE
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155-5556
Phone: 206-368-5440
Email: mhofman@cityoflfp.gov
www.cityoflfp.gov



Planning Commissioners
Ashton Alvarez McCartney, Chair
Janne Kaji, Vice-Chair
Sam Castic
Melissa Cranmer
Meredith LaBonte
Madlyn Larson
Lois Lee
Cherie Finazzo
David Kleweno

Dear City Council and Mayor French,

Beginning in the summer of 2023, the Planning Commission was tasked with the periodic update of the City’s Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the 1990 Washington State Growth Management Act. Since the last periodic update in 2015, new state laws as well as updated Countywide Planning Policies and growth targets provided new considerations for this update, particularly around issues of housing, equity and climate resilience. We are pleased to transmit our recommendations for City Council consideration.

This past year, the Commission has dedicated significant time and effort to studying these issues, critical evaluation of what they mean for Lake Forest Park, extensive open discussion and multiple avenues of community outreach. The Planning Commission held twenty-four Comprehensive Plan meetings/special meetings, executed a public survey in March, hosted an Open House in July and held a Public Hearing in August. Each of these community touchpoints were carefully constructed in various mediums to target input from all our valued community members. We are proud of the volume and quality of responses received and have incorporated feedback into our discussions and ultimately into our recommendations.

The Commission and community generally agree that the existing Comprehensive Plan remains a valuable and well-crafted reflection of our vision for the city but lacks consistency with recent State legislative changes as well as updates to King County’s Countywide Planning Policies. These issues revolved mainly around housing (especially “middle housing”), climate resilience, and the explicit consideration of equity across all policy areas. These became the major lenses with which the Planning Commission reviewed each section of the plan.

Our recommendations reflect broad consensus within the commission, except as it pertains to specific language regarding equity. The following section describes the major themes shaping our draft recommendations to the Council.

Key themes:

- In considering the new state requirements pertaining to middle housing, the Commission and community are cautiously excited by the potential opportunities that the proposed policies and subsequent code changes pertaining to housing type, density and scale may offer for the city going forward. In particular, we see the potential for meeting the needs of renters, first-time home buyers, aging adults, and other key demographics that are not currently well-served by the city’s existing housing stock. At the same time, it is crystal clear from the community that there is no support for compromising environmental protection as a result of increasing housing

density. This strong sentiment will be central to the Commission’s work on middle housing going forward.

- There is great interest within the Commission and in the community for boosting economic development in the city. We would like to see more opportunities for commercial development along our two main arterials – SR 522 and Ballinger Way – to promote opportunities for new local businesses. Regarding SR 522 and the Southern Gateway, we are keen to understand why so little commercial or higher-density residential development has taken place in the decade since the Southern Gateway plan was finalized, while neighboring jurisdictions seem to be attracting significant interest. Unlocking that potential would be a tremendous lift for the city and its tax base.
- Another issue that surfaced throughout this process was the desire to strengthen the language around SR522, and the need to mitigate the direct negative effects of this high-speed, vehicular traffic corridor on the Town Center, the Southern Gateway community, our public gathering spaces, and safe pedestrian/bike access in this area.
- The Commission appreciates the in-depth work of the Climate Action Committee and their thoughtful consideration of climate resilience and the city’s carbon footprint. We look forward to our joint efforts going forward with the Climate Action Committee and understanding what the feasible goals are we can collectively pursue.
- Finally, regarding consideration of equity, many of the Commissioners agreed with the State’s recognition as reflected in HB1220 of the need to address inherent disparities in outcomes for different racial groups as a result of historic policies and practices. Some felt the language of the Comprehensive Plan should specifically recognize these disparities, including distinguishing between principles of equality and equity. However, other voices among the Commission and community expressed concern that new language pertaining specifically to Black, Indigenous, or other people of color was not truly inclusive of *all* members of Lake Forest Park residents and that language specifying different racial groups shows preference, thus undermining the true spirit of the words, equality and equity. We encourage the Council to thoughtfully consider this language woven throughout the Comprehensive Plan with care as you shape our recommendations into a final product for adoption.

We are honored to have had the opportunity to engage with our community in constructing these recommendations and look forward to further engagement with Council as we shift our attention to the details of middle housing, climate resilience, and updates to the municipal code.

Ashton Alvarez McCartney – Chair

Janne Kaje – Vice Chair

Sam Castic – Commissioner

Melissa Cranmer – Commissioner

Meredith LaBonte – Commissioner

Madlyn Larson – Commissioner

Lois Lee – Commissioner

Cherie Finazzo – Commissioner

David Kleweno – Commissioner



City of Lake Forest Park

Comprehensive Plan Update

June 2024



Volume I | Goals & Policies

Table of Contents

- Volume I | Goals & Policies 1
- Introduction..... 2
 - Introduction..... 3
 - What is a Comprehensive Plan?..... 3
 - What’s inside the Comprehensive Plan? 3
 - A Snapshot of Lake Forest Park..... 4
 - Planning Context 6
 - The Comprehensive Plan and *VISION 2050*..... 6
 - The Comprehensive Plan and the Lake Forest Park *Legacy 100-Year Vision* 7
 - Other Local Plan Guidance..... 8
 - Public Participation 9
 - Guidelines for Future Public Participation..... 10
 - Lake Forest Park Vision 10
 - Vision Statement..... 11
 - Amending the Comprehensive Plan 12
 - Guidelines for Implementing and Amending the Comprehensive Plan..... 13
- LU: Land Use** **14**
 - Introduction..... 15
 - Goals and Policies..... 16
 - Goal LU–1: Land Use Pattern 16
 - Goal LU–2: Community Character..... 19
 - Goal LU–3: Compatibility with Natural Environment..... 21
 - Goal LU–4: Residential Neighborhoods..... 22
 - Goal LU–5: Economic Vitality 23
 - Goal LU–6: Public Uses 24
 - Goal LU–7: Healthy Communities 24
 - Goal LU–8: Historic Preservation..... 25
 - Goal LU–9: Regional Issues..... 25



Goal LU-10: Equity 26

Goal LU-11: Climate Commitment 26

EQ: Environmental Quality & Shorelines 27

Introduction..... 28

Goals and Policies..... 29

 Goal EQ-1: Land Use Pattern 29

 Goal EQ-2: Shoreline Development/Access 30

 Goal EQ-3: Water Quality Protection 31

 Goal EQ-4: Development in Geologically Hazardous Areas..... 32

 Goal EQ-5: Alternative Energy..... 33

 Goal EQ-6: Air Quality, Noise Abatement, and Light Pollution..... 33

 Goal EQ-7: Coexistence with Wildlife 34

 Goal EQ-8: Forest Canopy..... 34

 Goal EQ-9: Climate Commitment 35

 Goal EQ-10..... 36

 Goal EQ-11 36

H: Housing..... 37

Introduction..... 38

Goals and Policies..... 39

 Goal H-1: Housing Supply and Diversity..... 39

 Goal H-2: Neighborhood Form and Scale..... 40

 Goal H-3: Housing Affordability 41

 Goal H-4: Special Needs..... 43

 Goal H-5: Internal Consistency..... 43

ED: Economic Development 44

Introduction..... 45

Goals and Policies..... 46

 Goal ED-1 46

 Goal ED-2 46

 Goal ED-3 47

 Goal ED-4 47

 Goal ED-5 48



Goal ED-6 49

CSPS: Community Services & Public Safety..... 50

Introduction..... 51

Goals and Policies..... 52

 Goal CS-1: Community Service Vision..... 52

 Goal CS-2: Quality of Life..... 53

 Goal CS-3: Youth..... 54

 Goal CS-4: Seniors..... 54

 Goal CS-5: Families..... 55

 Goal CS-6: Residents..... 55

 Goal CS-7: Public Safety Vision..... 56

 Goal CS-8: Community Resilience..... 56

CF: Capital Facilities..... 57

Introduction..... 58

Goals and Policies..... 59

 Goal CF-1..... 59

 Goal CF-2..... 60

 Goal CF-3..... 62

 Goal CF-4..... 63

 Goal CF-5..... 64

 Goal CF-6..... 65

PT: Parks, Trails, and Open Space..... 66

Introduction..... 67

Goals and Policies..... 68

 Goal PT-1: Development and Maintenance..... 68

 Goal PT-2: Trails..... 68

 Goal PT-3: Safe Access to Parks..... 69

 Goal PT-4: Environmental Protection..... 69

 Goal PT-5: Active Parks..... 69

 Goal PT-6: Signage..... 70

 Goal PT-7: Arts and Culture..... 70

 Goal PT-8: Building Community..... 71



Goal PT-9: Legacy 100-Year Vision Implementation 71

Goal PT-10: Equity 72

U: Utilities..... 73

Introduction..... 74

Goals and Policies..... 75

 Goal U-1: Service Quality 75

 Goal U-2: Planning 76

 Goal U-3: Community Impacts..... 77

 Goal U-4: Environmental Impacts..... 77

 Goal U-5: Climate Commitment..... 78

T: Transportation..... 79

Introduction..... 80

Goals and Policies..... 82

 Goal T-1 82

 Goal T-2 85

 Goal T-3 87

 Goal T-4 88

 Goal T-5 89

 Goal T-6 90

 Goal T-7 90



Volume II | Background Analysis

Table of Contents

Volume II | Background Analysis..... 91

Introduction..... 92

 H2..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

 H3..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

LU: Land Use..... 94

 Introduction..... 95

 Context & Background..... 95

 Natural Environment..... 95

 Existing Land Use..... 98

 Growth Targets..... 98

 Land Capacity..... 98

 The Comprehensive Plan & Other Land Use Policy Guidance..... 100

 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map..... 100

 Zoning Map & Designations..... 101

EQ: Environmental Quality & Shorelines..... 103

 Introduction..... 104

 Planning Context..... 104

 Lake Forest Park *Legacy 100-Year Vision* (2008)..... 105

 Lake Forest Park Community Forest Management Plan (2010)..... 105

 Wildlife Management Plan (2011)..... 107

 Shoreline Master Program (2019)..... 107

 Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Chinook Salmon Conservation
Plan 10-Year Update (2017)..... 108

 Environmental Features of Lake Forest Park..... 109

 Streams and Surface Water Drainage..... 109

 Flooding..... 109

 Wetlands..... 110

 Groundwater..... 110



Steep Slope and Landslide Hazard Areas 110

Erosion Hazard Areas 110

Seismic Hazard Areas 110

Resident Volunteers 111

Recycling 111

H: Housing 112

 Introduction 113

 Planning Context 113

 State & Regional Framework 113

 PSRC VISION 2050 and King County Countywide Planning Policies 114

 Growth Targets & Land Capacity 114

 Who We Are 116

 Age Characteristics 116

 Race & Ethnicity 117

 Household Characteristics 120

 Household Income 123

 Cost Burden 129

 Disability 132

 Where We Live 132

 Inventory 133

 Housing Value 135

 Housing Development Trends 136

 Home Sales 136

 Rental Market Trends 138

 Housing Affordability 140

 Special Needs Housing 141

 Where We Work 141


 Employment 141

 Workforce Housing Affordability 142

 Commuting Patterns 144

 Conclusions and Considerations 145

ED: Economic Development 147



Introduction & Approach.....	148
Background and Purpose.....	148
Organization of this Section.....	148
Peer City Framework.....	148
Demographic Profile.....	149
Population.....	149
Age Distribution.....	150
Educational Attainment.....	151
Household Income.....	152
Housing Tenure.....	152
Housing Type.....	153
Commercial Uses.....	153
Local Employment.....	153
Resident Occupations.....	154
Resident and Employee Commuting Patterns.....	156
Jobs-to-Housing.....	157
Real Estate Indicators.....	159
Real Estate Market Conditions.....	159
Key Takeaways.....	164
CSPS: Community Services & Public Safety.....	165
Introduction.....	166
Community Services Background.....	166
Areas of Emphasis.....	167
Public Safety Background.....	169
Police Department.....	169
Hazard Mitigation Plan.....	169
Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).....	170
Natural Surveillance.....	170
Natural Access Control.....	171
Territoriality/Defensible Space.....	171
CF: Capital Facilities.....	172
Introduction.....	173



Public Facility Providers.....	173
City-Provided Public Facilities.....	176
City Hall, Police, & Other Public Buildings.....	176
Drainage.....	177
Parks.....	179
Sewer.....	180
Transportation.....	182
Facilities Provided by Other Entities.....	184
Fire & Emergency Medical Response Services.....	184
Libraries.....	184
Schools.....	185
Sewer.....	185
Water.....	187
PT: Parks, Trails, and Open Space.....	192
Introduction.....	193
Planning Context.....	193
Lake Forest Park <i>Legacy 100-Year Vision</i>	193
Inventory of Parks and Recreation Facilities.....	194
Park Standards.....	194
Mini Park.....	194
Neighborhood Park.....	194
Community Park.....	194
Active Park.....	194
Passive Park.....	194
Integrated Pest Management.....	197
Percent for Art Program.....	197
U: Utilities.....	198
Introduction.....	199
Water.....	199
North City Water District (NCWD).....	201
Northshore Utility District (NUD).....	201
Lake Forest Park Water District (LFPWD).....	201



Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) 202

Sewer 202

 Lake Forest Park Sewer Department 202

 Northshore Utility District (NUD) 204

Surface Water 204

Electricity 205

Natural Gas 205

Telecommunications 205

Solid Waste 206

T: Transportation 207

 Introduction 208

 Conditions for Driving 209

 Impacts of Lake Forest Park Growth on State Facilities 211

 Freight and Goods Movement 212

 Conditions for Transit 213

 Conditions for Walking & Biking 216

 Transportation Funding 220

 Level of Service Policies 221

Appendices & Attachments 222



Volume I | Goals & Policies



Introduction



Introduction

Lake Forest Park is looking ahead to 2044, following a tumultuous few years both locally and nationally. We are collectively recovering from a global pandemic while the region experiences unprecedented growth and change in how we live, work, and play. This Comprehensive Plan considers where we've been and where we need to go as we rise to meet these challenges and take advantage of opportunities.

The Lake Forest Park Comprehensive Plan sets an aspirational vision for the future, sets goals and policies to achieve that vision and guide decision-makers, and forms the basis for the City's regulations. It builds on the 2015 Comprehensive Plan, incorporates current community values and priorities, and fulfills the Washington Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements for periodic review. It also conforms to King County's Countywide Planning Policies and guidance from the Puget Sound Regional Council *VISION 2050*.

What is a Comprehensive Plan?

A comprehensive plan is a broad statement of the community's values and vision for its future. It is a policy roadmap that directs the orderly and coordinated physical development of the city for the next 20 years. It anticipates change

and guides action so growth is well-managed and consistent with community needs. Lake Forest Park's Comprehensive Plan intends to sustain the attractive residential character and natural environment that are defining features of the city.

The Plan encompasses topics that address the physical, social, and economic health of the city over the next 20 years. Guidance is intentionally general, providing broad direction. The implementation plan lists specific implementation measures necessary to accomplish the goals and policies. A plan is also a living document, adaptable to evolving conditions, and offering a framework for the consideration of policy changes.

What's inside the Comprehensive Plan?

As established by the GMA, the City is required to include chapters, or elements, that address land use, housing, transportation, capital facilities, and utilities. The City may also include elements on other topics of local importance. For this plan, the City of Lake Forest Park has opted to include chapters on environment quality, economic development, community services and public safety, and parks, trails, and open space.

In addition to this introduction, the Lake Forest Park Comprehensive Plan contains nine elements, with goals and policies identified for each element. The goals and policies are numbered and labeled according to their respective elements. The contents of each element are briefly summarized below. Where appropriate, each element addresses the City's commitment to planning for climate change.



Table I-1: Comprehensive Plan Element Summary

Element	Focus
Land Use	Land use capacity to meet projected growth, land use patterns, community character, compatibility with the natural environment, residential neighborhoods, Town Center, economic vitality, public uses, healthy communities, and historic preservation
Environmental Quality & Shorelines	Compatible development, shoreline development and access, water quality protection, alternative energy, air quality and noise abatement, wildlife and habitat, and forest canopy
Economic Development	Town Center and other commercial centers, communication with the community, commercial and retail opportunities, local business support, Lake Forest Park character, and technological opportunities
Housing	Housing supply and diversity, neighborhood character, affordability, special needs, internal consistency, and regional coordination
Community Services	Quality of life, seniors, youth, families, all residents, participation in community activities, and ongoing priorities
Capital Facilities	Facilities and infrastructure needed for public services that will support planned population and employment, level of service standards, financing feasibility, design and location, maintenance
Parks, Trails, & Open Space	Green infrastructure, trails, parks and gathering places, development and maintenance, citizen participation, and arts and culture
Utilities	Location and design of utilities, quality of service, and collaboration with regional partners
Transportation	Transportation connections, non-motorized/active systems and access, traffic management, sustainable funding, minimizing impacts of state highways, and transit service


A Snapshot of Lake Forest Park

Lake Forest Park is in northern King County, adjoining the northwestern shoreline of Lake Washington. Lake Forest Park is almost three and a half square miles in area, bordered by the City of Seattle to the south, the City of Shoreline to the west, the City of Mountlake Terrace and the City of Brier to the north, and the City of Kenmore to the northeast (see Figure I-1 on the following page). Defining natural features include the Lake Washington shoreline, the slopes and watercourses that drain to Lake Washington, and the city’s extensive forest canopy.

Lake Forest Park has a population of about 13,631 people (US Census, 2020 Population). The City had its beginnings as one of the first planned communities in King County and was originally platted in 1910 around natural features and existing terrain. It was marketed as a residential retreat into nature for professionals of nearby Seattle. In 1961, the area was incorporated as the City of Lake Forest Park when residents united in response to increasing development pressure. Today, preservation of the natural surroundings continues to be an important value in Lake Forest Park.



Figure I-1: Lake Forest Park Vicinity Map



Planning Context

The Comprehensive Plan and *VISION 2050*

The Lake Forest Park Comprehensive Plan was developed to support and help implement the multicounty policy guidance of Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) *VISION 2050*. Lake Forest Park’s Comprehensive Plan advances the overall direction established by *VISION 2050*, supporting a sustainable approach to growth and future development that is balanced with environmental preservation and enhancement. The Plan acknowledges Lake Forest Park’s role in the regional growth strategy and align policies to implement land use, transportation, and capital facilities/utilities patterns with regional directives.

The comprehensive plan has been updated based on residential and employment allocations that recognize *VISION 2050*. King County identified the number of housing units by income level the City must plan to accommodate through the year 2044, and Lake Forest Park’s Comprehensive Plan establishes a realistic approach to meet the projected needs. The Comprehensive Plan provides for a range of housing options at a variety of affordability levels to meet the needs of the community, and does it in a way that emphasizes regional transportation connectivity to job centers and activity hubs.

The Comprehensive Plan addresses each of the policy areas in *VISION 2050*. Comprehensive plan policies address housing, transportation, habitat protection, water conservation, air quality, and climate change.

- Environmentally friendly development techniques, such as low-impact development and stormwater management techniques are supported. The plan calls for mixed-use urban development focused in the Town Center and supports design guidelines for mixed-use development.
- The housing element commits to expanding housing production at all income levels to meet the diverse needs of both current and future residents, specifically focused on housing needs by income band to maximize affordability.
- Economic development policies support strong communication and capitalize on Lake Forest Park’s distinctive built and natural character and high quality of life as key economic development drivers.
- Transportation policies advance cleaner and more energy-efficient multi-modal mobility, with strategies that advance alternatives to driving alone and connecting regionally. Transportation planning is coordinated with the state and neighboring jurisdictions, including level-of-service standards and concurrency provisions.
- Public service policies emphasize sustainability and conservation. The comprehensive plan also addresses local implementation actions in *VISION 2050*, such as co-location of public facilities and housing targets.



The Comprehensive Plan and the Lake Forest Park Legacy 100-Year Vision


Adopted in 2008, the Lake Forest Park Legacy 100-Year Vision seeks to preserve unique community resources and strengthen the relationship between the natural and built environments over a 100-year time frame. The Legacy Vision recognizes the City’s green infrastructure as an essential element for the community’s well-being and focuses on strengthening green infrastructure over the long-term future.

The Comprehensive Plan and Legacy Vision share a common vision of sustainability and environmental preservation and enhancement. The Legacy Vision identifies many specific green infrastructure projects that could be implemented over time to achieve this vision. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes and incorporates the importance of environmental preservation in all elements of the plan and highlights specific green infrastructure projects identified in the Legacy Vision next to applicable goals and policies. Together, the Comprehensive Plan and Legacy Vision seek to promote, enhance, and preserve the City’s long-term environmental quality and green character.

The Legacy Vision defines green infrastructure as the natural life support system of the living landscape—a strategically planned and managed network of wilderness, parks and greenways; conservation easements; and lands with conservation value that support native species, natural ecological processes, and air and water resources.



Figure I-2: Planning Context - Document Covers



Other Local Plan Guidance

This Comprehensive Plan builds on many planning initiatives undertaken by the City since the adoption of the last Comprehensive Plan. These include:

- **Southern Gateway Subarea Plan (2013)**—Includes policies, implementing regulations, and design guidelines for the Southern Gateway area located in the southeast portion of the City. Land Use Element goals and policies recognize the *Southern Gateway Subarea Plan*.
- **Shoreline Master Plan (2013)**—The City’s first city-specific *Shoreline Master Plan* is addressed in the Environmental Quality Element.
- **Community Forest Management Plan (2010)**—The *Community Forest Management Plan* was adopted to help guide the City’s tree regulations and is addressed in the Environmental Quality Element



Public Participation

An active public participation program was an essential part of the Comprehensive Plan update work in 2023-2024. Public outreach validated the visioning process conducted in 2014. Major components of the City’s outreach program included:

1. **Community Survey.** The City conducted a broad community survey addressing many topics, including community vision, values, planning priorities, housing, transportation and infrastructure, public services, and climate resilience. The survey used a digital platform with paper surveys available upon request.
2. **Planning Commission Meetings.** Between mid-2023 and adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 2024, the Planning Commission met 24 times to review information, discuss policy issues, and make recommendations. All meetings were open to the public with in-person and virtual (remote) attendance options. Public comment was invited at each meeting. Planning Commission meeting information was also posted on the City’s website.

Other commissions, including the Climate Action Committee, Parks Board, and Tree Board, met to provide direct input and guidance to applicable elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

3. **Public Meetings and Workshops.** A total of two public meetings were held to educate participants about the update process and requirements and to invite input and feedback on the draft Comprehensive Plan. Community meetings were advertised through the City’s listserv, newsletter, Facebook, emailed notices, and postings at community gathering places. The City also advertised the meetings in the Seattle Times newspaper.
4. **Web Page.** Project information was shared on the City’s website to describe the Comprehensive Plan update purpose, process, and opportunities to participate. Background materials and draft plan elements were posted on an ongoing basis and comments were invited. Web visitors could also sign up for an email update list and provide comments online.
5. **City Council Meetings and Hearings.** The City Council met 10 times to review the draft Comprehensive Plan, including an open house and two formal public hearings to invite comments prior to adoption.



Guidelines for Future Public Participation

Going forward, active public participation remains a vital component of the City’s planning process and should follow these guidelines:

- Encourage and facilitate user-friendly public participation in community decision-making.
- Consider the interests of the entire community in making decisions.
- Encourage and emphasize open communication between all parties when considering planning issues.
- Incorporate a variety of public outreach approaches to oversee major amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.
- Share information with the public about planning and development processes, how they interrelate, and how to provide effective input.
- Consider the interests of present and future residents, including those who have historically been under-engaged, over the length of the planning period when making decisions.

Lake Forest Park Vision

A vision statement is an aspirational description of the future that the City is trying to achieve through its plans and actions. For this Comprehensive Plan, the vision statement uses words to paint a picture of the City of Lake Forest Park in 2044.



Vision Statement

“In 2044, our balanced approach to environmental preservation, economic vitality, and attractive residential character has allowed Lake Forest Park to flourish. We have preserved and enhanced our natural environment and unique residential neighborhoods as defining features of our city. We are a welcoming and inclusive community enriched by diverse cultures and perspectives. A vibrant Town Center district is the cultural heart of our community and, together with other neighborhood centers, fosters a resilient economy and provides a diversity of shopping and entertainment opportunities that appeal to all ages. Our neighborhoods are safe and connected to each other and to community gathering places by well-designed paths, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Our legacy of collaboration with neighboring jurisdictions has inspired solutions to our regional needs and issues.”



Amending the Comprehensive Plan

Comprehensive plans are dynamic living documents that require regular review and revision to ensure that they respond to the changing needs of the community and to new federal and state laws and rulemaking. The GMA requires the Comprehensive Plan to be updated every 10 years, and updates can be made up to once per year. Updates need to be consistent also with King County's Countywide Planning Policies, which are applicable to all incorporated cities in the County, and with PSRC's *VISION 2050*.

Policy revisions often necessitate a review and update of the municipal code to more closely align with the Comprehensive Plan. The City's municipal code is a primary implementation tool for the Comprehensive Plan. The code specifies the kinds of uses that are allowed in each zone and sets standards for all new development and re-development.

The Comprehensive Plan also guides the location and sizing of infrastructure and other capital facilities and the implementation of operational activities that affect community health, safety, and character.

As noted before, Comprehensive Plan goals and policies provide guidance but are intentionally written broadly to allow for flexibility in their future implementation. The City's approach to review and amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is described in the guidelines on the following page.



Guidelines for Implementing and Amending the Comprehensive Plan

- Consistent with GMA requirements, develop and document a strategy for implementation of the Comprehensive Plan, including a proposed schedule and priorities.
- Maintain the Comprehensive Plan to ensure that changing conditions, including changes in the community and changes to regional, state, and federal policies and regulations, are reflected in the plan.
- Consider proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments concurrently so that the cumulative effect of the proposals can be determined. Evaluate the following considerations in future proposed amendments to the comprehensive plan:
 - Need and rationale for the proposed amendment,
 - Consistency with GMA goals and specific requirements,
 - Consistency with the City's vision,
 - Consistency with the balance of the Comprehensive Plan, and
 - Public review and comment on the proposed change.
- Ensure proposed Comprehensive Plan policy amendments are accompanied by any related and required implementing actions.
- Ensure that the Comprehensive Plan amendment process results in decisions that are consistent with other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Implement a public participation strategy appropriate for each Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle, as established in the Guidelines for Future Public Participation.
- Ensure that the Comprehensive Plan, development regulations, City and other agency functional plans and budgets are mutually consistent and reinforce each other.
- Prepare five-year implementation progress reports, consistent with the GMA.



LU: Land Use



Introduction

The Land Use Element guides future use of land in Lake Forest Park and helps to ensure the City's high quality of life and community character. The Element includes policies that support compatibility with natural features and environmental protection, foster a sense of community, reflect current and historic character, and keep new growth compatible with existing development.

The requirement for a Land Use Element in comprehensive plans is one of the key components of the Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA requires cities to show how they will be able to accommodate 20 years of growth through sufficient buildable land that is zoned appropriately. In addition to containing growth and avoiding sprawl, the Land Use Element sets goals and policies for the design and layout of cities. These provide the opportunity to shape communities into more livable, inclusive, healthy spaces. Regional and county goals promote compact, walkable cities that make it easy to use active transportation and contribute to a sense of community.

The Land Use Element Background Analysis (Volume II) contains the background data and analysis that provide the foundation for the Land Use Element goals and policies. Major topics addressed in Volume II Land Use include:

- Existing Land Use Patterns,
- Growth Targets,
- Land Capacity,
- Current Comprehensive Plan and Other Policy Guidance,
- Land Use Map,
- Current Zoning.



Goals and Policies



Goal LU-1: Land Use Pattern

Facilitate a development pattern that preserves the scale and form of Lake Forest Park while allowing for variety in new housing types and development uses.

Policy LU-1.1: Designate the general distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land for housing, commerce, recreation, open spaces, public utilities and facilities, and other land uses.

Policy LU-1.2: Coordinate the land use designations, densities, & intensities shown in Table I-2.

Table I-2: Land Use Designations

Land Use Designation	Implementing Zoning Designation*
<p>Conservation Residential, Low, Moderate: In this designation, residential development shall be lower in density and allow for alternatives to the single unit detached house (such as accessory dwelling units, duplexes, etc.). These classifications are reserved for portions of the city containing environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	<p>RS-20 RS-15</p>
<p>Low-Density Residential, Mod/High: Residential development within this category shall be lower in density and allow for innovative housing alternatives (such as accessory dwelling units, duplexes, etc. as permitted). The RS-10 and RS-9.6 zoning classifications resulted from two different zoning codes that were combined after a series of annexations in the city. The RS-10 zoning classification contains a street frontage requirement for the creation of new lots and the RS-9.6 zoning classification requires a minimum lot width only.</p>	<p>RS-9.6 RS-10</p>
<p>Low-Density Residential, High: Residential development within this category shall be low-density residential housing types and allow for alternatives to the single unit detached house (such as accessory dwelling units, duplexes, townhomes, cottage courts, etc.).</p>	<p>RS-7.2</p>
<p>Multi-Unit, Low: Multi-unit residential development within these categories should be of a lower multi-unit target density not to exceed 20 units per acre. These categories should serve as transition areas between neighborhood business or higher density multi-unit categories and single-unit categories. Uses within these categories should be characterized with design features and restrictions commonly associated with higher density single-unit uses.</p>	<p>RM-2400 RM-3600</p>



<p>Multi-Unit, High: These categories should serve as the city’s highest density multi-unit residential categories. Densities may be increased with the inclusion of special needs or senior housing where appropriate. Uses within these categories should be in proximity to major arterials and transit routes. Limited commercial and business uses may be allowed in this classification as part of mixed-use development, consistent with adopted development standards.</p>	<p>RM-900 RM-1800</p>
<p>Neighborhood Business: Business development in this category shall be at a smaller scale, pedestrian-oriented where possible, and serve the needs of the more suburban residential area. Included in this category are specialty shops, professional and business offices, and small merchandise and food stores. These businesses should not add significant amounts of traffic on state arterials or city streets. Residential uses may be allowed in this classification as part of mixed-use developments, consistent with adopted development standards.</p>	<p>BN</p>
<p>Corridor Commercial: Commercial development in this category shall include a mix of commercial development, including the type of development which currently exists along the Ballinger Way and Bothell Way corridors. Corridor commercial areas shall be sited to take advantage of transit facilities and be compatible with surrounding land use designations and environmentally sensitive areas. New development or redevelopment of these commercial areas shall strive for a clustered retail and pedestrian-friendly design as opposed to strip or lineal development. Residential uses may be allowed in this classification as part of mixed-use developments, consistent with adopted development standards.</p>	<p>CC</p>
<p>Mixed-Use Town Center: Development in the Town Center category shall continue to be pedestrian oriented. A diversity of housing, business, commercial, civic, recreational, and employment opportunities that complement the primary commercial use should be encouraged. It is not the intent of the City to mandate or require that housing be included in any development proposals concerning the Town Center, but rather to encourage it as an option. As applied to the Town Center category, pedestrian orientation means continued provision of sidewalks, landscaped parking areas, and attractive, safe, and convenient access between the center, adjacent bus stops, and pedestrian access routes.</p>	<p>TC</p>
<p>Southern Gateway, Corridor: The intent of this category is to encourage neighborhood and community scale residential and commercial development, support an active, walkable mixed-use center, create an attractive gateway and streetscape character, protect the livability and attractiveness of adjacent residential neighborhoods, and implement the City’s sustainability objectives (e.g., more green infrastructure, increased tree canopy, and more parks).</p>	<p>SG-C</p>



<p>Southern Gateway, Transition: The purpose of this category is to provide for increased diversity for allowed business, commercial, civic, recreational, employment, and housing opportunities in a manner that is compatible with the residential character and scale of the local neighborhood. This designation encourages small to moderate scale neighborhood and community-oriented residential and commercial uses, serves as a transition between the more intense development along Bothell Way and the smaller single-unit scale to the north and east, supports an active walkable mixed-use center, and protects the livability and attractiveness of residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>SG-T</p>
<p>Southern Gateway, Low Density: This category supports a low-density residential neighborhood in the Southern Gateway subarea that is attractive and functional, promotes social and economic vitality, fosters safety and comfort, and supports an active, walkable mixed-use center.</p>	<p>SG-SF</p>
<p>Public Facility: This category includes areas devoted to schools, water and wastewater facilities, fire stations, public buildings, churches, and other similar public uses.</p>	<p>permitted in multiple zones</p>
<p>Cemetery: This category includes areas devoted to the burial of the dead and dedicated for cemetery purposes, including columbaria, crematories, mausoleums, and mortuaries when operated within the boundaries of the cemetery.</p>	<p>permitted in multiple zones</p>
<p>Recreation/Open Spaces: This category includes areas devoted to public recreational facilities, such as parks, pedestrian trails, and bicycle trails. This category also includes public open space, private and semi-private community clubs, and other similar public uses.</p>	<p>permitted in multiple zones</p>

**For additional information about zoning designations, please see the Zoning Map & Designations discussion in Volume II, Land Use.*

Policy LU-1.3: Maintain a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map that designates the future distribution, extent, and location of the generalized land uses described above (see Figure I-1, Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map).

Policy LU-1.4: Manage and maintain the City’s Official Zoning Map to ensure consistency with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.

Policy LU-1.5: Implement land use designations through a clear regulatory process that ensures transparency, inclusion, and predictability in the land development process.

Policy LU-1.6: Collaborate with all residents during the land use planning process (e.g., comprehensive planning, ordinance development, etc.) and intentionally connect with people that have not historically been engaged, including racial and ethnic minorities, those with lower incomes, youth, seniors, and others.



Policy LU-1.7: Provide opportunities for inclusive public participation in the land development process where appropriate.

Policy LU-1.8: As needs are identified, continue to develop and implement small area studies and subarea plans that help achieve the community’s vision for the future.

Policy LU-1.9: Ensure water, sewer, transportation, and other infrastructure plans are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and land use policies.



Goal LU-2: Community Character

Promote and strengthen Lake Forest Park’s identity, vision, and values through the future land use pattern.

Policy LU-2.1: Maintain land use policies and regulations that reflect the importance of the city’s natural environment, tree cover, and Lake Washington shoreline in community identity.

Policy LU-2.2: Encourage a high-quality pedestrian environment that is barrier-free for nonmotorized travel and that connects residential neighborhoods to businesses, services, and local and regional transit options.

The Legacy 100-Year Vision identifies several possible gateway locations, as well as integrated corridors and greenways.

Policy LU-2.3: Consider entry and gateway features to enhance community identity and highlight community assets (see Figure I-3 on the following page).

Policy LU-2.4: Promote a sense of place through compatible land uses that recognize the variety of unique neighborhoods in the city.

Policy LU-2.5: Provide for smooth transitions between differing land uses through landscape buffers, site and building design measures, or other appropriate techniques.

Policy LU-2.6: Foster a sense of community by increasing formal and informal gathering places, such as in Town Center, local businesses, parks, and public open spaces that are easily accessible by all residents.


Policy LU-2.7: Ensure that collective community values and aspirations are reflected in the City’s plans.

Policy LU-2.8: Recognize the value that diversity in race, age, gender, socioeconomic status, and other characteristics bring to the community.

Policy LU-2.9: Ensure all residents are treated equitably in the land development process, including considering displacement risk and racially disparate impacts as development occurs.



Figure I-3: Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map





Goal LU-3: Compatibility with Natural Environment

Promote designs and developments that respect and conserve the natural environment as an important resource for all residents.

Please see the **Environmental Quality & Shorelines Element** for additional guidance on the natural environment, including stormwater management.

Policy LU-3.1: Encourage the integration and expansion of natural landscapes in new land and roadway developments by including both natural and compatible ornamental plants, shrubs, and trees.

Policy LU-3.2: Provide design flexibility to conserve and expand desirable existing and potential site features that promote the city’s natural environment, including clusters of trees, watercourses, slopes, open spaces, and similar assets.

Policy LU-3.3: Recognize tree canopy conservation and expansion as an integral city resource that supports healthy communities for all residents, particularly in areas of the city that lack or are at risk of losing trees as a vital resource.

Policy LU-3.4: Designate scenic vistas and water access to be conserved as development occurs.

Policy LU-3.5: Always consider implications of land use decisions on stormwater patterns and support low-impact development measures.

As described in the Legacy 100-Year Vision, **green infrastructure planning** is the process by which green spaces and networks can be properly designed, conserved, and integrated into community planning.

Policy LU-3.6: Support the natural drainage and green infrastructure concepts and projects identified in the Legacy 100-Year Vision.





Goal LU-4: Residential Neighborhoods

Facilitate quality, form, and function in diverse residential neighborhoods.

Policy LU-4.1: Consider natural constraints, surrounding development, pedestrian corridors, proximity and access to services and facilities, and loads to existing infrastructure when establishing residential densities.

Policy LU-4.2: Provide flexibility for innovative design options to conserve significant natural features, to provide transitions between different types of uses, or to meet other community objectives.

*Flexibility to support **innovative design approaches** include measures that creatively use site setting, enhance community design character, preserve natural features, or consider other unique features on a site and in a neighborhood. Please see the **Housing Element** for additional housing and residential neighborhood goals and policies.*

Policy LU-4.3: Identify underused land and encourage infill development that is compatible with the scale and form of surrounding development and advances the city's goals to support both housing diversity and affordability.

Policy LU-4.4: Encourage mixed-use developments in proximity to transit stops (Transit-Oriented Development or TOD) with higher densities of multi-unit development that expands the city's existing green resource for all residents in areas nearest to transportation facilities, commercial services, open space, and other amenities.

Policy LU-4.5: Encourage a compatible mix of residential densities in the city's neighborhoods.

Policy LU-4.6: Placeholder for Middle Housing Policies.





Goal LU-5: Economic Vitality

Promote long-term economic vitality of commercial development that meets the needs of the city and its residents.

Policy LU-5.1: Support expansion of commercial and/or mixed-use zoning along transportation corridors that improves diversity of uses within the city.

Policy LU-5.2: Provide for a mix of uses in commercial zones that meet the daily needs of residents and the traveling public.

Policy LU-5.3: Establish standards to enhance visual interest of commercial areas and to ensure long term compatibility with surrounding areas. For example, consider building height, bulk, and orientation; landscape improvements; signs and hardscape improvements; parking lot orientation; and non-motorized access.

Policy LU-5.4: Enhance street-level interest and liveliness through improvements for pedestrians and nonmotorized transportation, and ground floor commercial or public uses.

Policy LU-5.5: Encourage amenities—such as open space, water features, public art, planters, and courtyards—to enhance vitality and visual interest.

Policy LU-5.6: Inventory and encourage the redevelopment of underutilized commercial areas through regulatory techniques and incentives.

For example, **regulatory incentives** may include regulatory assistance to expedite approvals, density bonuses, and regulatory relief from specific development standards.

Policy LU-5.7: Promote safe and contiguous nonmotorized access to commercial areas for all residents, without negotiating or competing with high-velocity vehicular traffic.





Goal LU-6: Public Uses

Ensure that public uses support and strengthen diverse communities.

Policy LU-6.1: Promote identity through the protection of the city’s forest resources, cultural landmarks, and the development process.

Policy LU-6.2: Encourage joint siting of public facilities to increase convenience for the public and promote efficiency in public investments.

Policy LU-6.3: Enhance the public right-of-way as a character-defining element of the community, by promoting pedestrian safety, Safe Streets elements, and streetscape improvements—such as wayfinding signs, lighting, public art, enhanced landscaping, and street furniture.

■ *The Legacy 100-Year Vision identifies several possible **street greening projects**.*

Policy LU-6.4: Prioritize environmental justice when planning, designing, and developing public projects.



Goal LU-7: Healthy Communities

Promote a land use pattern that supports community health.

Policy LU-7.1: Promote nonmotorized transportation and physical activity through connections to the existing and planned trail system, residential neighborhoods, and commercial centers.

Policy LU-7.2: Encourage pedestrian-scale improvements that focus on color, materials, form, and functional utility on streets and trails.

Policy LU-7.3: Support safe walking and bicycling routes to schools.

Policy LU-7.4: Promote attractive street fronts and connecting walkways within commercial centers to prioritize pedestrians.

Policy LU-7.5: Encourage land uses that expand options and access to healthful foods.



Policy LU-7.6: Promote activities such as farmers' markets that improve access to healthful foods.

Policy LU-7.7: Support the expansion of the city's green resource to promote safer pedestrian and bicycle access along high-velocity traffic corridors.



Goal LU-8: Historic Preservation

Protect and preserve historic, cultural, and archaeological resources.

Policy LU-8.1: Support the preservation of the city's geographic and cultural history through a King County Historical Preservation Program interlocal agreement, the adoption of an ordinance, and/or the implementation of administrative procedures as appropriate.

Policy LU-8.2: Participate in regional efforts to sustain historic, visual, and cultural resources, and consider potential impacts to culturally significant sites and tribal treaty fishing, hunting, and gathering grounds.

Policy LU-8.3: Encourage educational and outreach programs that inform residents about incentives and resources available through interlocal agreement participation.

Policy LU-8.4: Support community organizations dedicated to preservation of historic and cultural resources.



Goal LU-9: Regional Issues

Facilitate inter-agency partnerships that proactively address regional planning issues.

Policy LU-9.1: Encourage balance in addressing differing needs through long-term plans that are coordinated with neighboring special districts and general-purpose governments.

Policy LU-9.2: Promote extensive use of sustainable landscaping to provide safe and buffered non-motorized accessibility.

Policy LU-9.3: Ensure that utilities are installed and maintained in a manner consistent with the City's vision and adopted plans through franchise agreements with utility partners.





Goal LU-10: Equity

Promote equity in the planning and development process.

Policy LU-10.1: Collaborate with all residents during the comprehensive planning process and intentionally connect with people who self-identify as Black, Indigenous, or other people of color, those with lower incomes, youths, seniors, and other groups that have not historically engaged in long-range planning processes.

Policy LU-10.2: Expand access to opportunity for all residents, considering the need for access to employment, schools, services, open spaces, recreational activities, and other needs.

Policy LU-10.3: Encourage nonmotorized, pedestrian, and transit connections from residential neighborhoods to businesses, services, and regional destinations.

Policy LU-10.4: Consider displacement risks and racially disparate impacts when adopting or amending development regulations.

Policy LU-10.5: Develop mitigation strategies or requirements for residential and commercial displacement that occurs as a result of new development.

Policy LU-10.6: Reduce health disparities by providing greater access to safe walking and rolling routes, parks and open spaces, and recreational opportunities.



Goal LU-11: Climate Commitment

Promote development that advances climate planning, resilience, and greenhouse gas emissions reduction.

Policy LU-11.1: Promote land use designations that reduce community-wide driving and improve “first mile/last mile” connections.

Policy LU-11.2: Encourage land use policies and regulations that enhance the community’s adaptive capacity, resilience, and social capital.

Policy LU-11.3: Support developments that utilize clean energy or reduced energy consumption.



EQ: Environmental Quality & Shorelines



Introduction

The Environmental Quality Element Goals and Policies support the City’s commitment to preserving and enhancing the natural environment. The Element includes policies that provide guidance on balancing environmental protection with development potential and recognizing environmental resources as an essential living infrastructure.

This Element also ties the City’s environmental policy guidance to several strategic or issue-specific plans that have been developed since the last Comprehensive Plan update. Those plans include the *Shoreline Master Program*, the *Community Forest Management Plan*, the *Wildlife Management Plan*, and the *Legacy 100-Year Vision*, links for which can be found throughout this Element and Background Analysis. The Environmental Quality & Shorelines Element Background Analysis (Volume II) provides narrative and details that support the Environmental Quality Element Goals and Policies, including the following sections:

- **Planning Context,**
- **Resident Volunteers,**
- **Recycling.**



Goals and Policies



Goal EQ–1: Land Use Pattern

Protect the natural environment through zoning and land use decisions.

Policy EQ–1.1: Conserve designated sensitive areas, including ravines, steep slopes, wetlands, riparian zones, and other features.

Designated sensitive areas include erosion hazard areas, landslide hazard areas, seismic hazard areas, steep slope areas, streams, wetlands, fish-bearing waters, areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water, flood hazard areas and the adjoining protective buffers necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare (Lake Forest Park Municipal Code 16.24.020).

Policy EQ–1.2: Encourage mixed-use commercial development and pedestrian-prioritized development, including housing, in any major redevelopment of the Town Center.

Transit-oriented development (TOD) describes a mix of housing, office, retail, and amenities integrated into a walkable neighborhood and anchored by high quality public transit.

Policy EQ–1.3: Promote the health and expansion of existing native and compatible vegetation in all elements of land use considerations, including infrastructure.

Policy EQ–1.4: Use the best scientific information available in an adaptive management approach to preserve or enhance the functions and values of sensitive areas through regulations, programs, and incentives. Implement integrated and interdisciplinary approaches to environmental planning strategies.

Policy EQ–1.5: Sustain and enhance the integrity of ecosystems.

Policy EQ–1.6: Incentivize LEED building standards, low impact development stormwater infrastructure, or other sustainable development standards, especially for development adjacent to sensitive areas, and consider adopting sustainable development standards for public facilities.

Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) is a set of rating systems for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of green buildings, homes, and neighborhoods.



Policy EQ-1.7: Ensure all residents have safe and viable access to a clean and healthy environment.

Policy EQ-1.8: Identify and mitigate unavoidable negative impacts of public actions with disproportionate impacts on vulnerable populations.

 **Goal EQ-2: Shoreline Development/Access**

Protect the city’s shoreline while accommodating reasonable and appropriate uses near shorelines.

Policy EQ-2.1: Protect and enhance public access to the Lake Washington shoreline in adherence with the goals and policies of the Lake Forest Park *Shoreline Master Program* (SMP).

The Shoreline Master Program is an appendix to the Comprehensive Plan and is available online at: www.cityoffp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1098.

Policy EQ-2.2: Facilitate community and neighborhood agreement on any proposal to improve shoreline access where the proposal has the potential to negatively impact private property owners.

Policy EQ-2.3: Promote education efforts that demonstrate the connection between stormwater drainage activities and the city’s water quality.

Policy EQ-2.4: Ensure safe pedestrian and nonmotorized access to the Lake Washington shoreline for all residents and promote a safe passageway through and across the adjacent SR 522.





Goal EQ–3: Water Quality Protection

Improve water quality by protecting and monitoring water from natural sources and through effective storm and surface water management.

Policy EQ–3.1: Promote the community as a model for stream restoration and enhancement.

Policy EQ–3.2: Protect critical aquifer recharge areas (CARAs) and the quality of groundwater used for public water supplies to ensure adequate and healthy future potable water.

Policy EQ–3.3: Coordinate with regional efforts to monitor water quality and identify sources of water pollution in the city’s streams and Lake Washington.

Policy EQ–3.4: Increase public awareness and enforcement of regulations that prohibit illegal dumping.

Policy EQ–3.5: Ensure that new developments are connected to the sanitary sewer system. Support a long-term strategy to convert existing developments from onsite sewage systems to the sanitary sewer system and undertake all means reasonable to ensure the quality of water discharged from existing onsite sewage treatment systems. Support planning efforts to ensure no sewage overflow happens in Lake Forest Park’s waterways.

Policy EQ–3.6: Maintain and enhance natural drainage systems to protect water quality, reduce public costs, protect property, and prevent environmental degradation, including supporting riparian restoration with or without partnership from community organizations.

Low-impact development (LID) is a stormwater and land use strategy that strives to mimic pre-disturbance hydrologic processes. LID measures emphasize conservation, use of on-site natural features, site planning, and integration of stormwater management practices into project design. Rain gardens and permeable hardscapes are examples of LID measures.

Policy EQ-3.7: Encourage low-impact development alternatives and appropriate enhancements of the street maintenance program to minimize urban runoff.

Policy EQ-3.8: Require appropriate mitigation measures through the City’s development review process to reduce negative impacts to water quality from new developments.



Policy EQ-3.9: Coordinate with the regional agencies and neighboring jurisdictions to improve regional surface water management and salmon recovery efforts, resolve interjurisdictional concerns, and implement watershed-based action plans.

***Watershed action plans** are multi-jurisdictional plans that coordinate efforts to address water quality and storm water runoff problems that can contribute to flooding and property damage within a watershed that crosses the boundaries of two or more jurisdictions. The cities of Lake Forest Park, Edmonds, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Shoreline, and Snohomish County have formed a watershed forum to guide the development of a watershed action plan for the Lake Ballinger/McAleer Creek watershed.*

Policy EQ-3.10: Support the removal or retrofit of existing culverts and encourage daylighting of creeks wherever possible to restore natural waterways.

Policy EQ-3.11: Support public education programs about the interconnection between urban streams and human activities.

Goal EQ-4: Development in Geologically Hazardous Areas

Encourage planning efforts to prepare for and recover from environmental disasters.

Policy EQ-4.1: Minimize risk posed by geological and flood hazard areas to people, property, and the environment.

Policy EQ-4.2: Regulate development in hazard areas to ensure that it does not cause safety risks and that appropriate building standards and mitigation measures are used to address site conditions.

Policy EQ-4.3: Promote retention of vegetation and limit land disturbance in identified steep slope and landslide hazard areas.

Policy EQ-4.4: Protect existing natural areas that provide stormwater storage during flood events.

Policy EQ-4.5: Promote educational efforts to inform landowners and residents about hazard areas, how to prepare for emergencies, and resources available to mitigate risks.





Goal EQ–5: Alternative Energy

Promote clean, renewable energy production and use throughout the city.

Policy EQ–5.1: Promote public and private clean energy pilot projects, such as a comprehensive network of electric vehicle charging stations or community solar projects, with the active participation of residents and businesses.

Policy EQ-5.2: Reduce energy demand, support energy management technology, and encourage greater reliance on sustainable energy sources compared to conventional sources.

Policy EQ-5.3: Educate residents about incentives for emerging alternative energy technology, such as tax exemptions for solar installations, and increase resident awareness of existing solar arrays and water heating systems in the city.

Policy EQ-5.4: Participate in regional efforts to create a state-wide alternative energy policy and decrease local greenhouse gas emissions.

Policy EQ-5.5: Encourage businesses, residents, and new developments to utilize electric or solar energy.

Policy EQ-5.6: Facilitate the city's 70 percent recycling rate goal (as adopted by King County) and expand current recycling efforts, such as the battery recycling program at City Hall.



Goal EQ–6: Air Quality, Noise Abatement, and Light Pollution

Support actions to improve air quality, reduce noise and light pollution, and minimize associated negative health effects.

Policy EQ–6.1: Promote clean burning wood stoves within the city.

Policy EQ–6.2: Encourage transportation infrastructure for buses, carpooling, nonmotorized transportation, and electric vehicles, and the planting of trees along arterials.

Dark skies standards seek to reduce light pollution by addressing urban sky glow, glare, light trespass, and light clutter.



Policy EQ-6.3: Promote dark skies through measures that encourage reduced light trespass and use of lighting appropriate to the task. For properties along Lake Washington, encourage application of best practices regarding Artificial Light at Night to help reduce negative impacts on threatened salmon populations.

Policy EQ-6.4: Coordinate with other agencies and local governments in monitoring aircraft noise levels and flight patterns and in finding ways to minimize air traffic noise.

Policy EQ-6.5: Educate residents about noise and air pollution from gas-powered leaf blowers and other such machinery.

Policy EQ-6.6: Identify areas in the city with populations that are at higher risk of negative health effects, noise and light pollution, and lower air quality, and coordinate with the communities to explore focused solutions.

Policy EQ-6.7: Support litter pickup programs within the city to reduce the amount of waste that accumulates in roads, public spaces, neighborhoods, and natural habitats.



Goal EQ-7: Coexistence with Wildlife

Promote, support, and facilitate human coexistence with urban wildlife.

Policy EQ-7.1: Promote educational programs that help residents create an understanding of typical wildlife behavior, encourage empathy for wildlife, and emphasize human behavior modification as the primary means to minimize conflicts with wildlife.

Policy EQ-7.2: Consider updating relevant regulations to promote responsible pet and livestock guardianship.

Policy EQ-7.3: Promote preventative measures to dissuade humans from interacting with wild animals.

Policy EQ-7.4: Encourage the maintenance of native plantings in sensitive area buffers for wildlife when development occurs and encourage improvement to contiguous wildlife corridors whenever possible.

Policy EQ-7.5: Discourage the use of pesticides, herbicides, and inorganic fertilizers.

Policy EQ-7.6: Increase fish habitat restoration efforts along the city's stream systems and along the lakeshore.



Goal EQ-8: Forest Canopy



Officially recognize the forest canopy as a key city resource and promote tree canopy conservation for a healthy and diverse community forest, which consists of both native and compatible non-native plant species.

Policy EQ-8.1: Maintain or exceed the minimum citywide canopy cover goals established by the *Community Forest Management Plan* through regular evaluation and refinement of the City’s land use and environmental regulations and policies.

■ The **Community Management Plan** is available online at www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/6175.

Policy EQ-8.2: Develop a tree planting, inventory, and maintenance program for publicly-owned property that considers the species of trees that will be most successful in environments such as public rights-of-way. Pay special attention in the planting program to areas with vulnerable populations.

Policy EQ-8.3: Ensure zoning and subdivision regulations are consistent with the *Community Forest Management Plan* and review them regularly to ensure they do not disproportionately affect vulnerable communities.

Policy EQ-8.4: Maintain a community forest management plan advisory committee to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the *Community Forest Management Plan* and ensure participation from a wide variety of residents.

Policy EQ-8.5: Encourage the study of the potential effects of climate change to native trees and develop strategies to adapt to and/or mitigate the likely effects of climate change to the community forest.

Policy EQ-8.6: Require all new private and public site developments include a tree-replacement plan that achieves or enhances canopy coverage goals.

Policy EQ-8.7: Develop a vigorous program to control invasive plant species, such as English ivy, laurel, and holly on public property and encourage their control on private properties.

Policy EQ-8.8: Continue to balance tree conservation efforts with recognition of private property rights and public safety.

Policy EQ-8.9: Support community education about the value of trees for human health and mitigating the impacts of climate change.



Goal EQ-9: Climate Commitment

Protect environmental quality and community resilience



in a changing climate.

Policy EQ-9.1: Identify areas with vulnerable populations and coordinate mitigation and recovery planning efforts with those communities.

Policy EQ-9.2: Encourage policies to increase tree canopy cover in socially and economically disadvantaged neighborhoods.

Policy EQ-9.3: Support nonprofit organizations that provide education and participation in forest conservation strategies.



Goal EQ-10

Promote education on sustainable food production and waste prevention.

Policy EQ-10.1: Support a sustainable food economy.

Policy EQ-10.2: Promote educational programs on food waste prevention.

Policy EQ-10.3: Coordinate efforts to reduce waste by making recycling and composting more accessible and efficient.



Goal EQ-11

Promote waste reduction and diversion to reduce the amount of material in the landfill.

Policy EQ-11.1: Support community waste reduction programs and promote education on the life cycle of goods and materials.

Policy EQ-11.2: Encourage zero-waste educational programs.



H: Housing

DRAFT



Introduction

The Housing Element addresses the preservation, improvement, and development of housing; identifies land to accommodate different housing types; and makes provisions for the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Lake Forest Park’s housing element ensures that there will be enough housing to accommodate expected growth in the city, and the variety of housing necessary to accommodate a range of income levels, ages, and special needs. At the same time, the element seeks to ensure new housing is consistent with existing neighborhood form and scale by including policies that will keep new development compatible.

Recognizing that housing is an issue in which multiple interests need to be balanced—including environmental conservation, demographic characteristics, and affordability—the Housing Element is supported by the Housing Element Background Analysis (Volume II). This analysis is covered in detail in the Background Analysis, and reviews existing and projected housing needs and the housing inventory necessary to accommodate projected growth. This analysis prompts the City to consider the needs of current and future residents, which in turn informs policies that shape the zoning and development standards in place today and planned for the future. Information included in the Background Analysis includes:

- **Planning Context** — a summary of state and regional framework for housing planning,
- **Who We Are** — demographic characteristics and trends,
- **Where We Live** — what kind, how much and where is our housing,
- **Forecast of Future Need.**



Goals and Policies



Goal H-1: Housing Supply and Diversity

Ensure that Lake Forest Park has sufficient quantity and variety of housing types to meet projected growth and needs of people of all income levels and demographic groups.

Policy H-1.1: Promote fair and equitable access to housing for all persons, regardless of race, religion, ethnic origin, age, household composition or size, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, or income.

Policy H-1.2: Provide an adequate supply of land through zoning and development regulations to meet the city’s housing growth target, as established in the King County County-wide Planning Policies, for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households as well as emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing.

*Adopted and ratified in 2021, and amended in 2023, the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) provide a countywide vision and serve as a framework for each jurisdiction to develop its own comprehensive plan. As updated from the CPPs, the **Lake Forest Park growth targets are 870 housing units and 550 jobs by 2044, with other targets for housing needs by income and special needs.***

Policy H-1.3: Increase the variety of residential densities and housing types allowed throughout Lake Forest Park’s residential areas to meet the needs of people of all incomes and life stages and increase access to housing for both renters and homeowners.

Policy H-1.4: Consider the impact of land use policies and regulatory decisions on housing capacity and diversity, and regularly monitor and assess existing and projected housing needs, gaps in partnerships, policies and dedicated resources for meeting housing needs of all segments of the population.





Policy H-1.5: Promote infill development of compact middle housing types as a means of meeting a more diverse range of housing needs while protecting environmentally sensitive areas.

Middle housing means buildings that are compatible in scale, form, and character with single-family houses and contain two or more attached, stacked, or clustered homes within a development site to preserve sensitive natural features, open spaces, or other important characteristics while increasing housing opportunity and choice.

Policy H-1.6: Encourage opportunities for multi-unit and mixed use development in areas where a mix of commercial and residential uses would promote increased access to economic opportunity and services, including transit-oriented development near planned or existing transit-stops and along transit corridors.

Policy H-1.7: Create opportunities for a variety of housing types, sizes, and affordability levels throughout different settings and neighborhoods of the City as a recognition of historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for Black, Indigenous and People of Color communities.


Policy H-1.8: Allow for flexibility in zoning and development regulations to encourage a variety of housing types that respond to the diverse needs of different household sizes, incomes and ages, including accessory dwelling units (mother-in-law units), duplexes, townhouses, small apartments, and other types of middle housing.

Policy H-1.9: Continue to ensure that manufactured housing, as defined in the current building code, is allowed in all residential zones and regulated the same as stick-built housing.

Policy H-1.10: Adopt policies and strategies that promote equitable development, mitigate displacement of low-income households and address impacts of past and present racially exclusive and discriminatory policies and practices.



Goal H-2: Neighborhood Form and Scale



Complement and enhance the form and scale of the City’s residential neighborhoods while meeting the housing needs of existing and future residents.

Policy H-2.1: Incorporate clear and predictable site standards, landscaping, and building design guidelines into land use regulations that integrate infill development with consideration to form and scale that complements surrounding uses while not creating additional barriers or increased costs to new housing development.

Infill development is the process of developing vacant or under-used parcels within a surrounding area that is already largely developed.

Policy H-2.2: Promote residential neighborhoods that protect and promote quality outdoor spaces and contribute to an equitable distribution of parks and open space throughout the city.

Policy H-2.3: Develop guidelines for transitions and buffers that integrate and connect higher intensity uses with surrounding development to enhance a sense of community in neighborhoods.


Policy H-2.4: Enhance the condition of neighborhoods by supporting the maintenance and improvement of existing housing through both public and private investment.

Goal H-3: Housing Affordability

 Provide a range of housing opportunities to promote access to housing that is affordable, accessible, healthy, and safe to people of all economic segments.

Affordable housing is generally defined as costing no more than 30% of gross household income. It also refers to income-restricted subsidized housing that meets the needs of low-income households. Additional information is provided in the Housing Element Background Analysis in Volume II.

Policy H-3.1: Invest into neighborhoods with existing affordable housing stock to enhance access to opportunity and services.



Policy H-3.2: Implement and promote incentives to increase the supply of long-term income-restricted affordable housing for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households through density bonuses, height increases, tax incentives, and simplified and streamlined design requirements.

Policy H-3.3: Support and collaborate with non-profit and community-based organizations, and other local and regional partners, that fund, construct and manage income-restricted affordable housing.

Policy H-3.4: Encourage the development and preservation of income-restricted affordable housing near community amenities and services, particularly within walking distance to planned or existing high-capacity and frequent transit.

Policy H-3.5: Expand access to both rental and ownership forms of affordable housing in a wide variety of locations, types, and sizes to reduce disparities in access to housing and neighborhood choices.

Policy H-3.6: Encourage energy efficient design features in new affordable housing units.


Policy H-3.7: Connect residents to community-based organizations and programs providing information on affordable housing, financial literacy, and homeownership counseling.

Policy H-3.8: Evaluate the impacts of City regulations and policies on housing costs and supply, including development standards and regulations, permitting fees and timelines, parking requirements, and implement strategies to address impacts and overcome barriers.

Policy H-3.9: Collaborate with regional jurisdictions to implement policies and strategies, and address funding gaps, that address housing issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

Policy H-3.10: Work with community and regional partners, including the King County Housing Authority, to address the demand for special needs housing and affordable housing in Lake Forest Park and the surrounding area.

Policy H-3.11: Explore policies that protect housing stability for renter households and expand protections and supports for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income renters and renters with disabilities.





Goal H-4: Special Needs

Encourage and support a variety of housing opportunities for those with special needs, including older adults, people with disabilities, and the homeless.

Policy H-4.1: Support measures that allow those with special needs to remain in the community as their housing needs change, including connecting them with available services and benefits.

Policy H-4.2: Explore creating incentives to encourage universal design to maximize building lifecycle and accessibility.

***Universal design** is the design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the extent possible, without the need for specialized adaptation. Examples of universal design in a house could include wide doors, elimination of entrance steps, or electrical outlets installed higher up from the floor.*

Policy H-4.3: Ensure development regulations support housing opportunity for special needs populations in a variety of locations, including permanent supportive housing and emergency shelters, with a focus on high opportunity areas with access to transit and services.

Policy H-4.4: Incentivize the location of special needs housing near services and public transportation to promote access to jobs, medical care, social contacts, and other necessities.


Policy H-4.5: Partner with public and private partners to preserve existing affordable housing, and prioritize the use of resources to support housing services for people experiencing homelessness and others with disproportionately greater housing needs.



Goal H-5: Internal Consistency

Balance and maintain consistency between housing needs and related City policies, including land use, environmental preservation, human services, and economic development.

Policy H-5.1: Provide physical infrastructure and amenities to support vibrant residential neighborhoods, consistent with adopted land use designations.



ED: Economic Development



Introduction

The Economic Development Element includes policies that seek to foster a balanced and sustainable local economy. It encourages a strong relationship between the city, residents, and employers in coordination with the surrounding region by supporting PSRC *VISION 2050*, the Regional Economic Strategy, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies on the economy. By working in partnership with these stakeholders, the city is in a strong position to encourage economic growth and business retention.

The element also supports the Town Center district as a vibrant mixed use center for the city, seeking to ensure that land use policies enhance the City’s ability to achieve this vision and to promote a pedestrian-friendly, vibrant mix of commercial, civic, residential uses, public open spaces, and natural areas with a distinctive development pattern and multi-modal access. The element also promotes a diverse range of retail, service and other amenities that enhance the quality of life for residents and visitors. Small local businesses, compatible home occupations, and locally produced goods and services are encouraged.

Lake Forest Park’s many amenities, including open space, high quality urban design, green character, and Lake Washington access, are an important economic development asset and the element provides guidance for preservation and enhancement of these amenities.

Additional information supporting the Economic Development Goals and Policies can be found in the Economic Development Element Background Analysis (Volume II). The background analysis was prepared by Leland Consulting Group. and focuses on the following:

- The city’s demographic profile,
- Local and adjacent-community commercial uses,
- The city’s real-estate market.



Goals and Policies



Goal ED-1

Foster a balanced and sustainable local economy that supports quality of life for Lake Forest Park residents.

Policy ED-1.1: Pursue a balanced local economy that enhances the city’s natural and built character and provides a greater number of businesses and services that serve the community.

Policy ED-1.2: Preserve and expand the current economic base for long-term economic sustainability.

Economic base: the businesses that generate employment in a community.

Policy ED-1.3: Provide a stable tax base to support sustainable delivery of public services and facilities and reduced reliance on the city’s residential tax base.

Policy ED-1.4: Promote a diverse housing stock, transportation connections, and other amenities that attract future employees and employers.




Goal ED-2

Create strong relationships with public and private partners to enhance local business retention and long-term economic growth.

Policy ED-2.1: Actively work with other jurisdictions, economic development organizations and local business associations to stimulate business retention, encourage growth, and implement regional economic development strategies.

Policy ED-2.2: Support regular communication with local businesses and residents through town hall meetings, online forums and other communications avenues.





Goal ED-3

Support the Town Center district as a vibrant mixed use center and the cultural heart of Lake Forest Park.

Policy ED-3.1: Evaluate the potential for City acquisition and/or public-private partnership of some or all of Town Center to enhance the City’s ability to achieve its vision for a vibrant town center.

Policy ED-3.2: Explore and expand partnerships with primary property owners in Town Center and interested stakeholders to achieve the future vision for the Town Center district.

Policy ED-3.3: Maintain development regulations that set the conditions in place to support a mix of uses, including residential, retail, office, and community gathering places, and monitor their effectiveness to enable and encourage quality redevelopment.

Policy ED-3.4: Continue to maintain design guidelines that support the aesthetic character and reinforce Town Center as a distinctive landmark with transit- and pedestrian-oriented uses, public spaces, recreation facilities, and other community amenities.

Policy ED-3.5: Prioritize public and non-motorized transportation systems to and within Town Center.




Goal ED-4

Enhance the diversity of Lake Forest Park retail, services and amenities.

Policy ED-4.1: Recognize and promote locally serving businesses as an important source of revenue and an economic engine for the city.

Policy ED-4.2: Provide a diverse range of commercial uses that capture local household spending.

Policy ED-4.3: Identify and plan for expanded commercial and mixed use nodes at locations that



Policy ED-4.4: Support incubator and home-grown economic development opportunities, such as compatible home occupations in residential areas and other neighborhood-serving shops and restaurants.

A **business incubator** supports the growth and success of new and small businesses through an array of resources and services that could include physical space, capital, coaching, common services, and networking connections.

Policy ED-4.5: Improve access and visibility for local businesses through pedestrian, urban design and circulation improvements.

Policy ED-4.6: Promote diversity in business by focusing on the advancement of economic opportunity for locally, women-, and minority-owned small businesses and start-up companies.



Goal ED-5


Recognize and promote Lake Forest Park’s unique identity and amenities as an economic development asset.

Policy ED-5.1: Develop an economic development strategic plan that identifies clear short and long term goals and implementing actions.

Policy ED-5.2: Recognize and emphasize the urban amenities in Lake Forest Park, including open space and recreational facilities, high quality urban design, green character, and community events, as important elements in the city’s economic development strategy.

- Connect recreational and open space areas to commercial centers.
- Improve visibility and access to Lake Washington.
- Expand pedestrian and bicycle routes to commercial centers and nodes.
- Preserve the city’s tree canopy and green character.
- Encourage high quality design.

Policy ED-5.3: Develop and maintain community profile information for use by current and potential business owners, and others.





Goal ED-6

Retain existing and cultivate new businesses that enhance the quality of life in the community.

Policy ED-6.1: Promote local businesses and locally produced goods and services.

Policy ED-6.2: Where commercial areas are in decline or experiencing development pressures, work with stakeholders to identify actions to mitigate displacement of legacy businesses.

Policy ED-6.3: Ensure that regulations support economic growth while continuing to preserve the environment, community aesthetics, and residential quality of life.

Policy ED-6.4: Promote both environmental and socially responsible business practices that address climate change, resilience, and improved health outcomes for current and future resident.



CSPS: Community Services & Public Safety




Introduction

The Community Services and Public Safety Element Goals and Policies support the City's commitment to addressing the needs of underserved populations, creating and maintaining effective partnerships that improve security and public safety, and reducing the impact of disasters.

Additional information supporting these goals and policies can be found in the Community Services & Public Safety Element Background Analysis (Volume II), including:

- Providers of community and social services,
- Background on public safety programs,
- Background on emergency management programs.



Goals and Policies



Goal CS-1: Community Service Vision

A. Lake Forest Park is a sustainable, vibrant community in which all residents are welcome to live, work, and play.

Policy CS-1.1: Maintain spaces for residents to communicate and exchange ideas with each other and the City.

Policy CS-1.2: Encourage arts and cultural programs, and other active recreational activities to promote physical and mental health and social interaction.

Policy CS-1.3: Maintain adequate access to mental health support services for all residents.

Policy CS-1.4: Leverage the Town Center, other neighborhood center locations, and transit hubs to deliver community services and to foster a high quality of life for residents of all ages.

B. Address the needs of underserved populations within our community.


Policy CS-1.5: Promote adequate housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income residents, seniors, and special needs populations.

Policy CS-1.6: Increase access to opportunities for all people and communities through City policies, regulations, services, and community engagement.

Policy CS-1.7: Seek out and maintain regional partnerships to leverage resources, coordinate and deliver human services, and promote a full range of accessible human service programs, including the arts and other cultural opportunities.

Policy CS-1.8: Provide equitable planning, funding, and delivery of community services. Prioritize investment to address social, economic, and health disparities.

Policy CS-1.9: Protect and enhance the environment and public health and safety when providing community services.





Goal CS-2: Quality of Life

Enhance and enliven the quality of life for all members of the community while meeting basic physical, economic, and social needs.

Policy CS-2.1: Promote a continuum of human services that meet immediate, preventive, and ongoing needs to enhance the quality of life for all families and individuals.

Policy CS-2.2: Ensure that equitable human services are available to Lake Forest Park residents and are provided in a non-discriminatory manner.

Policy CS-2.3: Maintain a coherent, culturally relevant program of care services that protects vulnerable populations and invests in human development.

Policy CS-2.4: Increase services that are accessible to all residents by removing physical, cultural, language, communication, accessibility, affordability, and other barriers.

Policy CS-2.5: Facilitate de-escalation training for the police and other public authorities to support safe and positive interactions with local youth.





Goal CS-3: Youth

Promote health, caring, and responsibility among the city's youth.

Policy CS-3.1: Support existing community-based organizations that provide opportunities for youth to develop leadership skills that lead to positive outcomes in the community.

Policy CS-3.2: Maintain a partnership with local schools to engage youth in the planning processes.

Policy CS-3.3: Maintain a variety of positive, enriching activities for youth of all ages.

Policy CS-3.4: Help youth avoid the use of drugs, alcohol, and other dangerous substances, and provide support for resources to address challenges such as depression, anger, and physical and/or emotional abuse.

Policy CS-3.5: Support programs to increase academic achievement for students at schools with higher proportions of low-income families, students with disabilities, homeless students, and students excluded due to behavioral violations.

Policy CS-3.6: Increase opportunities for youth to learn fiscal responsibilities through education and age-appropriate employment.




Goal CS-4: Seniors

Facilitate the physical and emotional well-being of seniors.

Policy CS-4.1: Support services and activities for seniors that encourage physical exercise, social interactions, and healthy lifestyles.

Policy CS-4.2: Promote land uses that encourage housing and neighborhood developments that enable seniors to remain in their homes.

Policy CS-4.3: Increase mobility options for seniors through the provision of vanpooling, neighborhood pick-up, and other such services.





Goal CS-5: Families

Encourage the health, self-sufficiency, and safety of families.

Policy CS-5.1: Support services that enhance parenting skills and lifestyles of multicultural and families of all compositions.

Policy CS-5.2: Advocate for quality, accessible childcare and early-childhood education programs that are affordable to families of all income levels.

Policy CS-5.3: Evaluate strategies for expanding domestic violence prevention and intervention services to include support and education.



Goal CS-6: Residents

Encourage all residents to participate in community activities, identify community needs, and develop ideas for resources and programs.


Policy CS-6.1: Promote community activities and events that encourage the participation of all residents.

Policy CS-6.2: Explore opportunities to learn about community needs and ways to meet those needs through connections with existing community groups and gathering spaces.

Policy CS-6.3: Encourage active recreational activities that promote health and social interaction.

Policy CS-6.4: Assess affordable and accessible housing needs, and advocate for emergency housing, transitional housing, and support services to meet the basic needs of diverse populations.

Policy CS-6.5: Promote multi-jurisdictional collaboration to increase community resilience.





Goal CS–7: Public Safety Vision

Promote effective partnerships between Lake Forest Park residents, community resources, and emergency services (police, fire, and ambulance) to foster public health and safety and reduce the impact of disasters.

Policy CS-7.1: Proactively support programs, such as food banks and YouthCare, to aid in crime prevention and community wellness by building partnerships between neighborhoods, first responders, and the community.

Policy CS-7.2: Promote safer streets, walkways, and lighting by supporting Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

See the discussion of **CPTED** in the *Community Services & Public Safety Element Background Analysis*.

Policy CS-7.3: Promote community education to address safety concerns and reduce the impact of disasters.



Goal CS–8: Community Resilience


Foster a friendly, caring, and mutually supportive community to improve climate resilience.

Policy CS-8.1: Enhance partnerships between the City and community-based organizations to support equity in decision-making.

Policy CS-8.2: Support community-building events to clean up beaches and parks and restore riparian zones.



CF: Capital Facilities



Introduction

The Capital Facilities Element discusses facilities needed for public services that will support planned population and employment. Public facilities addressed in the Capital Facilities Element include the transportation system (streets, sidewalks, street-lighting systems), parks, schools, libraries, drainage, water and sanitary sewer systems, public safety, and governmental services.

Capital Facilities include: streets, sidewalks, street-lighting, parks, schools, libraries, drainage, water & sanitary sewer system, and government buildings.

This element helps the City to ensure that the right facilities are in the right place to support the development that is planned in the Land Use Element. It also supports other elements, such as Transportation and Parks, Trails, & Open Space, which drive the policies for capital facilities on those topics. By planning ahead to identify which facilities will be needed, the City is better able to ensure that expectations for quality level of service can be met. Consistent with this direction, goals and policies in this element guide the City to have facilities that adequately support new development, address any past deficiencies, and maintain their stated levels of service.


The Growth Management Act establishes five requirements for this element:

- Provide an inventory of facilities
- List a forecast of needs
- Show proposed locations and capacity of planned facilities
- Provide a financing plan for needed facilities, and
- Reassess planned facilities if they cannot be provided and paid for.

The process of addressing these five requirements helps the decision-making process of the City by organizing and prioritizing future capital improvement projects (CIP). The first four requirements are addressed in the Capital Facilities Element Background Analysis (Volume II). The fifth requirement is addressed in Policy CF-3.6.

Volume II contains the background data and analysis that provide the foundation for the Capital Facilities Element goals and policies. Major topics addressed in Volume II include:

- Inventory,
- Forecast of Future Needs,
- Capital Projects,
- Funding Sources.



Goals and Policies



Goal CF-1

Provide capital facilities and public services necessary to support existing and new development envisioned in the Land Use Element and in conformity with all sections of this comprehensive plan.

Policy CF-1.1: Plan capital facilities that have the capacity and are located to serve existing development and future growth planned in the Land Use Element.

Policy CF-1.2: Provide and maintain City capital facilities, including City Hall and other public buildings, drainage and sewer systems, parks, police, and transportation infrastructure.

Policy CF-1.3: When services are provided by alternative providers, coordinate with them to better understand their provision of fire and rescue, library, schools, sewer, transportation, water, solid waste collection, and other utilities and services.

Policy CF-1.4: Adopt by reference the capital facilities plans of the following providers of public facilities and services in Lake Forest Park, provided those plans are consistent with this Comprehensive Plan.

- Fire and Rescue: Northshore Fire Department.
- Library: King County Library System.
- Schools: Shoreline School District.
- Transportation: Metro, Sound Transit, Washington State Department of Transportation.
- Water and Sewer: North City Water District, Lake Forest Park Water District, Seattle Public Utilities, Northshore Utility District.

Policy CF-1.5: Support processes for planning capital facilities of regional or statewide importance, including airport and transportation system changes and expansions.

Policy CF-1.6: If Lake Forest Park is selected as a site for a regional or statewide capital facility, or is otherwise impacted by a regional or statewide facility’s development, expansion, or operation, ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent that they are compatible with the goals and policies of Lake Forest Park.

Policy CF-1.7: Investigate ways to improve broadband services, including evaluating the feasibility of the City partnering or providing broadband services.





Goal CF-2

Promote capital facilities that address past deficiencies, meet the needs of growth, and enhance the quality of life through acceptable levels of service (LOS).

Policy CF-2.1: Maintain acceptable standards necessary for City-provided facilities to adequately serve all developments.


Table I-3: City-Owned Capital Facilities

Type of Public Facility	Level of Service
Drainage	Drainage design shall be consistent with the City's drainage ordinance.
Sewer	All development shall be served by central sewer facilities. Treatment of sewage effluent shall be in accordance with Washington state law and administrative code.
Transportation	LOS C/D for local roadways.

The City's **drainage ordinance** is contained in Title 16.24 of the Lake Forest Park Municipal Code, which can be accessed online at: www.codepublishing.com/wa/lakeforestpark/.

The City intends to develop **multimodal transportation LOS standards**, consistent with Policy T-1.16 in the Transportation Element

Policy CF-2.2: Implement the parks LOS standards consistent with the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PROST) Plan and the policy guidance in the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Element and the *Legacy 100 Year Vision*.



Policy CF-2.3: Designate LOS standards that guide the future delivery of community services and facilities provided by other agencies, while providing a measure to evaluate the adequacy of actual services.

Table I-4: Capital Facilities Provided by Other Agencies

Type of Public Facility	Level of Service
Fire and Rescue	Land use planning, development review, and fire protection facility planning will be coordinated to ensure that adequate fire protection and emergency medical service can be provided, while ensuring project designs minimize the potential for fire hazard.
Schools	As established by school district capital facilities plan.
Sewer	All development shall be served by central sewer facilities. Treatment of sewage effluent shall be in accordance with Washington state law and administrative code.
Transportation	LOS D-Mitigated for state routes. Coordinate with state and regional entities to ensure continued mobility on state owned routes (SR 522 and SR 104), including efforts to achieve the stated level of service standards for these facilities.
Water	The water system will strive to maintain a minimum of 1,000 gpm in order to provide enough water flow for adequate fire protection. This flow rate exceeds the average customer’s daily demands. Water quality will be in compliance with the Washington Administrative Code requirements. (Washington state law also requires that potable water be available as a condition of development).

Policy CF-2.4: Coordinate with other agencies to ensure that the LOS for fire and rescue, schools, sewer, and water are consistent between the providers’ plans and this Capital Facilities Element.

Policy CF-2.5: Identify LOS deficiencies in City and non-City capital facilities based on adopted LOS and facility lifecycles, and determine the means and timing for correcting these deficiencies.

Policy CF-2.6: Identify needs for additional capital facilities based on adopted LOS and forecasted growth, and determine the means and timing for providing needed additional facilities.

Policy CF-2.7: Provide capital facilities that achieve the LOS concurrent with development as defined in City code and Washington State Law.





Goal CF-3

Ensure that planned capital facilities are financially feasible.

Policy CF-3.1: Identify specific sources and provide realistic projected amounts of public funds that will provide full funding opportunities for the capital improvement projects needed for existing and future development.

Policy CF-3.2: Support inclusive public engagement actions to identify new or increased sources of revenue required to make the Capital Facilities Element financially feasible.

Policy CF-3.3: Charge impact fees when the City Council determines that new development should pay a proportionate share of the capital facilities that it needs.

Policy CF-3.4: Use grants, public/private partnerships, and investments by businesses locating in Lake Forest Park to supplement local funding.


Policy CF-3.5: Acquire City debt when the City Council determines that it is appropriate to advance the construction of priority capital improvement projects and to amortize the project cost over the life of the public facility.

Policy CF-3.6: Maintain a balance between available revenue and capital facilities needed to support the City's adopted LOS.

Policy CF-3.7: Use the City's Capital Improvement Plan as the short-term process for implementing the long-term Capital Facilities Element.

*Lake Forest Park's **Capital Improvement Plan** includes a six-year plan for the capital improvements that will be made by the City and how they will be funded, including transportation projects. The Capital Improvement Plan is updated every two years as part of the City's biannual budget process.*

Policy CF-3.8: Prioritize capital improvements that are needed to correct existing deficiencies or maintain existing LOS over those that would significantly enhance service levels above those designated in the Comprehensive Plan.





Goal CF-4

Promote expanded, redeveloped, and new capital facilities with features and characteristics that support the environment, energy efficiency, local aesthetics, technological innovation, cost-effectiveness, and sustainability.

See the Legacy 100-Year Vision for **recommended capital improvement programming** for green infrastructure projects.

Policy CF-4.1: Design, locate, and build capital facilities that model sustainable design techniques, including incorporating natural infrastructure into projects whenever feasible to mimic ecological processes and minimize the need for built infrastructure.

Policy CF-4.2: Incorporate considerations of physical health and well-being into decisions regarding the location, design, and operation of capital facilities.

Policy CF-4.3: Promote environmental stewardship, sustainability, and regenerative design in capital facilities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Regenerative design allow buildings to create or renew resources required for their operations, such as power and water, and to reduce or eliminate waste.

Policy CF-4.4: Promote the use of renewable energy sources, and reduce energy use and potable water consumption by City buildings and operations.

Policy CF-4.5: Encourage environmentally sensitive building techniques and low impact drainage methods.

Policy CF-4.6: Increase multimodal accessibility to capital facilities.

Policy CF-4.7: Maintain capital facilities at designated historical sites and promote enhancements that increase accessibility to cultural enrichment.

Policy CF-4.8: Promote the location of capital facilities to enhance efficient use of land, reduce public costs, reduce travel demand, and minimize disruption to the community.

Policy CF-4.9: Promote water reuse and water conservation opportunities that diminish impacts on water, sewer, and drainage systems.



Policy CF-4.10: Partner with non-city providers to encourage that their facilities support the policies of this goal.

Policy CF-4.11: Encourage adoption of a standard for sustainability, environmental design, and energy conservation in public buildings.

Examples of **green building standards** the City could adopt under Policy CF-4.12 include: Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED); Living Building Challenge Green Globes; National Green Building Standard.

 **Goal CF-5**

Maintain capital facilities that are reliable, functional, safe, sanitary, clean, attractive, and financially sustainable.


Policy CF-5.1: Maintain public spaces and capital facilities and enhance their appearance.

Policy CF-5.2: Develop, adopt, and use schedules and plans for replacement of capital facilities upon completion of their useful lives.

Policy CF-5.3: Minimize operating and maintenance costs of capital facilities.

Policy CF-5.4: Explore operations and management techniques to reduce the carbon footprints of capital facilities.

Policy CF-5.5: Collaborate with non-city providers to support equitable maintenance of and enhancements to facilities.





Goal CF-6

Maintain and invest in capital facilities that support community resilience, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and improve environmental justice outcomes.

Policy CF-6.1: Support the co-location of capital facilities to maximize the use of land and minimize the impacts of facilities on the community.

Policy CF-6.2: When siting new capital facilities, consider environmental justice criteria in making decisions.

Policy CF-6.3: When building new capital facilities or completing major renovations, consider the feasibility of establishing a resilience hub.

Policy CF-6.4: Plan for redundancy and continuity of operations in the event of a natural disaster or other emergency.



PT: Parks, Trails, and Open Space



Introduction

The Parks, Trails, and Open Space Element Goals and Policies support the City’s commitment to developing and maintaining an exceptional park and trail system that provides diverse recreational opportunities in addition to preserving environmentally sensitive areas and forested and habitat areas. The Element includes policies that provide guidance on park maintenance, funding strategies, and tie-ins to the *Legacy 100-Year Vision*.

Additional information supporting these goals and policies can be found in Parks, Trails, & Open Space Element Background Analysis (Volume II), which includes:

- Inventory of the City’s parks,
- Standards for various types of parks,
- Integrated Pest Management information,
- One Percent for Art Program information.



Goals and Policies



Goal PT-1: Development and Maintenance

Maintain a high standard for the development and maintenance of the City’s parks for both active and passive uses.

Policy PT-1.1: Seek and encourage the development of a sustainable funding source to acquire, develop, and maintain recreational properties and facilities.

Policy PT-1.2: Continue efforts toward identification and acquisition of appropriate property for development of parks and open space that address the community’s needs.

Policy PT-1.3: Support community gathering places as valuable assets for community members.


Policy PT-1.4: Promote parks, recreation, open spaces, and trails as essential components to physical, mental, and emotional health and well-being.



Goal PT-2: Trails

Promote a safe, interconnected system of trails throughout the City, that serve important recreational and transportation roles for regional and local bicycle and pedestrian trail systems.

Policy PT-2.1: Encourage safe walking and bicycle paths through and throughout the city.





Goal PT-3: Safe Access to Parks

Provide multimodal and non-motorized transportation routes to parks, trails, open space, and recreational facilities that are consistent with the Safe Streets project and Safe Routes to School program requirements.

Policy PT-3.1: Promote accessible routes to parks that meet the needs of all residents.

Policy PT-3.2: Consider appropriate mitigation strategies for the impacts of SR-522 on active transportation modes when accessing parks and trails, including the new waterfront park.

Policy PT-3.3: Prioritize infrastructure in the Capital Improvement Plan that improves access to parks and open space.

Policy PT-3.4: Facilitate intergovernmental coordination and partnerships between public, private, and non-profit sectors to enhance regional access to parks.



Goal PT-4: Environmental Protection

Protect environmentally sensitive areas, wildlife habitats, and wooded areas.

Policy PT-4.1: Encourage open space acquisition to conserve the city's watersheds, environmentally sensitive areas, wildlife corridors, fish and amphibian habitats, and wooded areas.

Policy PT-4.2: Coordinate open space priorities with the Environmental Quality Commission and community environmental organizations.

Policy PT-4.3: Promote educational programs about natural systems.


Policy PT-4.4: Promote the preservation of desirable lands for the public benefit.

Policy PT-4.5: Coordinate removal of invasive species in parks, trails, and open spaces.

Policy PT-4.6: Promote water reuse and reclamation.



Goal PT-5: Active Parks



Encourage a variety of recreational facilities and activities to serve the diverse interests of city residents.

Policy PT-5.1: Pursue the acquisition and development of active park facilities.

Policy PT-5.2: Engage with community groups and stakeholders in planning for active parks.

Policy PT-5.3: Increase collaboration with community organizations that sponsor recreational and cultural activities to supplement recreational opportunities in the city.

Policy PT-5.4: Coordinate with the Shoreline School District, neighboring cities, and community agencies to expand recreational potential in Lake Forest Park.

Goal PT-6: Signage

Promote inviting signage and wayfinding in the city's parks and at entrances to the city.

Policy PT-6.1: Encourage universal design techniques for accessible signage.

Policy PT-6.2: Support maintenance of signs and surrounding plantings to ensure visibility.

Goal PT-7: Arts and Culture

Encourage inclusive representation in art and cultural heritage for public places.

Policy PT-7.1: Support visual and performing arts in the community and promote art education and participation.

Policy PT-7.2: Encourage private and corporate support of the arts.





Goal PT-8: Building Community

Facilitate inclusive involvement in community activities.

Policy PT-8.1: Create and promote volunteer opportunities in the City's parks and recreational programs.

Policy PT-8.2: Encourage and promote accessibility for community-wide events.

Policy PT-8.3: Support community collaboration in the planning and program development process of parks projects.

Policy PT-8.4: Maintain park spaces for use as staging areas for disaster response.



Goal PT-9: Legacy 100-Year Vision Implementation

Support green infrastructure in the capital improvement program.

Green infrastructure is the natural life support system of the living landscape—a strategically planned and managed network of wilderness, parks, and greenways; conservation easements; and lands with conservation value that support native species, natural ecological processes, and air and water resources.


Policy PT-9.1: Identify and acquire appropriate property for future park facilities, with expansion of existing parks and active parks as priorities.

Policy PT-9.2: Encourage inclusive representation in the implementation of the Legacy 100-Year Vision.

Policy PT-9.3: Explore opportunities to fund property acquisitions for Legacy projects.

Policy PT-9.4: Consider initiating a parks bond and/or the creation of a parks district for park acquisition, restoration, improvement, and maintenance.

Policy PT-9.5: Utilize conservation easements or other means to expand protection of open space resources such as wildlife corridors and creeks.



Policy PT-9.6: Increase public access to Lake Washington.

Policy PT-9.7: Develop community gardens.



Policy PT-9.8: Prioritize green infrastructure in historically underinvested neighborhoods.

Goal PT-10: Equity

Promote equitable access to parks, trails, and open spaces.

Policy PT-10.1: Prioritize historically underserved neighborhoods for parks, trails, and open space improvements and investments.

Policy PT-10.2: Ensure that parks, trails, and gathering spaces are accessible within a five-minute walkshed of all the city's residents.



U: Utilities



Introduction

The Utilities Element addresses telecommunications, electricity, water and sewer services, and stormwater systems. In general, the goals and policies promote reliable and equitable services for all constituents in a cost-efficient manner.

Consistent with the Plan’s emphasis on sustainability and healthy communities, utilities policies promote resource efficiency and help to reduce the demand on utility infrastructure.

The Utilities Element Background Analysis (Volume II) contains the background data and analysis, including information on the proposed location of utilities, and capacity of existing and proposed utilities. Specific utilities discussed include:

- Water,
- Sewer,
- Surface Water,
- Electricity,
- Natural Gas,
- Telecommunications,
- Solid Waste.



Goals and Policies



Goal U–1: Service Quality

Ensure quality utility services throughout Lake Forest Park that meet the needs of current and future residents and businesses.

Policy U–1.1: Work with utility providers to ensure that reliable, quality services are provided at reasonable and fair rates in all areas of the City.

Policy U–1.2: Encourage the timely expansion and maintenance of utility infrastructure to meet evolving community needs.


Policy U–1.3: Encourage the use of new technologies that will enhance the quality of utility services while ensuring financial feasibility.

Policy U–1.4: Coordinate partnerships, interlocal agreements, and franchise agreements to increase the quality of utility services.

Policy U–1.5: Improve telecommunication services, with a focus on high-speed internet connectivity, for residents and businesses in Lake Forest Park.

Policy U–1.6: Consider alternative service provision options that may be more effective, efficient, and economical at providing service to residents and businesses, including reducing the number of water and sewer providers operating within the City.

Designated sensitive areas. *Include erosion hazard areas, landslide hazard areas, seismic hazard areas, steep slope areas, streams, wetlands, fish-bearing waters, areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water, flood hazard areas and the adjoining protective buffers necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare (Lake Forest Park Municipal Code 16.24.020).*





Goal U–2: Planning

Work with utility providers and other partners to plan for sustainable utility infrastructure that supports City and regional growth plans.

Policy U–2.1: Support utility service areas that are consistent with the growth and development patterns outlined in the City's Comprehensive Plan, the *King County Comprehensive Plan*, and *VISION 2050*.

VISION 2050 is available online at: <https://www.psrc.org/planning-2050/vision-2050>.

The **King County Comprehensive Plan** is available online at: <https://kingcounty.gov/en/dept/executive/governance-leadership/performance-strategy-budget/regional-planning/king-county-comprehensive-plan>.


Policy U–2.2: Communicate on a regular basis (consider annually) through sharing and requesting information with utility providers and other partners.

Policy U–2.3: Coordinate with utility providers to determine available capacity to accommodate development without lowering service standards, and identify needed system improvements.

Policy U–2.4: Encourage the joint use of utility corridors and facilities to minimize the amount of land area impacted by utility infrastructure.

Policy U–2.5: Educate residents about the importance of notifying utilities of construction activities, and lead by example during city construction projects. Facilitate coordination of trenching activities and work to decrease the need for making cuts in new road.

Policy U–2.6: Support the use of utility corridors for recreation and open space purposes, where appropriate.



Goal U-3: Community Impacts

Partner with utility providers to mitigate negative impacts of utility systems to community members.

Policy U-3.1: Support the use of construction, operation, and maintenance practices that limit adverse impacts, such as loud noises, service outages, transportation disruptions, and public safety hazards.

Policy U-3.2: Work with utility providers to inform the community about disruptive activities and to provide opportunities for public engagement in planning processes.

Policy U-3.3: Encourage the use of siting and design practices that minimize adverse visual impacts associated with utility infrastructure.

*Design measures such as color, varied materials, artwork, and superior landscape design can **promote compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.***

Policy U-3.4: Promote the undergrounding of utilities where physically and financially feasible.

Goal U-4: Environmental Impacts



Minimize negative impacts of utility systems to the environment.

Policy U-4.1: Encourage siting, construction, operation, and maintenance activities that are consistent with environmental best management practices.


Policy U-4.2: Coordinate and support public education by the utility providers of the need for water and energy conservation.

Policy U-4.3: Advocate for efficient water utility practices that protect natural resources and support a sustainable long-term water supply.

Policy U-4.4: Collaborate with utilities and other partners to identify the impacts of climate change and develop long-term strategies to address them.

Policy U-4.5: Advocate for efficient energy utility practices and explore alternative energy resources to meet long-term needs and reduce environmental impacts associated with traditional energy supplies.

Policy U-4.6: Coordinate tree removal and replacement plans with electric utilities to maintain power lines.



Please see the **Community Forest Management Plan** for background information, available online at: <https://www.cityoffp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/6175>.

Policy U-4.7: Encourage the waste management utilities to increase recycling, composting, yard waste, waste reduction, and responsible disposal of hazardous waste.

Policy U-4.8: Coordinate and support public education by the utility providers of alternatives to toxic and wasteful products.

Policy U-4.9: Protect water quality and quantity through operation of the City’s stormwater utility.

Please see the **Environmental Quality & Shorelines Element** for additional guidance on water quality.

Goal U-5: Climate Commitment

Enhance community resilience and support environmental justice outcomes through the provision of reliable utility services.


Policy U-5.1: When expanding or upgrading utilities, consider environmental justice criteria in making decisions.

Policy U-5.2: Plan for resilient and redundant utility services to improve resilience in the event of a natural disaster or other emergency.

Policy U-5.3: Promote underground utilities to the extent feasible.

Policy U-5.4: Encourage the expansion of fiber internet lines throughout the city.

Policy U-5.5: Encourage a transition from natural gas energy usage to electric energy for homes and businesses.



T: Transportation



Introduction

The intent of the Transportation Element is to guide the creation of an adaptive transportation system in Lake Forest Park that supports the City’s vision and character. The element is informed by the directives presented in Washington State’s Growth Management Act, the WSDOT Strategic Plan, relevant Puget Sound Regional Council documents (*VISION 2050, Transportation 2050*), and King County’s countywide planning documents.



While the city itself is, for all intents and purposes, built out and considered “mature,” regional forces have a significant influence on transportation conditions in Lake Forest Park. These forces include regional development patterns (especially to the northeast), tolling on SR 520, and changes in workforce travel trends that have occurred in the years following the COVID-19 pandemic. The extension of Sound Transit’s 1 Line and the future Sound Transit Stride bus rapid transit service along Bothell Way (SR 522) will continue to influence the transportation network. The goals and policies in the Transportation Element provide a framework for the City to respond to these changing conditions.

For reference, the City’s street network map is shown in Figure I-4 and additional information about the City’s transportation system is included in the Transportation Element Background Analysis (Volume II). Major topics addressed in Volume II, Transportation, include:

- Existing roadway classifications, as illustrated in Figure I-4;
- Daily and PM peak hour traffic counts;
- Transit service;
- Walking routes;
- Transportation funding; Level of Service policies



Figure I-4: Roadway Functional Classification Map



Goals and Policies



Goal T-1

Expand intermodal transportation connections, including walking, bicycling, driving/park & rides, and transit.

Policy T-1.1: Work to create a connected and complete transportation network, that prioritizes multimodal access to key destinations including the Town Center and other services, transit stations, parks, and trails.

Transit demand is high in Lake Forest Park. Many residents have historically commuted via bus to employment centers in Seattle and the Eastside. Regional investments in the Link 1 Line extension and planned Stride bus rapid transit and park & ride will continue to connect Lake Forest Park with the greater region.

Policy T-1.2: Develop a “park & ride” facility in Lake Forest Park in coordination with planned light rail and bus rapid transit services coming to and near Lake Forest Park. Work with neighboring communities to develop additional regional “upstream” park & ride facilities.


Policy T-1.3: Expand bicycle rack and locker capacity at appropriate transit stops and park & rides in a manner that meets Community Protection through Environmental Design (CPTED) guidelines.

See the discussion of CPTED in the Community Services & Public Safety Element Background Analysis.

Policy T-1.4: Identify and implement measures to accommodate the anticipated increase in the number of people accessing light rail via motorized and active transportation, including improving multimodal connections to the Town Center, bus routes, and future Stride Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) that connect with new light rail stations.

Policy T-1.5: Provide safe, efficient, and direct pedestrian and bicycle access to transit stops and light rail stations.

Policy T-1.6: Improve bus stop comfort and safety by coordinating with transit agencies, improve shelters and safe access for pedestrians and bicyclists.



Policy T-1.7: Coordinate with state and regional entities to enhance mobility for all modes on state owned routes (SR 522, SR 523, and SR 104), including efforts to achieve the stated level of service standards for these corridors. For facilities within Lake Forest Park, this means striving for LOS D along SR 522 and LOS E-mitigated along SR 104.

Policy T-1.8: In partnership with the state and other agencies, develop corridor plans for SR 522 and SR 104 that holistically address all modes of transportation, adjacent land uses, utility undergrounding, and the connecting street network.

Policy T-1.9: Include emergency service providers in review of roadway designs to ensure emergency vehicle passage.

Policy T-1.10: Achieve the following level of service (LOS) standards on the city's street network:

- Vehicle LOS C/D on local arterials, which allows for moderate congestion throughout the day.
 - **Multimodal:** Strive to complete the pedestrian networks as prioritized in the Safe Street, Safe Highways, and Safe Streets Town Center Connection plans.
 - **Transit:** coordinate with transit agencies to improve access to transit stops as prioritized in the Safe Street, Safe Highways, and Safe Streets Town Center Connection plans.

Policy T-1.11: Review and update roadway and sidewalk standards to ensure they meet multimodal transportation needs.

Policy T-1.12: Encourage all employers to consider implementing Commute Trip Reduction Program strategies and practices to reduce drive-alone miles and vehicle miles traveled especially during peak hours.


Travel Demand Management (TDM), is intended to reduce the need for roadway expansion by encouraging options such as telecommuting, employers providing free bus passes, and working flex hours.

Policy T-1.13: On major arterials, develop access management guidelines to reduce and consolidate access points reduce right-of-way needs and to minimize turning movement conflicts encouraging the expansion and safety of the multi-modal transportation network.

Policy T-1.14: Construct transportation facilities concurrent with growth to ensure the transportation system continues to meet the needs of Lake Forest Park residents.

Policy T-1.15: Plan a transportation system that accommodates users of all abilities, including the elderly and those with special needs. Develop and adopt an ADA transition plan that will identify existing obstacles to accessibility and create and establish a schedule to meet compliance.

Policy T-1.16: Develop multimodal LOS standards to align with the multi- county planning policies that require LOS standards to be based upon the movement of people and goods.



Policy T-1.17: Prioritize inclusive outreach in the transportation planning process.


Policy T-1.18: Review and identify areas with disadvantaged and historically underinvested populations and incorporate equity criteria considering disproportionate harm or benefit to identified populations in project prioritization.

Policy T-1.19: Ensure that the development provides mitigation measures when required to maintain appropriate levels of service for all modes and to meet concurrency requirements.

What is Transportation Level of Service (LOS)?

Level of service (LOS) is a qualitative measure used to evaluate the quality of public infrastructure. Cities have historically measured transportation LOS based on the experience of drivers, in terms of vehicle speed, traffic density, or how long vehicles wait at an intersection. Lake Forest Park has an auto-based LOS policy that measures traffic densities on arterials throughout the day. As shown in the figure below from *Planning Urban Roadway Systems* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2011), transportation LOS does not have to be limited to the experience of just vehicles. This Transportation Element expresses the intent to measure transportation LOS to also evaluate the experience of walking, biking, and taking transit in Lake Forest Park.

Figure I-5: Transportation Levels of Service





Goal T-2

Improve safety for active transportation and expand non-motorized transportation access to Lake Forest Park neighborhoods and destinations (parks, schools, Town Center, transit, Burke-Gilman Trail), and for recreation.

Policy T-2.1: Implement and regularly update the Safe Streets, Safe Highways, and Safe Streets Town Center Connections Plans that identifies:

- Designation of signed bike routes to Lake Forest Park destinations and provide linkages with neighboring cities' bike routes.
- Expansion of pedestrian trail network to link neighborhoods and destinations.
- Construction of sidewalks or separated walkways along streets that link destinations.
- Opening up city rights-of-way, including along appropriate streets, to provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access to destinations, including the light rail stations, and the Burke-Gilman Trail.
- Mode share goals to increase the amount of travel occurring via walking, biking, and transit.

Policy T-2.2: In conjunction with WSDOT and other regional authorities, consider pedestrian overpass/underpass crossings for major transportation corridors to improve access and safety.


Policy T-2.3: Incorporate consideration of the multimodal transportation LOS, when adopted, into the City's environmental review process to ensure that impacts of new development on the bicycle and pedestrian network are fully evaluated and mitigated.

Policy T-2.4: Improve signage and safe walkways, including pedestrian sidewalks, to Lake Forest Park trails such as the Burke-Gilman and between the Burke-Gilman and Interurban Trail.

Policy T-2.5: Install and improve appropriate streetlights at intersections and along pedestrian routes.

Policy T-2.6: Aim for complete streets designs for the safety of all modes. Install separators for bikes/pedestrians/cars in appropriate locations.


Policy T-2.7: Enforce regulation requiring homeowner maintenance of landscaping along pedestrian and bicycle facilities.



What are Complete Streets?

Complete streets think beyond the curb-to-curb and consider how the entire public right-of-way can support the transportation needs of all users. Complete streets do not prescribe a certain type of infrastructure be put in place, but that communities are striving to create a safe and comfortable travel environment for all modes.

Figure I-6: Complete Streets



Policy T-2.8: Expand Lake Forest Park’s “Safe Routes to School Program” participation, including an education and encouragement component, and continue to apply for local, state, and federal grants to enhance safe routes to school.


Policy T-2.9: Support education and outreach measures for all users— motorized and non-motorized.

Policy T-2.10: Design/improve crosswalks for maximum safety.

Policy T-2.11: Strive to improve the accessibility of the transportation system for all.

Policy T-2.12: Establish urban streetscape design criteria that are oriented towards active transportation use.

Policy T-2.13: Provide safe pedestrian crossings at bus stops on arterial roadways.



Policy T-2.14: Promote motor vehicle driver awareness of the need to honor the space of people walking, rolling, and biking.

Policy T-2.15: Support measures, including traffic enforcement cameras and enforcement strategies, that increase pedestrian safety.

 **Goal T-3**

Minimize and manage “cut-through” traffic on local streets through regional cooperation, as well as through implementation of local measures (transportation demand management and traffic calming).

Policy T-3.1: Continue the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program to address expressed concerns and implement appropriate local traffic calming devices/designs throughout Lake Forest Park neighborhoods.

Traffic calming is the deliberate slowing of traffic in neighborhoods through physical design, such as narrowed roads, traffic circles, speed humps, and other means.

Policy T-3.2: Monitor east-west routes that connect with new light rail stations, and coordinate with regional partners on needed enhancements.


Policy T-3.3: Work to find ways to reduce cut-through traffic, including working with neighborhoods, to confine/direct cut-through traffic to neighborhood arterials.

Policy T-3.4: Actively encourage commuting by bicycle and transit, or by car/vanpooling with others.

Policy T-3.5: Develop clean transportation programs and facilities, including actions to reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.

Clean transportation refers to the use of active modes, alternative fuels and advanced transportation technologies to reduce the use of traditional fossil fuels and promote cleaner air and greater energy security.

Policy T-3.6: Accommodate local deliveries and other goods movement that is necessary to serve Lake Forest Park residents and businesses and support the efficient movement of goods in the City’s commercial area.



Goal T-4

Create a sustainable funding plan for constructing and maintaining an adaptive multi-modal transportation system.

Policy T-4.1: Identify stable and predictable funding sources for maintaining and preserving existing transportation facilities and services.

Policy T-4.2: Look for opportunities for funding safety projects.

Policy T-4.3: Fund “complete streets” and pathways, while also maintaining existing infrastructure.


Policy T-4.4: Maintain and supplement a sustainable funding plan with grants for larger projects.

Policy T-4.5: Explore options to fund sidewalks and walkways that are consistent with priorities expressed in the Safe Streets, Safe Highways, and Safe Streets Town Center Connections Plans.

Policy T-4.6: Develop joint improvement plans for state highways with WSDOT, and pursue collaborative funding opportunities.

Policy T-4.7: Develop joint improvement plans with regional transit agencies to maintain and increase transit ridership and service.

Policy T-4.8: Incorporate environmental factors into transportation decision-making, including attention to human health and safety as described in the Environmental Quality & Shorelines Element.





Goal T-5

Minimize the impact of state highways on quality of life in Lake Forest Park.

Policy T-5.1: Take all reasonable actions to ensure quality of life and mobility of Lake Forest Park residents are preserved through the following measures:

- Actively review WSDOT programs for policies, potential funding, and potential design treatments of state routes heading through Lake Forest Park.
- Identify and implement safety improvements for property owners directly exposed to highway-speed traffic, whenever possible.
- Advocate for aesthetically pleasing and appropriate noise-mitigation opportunities, whenever possible. These barriers should not interfere with appropriate pedestrian or bicycle travel.
- Proactively pursue measures to improve access to traffic flow for residents along state routes, whenever possible.
- Maintain lobbying effort to encourage WSDOT to continue to improve state transportation infrastructure within city limits and prevent Lake Forest Park from becoming more of a “choke point” for traffic congestion.
- Prioritize the maintenance of the transportation system to facilitate continued operation during natural and human-caused hazards.

Policy T-5.2: Support implementation of expanded smart signal/traffic to optimize arterial through-put, while also considering arterial-neighborhood access interface.

Smart traffic signal technology allows traffic signals to use radar sensors, cameras, and algorithms to sense traffic and adjust signals based on real-time conditions, allowing adaptation to changing traffic conditions to reduce the amount of time that cars spend idling.

Policy T-5.3: Proactively coordinate with state and regional entities on implementation of regional tolling, per Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)’s Transportation 2040.

Policy T-5.4: Ensure that any major development has ease of access to arterials.



Goal T-6

Work with transit agencies to provide transit service that meets the community’s needs.

Policy T-6.1: Coordinate with regional transit entities to expand east-west transit options in Lake Forest Park and to Link Light Rail stations at 145th and 185th Streets.

Policy T-6.2: Coordinate with regional transit entities to increase bus capacity/frequency, including access to Stride service on SR 522.

Policy T-6.3: Support Sound Transit’s Long Range Plan for Stride 23 bus rapid transit through Lake Forest Park.

Policy T-6.4: Support creative mobility options for “last mile” connectivity for the elderly through the provision of vanpool services, neighborhood pickup vans, or with park & ride lots closer to Lake Forest Park.

Policy T-6.5: Optimize transit links to pedestrian and bicycle paths.

Policy T-6.6: Maintain easy and frequent transit access to major employment and shopping centers such as downtown Seattle, Northgate, the Eastside, and the University of Washington. Where possible, increase the number of destinations that are accessible by transit.




Goal T-7

Minimize negative environmental impacts of the transportation system.

Policy T-7.1: Support the transition to electrification of personal and City-owned fleet vehicles.

Policy T-7.2: Promote the reduction of stormwater pollution from transportation facilities, such as enhanced street sweeping and establishing best management practices to reduce and treat stormwater runoff.



Volume II | Background Analysis



Introduction



Introduction

Volume II contains background information that supports the goals and policies in Volume I. The Planning Commission reviewed this information during the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan in order to ensure that the goals and policies reflect current conditions in the community, are consistent with current state and regional policy frameworks, and are based on best available information.

Volume II also includes information that meets the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements for Comprehensive Plans. For instance, the Land Use section contains information on growth targets and land capacity, the Housing section contains an analysis of housing supply, the Transportation section contains an inventory of transportation facilities, and the Capital Facilities section contains plans for capital facilities improvements.

DRAFT



LU: Land Use



Introduction

This section contains information that was used in developing the update of the goals and policies in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan, including:

- Existing land use patterns,
- Growth targets,
- Land capacity,
- Current Comprehensive Plan and other policy guidance,
- Land use map,
- Current zoning.

Context & Background

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that cities provide a comprehensive plan with a Land Use Element to designate the proposed categories (residential, commercial, etc.) and intensities of uses of land. The GMA further specifies that the Land Use Element be the foundation of a comprehensive plan. This process of designating future land uses must account for future population growth and must be supported by adequate levels of public facilities and services. In this respect, the Land Use Element is an explicit statement of the ultimate vision for the City and determines the capacity of the infrastructure necessary to serve the projected land uses. Consistent with this legislative intent, the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) requires that a land use element contain the following:

- A. Designation of the proposed general distribution, location, and extent of land for all projected uses;
- B. Population densities, building intensities, and estimates of future population growth;
- C. Provisions for protection of the quality and quantity of ground water used for public water supplies;
- D. Consideration of urban planning approaches to promote physical activity;
- E. Review of drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff and guidance for discharges that pollute waters of the state, according to WAC 365-196-405.

Similarly, the Puget Sound Regional Council *VISION 2050* and King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) provide guidance that were consulted as part of this update.

Natural Environment

The natural features of the City of Lake Forest Park influence land use. For instance, environmentally sensitive areas such as steep slopes and wetlands limit development potential. The City may also choose to preserve natural areas to meet community objectives. See Figure II-1 on the following page for a map showing the city's environmentally sensitive areas.



Figure II-1: Lake Forest Park Sensitive Areas





Figure II-2: Lake Forest Park Existing Land Use and Acreage



Existing Land Use

According to the 2020 U.S. Census, the City of Lake Forest Park is 3.52 square miles, or 2,253 acres. Lake Forest Park is a mature community with much of its land already developed. The primary land use in the city is single-unit homes. There are some higher density residential uses and commercial uses located along Ballinger Way NE and NE Bothell Way. The city’s commercial center is located at the intersection of these two roads and contains commercial and civic uses. Public facilities, parks, and open spaces are located throughout the city. There is also a large private open space in the southern portion of the city that is used as a memorial park and cemetery. There is no industrial development within the city limits.

The Washington State Department of Ecology’s 2010 land use GIS dataset provides additional information about existing land uses in Lake Forest Park. Figure II-2 on the previous page shows the existing land uses and the acreage for each, based on the state’s data.

Growth Targets

The state sets targets for growth that counties will accommodate within the next twenty years, and counties and cities work together to allocate that growth in a way that makes sense. King County publishes the resulting growth targets as part of the King County Countywide Planning Policies. Growth targets adopted for the City of Lake Forest Park are identified for two-time frames. The 2019-2044 growth targets were adopted as part of the King County Countywide Planning Policies. While the growth targets extend to 2035, the new 20-year planning horizon for the Comprehensive Plan update is 2044. Growth allocations determined by King County are shown in Table II-1. Housing must be accommodated at several affordability levels (also called income bands), discussed further in the Housing chapter.


Table II-1: Lake Forest Park Growth Targets

	2015-2035 Targets	2019-2044 Targets
Housing	551 Housing Units	870 Housing Units
Employment	244 Jobs	550 Jobs

Source: King County Countywide Planning Policies, 2021

Land Capacity

Land capacity analysis is a tool for determining whether growth targets can be met within a city using existing zoning designations. The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires seven western Washington counties and the cities within them, including King County and Lake Forest Park, to measure their land supply (in acres) and land capacity (in housing units and jobs). The intent is to ensure that these counties and their cities have sufficient capacity—realistically measured—to accommodate forecasted growth.



The 2021 King County Buildable Lands Report (BLR) builds on and updates the work done in the 2014 BLR. It fulfills the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215 to report on residential and job changes since the 2014 BLR and to provide an updated picture of the county's overall capacity to accommodate growth. The 2021 BLR reports on the six-year period from January 2012 to January 2018 for the 40 jurisdictions across King County. It measures each jurisdiction's land supply and land capacity and updates those capacities to 2018. Amendments to the GMA in 2017 required counties to examine the ways jurisdictions were achieving targets and density goals. As such, the 2021 BLR compared housing and employment growth estimates from 2006-2018 relative to 2006-2035 growth targets, as well as the achieved densities of 2012-2018 development to the densities allowed in zoning and development regulations.

The 2014 King County Buildable Lands Report is available online at: <https://kingcounty.gov/en/legacy/depts/executive/performance-strategy-budget/regional-planning/-/media/depts/executive/performance-strategy-budget/regional-planning/UGC/KC-UGC-Final-Report-2021-Ratified.ashx?la=en&hash=38D2E7B9BC652F69C8BB0EA52DB7778F>.

In 2021, the City of Lake Forest Park had capacity for 1,870 housing units and 691 jobs. Compared to the targets shown in Table II-1, the City has adequate capacity to meet the 2044 housing and employment targets.



The Comprehensive Plan & Other Land Use Policy Guidance

Prior to this 2015 update, the City conducted two planning efforts that also provide guidance for future land use patterns in Lake Forest Park: the 2012 *Southern Gateway Subarea Plan* and the 2008 Lake Forest Park *Legacy 100-Year Vision*. The Southern Gateway area extends roughly from the city limits on the south to NE 157th Street on the north and from 35th Avenue NE to Lake Washington. It is an area that is facing development pressure and has a number of vacant lots. The *Southern Gateway Subarea Plan* outlines a community vision for this area that includes:

- A higher density single unit alternative
- Mixed use development that contributes to the City's fiscal health
- A more attractive southern entry into the City
- A greater diversity of retail services and attractive residential opportunities


The **Southern Gateway Subarea Plan** is available online at: www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7651.
The **Southern Gateway zoning map** is available online at: www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1696.

The *Legacy 100-Year Vision* outlines strategies to manage growth, conserve natural resources, and strengthen the relationship between the City's natural and built environments. The four overarching goals for the vision are:

- Increase safe, multi-modal networks among parks, open spaces, transportation hubs, neighborhoods and commercial centers
- Improve stream and lake water quality, and restore natural hydrologic functions
- Create and enhance habitat for fish and wildlife
- Promote and develop diverse gathering spaces

Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map

The Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map shows the future shape of the community and how its essential components will be distributed. The Land Use Map is provided in Figure II-2 on page 97 in the Land Use Element. Ordinance Number 1056 was adopted on April 4, 2013, and updated the Land Use Map to include land use designations consistent with *Southern Gateway Subarea Plan* recommendations. These designations are implemented by the city's zoning regulations described below.



Zoning Map & Designations

According to the Lake Forest Park Municipal Code, the city has fifteen zoning designations. This includes five residential single unit zoning designations, five residential multi-unit designations, neighborhood business, corridor commercial, town center, and two Southern Gateway mixed use zones.

The residential single-unit zoning designations are differentiated by minimum lot size and include RS-20 (minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet), RS-15, RS-10, RS-9.6, and RS-7.2. Permitted uses include single unit dwellings, home occupations, accessory structures, manufactured homes, and day care facilities.

The residential multi-unit zoning designations are differentiated by minimum unit size. They include RM-3600 (minimum lot area of 3,600 square feet per unit), RM-2400, RM-1800, RM-900, and the Southern Gateway high-density single-unit zone (SG-SFR). The principal purpose of these zones is to provide greater population density in appropriate areas of the city. All residential multi-unit zones allow for uses including duplexes, multi-unit dwellings, townhouses, apartments, cooperatives, condominiums, senior citizen apartments, and accessory structures. Additional uses are allowed in the higher density RM zones, such as day care facilities, retirement homes, rest homes, and convalescent homes.

The purpose of the Neighborhood Business (BN) zoning designation is to provide locations for business facilities that serve the everyday needs of the immediate neighborhood and do not attract excessive traffic from beyond that neighborhood. Permitted uses include small merchandise and convenience stores, general services, small gas stations, and small business offices.

The purpose of the Corridor Commercial (CC) zoning designation is to provide locations for commercial uses along the Bothell Way corridor. Clustered retail and pedestrian friendly design are encouraged in this zone. Permitted uses include retail, business, government uses, hotels and motels, public utilities, and adult use establishments.



The intent of the Town Center (TC) zoning designation is to encourage neighborhood and community scale uses that create interesting and vital places for residents of the city and the nearby community. Permitted uses include retail, business, government uses, day care facilities, and public facilities. The TC zone allows high density residential uses as part of mixed-use developments, including multi-unit, senior apartments, and senior care facilities.

The Southern Gateway zones were adopted in 2013 as part of the City's Southern Gateway Subarea planning effort. The Southern Gateway regulations and design guidelines promote a high density of single-unit residences and mixed-use development in a manner that reduces impacts to the surrounding low-density neighborhood. The southern gateway zones are single-unit detached and townhouse residential (SG-SFR), corridor (SG-C) and transition (SG-T).

Figure II-3 shows the city's current zoning designations and total acreage for each.



Figure II- 3: Lake Forest Park Zoning Designations and Acreage



EQ: Environmental Quality & Shorelines



Introduction

The natural environment of Lake Forest Park is an important part of the daily lives of its citizens. From the very beginning, our city’s natural environment has been its defining characteristic. An early land prospectus for the City of Lake Forest Park stated, “The strict fiat has gone forth that all the natural beauty must be preserved.” Our city was named for its proximity to Lake Washington, its abundance of streams, ravines, and wetlands, and its robust tree canopy. The need to protect and enhance the natural environment and wildlife inhabitants of Lake Forest Park extends far beyond its aesthetic beauty. The ecosystem and green infrastructure provided by the natural environment create economic and health benefits for the residents and workers of our community.

The benefits of preserving our environmentally sensitive areas are recognized, though these areas are increasingly challenged by growth, both in Lake Forest Park and the surrounding region. Effective environmental protection and climate resilience requires a vision that acknowledges the critical interdependence of the various contributing ecosystems as well as their relationships to the built environment. The city’s tree canopy can be a resource not only for Lake Forest Park residents, but for the entire region. What we build—where and how—has a lasting effect on our ecosystems, as well as on the health of our communities, region, and planet. Lake Forest Park can be an experimental, urban community for the development of best practices.

This background analysis contains information that was used to develop the updated goals and policies in the Environmental Quality & Shorelines Element:

- Planning Context,
- Environmental Features,
- Resident Volunteers,
- Recycling.

Planning Context

Several strategic and specific-issue plans have been developed to address environmental needs throughout the city, and these have contributed to the development of the Environmental Quality and Shorelines goals and policies. These plans, and their relations to this element, are described below. They include:

- *City of Lake Forest Park Legacy 100-Year Vision,*
- *City of Lake Forest Park Community Forest Management Plan,*
- *City of Lake Forest Park Wildlife Management Plan,*
- *City of Lake Forest Park Shoreline Master Program,*
- *Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan 10-Year Update.*





Lake Forest Park *Legacy 100-Year Vision* (2008)

Lake Forest Park’s *Legacy Vision* is a long-term strategic guiding document for enhancing the City’s green infrastructure—its forests, wetlands, wildlife habitats, and more. The Vision, which was the subject of extensive involvement from the community, identifies existing green infrastructure, sets goals for how this green infrastructure will be enhanced in the next century, and identifies projects that can be undertaken in the near-term to set the city on a path toward achieving these goals. This visionary document influences several elements of the Comprehensive Plan, including Environmental Quality & Shorelines and Parks, Trails, & Open Space.

■ The ***Legacy 100-Year Vision*** is available online at www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/362.

Lake Forest Park *Community Forest Management Plan* (2010)

The *Community Forest Management Plan* was drafted by the Urban Forest Task Force and adopted by reference by Ordinance 1015: Tree Canopy Preservation and Enhancement. The Plan’s purpose is to guide enhancement to Lake Forest Park’s tree canopy by identifying tree canopy goals, asset management strategies, and policies for promoting education on forestry issues. The plan was used to inform an update of the City’s tree regulations and acts as a supporting document for all future updates to LFPMC 16.14—Tree Preservation and Enhancement.

The city’s forest canopy is one of its defining characteristics and is a vital community resource. The amount of tree canopy coverage in a neighborhood is one of the most useful benchmarks of urban environmental quality. In 2009, Lake Forest Park undertook a survey of tree canopy coverage, the results of which are shown in Figure II-4.

■ The ***Community Forest Management Plan*** is available online at: www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/6175.







Figure II- 4: Lake Forest Park Tree Canopy Coverage by Parcel



Methods – i-Tree Eco

- i-Tree Eco Stratified Sampling Protocol
- Field Data Collection:
Fixed Radius Plot Inventory – 100 plots

	Stratum	Acres	Number of Plots
	Town Center	19	8
	≤ ¼ Acres	532	52
	> ¼ Acres	1750	40



The *Community Forest Management Plan* states that the benefits of trees include:

- Reducing surface water runoff (keeping pollution out of the rivers and ponds)
- Reducing soil erosion (decreasing sedimentation of water bodies and preventing landslides)
- Absorbing air pollutants and sequestering carbon dioxide (countering the greenhouse effect)
- Reducing noise pollution
- Cooling the city by absorbing sunlight and releasing water through evapotranspiration
- Creating wildlife habitat
- Conserving energy by providing temperature moderation
- Improving water quality

Wildlife Management Plan (2011)

The purpose of the *Wildlife Management Plan* is “to support human coexistence with urban wildlife using education, behavior modification, and the development of a policy to address human-wildlife conflicts.” Development of this plan led to changes in the City’s regulations, which established animal guardianship criteria and strengthened wildlife protection.

■ The **Wildlife Management Plan** is available online at: www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/487.

Shoreline Master Program (2019)

Lake Forest Park contains 10,560 feet (2 miles) of Lake Washington shoreline. The Washington State Shoreline Management Act requires that all cities containing or bordering “shorelines of the state” have a *Shoreline Master Program*. Lake Forest Park’s *Shoreline Master Program* was approved locally by the adoption of Ordinance No. 1042 in 2013 after review and approval by the state’s Department of Ecology and updated in 2019. Implementing regulations contain policies and regulations that focus on three main areas: Shoreline Use, Environmental Protection, and Public Access.

■ The **Shoreline Master Program** is an appendix to the *Comprehensive Plan* and is available online at: www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1098.

Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan 10-Year Update (2017)

The WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (Council) is composed of elected representatives from 29 local government partners (27 cities, King County, and Snohomish County), and representatives from community organizations, businesses, environmental interests, and state and federal agencies. The City of Lake Forest Park has been an active member of the Council since its inception in 2001. The Council oversees implementation of the science-based Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan for the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed. The watershed, also known as Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 8, runs from the Puget Sound nearshore and inland from the north end of Elliott Bay to south Everett, and east to the Bear Creek basin, the Issaquah Creek basin, and the upper Cedar River basin.

The city's creeks and lakeshore environment are home to several species of salmon through multiple life stages. The *WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan* provides strategies for protecting, restoring, and supporting healthy salmon habitat through voluntary actions by municipalities and by property owners. The city should implement the recommendations in the Conservation Plan and provide incentives and technical support for residents take part in actions such as planting native vegetation along creeks, reducing the use of pesticides and fertilizers, and implementing best practices related to Artificial Light at Night along the lakeshore.



Environmental Features of Lake Forest Park

The city contains the environmental features listed below. Figure II.1 in Volume II of the Land Use Element shows the general location of streams, wetlands, and steep slopes.

- Larger streams containing a variety of fish species that flow into the city from other jurisdictions
- Intermittent creeks that flow only during heavy precipitation events
- Large and complex wetland systems
- Small, pocket wetlands
- Floodplains associated with streams and wetlands
- Stable steep slopes as well as those prone to landslides
- Tree canopy

Streams and Surface Water Drainage

The two largest streams within Lake Forest Park are Lyon Creek and McAleer Creek. Both streams begin in neighboring jurisdictions to the north of the city and flow through local sub-basins to empty into Lake Washington. The city also contains several streams that originate within its boundaries, such as Brookside Creek, Schoolhouse Creek, McKinnon Creek, and others. Many of these are tributaries of Lyon Creek and McAleer Creek. Streams in the city are home to various species of fish, including endangered salmon and trout species.

The City owns and operates a stormwater system in order to manage surface water drainage (see Volume II of the Utilities Element for a description of the stormwater utility). Ongoing management of the city’s stormwater system is largely governed by state and federal agencies, such as the Department of Ecology and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program. The City follows these standards where applicable. The City has adopted by reference the 2021 King County Surface Water Design Manual. More detailed information about the City’s stormwater infrastructure can be found in the 2014 Surface Water Management Plan.

Flooding

In Lake Forest Park, flooding problems occur below NE Bothell Way on the alluvial fan deltas for Lyon Creek and McAleer Creek. Stream-transported sediments deposit in the low gradient reaches and reduce the channel capacity. Urbanization restricts channel location and continual channel maintenance is necessary to mitigate the natural flood hazard. In other areas, localized flooding occurs as result of channel obstructions, such as undersized culverts, low bridges, or reduced channel capacity.

Wetlands

Based on available information, there are approximately 50 acres of mapped wetlands in Lake Forest Park (Figure II.1). However, there are more unmapped wetland areas known to be present. Many of the wetlands in the city are located at the bases of steep slopes, within natural depressions, or within riparian corridors along streams. As with many urban environments, the wetland conditions in Lake Forest Park have often been altered, modified, and encroached upon by urban development.

Groundwater

Groundwater is the primary water supply for portions of the city served by the Lake Forest Park Water District (see Figure II.XX in Volume II of the Utilities Element). The Lake Forest Park Water District operates wells within a wellhead protection area located in the city. Other areas of the city receive water from utilities that acquire water from sources outside of Lake Forest Park. Since a portion of the city’s residents rely on groundwater as their source of potable water, protection of groundwater quality is particularly important.

Steep Slope and Landslide Hazard Areas

Sloped topographical conditions are prevalent throughout Lake Forest Park, and possible landslide and steep slope hazard areas are the most widely designated environmentally sensitive areas in the city (Figure II.1). Protection from the possible detrimental effects of landslides and slope related hazards are high priorities. Landslide activity in Lake Forest Park has occurred within recent years.

Erosion Hazard Areas

Erosion is a natural process whereby soil coverage is loosened and reduced by wind, rain, and running water. In the Puget Sound region, rain and running water are the main contributors to erosion. The potential for erosion depends upon the physical and chemical composition of the soil, vegetation coverage, slope length and gradient, intensity of rainfall, and velocity of surface water runoff. Erosion hazard areas are located throughout the city, however, they are generally found in the riparian areas of stream corridors and in steep slope and landslide hazard areas.

Seismic Hazard Areas

King County is an earthquake-prone region subject to ground shaking, seismically induced landslides, and liquefaction of soil. Seismic hazard areas in Lake Forest Park are generally located near stream corridors, large wetland areas, floodplains, the Lake Washington shoreline, and in previously filled areas.

Resident Volunteers

The natural environment of Lake Forest Park benefits from the many residents who are deeply passionate about protecting and enhancing it. These volunteer commissioners, tree board members, and non-profit members collaborate with the City regularly on projects and plans that embrace the city’s shoreline, streams, forests, and wildlife habitat.

The Lake Forest Park Stewardship Foundation, a community-run non-profit, was formed in 1998 and has worked tirelessly since that point to increase education and awareness of Lake Forest Park’s natural resources. Members of the Foundation have contributed to many community plans in the past and have been an integral part in developing the Environmental Quality and Shorelines goals and policies.

Recycling

King County has set a goal of minimizing waste by keeping valuable materials in use and out of the county’s only active landfill.¹ Lake Forest Park’s recycling rate (which includes composting) has already reached 65%, far above the state average of 50%.² The Cedar Hills landfill, which receives Lake Forest Park’s garbage, finds that nearly 70% of the waste that is sent there each year could have been recycled, composted, or re-used.³

Recycling and composting are important components of environmental protection, providing benefits such as:

- Reducing emissions of methane, a greenhouse gas more than twenty times as potent as carbon dioxide, from landfills
- Reducing the need for new material, such as trees, oil, and metals, and the fuel use involved with obtaining and transporting them
- Reducing the possibility of hazardous substances leaching into the water table
- Reducing the amount of plastics and other materials that end up in our water and land

Because our waste is landfilled outside of the city’s boundaries, the positive impact of recycling efforts on Lake Forest Park is not as directly visible as other environmental efforts. However, it is important to recognize our responsibility in the larger context. Pollution in other parts of our region finds its way into our air and water, and the methane emissions from landfills have a negative impact on the forests, streams, wildlife, and citizens of our community no matter how far away they are released.

¹ King County, “Re+ (zero waste),” last updated January 2024. <https://kingcounty.gov/en/dept/dnrp/waste-services/garbage-recycling-compost/solid-waste-programs/re-plus>.

² City of Lake Forest Park, “Summer 2014,” City News, 2014: 1 <http://www.cityofflp.com/Archive/ViewFile/Item/884>.

³ King County, “Re+ (zero waste),” last updated January 2024. <https://kingcounty.gov/en/dept/dnrp/waste-services/garbage-recycling-compost/solid-waste-programs/re-plus>.

H: Housing



Introduction

This section contains background information supporting the goals and policies in the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan, including:

- **Planning Context**—summary of state and regional framework for housing
- **Who We Are**—demographic characteristics and trends
- **Where We Live**—what kind, how much and where is our housing
- **Where We Work**—commuting trends and jobs in Lake Forest Park

Planning Context

State & Regional Framework

The Housing Element requirements of the Growth Management Act were substantially amended in 2021 by HB 1220, requiring a much more detailed analysis of future housing needs by income level as well as considerations of racially disparate impacts, exclusion, and displacement in housing. As outlined in the Department of Commerce’s Guidance for Updating Your Housing Element, the updated requirements for a housing element include the following:

- **Housing needs assessment (HNA):** An inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs by income level as provided by the Department of Commerce that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth.
- **Goals, policies and objectives:** A statement of goals, policies, objectives and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement and development of housing, including policies for moderate density housing options in urban growth areas.
- **Residential land capacity analysis:** Analysis to identify sufficient land to accommodate projected housing needs by income level.
- **Provisions for all economic segments:** Adequate provisions to address existing and projected needs of households at all income levels, including documenting programs and actions needed to achieve housing availability, consideration of housing locations in relation to employment locations and consideration of the role of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in meeting housing needs.
- **Address racially disparate impacts, exclusion, displacement and displacement risk:** Identify policies and regulations that result in racially disparate impacts, displacement and exclusion, and implement policies and regulations that begin to undo these impacts. Also, identify areas that may be at higher risk of displacement and establish anti-displacement policies.

PSRC VISION 2050 and King County Countywide Planning Policies


The housing element must also be consistent with PSRC VISION 2050 and King County’s Countywide Planning Policies. Some key themes incorporated in the new goals and policies to better align with PSRC and King County policies include:

- Specifics of planning for future housing unit targets by income band.
- Additions of specific middle housing types and ADUs, and policies to allow more housing types in neighborhoods.
- Discussion of racially disparate impacts in past housing policy and future policies to address these historic inequities and mitigate future displacement risk.
- Adjustments of language to acknowledge the need for some changes in housing types and locations, such as near future high-capacity transit

Growth Targets & Land Capacity


An overview of the Lake Forest Park growth targets for the 2044 Comprehensive Plan update, and the City’s land capacity to meet these targets is described in the HB 1220 Methodology and Results Report and summarized below in Figure II-5. As shown, the City’s 2044 growth target is 870 housing units and 550 jobs. The City has adequate land capacity to meet these targets without making any changes to its current land use or zoning designations.

Figure II-5: Net New Housing and Jobs Targets and Capacity in Lake Forest Park, 2019-2044



The city also has targets for housing units by income band set by King County. These targets are set based on the city’s allocation of countywide need for housing that can serve all economic segments of the population, as determined by the Department of Commerce. Lake Forest Park’s targets by income band, as a percentage of Area Median Income, as well as the target for emergency housing capacity are shown below.

Figure II-6: Lake Forest Park Existing and Target Housing Units by Income Band, 2019-2044



Source: King County 2021 Countywide Planning Policies (as amended in 2023).

As detailed further in the *HB 1220 Methodology and Results Report* (Attachment X), Lake Forest Park has sufficient zoned capacity to meet those targets. A summary table of the results of this analysis is shown below.

Table II-2: Lake Forest Park Housing Targets and Capacity by Income Band, 2019-2044

Income Band (% of AMI)	Zone Category	Housing Needs	Aggregated Housing Needs	Total Capacity	Surplus/ Deficit
0-30 PSH	Mid-Rise, Low-Rise	164	760	761	1
0-30 Non PSH		313			
30-50		143			
50-80		140			
80-100	ADUs, Middle Housing	14	30	68	12
100-120		16			
120+	Low Density	80	80	117	37
TOTAL		870	870	946	76

Source: Leland Consulting Group

Who We Are


The demographics described below provide a description of population and household characteristics in Lake Forest Park and neighboring communities.

Age Characteristics

Lake Forest Park’s population is substantially older than regional and statewide averages. Half of residents are over 45, compared to around 40 percent county and statewide. In addition, 18 percent of residents are over 65, compared to 13 percent countywide and 15 percent statewide. Since 2010, the share of residents over 65 has increased from 15 to 18 percent of the city’s population, or an increase of 534 residents. At the same time, the city has also seen a significant increase in residents aged 20 to 34.

The age composition of Lake Forest Park’s residents has important implications for housing needs in the city. An increasing share of older residents who may be “downsizing” can often signal the need for smaller housing units. On the other hand, an increasing share of young adults may result in new families which need more bedrooms. Older residents may also have specific housing needs such as accessible units or assisted living.

Figure II-7: Age Distribution in Lake Forest Park with Regional Comparisons, 2010-2021




Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05, 2010 US Census, Table P12

Race & Ethnicity

The population of Lake Forest Park is significantly less ethnically and racially diverse than King County as a whole, with 77 percent of residents identifying as White, compared with 57 percent countywide. Of the city’s non-White population, there are similar shares of Mixed-Race and Asian populations at six to seven percent each, with smaller shares of Hispanic/Latino and Black residents (three to four percent) and Native American / Hawaiian residents (less than one percent). The city has become more diverse since 2010, with an overall increase in BIPOC residents, particularly mixed-race residents.

When considering housing needs, race and ethnicity can present compounding challenges to housing affordability and accessibility. For example, in Lake Forest Park, 88 percent of homeowners are White, compared to only 57 percent of renters. Renters face greater housing instability than homeowners, and less opportunities for wealth-building. These type of reinforcing housing challenges are important to consider when planning for the housing needs of all residents in the city.


Figure II-8: Race/Ethnicity in Lake Forest Park with Comparisons, 2010-2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05


The map on the following page (Figure II-9) shows the share of BIPOC (Black, Indigenous and people of color) populations by Census block in Lake Forest Park. There are noticeable concentrations of BIPOC populations in the Southern Gateway and Town Center areas. Notably, the Southern Gateway area allows denser multifamily housing than other parts of the city.

Figure II-9: Race and Ethnicity by Census Block in Lake Forest Park, 2020



The majority of households in Lake Forest Park speak English at home, as shown below, but about 15 percent speak other languages. Most of these residents also speak English, according to the 2021 American Community Survey.

Figure II-10: Language Spoken at Home in Lake Forest Park, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates, Table S1601

Household Characteristics

As of 2023, there are 5,589 housing units in Lake Forest Park, up from around 5,100 in 2012 (an increase of just under 10% over that time). The majority of households in Lake Forest Park (69 percent) are family households. Of these, most are married couples. About 30 percent of Lake Forest Park households have children under 18. The city has a higher share of family households and of families with children than both King County and the state.

The other 31 percent of Lake Forest Park households are non-family households, which includes individuals living alone or any arrangement of unrelated residents. The majority of these households are residents living alone. Of these, 387 households are individuals over 65 living alone. This is a smaller share of older householders living alone than the county and state. The average household size in the city is 2.54, higher than the King County average of 2.44 and an increase from Lake Forest Park’s 2010 average household size of 2.36.

This data shows a need in Lake Forest Park for both larger units to accommodate families and smaller units to accommodate residents living alone.


Table II-3: Household Type in Lake Forest Park, 2021

	Lake Forest Park		King County		Washington	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Total Households	5,308		902,308		3,022,255	
Family households	3,680	69%	536,432	59%	1,937,081	64%
Married-couple family	3,242	61%	427,498	47%	1,503,723	50%
Other family	438	8%	108,934	12%	433,358	14%
With own children of householder under 18 years	1,521	29%	238,894	26%	809,198	27%
Nonfamily households	1,628	31%	365,876	41%	1,085,174	36%
Householder living alone	1,268	24%	269,580	30%	819,693	27%
Householder 65 years and over	387	7%	77,899	9%	304,599	10%

Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Table S2501).

Lake Forest Park’s households are similar in size to county and statewide averages. There is a slightly smaller share of one-person households than the county. Overall, the largest number of households are two-person households, at 37 percent.


Figure II-11: Lake Forest Park Household Size, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04

More than three-quarters of Lake Forest Park households are homeowners, a larger share than King County and the state overall, as shown below. This is consistent with current zoning in the city, in which 96 percent of the land is zoned for single-family residential development.

Figure II-12: Tenure in Lake Forest Park, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04

Table II-4 below shows selected changes over the past two decades in Lake Forest Park’s households. Household size has been relatively constant for homeowners, but renter households have increased in size, a trend seen nationally as increasing housing prices have caused more people to share housing. There are a smaller share of households with children and a larger share of older households in the city, which reflects the age trends discussed earlier in this report. Additionally, the share of single-person households has also risen over time, also reflective of the aging of Lake Forest Park’s population as well as implying the future need for smaller housing units in the city.

Table II-4: Selected Household Trends in Lake Forest Park, 2000-2021


	2000	2012	2021
Total Households	5,029	5,087	5,308
Average Household Size: Owner-Occupied Units	2.64	2.55	2.65
Average Household Size: Renter-Occupied Units	1.99	2.01	2.12
Family Households with One or More Persons Under 18	32%	28%	29%
Households with One or More Persons 65 or Older	23%	26%	30%
Family Households	72%	66%	69%
Non-Family Households	28%	34%	31%
Single Person Households	21%	27%	24%
Single Person Households, Age 65 or Over	6%	9%	7%

Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables DP04, S2501, and S1101

Household Income

Household incomes in Lake Forest Park are higher than county and statewide averages, with the 2021 median household income as reported by the Census at \$139,881, about 1.3 times higher than King County. This represents a 47 percent increase since the 2010 Census. Countywide, the median income increased 56 percent between 2010 and 2021.

Figure II-13: Lake Forest Park Median Household Income, 2010-2021




Source: US Census Bureau, 5-Year American Community Survey (Table S1501)

Household incomes in Lake Forest Park are not distributed evenly. Many of the lower-income households are in Census Block Groups near the Southern Gateway and in the NW of the city.




Figure II-14: Household Incomes by Census Block Group in Lake Forest Park, 2021



The chart below in Figure II-15 shows the breakdown of household incomes in Lake Forest Park by income bands, compared with King County. There are a significantly larger share of households earning over \$125,000 in the city when compared with the county, and smaller shares earning under \$45,000. In the \$50,000 - \$125,000 range, the share of households in the city is relatively similar to that seen countywide.


An analysis of household income required to afford housing at various price points is found later in this report, under "Housing Market Conditions."



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B19001

As shown previously in Figure II-12, about 20 percent of Lake Forest Park households are renters. Compared with homeowners, renters can face greater housing challenges from circumstances beyond their control such as rent increases and evictions. Both nationally and in Lake Forest Park, renters are more likely to be lower-income and more diverse. Roughly 30 percent of Lake Forest Park rental households earn 100 of the Area Median Income or higher, compared to three-quarters of homeowner households, as shown on the following page in Figure II-16.


Figure II-16: Income by Tenure in Lake Forest Park, 2020



Source: 2020 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)

Renters also tend to have smaller household sizes in the city, as shown in Figure II-17. About 40 percent of renter households are one-person households. When planning for housing needs in the city, this data shows that renters in the city have a much more acute need for affordable rents and are more likely to need smaller units. It also shows the challenges renters may face moving from renting to home ownership in the city, which will be further discussed below under “Affordability.”


Figure II-17: Lake Forest Park Household Size by Tenure, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04

As noted previously, Lake Forest Park residents are older than regional and statewide averages. This can introduce compounding challenges to housing affordability. As shown in Figure II-18, older households earn considerably less than younger households in Lake Forest Park. Nonetheless, most older households are homeowners, as shown in Figure II-19. Given the rising housing prices in the city discussed further under “Housing Market Conditions” later in this report, these households would likely be unable to afford their current housing units if they had to buy them today and may also face challenges if they need or wish to move and stay within the community.


Figure II-18: Age and Household Income in Lake Forest Park, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B19037




Figure II-19: Age and Tenure of Households in Lake Forest Park, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S2503


The chart below summarizes household income in Lake Forest Park and surrounding communities. The median income in Lake Forest Park is higher and poverty rate lower compared to nearby cities. This has remained consistent since the previous Comprehensive Plan in 2012, though as of 2021 the poverty rate is slightly lower in Woodinville than in Lake Forest Park.

Figure II-20: Median Household Income in Lake Forest Park and Comparison Communities, 2021



Source: US Census Bureau, 2021 5-Year American Community Survey (Table S1901)

Figure II-21: Percent of Households Below Poverty Level in Lake Forest Park and Comparison Communities, 2021




Source: US Census Bureau, 2021 5-Year American Community Survey (Table S1701)

Cost Burden

One metric used by HUD to determine housing challenges is “Cost Burden.” A household is considered cost-burdened if they spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs (including rent or mortgage and utilities). A severely cost-burdened household spends more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs. When housing costs exceed this threshold of affordability, households may be forced to trade-off the cost of housing with other nondiscretionary needs, such as health care, child care, and others.

The most recent available data on cost burden is from HUD’s 2020 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset. Overall, nearly a quarter of households in Lake Forest Park are cost burdened. Renters experience significantly higher rates of cost burden, with 31 percent of renters spending between 30 and 50 percent of their income on housing costs and another 16 percent spending more than half their income on housing costs, as shown in Figure II-22.


Figure II-22: Cost-Burdened Households by Tenure in Lake Forest Park, 2020



Source: 2020 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)

Figure II-23 shows cost burden by household income. Two-thirds of Lake Forest Park’s extremely low-income households, or 150 households, are spending more than half their income on housing costs. However, over half of lower- and middle-income households are also spending at least 30 percent of their income on housing. Overall, this data shows a need for more affordable units in the city, particularly for renters and lower-income households.


Figure II-23: Cost-Burdened Households by Income in Lake Forest Park, 2020



Source: 2020 HUD Comprehensive Affordability Strategy (CHAS).

Compared with neighboring cities, Lake Forest Park has similar rates of cost burden as Bothell and Kenmore. Among owner households with a mortgage, 24 percent spend more than 30 percent of their gross annual income on rent. Among renters, 46 percent are cost burdened.


Figure II-24: Rent Burden for Renters and Owner-Occupied Households with Mortgages, 2021



Source: US Census 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Tables S2503, B25074).

HUD also breaks down cost burden by a variety of other metrics, including household type in several categories, as shown below in Figure II-25. This data reinforces some of the data on age and income discussed earlier in this report, since “Elderly Families” overall have higher rates of severe cost-burden than other family types. Furthermore, about a third of older residents living alone are cost-burdened in Lake Forest Park. This data again shows the need for affordable, and potentially smaller units for the city’s older residents.

Figure II-25: Cost Burden by Household Type in Lake Forest Park, 2020



Source: 2020 HUD Comprehensive Affordability Strategy (CHAS).

Disability

About 14 percent of the households in Lake Forest Park have one or more members with a disability, according to the most recently available HUD data shown below in **Error! Reference source not found.** II-5. These numbers show households where any member has one of the limitations listed. Note that some residents may have more than one limitation, so the totals do not add up to 100 percent.

When planning for housing, it is important to take into consideration households which may need accessible units or units without stairs. Additionally, this data shows the need for some assisted living facilities in the city.

Table II- 5: Disability in Lake Forest Park, 2020

Disability Status	Number of Households	Share of Households
Household member has a cognitive limitation	285	5%
Household member has a hearing or vision impairment	260	5%
Household member has a self-care or independent living limitation	325	6%
Household member has an ambulatory limitation	300	6%
Household member has none of the above limitations	4,520	86%

Source: 2020 HUD Comprehensive Affordability Strategy (CHAS).


Where We Live

The following provides a brief overview of housing characteristics in Lake Forest Park, including inventory, market trends, affordability, and special needs housing.

Inventory

Lake Forest Park’s housing inventory reflects the City’s history as a low-density residential community. Most of Lake Forest Park’s housing units are single-family homes, at 82 percent, compared to 52 percent across King County and 63 percent statewide. About 4 percent of units in the city are “Middle Housing” units of between 2 and 9 units, and the remaining 15 percent are in apartment buildings of 10 units or more. As discussed previously, a lack of diversity of housing types can present barriers to housing for some segments of the population.


Figure II-26: Housing Unit Type in Lake Forest Park, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Table DP04).

When compared with neighboring communities, Lake Forest Park has the highest share of single-family homes, at 82 percent, as shown on the following page in Figure II-27. Although this is higher than other cities, the regional market is dominated by single family homes.


Figure II-27: Occupied Housing Types in Lake Forest Park with Comparison Communities, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Table S2504).

Housing in Lake Forest Park was predominantly built between 1950 and 1980, with very little production since the 1980s compared with King County as a whole, as shown below. A lack of sufficient production to keep up with housing demand can hamper housing affordability, as discussed subsequently in this report.

Figure II-28: Year Housing Built in Lake Forest Park, 2021




Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Table DP04).

As in 2012, the age of Lake Forest Park’s housing stock is more similar to the city of Shoreline’s compared with other neighboring jurisdictions. Just under one third of Lake Forest Park’s housing was built before 1960 and an additional 41 percent was built between 1960 and 1979. In Woodinville, over three quarters of housing units were built in 1980 or later.

In some communities, the presence of a relatively large inventory of older housing may be associated with lower prices and increased affordability. However, in the case of Lake Forest Park, housing values have remained high. This is likely due to a number of factors, including the unique natural setting, proximity to employment centers, construction quality, school district reputation, and others. Over time, the demand for housing in Lake Forest Park has remained strong while supply has failed to keep up with the increase in regional population.

Figure II-29: Age of Housing in Lake Forest Park and Comparison Communities, 2021



Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Table DP04).

Housing Value

As was the case in 2012, as of 2021 Lake Forest Park has a high proportion of property owners to renters compared to surrounding communities. The city also has comparatively high home values. Although the city has significantly fewer rental units compared to surrounding communities, rental rates are comparable with the surrounding communities.

Table II-6: Tenure and Housing Value in Lake Forest Park with Comparison Communities, 2021

	Lake Forest Park	Bothell	Kenmore	Shoreline	Woodinville
Median Home Value	\$746,400	\$638,000	\$656,200	\$627,500	\$770,800
Total Occupied Units	5,308	18,371	9,266	22,510	5,527
Percent Owner Occupied	78.8%	64.8%	69.6%	67.1%	61.4%
Percent Renter Occupied	21.2%	35.2%	30.4%	32.9%	38.6%
Median Rent	\$1,839	\$1,956	\$1,704	\$1,730	\$2,097


Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Table DP04).

Housing Development Trends

Single-family housing production in Lake Forest Park has followed prevailing economic trends over the past few decades, as shown below in Figure II-30. About 15-30 units per year were permitted in from the mid-1990s until the 2008 recession. After the economy recovered, single-family development resumed a similar pace with the addition of some multifamily, triplex and four-plex construction in 2015-2018.

The city has not seen any new multifamily projects permitted since 2018 and a lower rate of single-family construction in the past five years as well. There has been a slight uptick in ADU permitting in recent years, with several units permitted in 2020 and 2022, and additional ADU allowances adopted by the council in 2022.

Figure II-30: Housing Permits Issued in Lake Forest Park, 1992-2022




Source: US Census Building Permits Survey.

Home Sales

Sales prices in Lake Forest Park have been rising steadily over the past decade from around \$400,000 in 2012 to around \$1,000,000 in mid-2023, an increase of 150 percent, as shown Figure II-31. As with many suburban municipalities, housing prices rose rapidly immediately following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, though they subsided slightly as the housing market cooled in 2022. However, in 2023 prices have been slowly rising again.


Figure II-31: Lake Forest Park Median Home Sales Prices, 2012-2023



Source: Redfin.

The chart below shows the breakdown of sales prices for homes sold in Lake Forest Park between 2022 and 2023. Most single-family homes sold were relatively close to the median sales price of \$1 million, although there were several sales in excess of \$2 million and very few houses sold for under \$700,000. On the other hand, condos and townhomes sold in the past year were considerably less expensive, with most condos selling for between \$300,000 and \$500,000, and townhomes averaging slightly higher. This shows the value to potential homebuyers which can be achieved through increased density of development in ownership housing.

Figure II-32: Lake Forest Park Home Sales by Price and Type, July 2022-July 2023




Source: Redfin.

Rental Market Trends

Rents in Lake Forest Park have also been increasing over the past decade, as reported by the Census. The median rent in 2021 was \$1,839, just above the King County average of \$1,801. This is significantly higher than the statewide rent average. Rent prices are more difficult to track than housing sales prices and Census rent data often underestimates or lags behind the market reality. Costar, a national commercial real estate data provider, estimates current average rents in Lake Forest Park at \$1,993 as of mid-2023. Overall, the Census data does show a general picture of increasing rents in the city and region.


Figure II-33: Median Gross Rent in Lake Forest Park, 2011-2021



Source: US Census 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Table DP03).

The chart below shows the change in rent and home values compared with the change in household income in Lake Forest Park over the past decade. Although home prices and incomes were relatively stable in the first half of the 2010s, both have increased significantly in recent years, with home prices and rental prices outpacing income growth overall.

Figure II-34: Change in Rent, Home Value, and Income in Lake Forest Park, 2010-2021




Source: US Census 2021 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (Tables S2503, DPO3); Zillow.

Housing Affordability

The chart below shows the price of housing that would be affordable to various Lake Forest Park households based on their income, using the average 2023 year-to-date sales price from Redfin, Freddie Mac mortgage interest rates as of August 2023, and 2023 income estimates from ESRI, a global provider of Geographic Information Systems data.

A household earning the median income of \$150,000 could afford a home worth about \$570,000, whereas the median home sales price in the city is \$445,000 higher, at \$1.02 million. Or, to put it another way, the median household would need to earn \$117,000 more in order to afford the median home price.

Figure II-35: Housing Affordability in Lake Forest Park, 2023



Source: Esri; Redfin; Freddie Mac; Leland Consulting Group.



Comparing this data with the breakdown of household incomes shown earlier in this report, less than 25 percent of Lake Forest Park households would be able to afford the median home in the city as of this year. On the other hand, the types of housing which would be affordable to households earning the median income – housing priced around the \$500,000 mark – is condominium or townhome units, based on sales prices from the past year in Lake Forest Park shown previously.

As the city plans for future housing needs, this gap between incomes and housing prices will need to be carefully considered to ensure the availability of housing to a wider range of current and future residents of Lake Forest Park.

Special Needs Housing

In Lake Forest Park, the Woodland North apartments are part of the King County Housing Authority’s moderate income housing program. The development contains 105 units, comprised of a mix of studio, one-bedroom and two-bedroom apartments. The Housing Authority’s moderate income program is for people who can pay rent closer to market rates. Tenants pay a flat rent amount each month instead of a percentage of income. Three adult family homes, providing a total of 18 units and including a mix of assisted living and Alzheimer’s memory care services, are located in Lake Forest Park.


Where We Work

Employment

Lake Forest Park is primarily a residential community with little commercial development or activity outside of the Town Center and Southern Gateway. In 2022, the jobs-to-housing ratio was 0.34, compared to the King County average of 1.34.

Overall, Lake Forest Park’s employment numbers have been steady over the past two decades as shown here, and the breakdown by sector has also been consistent, particularly over the past decade. The services sector accounts for the largest share of jobs, and has seen a small spike post-pandemic, up to 1,006 jobs in 2022. The retail sector is the city’s second largest, and construction, education, and government each employ around 150 people in the city. There are much smaller numbers of jobs in warehousing and transportation, finance, and manufacturing.

Figure II-36: Employment by Sector in Lake Forest Park, 2000-2022



Source: Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Covered Employment Estimates.


Workforce Housing Affordability

Lake Forest Park’s top job sectors shown previously are generally sectors with relatively low wages. This chart shows the latest wages for retail workers, construction workers, teachers, and an average of a variety of service industry jobs in the Seattle Metro region as of 2023. All of these jobs, but particularly those in services and retail, are paying substantially lower wages than the Lake Forest Park median income. When compared with the most recent rent data in the city from CoStar, employees in all of these sectors (except teachers) would be cost-burdened, spending more than 30, or in some cases, more than 50 percent of their income to afford the average rents in the city, as shown in the yellow boxes.


From the perspective of ownership housing, only teachers would be able to afford any of the units which sold in the city over the past year, and then only at the price points of some condominium or townhome units, around \$350,000.

This shows that Lake Forest Park is essentially unaffordable to the majority of employees in its main employment sectors, particularly in a single-income household. If the city wishes to provide housing for its service and retail employees, reduce commuting, and provide more housing choice for workers in the city, more affordable units and smaller units will need to be developed in the city in the coming decades.

Figure II-37: Wages and Housing Costs for Top Employment Sectors in Lake Forest Park, 2023




Source: Washington Employment Security Department; CoStar; LCG.



Commuting Patterns


Most Lake Forest Park residents commute out to work, as shown in Figure II-38, from the most recently available Census commuting data. The heatmap in **Error! Reference source not found.** shows employment density in the city, with most jobs concentrated in the Town Center and Southern Gateway, as well as some commercial activity at Ballinger and 35th.

Figure II-38: Commuting Patterns in Lake Forest Park, 2020



Source: U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) via Census OnTheMap

Figure II-39: Lake Forest Park Employment Location Heatmap, 2020



Conclusions and Considerations

The data presented in this Housing Needs Assessment points to several important considerations for the potential needs of Lake Forest Park residents over the course of the planning horizon:

- **Aging Population:** The city’s older population is increasing, signaling a potential need for smaller and/or more easily accessible units.
- **Challenges for Renter Households:** Lake Forest Park’s renter households are significantly lower-income than homeowners, face higher rates of housing cost burden, are more racially and ethnically diverse, and are generally smaller households. More affordable units and a greater quantity and variety of rental units, ranging from apartments to ADUs, would better meet the needs of Lake Forest Park’s renter households.
- **Challenges for Workers:** The main job sectors in Lake Forest Park pay wages which are not sufficient for those employees to live comfortably in the city. Increasing housing choice would help employees have the opportunity to live in Lake Forest Park, reducing commuting time and resources and balancing jobs and housing.
- **Lack of Housing Size Options:** The vast majority of housing in the city are larger single-family homes. This provides fewer options for smaller households or those who wish to downsize. Smaller units also tend to be more affordable.
- **Limited Land Availability:** Lake Forest Park is zoned nearly exclusively for single-family development, and much of it is built out, with significant environmental constraints in many areas. There is limited land for denser housing development. Rezoning some areas may increase land capacity, but there are also concerns about displacement of naturally occurring affordable units.
- **High Ownership Housing Prices:** The majority of houses sold in Lake Forest Park in the past year were not affordable to most residents of the city. Housing prices are very high and continuing to increase. Production of more units, particularly townhomes and condominium units which have been selling at prices affordable to a wider range of Lake Forest Park Households, is necessary to help mitigate the continued increase in housing costs.
- **Spatial Equity Considerations:** Lower-income residents, a higher share of BIPOC households, and zones which allow multifamily housing are concentrated in several small areas of Lake Forest Park. Creating more opportunities for all residents to live in a larger area of the city through an increase in housing types such as ADUs and duplexes, which increase affordability while still maintaining neighborhood character, could help alleviate these spatial inequities.

ED: Economic Development



Introduction & Approach

Background and Purpose

The City of Lake Forest Park is a suburban community strategically located near several major employment centers. This section contains background analysis on the economy of the city, including jobs in Lake Forest Park as well as employment sectors of Lake Forest Park residents. It also provides a snapshot of demographic indicators relevant to the economy and to potential development in the city, as well as an overview of the regional real estate market. This background data supports the Economic Development Goals and Policies in the Comprehensive Plan.

Organization of this Section

- Section 1: Demographic Profile.** Detailed analysis of the city’s demographics as they relate to economic development).
- Section 2: Commercial Uses.** Analysis of employment, industries and workforce in the City.
- Section 3: Real Estate Indicators.** A brief snapshot of the City’s current real estate market.

Peer City Framework

To better understand Lake Forest Park’s position within the region and how it compares to other nearby communities, a peer city framework is utilized. This framework highlights ways in which the city differs from surrounding communities, revealing potential market opportunities. Peer cities were selected based on their proximity to Lake Forest Park and relevance to the City’s economy, residential and commercial development patterns, traffic and commerce.

- **Bothell:** Neighbor
- **Kenmore:** Neighbor
- **Shoreline:** Neighbor
- **Mountlake Terrace:** Neighbor
- **Pierce and King Counties:** Regional




Demographic Profile

Population

The demographic profile provides details on the City of Lake Forest Park and its residents. To better understand Lake Forest Park’s position within the region and how it differs from other communities, a series of analyses were conducted with a focus on the city’s people, their occupations, where they live and who they are. The analysis is used to provide context for future land use scenarios and further cement our understanding of the City’s economy.

Figure II-40 illustrates the City’s population change from 2013 to 2023, which has remained relatively consistent. Most of Lake Forest Park’s comparison communities, particularly Bothell and Shoreline, have seen significant amounts of growth over that time, particularly compared to Lake Forest Park’s slower growth rate.

Figure II-40: 2013 and 2023 Population, City of Lake Forest Park and Selected Comparison Cities



Source: Washington Office of Financial Management


Age Distribution

Age distribution is an important piece of demographic data for several reasons:

- It's important to retailers as they make decisions about where to locate new stores
- It's important to real estate developers as they make decisions about where to build and what types of units and amenities to offer
- It has implications for a City's housing needs, as discussed further in the Housing Element background chapter

Lake Forest Park's age distribution reflects an older demographic, with almost 50% of residents at or above 45 years of age, as shown below in Figure II-41. Shoreline has a similar demographic breakdown, but the other comparison cities have somewhat younger populations, particularly Bothell.

Figure II-41: Age Distribution in Lake Forest Park and Selected Comparison Cities, 2022




Source: American Community Survey 2022 5-Year Estimates

Educational Attainment

Figure II-42 presents the educational attainment levels in Lake Forest Park and comparison communities. The share of residents with a bachelor’s degree or higher is one common metric that describes how well-educated the residents of a city are. As shown below, Lake Forest Park residents are generally more highly educated than many peer communities.

- Educational attainment is closely related to household income, which drives spending power and dictates retail potential; in this way, educational attainment impacts retail demand and consumer preferences
- Higher levels of attainment have the potential to influence housing demand and housing mix

Figure II-42: Educational Attainment in Lake Forest Park with Selected Comparison Cities, 2022




Source: American Community Survey 2022 5-Year Estimates

Household Income

Figure II-43 below shows the median household income for Lake Forest Park and the selected comparison cities. With a median household income of over \$130,000, Lake Forest Park residents tend to have higher incomes than residents of the comparison cities.

- Household income is a key factor for retailers, especially national chains, when choosing where to locate a new store
- Higher incomes typically equate to increased disposable income and buying power

Figure II-43: Median Household Income in Lake Forest Park and Comparison Communities, 2021



Source: US Census Bureau, 2021 5-Year American Community Survey (Table S1901)

Housing Tenure

Lake Forest Park has a rate of home ownership that is significantly higher than the selected comparison cities, with 78.8 percent of households owning their homes, compared to homeownership rates between 61 and 69 percent in the comparison cities (see Figure 30 in the Housing Element Background Analysis).

The decision to purchase a home is often dependent on a number of factors, including an individual or family's financial preparedness, the state of the housing market, and long-term residency plans. Lake Forest Park's older, wealthier resident base is likely to prefer home ownership due to their ability to afford the home purchase and their plan to stay in Lake Forest Park for an extended period of time. However, the relative lack of more affordable home ownership options in the city, and fewer rental properties, means large segments of the regional economy are unable to afford a home in Lake Forest Park, including many of the city's existing labor force.

The high level of home ownership is mirrored by the high proportion of single-family housing units in Lake Forest Park (see Figure II-27 in the Housing Element Background Analysis). However, many older adults are down-sizing as they seek flexibility and carefree maintenance in their housing choices. These trends appear to favor multifamily construction, and there may be an opportunity to cater to current and aspiring Lake Forest Park residents by building for-sale multifamily products (e.g. condominiums).

Housing Type

82% of all housing units in Lake Forest Park are single family units; this is the highest proportion of single family housing units among all comparison cities (see Figure II-27 in the Housing Element Background Analysis).

Because owner-occupied multifamily units are rare in Lake Forest Park, the high level of home ownership is consistent with the high proportion of single family housing in the City.

Figure II-27 in the Housing Element Background Analysis illustrates the composition of Lake Forest Park household characteristics. These data help to better understand target markets for retail segmentation, and allow the City to make policy decisions that reflect the needs and wants of Lake Forest Park residents.

Commercial Uses

Local Employment

Examining the commercial uses in the City starts with studying local employment and the users of commercial land. The data in Figure 5 below characterize Lake Forest Park employment by job sector. Services and Retail account for a larger portion of jobs in Lake Forest Park than in any other comparison city. In Lake Forest Park, these sectors account for 69% of all jobs. Total employment in Lake Forest Park is significantly lower than in the comparison cities.

Table II-7: Employment by Sector, City of Lake Forest Park and Selected Comparison Cities, 2022

Employment by Sector by Number

	# Employed	Services	Retail	FIRE	Education	Manufacturing	Government	Const/Res	WTU
Lake Forest Park	1,866	1,006	271	63	149	7	129	189	52
Bothell	32,421	15,380	2,133	3,010	2,670	4,619	780	1,734	2,096
Kenmore	4,283	1,916	454	185	551	79	170	523	403
Mountlake Terrace	8,372	2,927	603	2,895	468	195	359	588	338
Shoreline	15,851	7,533	2,566	517	2,063	95	2,041	756	279

Employment by Sector by Percentage

	# Employed	Services	Retail	FIRE	Education	Manufacturing	Government	Const/Res	WTU
Lake Forest Park	1,866	54%	15%	3%	8%	0%	7%	10%	3%
Bothell	32,421	47%	7%	9%	8%	14%	2%	5%	6%
Kenmore	4,283	45%	11%	4%	13%	2%	4%	12%	9%
Mountlake Terrace	8,372	35%	7%	35%	6%	2%	4%	7%	4%
Shoreline	15,851	48%	16%	3%	13%	1%	13%	5%	2%

Note: FIRE = Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate; WTU = Warehouse, Transportation and Utilities

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council Covered Employment Estimates

Resident Occupations

The data in Table II-8 and Figure II-44 characterize the occupations of Lake Forest Park residents. Understanding the type of jobs residents have compared to the region can serve as an indicator for resident preferences and needs. Most notably, the mix of occupations of Lake Forest Park residents does not differ substantially from King County as a whole, although a smaller percentage of people have jobs in the technology (Information) sector, and higher percentage work in educational services. Fifteen percent of Lake Forest Park residents are self employed, down from 20 percent in 2012.







Table II-8: Jobs by Sector Worked by Lake Forest Park and King County Residents, 2021

	Lake Forest Park	King County
Health Care and Social Assistance	15%	13%
Educational Services	12%	7%
Retail Trade	12%	13%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	11%	11%
Information	7%	11%
Manufacturing	6%	6%
Accommodation and Food Services	6%	6%
Construction	5%	5%
Administration & Support, Waste Management and Remediation	4%	5%
Finance and Insurance	4%	3%
Other Services (excluding Public Administration)	3%	3%
Wholesale Trade	3%	4%
Public Administration	3%	3%
Transportation and Warehousing	3%	4%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	2%	2%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	2%	2%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	1%	2%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	0%	0%
Utilities	0%	0%
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	0%	0%

Source: Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics (LEHD) via Census OnTheMap

Figure II-44: Self-Employment in Lake Forest Park and Selected Comparison Cities, 2022




Source: American Community Survey 2022 Five-Year Estimates

Resident and Employee Commuting Patterns

The majority of people who work in Lake Forest Park do not live within city limits and are distributed in a wide range of locations in Lake Forest Park’s vicinity. Very few residents of the city also work in the city (only about 100 residents) as shown in Figure 8, from the most recently available Census commuting data.

Figure II-45: Commuting Patterns in Lake Forest Park, 2020



Source: U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) via Census OnTheMap

Workers in Lake Forest Park primarily commute in from Seattle (20%), and Shoreline (7%), as well as in smaller numbers from Everett, Kenmore, Kirkland, Lynnwood, and other surrounding municipalities.

Lake Forest Park residents mostly work outside of the City in major employment centers like Seattle and Bellevue, as shown below in Table II-9.

Table II-9: Work Locations of Lake Forest Park Residents, 2021


	Count	Share
Seattle city, WA	2,907	46.2%
Bellevue city, WA	437	6.9%
Shoreline city, WA	303	4.8%
Redmond city, WA	261	4.2%
Everett city, WA	236	3.8%
Bothell city, WA	230	3.7%
Kirkland city, WA	201	3.2%
Lynnwood city, WA	157	2.5%
Lake Forest Park city, WA	100	1.6%
Edmonds city, WA	92	1.5%
All Other Locations	1,364	21.7%

Source: Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics (LEHD) via Census OnTheMap

Jobs-to-Housing

The jobs-to-housing ratio illustrates whether a city is an employment center or bedroom community. Lake Forest Park’s 2022 jobs-to-housing ratio of 0.34 means that the city has nearly three times more housing units than jobs, indicating that the city is a bedroom community where residents commute elsewhere for their jobs. Lake Forest Park’s jobs-to-housing ratio remained essentially constant from 2012-2022. Cities such as Bothell and Shoreline which have seen significant housing construction in the past decade have seen their jobs-to-housing ratio fall notably.

Figure II-46: Jobs-to-Housing Ratio in Lake Forest Park and Selected Comparison Cities, 2012-2022



Source: Washington Office of Financial Management, Puget Sound Regional Council

Relative to the comparison cities and the region as a whole, Lake Forest Park has one of the lowest jobs-to-housing ratios, with neighboring Mountlake Terrace having a ratio of 0.78. Bothell, on the other hand, has a relatively high jobs to housing ratio of 1.56 and serves as an employment center for the region. Regional policy guidance suggests that cities with low jobs-to-housing ratios should work to increase the number to align with regional goals to reduce commuting times, traffic, and emissions, and encourage residents to live closer to where they work.

Figure II-47 below shows Lake Forest Park’s employment target as set by King County – an additional 550 jobs by 2044.

Figure II-47: Lake Forest Park Baseline and Target Jobs, 2019-2044



Source: King County Countywide Planning Policies

The city must show capacity to meet these targets through zoning of vacant or redevelopable land. As outlined in the “Land Capacity Analysis Methodology and Results” appendix, **Lake Forest**

Park has zoned capacity for 676 jobs, a surplus capacity of 126 over the target, on land classified by King County as vacant or redevelopable. This capacity primarily takes the form of potential expansion of retail or other commercial space in the Town Center, as well as ground floor commercial space in potential redevelopment in the Southern Gateway area

Real Estate Indicators

Real Estate Market Conditions


The following section provides an overview of the real estate market for multifamily housing, office and retail uses. Overall, as shown in the map on the following page in Figure II-48, commercial uses in Lake Forest Park are clustered in the small amount of commercial and mixed-use zoning in the city. **There have not been any significant commercial or multifamily developments in the city in the past decade**, although there have been several recent multifamily projects in Seattle just south of the city limits, shown with dotted outlines below.

The market for **multifamily** development in the greater Bothell-Kenmore submarket, which includes Lake Forest Park, has been very strong in the past decade, and multifamily development has continued even as interest rates have risen in the past year, with 560 units being constructed in the submarket in the past year, with average rents at about \$2.50 per square foot according to CoStar, up from about \$1.30 a decade ago. As shown in Figure II-48, **this boom in multifamily development has not resulted in any new units in Lake Forest Park, though the regional market is expected to remain strong.**

Figure II-49 shows recent multifamily rents in the larger submarket and in Lake Forest Park. Multifamily rents are somewhat lower in Lake Forest Park but track the overall recent rent growth trends of the larger submarket. Vacancy rates in the area have spiked recently in several rounds of new construction, but CoStar forecasts a gradual stabilization of vacancy once units in the pipeline are filled and continued rent growth in the region and the city, showing the expected continuation of demand for multifamily development. **Additional multifamily housing can benefit the local economy by increasing the city's customer base and supporting new retail development.**




Figure II-48: Commercial Development in Lake Forest Park



Source: CoStar.


Figure II-49: Multifamily Vacancy and Market Rent in Bothell-Kenmore Submarket and Lake Forest Park, 2014-2029 (forecast)



Source: CoStar.

The **office** market in the Bothell/Kenmore submarket has not seen significant construction in recent years. **Aside from one project in 2021, there has not been any new office development since 2015, and CoStar forecasts this trend to continue for at least the next five years.** The pandemic and reduced in-person office work has caused vacancy rates to rise in the submarket to around 15 percent, similar to the Seattle metro overall. As shown in Figure II-50, according to CoStar, **vacancy rates have been increasing and are also forecast to continue their upward trend.**

Figure II-50: Office Vacancy and Net Deliveries in Bothell-Kenmore Submarket and Seattle, 2014-2029 (forecast)




Source: CoStar.

Office rents in the area are around \$33 per square foot, slightly lower than the Seattle metro’s rates of around \$37. With such high vacancy and changes in remote and hybrid work, **it is unlikely that there will be significant office construction in the near term in the area, and particularly in Lake Forest Park, given the small amount of commercial zoning.**

As with office development, there has not been significant **retail** construction in the Bothell/Kenmore submarket, which includes Lake Forest Park, in recent years. However, **retail overall has fared considerably better than office in the past several years as people have returned to in-person shopping and dining since the pandemic.**

Retail vacancy in the larger submarket is around 3 percent but is even lower in Lake Forest Park. As shown on the following page in Figure II-51, retail vacancy increased during the COVID-19 pandemic, but has since gone down to essentially zero, suggesting that **there is potential demand for new retail space in the city.**

Figure II-51: Retail Vacancy Rate in Lake Forest Park, 2014-2029 (Forecast)



Source: CoStar.



Key Takeaways

Lake Forest Park’s population has not grown significantly in the past decade compared with peer cities.

- The population of Lake Forest Park is older, wealthier, more highly educated, and has a higher share of homeowners than nearby peer communities, suggesting potential demand for ownership housing and significant spending potential.
- Service and retail jobs are the largest sectors in Lake Forest Park, although the city has considerably fewer jobs overall than peer communities.
- Residents of Lake Forest Park work in similar sectors as overall King County averages, and most residents commute out to work, primarily in Seattle and Bellevue, with only about 100 people both living and working in the city.
- Lake Forest Park’s jobs-to-housing ratio is 0.34, showing that it serves as a bedroom community overall.
- The city has a target of 550 new jobs by 2044, and there is sufficient land capacity for 656 jobs under current zoning. The potential for new jobs takes the form of potential redevelopment in the Town Center and potential ground-floor commercial in multifamily development in the Southern Gateway.
- The market for multifamily real estate in the Bothell-Kenmore submarket, which includes Lake Forest Park, remains strong despite recent interest rate increases, though the city itself has not seen any multifamily development in the past decade.
- There has been very little office or retail development in the Bothell-Kenmore submarket in the past decade, although the existing retail space in Lake Forest Park is nearly completely leased, suggesting that the city could support new retail space in redevelopment in the Town Center.

CSPS: Community Services & Public Safety



Introduction

This section contains information that was used in developing the update of the goals and policies in the Community Services & Public Safety Element of the Comprehensive Plan, including:

- Community Services,
- Public Safety,
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

Community Services Background

Community Services range from basic services for people in immediate need to preventive and ongoing support, which includes emergency shelters, food banks, workforce development, education, and recreational programs. Lake Forest Park works closely with neighboring cities, the Shoreline School District, United Way, Third Place Commons, Shoreline Lake Forest Park Senior Center, and Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council, as well as other human and cultural community service agencies to combine resources and foster a continuum of care.

Lake Forest Park has a great deal of community strengths and assets. A county library located in the Lake Forest Park Town Center provides family literacy programs. The Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council provides free family engagement opportunities and arts education through schools and other venues. Third Place Commons offers a forum for the city and serves as a community center which provides multigenerational cultural, recreational, and educational activities. The Commons hosts the Farmers Market and sponsors a food assistance program to help individuals and families access fresh, healthy produce.

The Shoreline Lake Forest Park Senior Center located in Shoreline and the Northshore Senior Center in Bothell serve Lake Forest Park’s seniors. The Center for Human Services in Shoreline and Northshore Family Services in Bothell provide drug and alcohol treatment, family support, and family counseling. The area’s food banks include Hopelink in Shoreline and the North Helpline in Lake City. Hopelink also provides other emergency services to the area’s residents such as energy and rent assistance and shelter. More than one hundred agencies report that they provide services to residents in North King County with United Way funding, and approximately twelve have local sites or regularly deliver services out of a site in this area. Many residents also travel to neighboring cities to obtain services.

Public transportation is improving, but many believe it is still inadequate in north King County. Some seniors use the Shoreline Lake Forest Park Senior Center shuttle, and King County Metro provides Access Transportation vans for qualified residents. Some residents are eligible to use private transportation to access services.

Areas of Emphasis

This section provides information that supports the community service goals and policies related to domestic violence, children and youth, and seniors. In addition, other relevant information can be found in the figures and tables of Volume II: Housing Background Analysis.

Domestic Violence Victims

Domestic violence continues to be a concern in the city, however, the number of calls responded to by police has dropped. In 2013, the police responded to 77 domestic violence-related calls (see Table II.10), which was a 37 percent reduction from the number of calls in 2009. There are few shelters for women and their families to leave an abusive environment. Many people are forced to remain with an abusive partner for lack of options.

Table II.10: Domestic Violence-Related Emergency Calls (2009-2013)

Domestic Violence	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Verbal					
Assault					
Order Violations					
Harassment					
Rape					
Malicious Mischief					
Burglary					
Trespass					
TOTAL					

Children and Youth

There are many activities and programs for children and youth in the city and within a five-mile radius. The Shoreline Children’s Center operates after school programs in Lake Forest Park, Brookside, and Briarcrest elementary schools. There is a teen center located at The Rec in Shoreline; the City of Shoreline and the YMCA facilitate Hang Time, an after-school program at Kellogg Middle School. There are hundreds of programs and classes available through the City of Shoreline’s recreation program at the Spartan Recreation Center and Shoreline Pool, most low-cost and/or available with “resident” discounts. Day camps in the summer—operated by Shoreline, the YMCA, the Arts Council, the Kruckeberg Botanic Garden, and others—offer sports, arts, and nature activities. Transportation is sometimes cited as a problem for youth, as they require adults with cars to access these programs. Carpooling and non-motorized transportation facilities could mitigate this issue.

The City supports after-school youth programs, day camps and creative activities for youth. The Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Youth Court (SLFPYC) helps instill positive values and enables youth to serve others in their community. Youth are recruited to serve on a commission and to participate in community service activities. The Youth Council’s activities have included volunteering for work parties improving City parks, food packing for Food Lifeline in Shoreline, assisting with the community engagement process for the Comprehensive Plan update, and having dialogues with City department heads about City initiatives.

Seniors

The population of Lake Forest Park is getting older. According to the 2021 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, the percentage of residents aged 65 years and older has increased from 17 percent in 2012 to 18 percent in 2021.⁴ Additionally, the median age has decreased from 45 years in 2012, to 43.4 years in 2021, which could indicate a need for increased senior care in the future.

There are two organizations that offer engaging and supportive services to elderly residents in the area: the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park and Northshore Senior Centers. The Shoreline/LFP Senior Center offers home chore services and Meals on Wheels for frail and disabled residents. The City of Shoreline provides recreation activities for active seniors; one in particular is the free Shoreline Walks program, which has established a variety of routes for adults aged 50 years and over to explore with volunteer guides.

The need for affordable and market rate senior housing and assisted living ranks high among seniors and geriatric professionals. There are limited housing options or areas in the city that are suitable for building housing for seniors. When seniors are no longer able to drive, the hilly terrain and limited public transportation options can present challenges for getting around the city. Senior housing in an area that accommodates transportation and services is ideal. Currently, there are no requirements for senior housing in the City’s land use regulations.



⁴ The American Community Survey (ACS) is an ongoing statistical survey by the U.S. Census Bureau. The ACS is based on a statistical sampling of data rather than the complete counts taken every ten years. It allows communities to estimate changes to demographic characteristics during the period between the decennial censuses.

Public Safety Background

Police Department

There are 22 full time employees assigned to the Lake Forest Park Police Department. Most of the officers are in the patrol division; additionally, the Police Department has a traffic unit, criminal investigation detectives, canine unit, professional support staff, sergeants, a captain, and police chief.

In 2013, the average response time to calls for service for Lake Forest Park Police was two minutes and 17 seconds; the national standard is over five minutes. The Lake Forest Park Police Department partners with the King County Sheriff’s Office and the Coalition of Small Police Agencies (CSPA) for specialized services, homicide/robbery investigations, SWAT, K9, air support, bomb technicians, training, and other services.

Burglaries decreased from 91 in 2012, to 80 in 2013, thefts from vehicles remained the same, and vehicle prowls were down. Citations for driving under the influence (DUIs) increased by 36 percent from the previous year. The Lake Forest Park Police Department focused its efforts on reducing burglary and other property crimes, preventing crime, and creating an environment where people feel safe.

The police department will make several changes to focus on crime prevention and identifying and apprehending high impact offenders. Four areas the police will set clear direction and goals are:

- Reduce crime and collision loss in the community,
- Provide quality services and innovative police strategies delivered through excellent customer service,
- Provide appropriate resources to employees that foster a safe, ethical, innovative, knowledgeable, and diverse workforce,
- Provide emergency management oversight for City infrastructure and the community.

Hazard Mitigation Plan

The Lake Forest Park *Hazard Mitigation Plan* is the result of a partnership of local governments and regional stakeholders in King County, working together to update the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The purpose of this plan is to help local governments reduce the exposure of residents to risks from natural hazards, such as earthquakes and floods.

This plan was first created in 2004 and was updated in 2009. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA) require these plans to be updated every five years to maintain eligibility for assistance. The DMA improves upon the planning process to emphasize the importance of mitigation and encourages communities to plan for disasters before they occur.

- Organizing resources
- Assessing risk
- Engaging the public
- Identifying goals and objectives
- Identifying actions
- Developing plan maintenance and implementation strategies

The 2015 draft **Hazard Mitigation Plan** is available online at: www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1972.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)⁵

CPTED principles consider the entire neighborhood to identify areas or elements that may have the potential to attract crime. Knowing simple CPTED design principles can lead to solutions that can be undertaken to reduce perceptions of fear and prevent crime in these areas. CPTED can guide the designs for future neighborhood development. There are some basic strategies that can be incorporated into discussions with neighborhood groups for shared areas, such as parks or alleys. There are also strategies for personal property.

Natural Surveillance

CPTED does not promote the “fortressing” of properties; quite the contrary. The ability to see what is going on in and around a property should be the priority. Perpetrators of crime are attracted to areas and residences with low visibility. This can be counteracted in the following ways:

- **Lighting.** Streetlights should be well spaced and in working order, alleys and parking areas should also be lit. Lighting should reflect the intended hours of operation, i.e., lighting at playfields or structures in local parks may encourage after hour criminal activities. Motion-sensing lights perform the double duty of providing light when needed and letting trespasser know that “they have been seen.”

⁵ Source: <http://www.seattle.gov/police/prevention/neighborhood/cpted.htm>.

- **Landscaping.** Generally, uniformly shaped sites are safer than irregularly shaped sites because they provide fewer hiding places. Plants should follow the 3-8 rule: hedges no higher than 3 feet, and tree canopies starting no lower than 8 feet. This is especially important around entryways and windows.
- **Fencing.** Fences should allow people to see in. Even if the fences are built for privacy, the design should have some visibility and not be too tall.
- **Windows.** Windows that look out on streets and alleys are good natural surveillance, especially bay windows, and should not be blocked. This is a design concept referred to as “eyes on the street.”

Natural Access Control

Access Control refers to homes, businesses, parks, and other public areas that have distinct and legitimate points for entry and exit. However, this should also be balanced to avoid “user entrapment,” which does not allow for easy escape or police response to an area. Generally, crime is reduced in areas that only allow one way to enter and exit, and that have high visibility and/or a high volume of user traffic. This can be assured by:

- **Park designs with open, uninhibited access and a defined entry point.** A good example is a park with transparent fencing around the perimeter, and one large opening in the gate for entry. Putting vendors or shared public facilities near this entrance creates more traffic and more surveillance.
- **Businesses with one legitimate entrance.** Avoid recessed doorways.
- **Public restrooms near centers of activity.** Restrooms can become problem areas if they are located at the ends of long hallways, in foyer entrances with closed doors are far away from the entrance of a park or are not visible from the roadway.
- **Personal residences with front and back doors that are clearly visible and well lit.**

Territoriality/Defensible Space

Territoriality is a way of demonstrating community ownership of a neighborhood. This includes removing graffiti and keeping buildings and yards maintained and refers to small personal touches. Creating flower gardens or boxes, displaying seasonal decorations, or maintaining the plants in traffic circles seems simple, but sends a clear message that people care about the neighborhood. These kinds of personal touches work in business communities as well. More complex design efforts can be undertaken for more dramatic changes. These are some things that should be considered when planning for future growth:

- **Front porches and apartment balconies add to street surveillance.**
- **Traffic plans that consider the size of the neighborhood.** People drive by “feel” more than speed limits; wide, two-lane residential streets can lead to speeding. Traffic circles or increased curb size can help to calm traffic.
- **Institutional architecture that respects the scale and form of the neighborhood.**
- **Clear transitions between private, semi-private, and public areas.**

CF: Capital Facilities



Introduction

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that communities plan for capital facilities to ensure there is an adequate level of facilities and services in place to support development at time of occupancy or use, that new development does not decrease level of service below locally established standards, and that the City has the ability to pay for needed facilities.

The GMA requires that the Capital Facilities Element include an inventory of existing publicly owned capital facilities, a forecast of the future needs for new or expanded facilities, and a capital facilities plan that plans for at least six years and identifies financing sources for the identified future facilities.

Public Facility Providers

Capital facilities in Lake Forest Park are provided by the City and by other entities, as shown in Table II-10 and Table II-11, respectively. The different types of capital facilities are described in the following sections, and include an inventory of existing facilities, a forecast of future needs, and a description of projected capital facility projects and funding sources. Where reliable information could be developed, the City has identified projects over the 20-year time period. Over the next 20 years, the City plans to maintain existing infrastructure and invest in expanded or new infrastructure to support the development patterns called for in the Land Use Element. While Lake Forest Park is largely built out and bordered by other incorporated cities, the population is projected to increase by 10.5% by 2044. The City will continue to work with fellow providers to monitor the performance of existing systems and improve them as needed to provide adequate equitable public services to the community.



Table II- 10: City-Provided Facilities

Capital Facility	Provider
City Hall, Police, & Other Public Buildings	City of Lake Forest Park
Drainage	City of Lake Forest Park
Parks	City of Lake Forest Park
Sewer	City of Lake Forest Park Other Providers (see Table II-xx)
Transportation	City of Lake Forest Park

Table II- 11: Facilities Provided by Other Entities

Capital Facility	Provider
Fire & Emergency Medical Services	Northshore Fire Department
Libraries	King County Library System
Schools	Shoreline School District
Sewer	Northshore Utility District
Water	Lake Forest Park Water District North City Water Utility District Northshore Utility District Seattle Public Utilities

Table II-12 summarizes the total costs of the capital facility improvements the City is planning to make over the next six years. Table II-13 summarizes the funding sources for these

improvements. More detailed information about project costs and funding sources is provided on the following pages.

Table II- 12: Capital Improvement Costs by Type of City Facility (2024-2029)

Capital Facility	Provider
City Hall, Police, & Other Public Buildings	xxx
Drainage	\$5,251,567
Parks	\$359,648
Sewer	\$2,500,000
Transportation	\$7,054,287
TOTAL	xxx

Table II- 13: Funding Sources for City Capital Improvements (2024-2029)

Source	Amount
Capital Facilities	xxx
Grant Opportunities	xxx
Fund	xxx
Surface Water Capital	xxx
Transportation Fund	xxx

REET I allows local jurisdictions to levy up to 0.25 percent of the selling price of real property for financing capital improvements. **REET II** allows local jurisdictions fully planning under the Growth Management Act to levy an additional 0.25 percent to finance capital projects identified in the capital facilities element of the comprehensive plan.

City-Provided Public Facilities

City Hall, Police, & Other Public Buildings

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** Lake Forest Park’s City Hall is located at 17425 Ballinger Way NE. The Lake Forest Park Police Station is located at City Hall. The Public Works Office and Public Works Maintenance Shop are located at 19201 Ballinger Way NE.
- Forecast of Future Needs.** The need for capital improvements to City Hall, police facilities, and other public buildings was updated by City staff by referencing projects from the City’s 2019-2024 *Capital Improvement Plan*. Individual descriptions for currently proposed projects were pulled from the Capital Improvement Plan. In particular, see the “Background,” “Policy Basis,” and “Project Rating” sections of each project for specifics.

*The Capital **Improvement Plan** is a six-year plan for expenditures on infrastructure projects within the city. Additional information is available online at: www.cityofflp.com/index.aspx?nid=134.*

- Capital Projects and Funding.** The capital projects planned for City Hall, police facilities, and other public buildings during the next six years are shown in Table II-14. The location, capacity, and timing of these projects is provided in the City’s 2019-2024 *Capital Improvement Plan*. Funding sources are shown in Table II-15.

Table II-14: Capital Improvement Projects for City Hall, Police Facilities, and Other Public Buildings (2024–2029) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
City Hall Facilities	xxx
Secure Parking	\$88,000
Police Station Sally Port	\$12,000
TOTAL	xxx

Table II-15: Sources for Improvement Funding for City Hall, Police Facilities, and Other Public Buildings (2024–29)

Source	Amount
Capital Facilities	xxx
TOTAL	xxx

The City plans to replace the Public Works building with a new facility on the current site sometime after 2030. The existing Public Works building is a wood frame, two-story former residence that is not conducive to day-to-day public works operations. The City has struggled to make the existing residential structure meet their needs for many years and seeks to improve efficiency with a new facility that is Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified and incorporates recycled materials and low impact development techniques. The preliminary estimated cost for project construction is being investigated by the City.

The City plans to provide 100 percent funding for the project through the City Capital Fund.

The city also has plans to implement various City Hall security projects after 2030.

Drainage

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** The inventory of existing drainage facilities are illustrated in the map on the following page (Figure II-52).
- Forecast of Future Needs.** The need for drainage capital improvements is described in individual project descriptions in the City’s 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan. In particular, see the “Background,” “Policy Basis,” and “Project Rating” sections of each project.
- Capital Projects and Funding.** The capital projects planned for drainage during the next six years are shown in Table II-16. The location, capacity, and timing of these projects is provided in the City’s 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan. Funding sources are shown in Table II-17.


Table II-16: Drainage Capital Improvement Projects (2024-2029) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
Material Bin Covers	\$550,000
Culvert L70 Replacement	\$2,316,329
Culvert L110 Replacement	\$2,385,238
TOTAL	\$5,251,567

Table II-17: Sources for Drainage Capital Improvement Funding (2024-29)

Source	Amount
Surface Water Management Capital Fund	\$5,251,567
TOTAL	\$5,251,567

Figure II-52: City of Lake Forest Park Culvert Map



Beyond the six-year time period, the City plans to replace an 18” culvert on Hillside Creek that is under the 35th Ave NE entrance to Brookside Elementary with a 64” culvert to reduce flooding in the area and enhance fish passage. The estimated cost of the project is \$665,584. The City is also planning for some miscellaneous surface water projects after 2030 with an estimated cost of \$658,224, and plans to replace the L80 (35th Avenue NE) and L90 (NE 185th Street) along with the restoration of the collapsed culvert creek channel within the private property at 18503 Ballinger Way NE. The estimated cost for the L80-L90 culvert replacement is \$9,563,926.

The City is working to identify outside funding sources and plans to provide a 25 percent match. The tentative start date for these projects is sometime after 2030.

Parks

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** The inventory of existing parks, including locations and capacities, is described in the Parks, Trails, & Open Space Element of this Comprehensive Plan.
- Forecast of Future Needs.** The need for park capital improvements is described in individual project descriptions in the City’s 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan. In particular, see the “Background,” “Policy Basis,” and “Project Rating” sections of each project. Additional information about future parks needs is provided in the Parks, Trails, & Open Space Element of this plan.
- Capital Projects and Funding.** The capital projects planned for parks during the next six years are shown in Table II-18. The location, capacity, and timing of the projects is provided in the City’s 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan. Funding sources are shown in Table II-19.

Table II-18: Parks Capital Improvement Projects (2024–2029) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
McKinnon Creek Trail	\$122,145
Tennis Court Lighting at Lake Forest Park Elementary	\$47,500
Animal Acres Park – McAleer Creek Restoration – Hillside Project	\$81,430
Park Property Development – SPU Property	\$108,573
TOTAL	\$359,648

Table II-19: Sources for Parks Capital Improvement Funding (2024-29)

Source	Amount
Capital Improvement	\$359,648
TOTAL	\$359,648

The City has identified additional parks projects it is interested in pursuing such as beyond the six-year time period. Park Property Development on Sims Property that was acquired by the city in 2017.

Potential funding sources for these projects include conservation grants, state funding, federal funding, and parks levy funds.

Sewer

Lake Forest Park is served by two sewer providers, the Lake Forest Park Sewer Department (3,300 customers) and Northshore Utility District (1,500 customers). The following information is about the City’s Sewer Department. The description of the Northshore Utility District’s sewer service is presented in a separate section, below, for facilities provided by other entities.

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** The Sewer Department primarily services areas in the center of the City and north of the central area along Ballinger Way NE and 40th Place NE. The Sewer Department uses a gravity-flow collection system. All components of the system discharge into the King County interceptor lines along McAleer and Lyon Creeks. King County provides sewer transmission, interception, treatment, and disposal for the Sewer Department, as it does for all regional sewer utilities. The City has an agreement with King County through the year 2036. See the map below for an inventory Lake Forest Park sewer facilities.
- Forecast of Future Needs.** The need for sewer capital improvements is described in individual project descriptions in the City’s 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan. In particular, see the “Background,” “Policy Basis,” and “Project Rating” sections of each project. Future sewer capital improvements and expansions will be depend upon the capacity of the current system to support new connections outside of new development such as to an existing homes currently served by a septic system. The direction of housing development decisions related to middle housing or the re-development of the downtown center will dictate future sewer facility needs.
- Capital Projects and Funding.** The location, capacity, and timing of the projects listed in Table II-20, is provided in the City’s 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan. Funding sources are shown in Table II-21.

Figure II- 53: City of Lake Forest Park Sewer Network




Table II-20: Sewer Capital Improvement Projects (2024-2029) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
Beach Drive Sewer Lift Stations	\$2,500,000
TOTAL	\$2,500,000

Table II-21: Funding Sources for Sewer Capital Improvement Projects (2024-29)

Source	Amount
Sewer Capital Fund	\$2,500,000
TOTAL	\$2,500,000

Transportation

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** The inventory of existing transportation facilities, including locations and capacities, is described in the Transportation Element of this Comprehensive Plan.
- Forecast of Future Needs.** The need for transportation capital improvements is described in individual project descriptions in the City’s 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan. In particular, see the “Background,” “Policy Basis,” and “Project Rating” sections of each project. Additional information about future transportation needs is provided in the Transportation Element of this plan.
- Capital Projects and Funding.** The capital projects planned for transportation during the next six years are shown in Table II-22. The location, capacity, and timing of the projects is provided in the City’s 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan. Funding sources are shown in Table II-23.

Table II-22: Transportation Capital Improvement Projects (2024-2044) & Future Cost of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
Transportation Master Plan	\$54,287
SR104 / 40 th PI Roundabout	\$7,000,000
TOTAL	\$7,054,287

Table II-23: Sources for Transportation Capital Improvement Funding (2024-44)

Source	Amount
Transportation Capital Fund	xxx
Future Grant Opportunities	xxx
TOTAL	\$7,054,287

The City has identified a number of street and trail improvements it would like to make in the future. These include sidewalk improvements along 37th Ave N and constructing a grade separated crossing at SR 522 to access the new BRT station. Potential funding sources include conservation grants, state funding, and federal funding.

One of the projects planned for the next six years is development of a Transportation Master Plan. This plan will provide a long-term strategy for the City’s transportation system and detailed information about projected project needs.



Facilities Provided by Other Entities

Fire & Emergency Medical Response Services

Shoreline Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical services, both basic life support and advanced life support, within the city of Lake Forest Park.

- **Inventory of Existing Facilities.** There are two staffed stations within the Fire Department, including Station 57 in Lake Forest Park.
- **Forecast of Future Needs.** Shorelines Fire Department’s facilities are relatively new and were constructed with future growth trends taken into consideration. It is not anticipated that the call volume in Lake Forest Park will exceed the current capability in terms of staffing and facility requirements. The Kenmore station can accommodate additional response units when the increase in the number of calls for service dictates additional staffing.
- **Capital Projects and Funding.** There are no capital projects for fire protection facilities. As such, no funding is projected.

Libraries

The King County Library System provides library services to the City of Lake Forest Park.

- **Inventory of Existing Facilities.** The King County Library system offers services through a branch expanded in 2012 to 5,841 square feet. The Lake Forest Park library has a collection of 41,000 items and provides access to the King County Library System’s collection of over 4.5 million items.
- **Forecast of Future Needs.** There are no plans for the near future to expand or relocate the Lake Forest Park library.
- **Capital Projects and Funding.** There are no specific capital projects proposed for the Lake Forest Park library facility. As such, no funding is projected.

Schools

The City of Lake Forest Park is served by the Shoreline School District. Shoreline School District does not have a capital facilities plan, but is in the process of developing one and expects to have it completed by the Fall of 2015.

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** The district encompasses a 16 square mile area bounded by Puget Sound on the west, Lake Washington to the east, 145th Street to the south, and the King/Snohomish County line to the north. This area includes the City of Shoreline and the City of Lake Forest Park. The district has two high schools, two middle schools, nine elementary schools, and the Shoreline Children’s Center. In addition to these facilities, the district maintains a transportation center and a warehouse with a central kitchen. Facilities located in Lake Forest Park are shown in Table II-24. The district substantially renovated Shorecrest High School in 2012 to meet the Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol.

Table II- 24: Shoreline School District Inventory for Lake Forest Park

Facility	Location	Student Capacity
Lake Forest Park Elementary	18500 37th Ave. NE	575
Brookside Elementary	17447 37th Ave NE	575
Kellogg Middle School	16045 25th Ave NE (outside city limits)	1,000
Cascade K-8 Community School	2800 NE 200th St.	Xxx
Shorecrest High School	15343 25th Ave NE (outside city limits)	1,600

- Forecast of Future Needs.** Shoreline School District expects to complete its Capital Facilities Plan by the Fall of 2015. If the district finds a need to expand capacity, there are a number of steps it could take. These include changing programming to free up classroom space, boundary adjustments, grade reconfiguration, adding portables, and building new facilities.
- Capital Projects and Funding.** Shoreline School District expects to complete its Capital Facilities Plan by the Fall of 2015.

Sewer

Lake Forest Park is served by two sewer providers, the Lake Forest Park Sewer Department, which has 3,300 customers, and Northshore Utility District (NUD), which has 1,300 customers.

The description of the City’s Sewer Department is presented in a separate section, above, for facilities provided by the City.

NUD’s sewer service facilities are described below. Capital facilities information is based on NUD’s 2006 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan, which provides a 20-year wastewater planning strategy intended to serve the needs of current and future sewer customers.

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** Wastewater is collected for NUD through three main King County interceptors. Wastewater from the southeast portion of the District is collected and pumped via the Juanita Bay Pump Station to the South Treatment Plant. Wastewater from the northwest portion is pumped to the West Point Treatment Plan via the Kenmore Pump Station. Both pump stations are owned by King County. The new Brightwater Plant is not going to be used to treat flows from NUD until after 2040. Wastewater treatment is provided on a wholesale basis by King County Metro; NUD holds a contract with King County for treatment through the year 2036.
- Forecast of Future Needs.** Analysis and forecast of future needs is provided in the Wastewater Comprehensive Plan.
- Capital Projects and Funding.** NUD’s 2006 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan provides a list of capital projects planned for 2007–2016. Capital projects for years 2015 and 2016 are summarized in Table II-25. The detailed projects and the location, capacity, and timing of the projects are provided in the plan. Funding is summarized in Table II-26.

Table II- 25: Sewer Capital Improvement Projects (2024-2029) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
xxx	xxx
xxx	xxx
xxx	xxx
TOTAL	xxx

Table II- 26: Funding Sources for Sewer Capital Improvement Projects (2024-29)

Source	Amount
Sewer Capital Fund	xxx
TOTAL	xxx

NUD’s 2006 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan also identifies certain projects that are projected to be needed after 2016. These include purchase of a flush truck in 2019, annual sewer extensions,

and replacement of Lift Station #19 with a gravity sewer line by 2026. Lift Station #19 is located on the east side of I-405 north of NE 160th Street in the City of Bothell.

Water

Four public water utilities serve the City of Lake Forest Park, listed here in order by the percent of City water customers that are served by each utility:

- North City Water District: 44 percent of Lake Forest Park
- Northshore Utility District: 28 percent of Lake Forest Park
- Lake Forest Park Water District: 19 percent of Lake Forest Park
- Seattle Public Utilities: 9 percent of Lake Forest Park

North City Water District (NCWD)

NCWD’s most recent capital improvement plan was prepared as part of the District’s 2020-2030 Water System Plan. The following summary of inventory, forecast of needs, capital projects, and funding are from that Water System Plan.

- **Inventory of Existing Facilities.** NCWD serves the western and southern sections of the City. NCWD has approximately 25,000 customers in Lake Forest Park and the city of Shoreline.. The utility purchases all of its water on a wholesale basis from Seattle Public Utilities (SPU). The current contract with SPU is until 2065. NCWD is served by a 66” SPU transmission main with five connections to the District that runs through the service area. NCWD has two reservoirs. Two emergency interties exist with the City of Mountlake Terrace, which is served from the City of Everett’s water supply. There are approximately 96 miles of water mains in the service area, not including service lines.
- **Forecast of Future Needs.** The forecasts of future needs are described in the District’s Water System Plan 2020-2030.
- **Capital Projects and Funding.** Capital projects are summarized in Table II-27. The detailed projects and the location, capacity, and timing of the projects are provided in the District’s Water System Plan and in the 2024 Budget. Funding is summarized in Table II-28.



Table II-27: NCWD Water Capital Improvement Projects (2023-2025) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
Beach Drive Watermain Replacement	\$1,711,000
Project 114 – 41 st St to Beach Drive	\$428,000
Misc. Main Replacement – on 38 th and 38 th Streets	\$2,494,000
TOTAL	\$4,633,000

Table II-28: Funding Sources for NCWD Water Capital Improvement Projects (2015-20)

Source	Amount
Rates Revenue	\$4,633,000
TOTAL	\$4,633,000

Northshore Utility District (NUD)

NUD’s water service facilities are described below. Capital facilities information is based on the NUD 2017 Water System Plan, which provides a 20-year water planning strategy intended to serve the needs of current and future sewer customers.

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** The northeast section of the City is served by NUD. NUD is a Special Purpose District providing both water and wastewater service covering more than 17 square miles in Kenmore, Bothell and Kirkland. NUD has approximately 1,500 customers in Lake Forest Park and another 20,000 in other jurisdictions. All water is purchased on a wholesale basis from SPU, although NUD owns eight water storage facilities. The latest wholesale contract expires in 2062. Transmission of the water is provided from the Tolt Pipelines No. 1 and No. 2 with ten metering points combined and from the Tolt Eastside Supply Line with one metering point. There is also an emergency interconnection on SPU’s Maple Leaf Pipeline. The District is also part of the Snohomish River Regional Water Authority (RWA), along with the City of Everett and Woodinville Water District.
- Forecast of Future Needs.** The forecasts of future needs are described in the District’s Water System Plan.
- Capital Projects and Funding.** NUD’s 2017 Water System Plan provides a list of capital projects planned for 2017–2035. Capital projects for those years are summarized in Table II-29. The detailed projects and the location, capacity, and timing of the projects are provided in the plan. Funding is summarized in Table II-30.

Table II-29: NUD Water Capital Improvement Projects (2024-2029) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
Miscellaneous Projects	\$375,000
200 / 55 Water Main Replacement	\$113,000
TOTAL	\$488,000

Table II-30: Funding Sources for NUD Water Capital Improvement Projects (XXXX-XX)

Source	Amount
Water Capital	\$xxx
TOTAL	\$xxx

Lake Forest Park Water District (LFPWD)

LFPWD’s most recent capital improvement plan was prepared as part of the District’s draft 2015 Comprehensive Water System Plan and covers years 2024– 2028. The following summary of forecast of needs, capital projects, and funding are from this plan.

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** The central portion of the City is served by LFPWD. It serves approximately 900 customers and its service area is entirely within the City limits. Unlike the other water utilities serving the City, LFPWD does not purchase wholesale water from SPU. Water supply is sourced from eight artesian wells, three deep wells, and one backup well at the McKinnon well field. Two additional wells were added near the SPU reservoir in the Horizon View area. Storage is provided by LFPWD’s lower reservoir, standby tank, and standpipe. LFPWD has an intertie with NUD and SPU.
- Forecast of Future Needs.** Analysis and forecast of future needs is provided in the District’s draft 2015 Comprehensive Water System Plan. Future needs are partially contingent on potential development of any middle housing programs or potential re-development of town center.
- Capital Projects and Funding.** Capital projects are summarized in Table II-31 on the following page. The location, capacity and timing of the projects are provided in the District’s draft 2015 Comprehensive Water System Plan. Funding is summarized in Table II-32.

Table II-31: LFPWD Water Capital Improvement Projects (2024-2029) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
178th St Watermain @ 180th to Ballinger Replacement	\$482,000
Ballinger Way Watermain 37th – 40th Replacement	\$586,000
178th St Watermain East of 4th Ave Replacement	\$791,000
Ballinger Way Watermain 178th – Bothell Way Replacement	\$413,000
TBD Watermain Replacement	\$967,000
TOTAL	\$3,239,000

Table II-32: Funding Sources for LFPWD Water Capital Improvement Projects (2024-29)

Source	Amount
PWTF Loan	\$464,304
District Funds	\$116,136
Unfunded	\$2,658,560
TOTAL	\$3,239,000

Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)

SPU’s most recent capital improvement plan was prepared as part of SPU’s 2019 Water System Plan. The following summary of forecast of needs, capital projects, and funding are from the years 2019–2040 from the 2019 Water System Plan.

Details of location, capacity, timing, costs, and funding are provided in SPU’s 2019 Water System Plan and supporting documents.

- Inventory of Existing Facilities.** SPU serves approximately 400 customers in the City, 11,000 customers in Shoreline, and 186,000 customers in the City of Seattle. SPU is a municipal utility providing water, wastewater, , and surface water service. SPU also provides wholesale water to 26 different utilities in the region, including NCWD and NUD. About 60–70 percent of SPU’s water is supplied from the Cedar River and another 30–40 percent from the South Fork Tolt River. SPU also owns two well fields to supplement the Cedar and Tolt surface water supplies,

especially during the peak summer season. The well fields are located outside of Seattle in the City of SeaTac. SPU’s 2019 Water System Plan forecasted adequate supply to meet demand through 2060. With respect to the transmission and distribution system, SPU is facing issues related to aging facilities and plans to address these through its capital improvement program. SPU is investigating ways to increase water supply resiliency to adapt to climate change, while also mitigating the risks of a catastrophic wildfire.

- **Forecast of Future Needs.** Analysis and forecast of future needs is provided in SPU’s Water System Plan and supporting documents.
- **Capital Projects and Funding.** Capital projects are summarized in Table II-33. The location, capacity, and timing of the projects are provided in SPU’s Water System Plan and supporting documents. Funding is summarized in Table II-34.

Table II-33: SPU Water Capital Improvement Projects (2024-2028) & Future Costs of Listed Projects

Project	Cost
Water Resources	\$25,551,000
Water Quality and Treatment	\$17,683,000
Transmission	\$68,681,000
Distribution	\$291,388,000
Major Watersheds	\$4,896,000
Other	\$102,855,000
TOTAL	\$511,054,000

Table II-34: Funding Sources for SPU Water Capital Improvement Projects (2024-28)

Source	Amount
Water Capital	\$511,054,000
TOTAL	\$511,054,000

PT: Parks, Trails, and Open Space



Introduction

Lake Forest Park has several designated parks, open spaces, and recreational facilities within the community. These spaces allow for both passive and active recreation. Lake Forest Park has trails for hiking and rolling, playgrounds, recreational facilities, and views of majestic Mount Rainier. These parks and open spaces are assets to the community that provide physical and mental health benefits and promote social capital. The City intends to increase both the quality and quantity of parks and open space accessible to the community.

This background analysis contains information that was used in developing the update of the goals and polices in the Parks, Trails, & Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan including:

- Planning Context,
- Inventory of Parks and Recreation Facilities,
- Park Standards,
- Integrated Pest Management,
- The Percent for Art Program.

Planning Context

Lake Forest Park *Legacy 100-Year Vision*

The primary purpose of the *Legacy 100-Year Vision* is to promote the enhancement of the City's green infrastructure over the next century. A robust system of green infrastructure is made up of several "hubs," such as parks, natural areas, and other open spaces, and connected by "links," such as greenways and trails. The *Vision*, which was the subject of extensive community involvement, identified several projects for the future. The Parks, Trails, & Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan contains policies that work to implement the recommendations of the *100-Year Vision*.



Inventory of Parks and Recreation Facilities

Table II-35 on the following page lists the parks and recreation facilities in Lake Forest Park. Figure II-54 on page 196 shows the location of these facilities.

Park Standards

Table II-36 uses the following standards to classify parks.

Mini Park

Passive recreation or specialized facilities that serve a concentrated or limited population or a specific group such as children or seniors. These facilities have minimal improvements.

Neighborhood Park

Designed to serve the immediate surrounding residential population or employment base. Often includes areas for active recreation such as ball fields, courts, and passive recreation.

Community Park

Designed to serve the surrounding community (several neighborhoods). May contain special amenities attractive to visitors throughout the area.

Active Park

An active park is a public area designed as a park which provides facilities and/or equipment for exercise or play. It can also have elements of a nature park or green space.

Passive Park


A passive park is a public area designated as a park but does not contain any facilities or equipment for exercise or play, i.e., a nature park or green space. It can have benches or trails but is not intended for any active uses, such as sports.

Table II- 35: Inventory of Parks and Recreation Facilities in Lake Forest Park

Facility Name	Ownership	Size (Acres)	Facilities	Active / Passive	Classification
Pfingst Animal Acres Park	City	3.9	Picnic Area, Walking Trail, Children's Garden, Public Art, Viewing Deck, Parking	Passive	Community Park
Eagle Scout Park	City	0.25	Sitting Area	Passive	Community Park
Blue Heron Park	City	0.5	Sitting Area, Natural Area, Stream Side, Bridge with Public Art, Parking	Passive	Mini Park
Whispering Willow Park	City	0.62	Natural Play Area, Boardwalk, Sitting Area, Wetland, Parking	Passive	Community Park
Horizon View Park	City	8.4	Playground, Play Field, Tennis Court, Half Basketball Court, Walking Trail, Parking	Active	Community Park
Lake Forest Park Civic Club	Private	1.5	Boating, Picnic Area, Playground, Restrooms, Swimming Beach, Parking	Active	
Sheridan Beach Club	Private	0.74	Boating, Pool, Playground, Cabana		
Lake Forest Park	Shoreline School District	1	Playfield, Basketball, Tennis Courts, Playground, Parking	Active	Neighborhood Park
Elementary School	Shoreline School District	1	Playfield, Basketball Court, Playground, Parking	Active	Neighborhood Park
Brookside	King County	26 mi. (2.1	Bicycling, Walking, Jogging and Skating	Active	Community Park
Elementary School	Private	mi. in City)	Food, Entertainment, Meeting Space, Play Area, Stage	Active	
Burke-Gilman Trail	City	20,000 ft2	Waterfront Access, Trail, Picnic Area, Sitting, Dock	Passive	Community Park
Third Place Commons	City	0.89	Walking Trails, Environmental Education, Ponds/Wetland		Community Park
Lyon Creek Waterfront Preserve	City	6	Walking, Jogging, ADA access, Sitting Areas, Transit Access	Passive	Neighborhood Park
Grace Cole Nature Park	City	0.45	Undeveloped Open space	Passive	
Southern Gateway Park	City	0.45	Undeveloped Open space	Active	
Culver Property	City	2.68	Undeveloped Open space	NA	
Baird Property	City	1.45	Undeveloped Open space	NA	

Source: City of Lake Forest Park, 2015

Figure II- 54: Location of Parks and Open Space in Lake Forest Park



Integrated Pest Management

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) involves dealing with pests in an environmentally sensitive way. Rather than aiming for the total elimination of pests, IPM’s goal is to keep pests at an acceptable level that minimizes damage to plants. According to the Pacific Northwest Landscape IPM Manual, these techniques can reduce pesticide use by at least half without affecting the quality of plants. Guided by programs set in place by Seattle Tilth, the City of Lake Forest Park strives to use IPM in caring for its parks and other open spaces.

Percent for Art Program

Percent for Art programs exist in public agencies all over the country. These programs stipulate that a percentage of project costs from certain types of projects must be used for public art. For over four decades, King County has required one percent of the cost of certain capital improvement projects be set aside for art. Lake Forest Park currently does not have such a program or requirement in its code. Instituting a Percent for Art requirement in Lake Forest Park would increase the amount of art in public parks, enhance their aesthetic qualities, and attract more visitors.



U: Utilities



Introduction

This background analysis contains information that was used in developing the update of the goals and polices in the Utilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The analysis provides information about the utilities that serve Lake Forest Park, include City-owned utilities, other public utilities, and private utilities, including:


- **Water:** North City Water District, Northshore Utility District, Lake Forest Park Water District, Seattle Public Utilities
- **Sewer:** Lake Forest Park Public Works Department, Northshore Utility District
- **Surface Water:** Lake Forest Park Public Works Department
- **Electricity:** Seattle City Light
- **Natural Gas:** Puget Sound Energy
- **Telecommunications:** private companies including Comcast and Lumen
- **Solid Waste:** Republic Services

Water

Lake Forest Park is served by four water providers: North City Water District (NCWD), Northshore Utility District (NUD), Lake Forest Park Water District (LFPWD), and Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) (see Figure II-55). The largest share of the City is served by NCWD with about 44 percent of total water customers. This is followed by NUD with 28 percent of the total, LFPWD with 19 percent, and SPU with nine percent.



Figure II-55: Lake Forest Park Water Service Providers



Source: City of Lake Forest Park, 2019.

North City Water District (NCWD)

NCWD is a Special Purpose District serving the western and southern sections of the City. NCWD has approximately 25,000 customers in Lake Forest Park and City of Shoreline. It is governed by a three-member Board of Commissioners elected by ratepayers. The utility purchases all of its water on a wholesale basis from SPU. The contract with SPU was entered into in 2001 and revised in 2005, with a 60-year term. The District is served by a 66-inch SPU transmission main with five connections to the District that runs through the service area. NCWD has two reservoirs. Three emergency interties exist with the City of Mountlake Terrace, which is served by the City of Everett's water supply. There are approximately 96 miles of water mains in the service area, not including service lines.

Northshore Utility District (NUD)

The northeast section of the City is served by NUD. NUD is a Special Purpose District providing both water and wastewater service covering more than 17 square miles in Kenmore, Bothell, Kirkland, Woodinville, and Lake Forest Park. NUD serves approximately 1,500 households in Lake Forest Park and another 21,000 in other jurisdictions. It is governed by a five-member Board of Commissioners elected by ratepayers,

and has approximately 50 employees. All water is purchased on a wholesale basis from SPU, although NUD owns eight water storage facilities. The latest wholesale contract was signed in 2005 and expires in 2062. Transmission of the water is provided from the Tolt Pipelines No. 1 and No. 2 with ten metering points combined and from the Tolt Eastside Supply Line with one metering point. There is also an emergency interconnection on SPU's Maple Leaf Pipeline. The District is also part of the Snohomish River Regional Water Authority (RWA), along with the City of Everett and Woodinville Water District. RWA provides regional cooperation in planning, development, operation, and management of new municipal water sources and has acquired the former Weyerhaeuser water right on the Snohomish River. NUD has a 28 percent share of the water right.

Lake Forest Park Water District (LFPWD)

The central portion of the City is served by LFPWD. It serves approximately 900 customers, and its service area is entirely within the City limits. LFPWD is a Special Purpose District and is governed by three elected Commissioners. Unlike the other water utilities serving the City, LFPWD does not purchase wholesale water from SPU. Water supply is sourced from eight artesian wells, three deep wells, and one backup well at the McKinnon well field. Two additional wells were added near the SPU reservoir in the Horizon View area. Storage is provided by LFPWD's lower reservoir, standby tank, and standpipe. LFPWD has an intertie with NUD and SPU.

Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)

SPU serves approximately 400 customers in the City, 11,000 customers in Shoreline, and 186,000 customers in the City of Seattle. SPU is a municipal utility providing water, wastewater, and surface water service. SPU also provides wholesale water to 26 different utilities in the region, including NCWD and NUD. About 60-70 percent of SPU's water is supplied from the Cedar River and another 30-40 percent from the South Fork Tolt River. SPU also owns two well fields to supplement the Cedar and Tolt surface water supplies, especially during the peak summer season. The well fields are located outside of Seattle in the City of SeaTac. SPU's 2019 Water System Plan forecasted adequate supply to meet demand through 2060. With respect to the transmission and distribution system, SPU is facing issues related to aging facilities and plans to address these through its capital improvement program.


Sewer

Lake Forest Park is served by two sewer providers, the Lake Forest Park Sewer Department and Northshore Utility District (NUD) (see Figure II-56).

Lake Forest Park Sewer Department

The Sewer Department is part of the Public Works Department, which also oversees surface water, streets, and parks. It has approximately 3,300 customers in the City. The Department is overseen by the mayor and six City Council members. The Sewer Department's utility service area encompasses approximately 980 acres. The Sewer Department primarily services areas in the center of the City and north of the central area along Ballinger Way NE and 40th Place NE. By mutual agreement, the City has allowed parcels within its service area to be served by the NUD. The Sewer Department has over 225,000 feet of gravity sewer main, 11,000 feet of pressure main, and oversees two lift stations. All components of the system discharge into the King County interceptor lines along McAleer and Lyon Creeks. King County provides sewer transmission, interception, treatment, and disposal for the Sewer Department, as it does for all regional sewer utilities. The City has an agreement with King County through the year 2036.

Figure II-56: Lake Forest Park Sewer Service Providers



Source: City of Lake Forest Park, 2019.

Northshore Utility District (NUD)

NUD is a Special Purpose District providing both water and wastewater service covering more than 17 square miles in Kenmore, Bothell, Kirkland, Woodinville, and Lake Forest Park. NUD serves approximately 1,300 households in Lake Forest Park. It is governed by a five-member Board of Commissioners elected by ratepayers and has approximately 50 employees. Wastewater treatment is provided on a wholesale basis by King County Metro; NUD holds a contract with King County for treatment through the year 2036. Wastewater is collected through three main King County interceptors. Wastewater from the southeast portion of the District is collected and pumped via the Juanita Bay Pump Station to the South Treatment Plant.

Wastewater from the northwest portion is pumped to the West Point Treatment Plan via the Kenmore Pump Station. Both pump stations are owned by King County. The new Brightwater Plant is not going to be used to treat flows from NUD until after 2040.

Surface Water

Lake Forest Park is located within the McAleer Creek and Lyon Creek watersheds. The city represents only 16 percent of the total area of the two creek basins and is located at the termini of these basins. Consequently, runoff from King and Snohomish counties, including the Cities of Mountlake Terrace and Shoreline, is conveyed through City facilities to Lake Washington.

The City owns and operates extensive stormwater collection and conveyance systems in both the Lyon Creek and McAleer Creek basins. Within the basins, collection is by both open channel ditch systems and piped systems with catch basin inlets. The stormwater systems discharge to the tributaries of the creeks at numerous outfall locations. A detailed inventory of Lake Forest Park’s stormwater collection facilities and a list of planned improvement projects are included in the City’s Surface Water Management Plan (2009). Maintenance of the City’s stormwater collection facilities is performed by the Public Works Department. The Public Works Department participates with a King County user group to monitor surface water maintenance activities and develop improved best management practices (BMPs) as a method to enhance water quality.

■ The City’s **Surface Water Management Plan** is available online at: www.cityofflp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/396.

Two regional drainage facilities are in proximity to Lake Forest Park. These include the Cedar Way Detention Pond located on Lyon Creek in Mountlake Terrace, and the 196th Street Pond within the McAleer Creek drainage basin in the City of Shoreline.

Maintenance of drainage facilities on private property is the responsibility of the individual property owner. Volunteer groups within the City, including the Environmental Quality Commission and Streamkeepers, have been active in assisting homeowners with removing blockages to their private stormwater collection systems and developing improved systems.

Electricity

Electricity is provided to Lake Forest Park by Seattle City Light (City Light). City Light is a municipal electric utility, owned by the residents of Seattle and run by the City’s elected officials. City Light serves a population of almost 940,000 people living in a 131 square-mile area, including the City of Seattle and several adjoining jurisdictions. To serve these customers, City Light owns, maintains, and operates a multi-billion-dollar physical plant. The physical plant includes: a power supply generation system consisting of seven hydroelectric plants; a distribution system with 16 major substations and more than 2,300 miles of overhead and underground cable; a System Control Center; and billing and metering equipment. There are no distribution substations within the incorporated limits of Lake Forest Park. The Shoreline distribution substation is the closest substation to the city.

City Light relies on a mix of resources to fulfill its customers’ energy needs. The current resource portfolio includes City Light-owned generation resources; investments in conservation; and long-term contract resources supplemented with power-exchange agreements, near-term purchases, and sales made in the wholesale power market. The vast majority of City Light’s electricity comes from clean energy sources. City Light works to ensure it has enough power and supporting infrastructure to meet demand, while also supporting energy conservation.

Natural Gas

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) provides natural gas and propane to customers in the Lake Forest Park area. PSE operates the state’s largest natural gas distribution system serving more than 800,000 gas customers in six counties. PSE manages a diversified gas supply portfolio. About half the gas is obtained from producers and marketers in British Columbia and Alberta, and the rest comes from Rocky Mountains states. All the gas PSE acquires is transported into its service area through large interstate pipelines owned and operated by another company.

Once PSE takes possession of the gas, it is distributed to customers through more than 26,000 miles of PSE-owned gas mains and service lines. Natural gas is supplied to the City of Lake Forest Park through the North Seattle Border Station.

Telecommunications

Telecommunications is a broad term encompassing television, Internet, telephone, mobile telephone, and radio service. Telecommunication providers in Lake Forest Park include Comcast, Lumen, which was formally Century Link, and other private companies, several of which have facilities and equipment located in the City. These companies analyze market trends and expand services in response to increased demand, as their business plans allow.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996, passed by the federal government, regulates local and long-distance telephone service, cable programming, and other video services, broadcast services, and services provided to schools.

The Act generally preempts barriers to entry to telecommunications markets, however, it does not interfere with local governments' ability to manage their public rights-of-way and to be compensated for their use, so long as they manage and charge compensation in an equitable fashion.

The law covers all telecommunications and cable providers that use the right-of-way. The legislation also grants local municipalities the authority to issue zoning decisions concerning wireless facilities, so long as municipal zoning decisions do not unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services or preclude cellular service from a community. In 1998, the City adopted regulations addressing the siting of wireless communication facilities and regulations that establish the requirements for telecommunication carriers to use the City right-of-way, register with the City and obtain the appropriate franchise for operation in the City.

During the previous Comprehensive Plan update process, community members provided feedback that there is a need for improvements in current internet service for residents and businesses. They also expressed interest in building on existing fiber optic infrastructure in the City.

Solid Waste

The 2018 King County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan guides solid waste disposal in King County. Lake Forest Park, like most cities in King County, has signed an interlocal agreement with King County to provide solid waste

planning within the city. The terms of the Solid Waste Interlocal agreement, which were originally in effect from July 1, 1988, to June 30, 2028, have been extended to 2040. Under the agreement, King County is responsible for solid waste management, planning and technical assistance.

Lake Forest Park contracts with Republic Services for collection of residential and commercial waste. Republic Services is the second largest provider of solid waste collection, transfer, recycling, and disposal services in the nation. Waste is transported to and disposed of at the Cedar Hills Landfill, which is managed by the King County Solid Waste Division. Approximately 850,000 tons of waste are disposed of at the facility annually. In 2018, the King County Council approved a Project Program Plan (PPP) enabling the Solid Waste Division to move forward with further development of Cedar Hills. As approved in the PPP, a disposal new area will be developed; this will help extend the life of the landfill through about 2040. King County is currently pursuing additional long term means of solid waste disposal as the Cedar Hills Landfill approaches its useful life. King County expects a modest increase in disposal rates to help address capital improvements projects in the near future.

The City offers a residential curbside recycling program under its contract with Republic Services. In 2023, recycling rate for Lake Forest Park was 61 percent, including yard waste and other organics. In addition to its collection programs, the City has developed and implemented a variety of education programs to encourage waste reduction and recycling.

T: Transportation



Introduction

The Lake Forest Park community is mostly residential with a commercial core located in the Town Center near the intersection of Bothell Way (SR 522) and Ballinger Way (SR 104). The city's transportation network is defined by two heavily traveled state routes that connect with winding minor arterials and local streets that serve quieter residential neighborhoods. Transit service has historically been well utilized, as it connects to city with regional destinations, like downtown Seattle and University of Washington's Bothell campus. With the new light rail stations in the neighboring City of Shoreline, and planned Stride S3 service, Lake Forest Park's connection to the broader regional will improve.

Walking routes have been identified throughout the city, although many routes do not have a completed sidewalk on one or both sides of the road. The Burke- Gilman Trail is a major shared use facility that parallels the Lake Washington shoreline. Other bicycle routes have been identified throughout the city, but lack dedicated right-of-way or wayfinding signage. In general, most of these bicycle routes are shared with automobiles, and there are no road markings such as sharrows or painted bicycle lanes.

This section contains background information supporting the goals and policies in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, including:

- Conditions for driving,
- Conditions for transit,
- Conditions for walking and biking,
- Transportation funding,
- Level of service policies.



Conditions for Driving

The City of Lake Forest Park has two state routes, (SR 522/Bothell Way and SR 104/Ballinger Way), that carry a large amount of regional travel and divide the City. Currently an estimated 40,000 vehicles per day travel on SR 522 and an estimated 16,000 vehicles per day travel on SR 104.⁶ This is about a 12% volume reduction from the volume counts reported in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan, however the vehicle travel demand volumes on these routes are expected to increase in the next 20 years, with growth in both Lake Forest Park and the surrounding region. Most of the city’s minor arterials and neighborhood connectors are narrow, tree lined winding roadways. Roadway functional classifications are characterized as the following (*Comprehensive Plan—Transportation Element, 2015, and King County Road Services—Arterial Classification*):

- **Principal Arterial:** A major highway or through-street that connects major community centers and facilities. Frequently, this type of roadway has certain restrictions on access (e.g., partial limitations on access at intersections or from driveways). Principal arterials generally carry the highest amount of traffic volumes and provide the best mobility to serve both urban and rural areas. Major bus routes are usually located on principal arterials. Examples: Bothell Way (SR 522), Ballinger Way (SR 104).
- **Minor Arterial:** An access street providing connection between local destinations within a community. This type of facility stresses mobility and circulation needs over providing specific access to properties. Minor arterials allow more densely populated areas easy access to principal arterials, adjacent land uses (i.e., shopping, schools, etc.) and have lower traffic volumes than principal arterials. Examples: Brookside Boulevard, 35th Avenue NE, NE 178th Street, 40th Place NE.
- **Local Access Street:** This category comprises streets that have the sole purpose of providing direct access to specific abutting properties (such as residences). This type of roadway usually connects with a minor arterial and enables access between a place of residence and a commercial business or place of employment. Typically, traffic moves at low speeds (20 to 25 miles per hour) on local access streets and there are numerous turning movements on these streets. Local streets that carry more traffic to connect with arterials have been identified as “Neighborhood Connectors” in Figure I-4 on page 81. Examples: 28th Avenue NE, Hamlin Road NE, 41st Avenue NE.

Arterials within the City are listed in Table II-36 and mapped in Figure I-4.

Bothell Way and Ballinger Way are the most heavily traveled arterials in the city. These routes serve large volumes of regional through traffic, and can be very congested during the peak hours. By 2044, it is expected that the average daily traffic will grow from 40,000 to 57,000 daily vehicles on SR 522 near NE 160th Street.

⁶ WSDOT Community Planning Portal, 2022.

Table II- 36: Roadway Functional Classification System

Roadway Functional Classification	Example Roadways*
Principal Arterials	Bothell Way (SR 522); Ballinger Way (SR 104)
Minor Arterial	Brookside Boulevard; Forest Park Drive; 35th Avenue NE; 37th Avenue NE; 40th Place NE; NE 178th Street
Local Access Streets	NE 175th Street; NE 193rd Street; NE 195th Street; NE 196th Street

* This list is not comprehensive.

Sources: Fehr & Peers, 2015; City of Lake Forest Park Comprehensive Plan, 2015.

Traffic volumes on SR 104 near NE 178th Street are forecast to increase from 16,000 to 22,000 daily vehicles.⁷ While the state routes are generally busy, other streets in Lake Forest Park carry fewer regional trips given their circuitous nature.⁸ As the city is mostly built out, traffic volumes on non-state routes have remained relatively static compared to the traffic counts reported in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan (see Table II-37 below).

The two new light rail stations in Shoreline may increase traffic volumes through Lake Forest Park. As the mostly two-lane roadways in the city may not be up to the same standards as connecting roadways in neighboring cities, Lake Forest Park may become the choke point that limits regional travel and access to and from the new high capacity transit stations.

Table II-37: Daily and PM Roadway Traffic Counts

Location	PM Peak Hour Count	Daily Count
SR 104 @ North City Limits	1,049	16,303
SR 522 @ East City Limits	3,744	--
SR 522 @ West City Limits	4,096	--
25 th NE/NE 178 th	--	1,000
40 th PI NE/45 th PI NE	--	2,528
55 th NE/NE 193 rd	--	4,601
55 th NE/NE 204 th	--	4,696
NE 178 th /25 th NE	--	7,040
NE 178 th / 37 th NE	--	6,294

Sources: City of Lake Forest Park, 2005 Comprehensive Plan; WSDOT, 2012–2014; City of Kenmore, 2015.

⁷ Fehr & Peers, PSRC Travel Demand Model, 2015.

⁸ Residents have reported instances of speeding on neighborhood streets by pass through traffic.

Impacts of Lake Forest Park Growth on State Facilities

To understand how the growth anticipated in this plan may impact the two state highways traversing the City of Lake Forest Park, Bothell Way (SR 522) and Ballinger Way NE (SR 104), PM peak hour traffic conditions were analyzed.

As stated in the Land Use Element Background Analysis, the City's Growth Targets include 870-housing units and 244 additional employees in Lake Forest Park. To evaluate the transportation impacts of this growth, the additional vehicle trips that could be generated by this growth were estimated:

- For the housing growth the assumption was made that all of these units would be single-family detached units. This will result in a conservative value, as single-family detached units will generate the highest PM peak hour trips as compared to multi-family units. Using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 8th Edition, the number of PM peak hour trips that would be generated is 1.01 per unit or 557 total trips. The ITE manual also suggests that 351 (63%) of these trips will be returning home and 206 (37%) will be leaving.
- For the employment growth, the assumption was made that it would be a mix of retail, services, and office employees. Using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 8th Edition, and standard assumptions of the relationship between employment and square footage, the number of PM peak hour trips that would be generated from employment is 734 trips, with 385 arriving and 349 leaving.

This analysis assumes all of these trips will be using state routes to either enter or leave the City, resulting in 736 vehicular trips arriving and 555 leaving. This is an extremely conservative assumption in that it overstates the probable number of trips using state routes. Some of the housing trips will likely remain in their respective neighborhoods, make short trips to the shopping center or leave/enter via other arterial streets. Also some of the employment trips will likely come from inside Lake Forest Park.

Existing traffic volume counts were obtained from WSDOT and the recent Transportation Element Update for the City of Kenmore. Based on these counts, which were collected in 2012-2014, it is possible to distribute the additional entering and exiting traffic volumes on each of the state routes based on existing proportions. These additional traffic volumes are compared to the existing traffic volumes in Table II.39.

The projected growth for the City represents a 13% increase to the existing traffic for trips entering the City along state highways and a 10% increase to the existing traffic exiting the City along state highways. When these additional trips are aggregated by location, the totals become 208 to/from the north, 565 to/from the east, and 518 to/from the west.

Table II-38: Existing and Additional PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

	Existing Entering	Additional Entering	Existing Exiting	Additional Exiting	Total Additional
SR 104 @ North City Limits	709	100	660	108	208
SR 522 @ East City Limits	2,185	295	2,646	269	565
SR 522 @ West City Limits	2,519	341	1,745	178	518

Sources: City of Lake Forest Park, 2005 Comprehensive Plan; WSDOT, 2012–2014; City of Kenmore, 2015.

Freight and Goods Movement


The routes in Lake Forest Park that are within WSDOT’s designated Freight and Goods Transportation System are shown in Figure II-57. All freight routes within the City have T3 designation which is defined as routes carrying 300,000 to 4 million tons per year.

Knowing the designation of these routes is important, as it should inform how streets are planned, designed, and managed to provide for the continued efficient movement of goods while also ensuring the safety of citizens and travelers along these routes.

Lake identified that SR 522 (Bothell Way) and SR 104 (Ballinger Way) divide the community by their size, traffic volumes and designs and offered little in the way to accommodate people not traveling in a car. To improve the conditions for all travelers on these state routes, the City authorized the Safe Highways Plan. This plan provides recommendations for:

- SR 104 cross-sections and intersection layouts,
- SR 522 cross-sections and for 145th Street/SR 522 intersection layout,
- Active transportation access to transit investments,
- And additional considerations to achieve community goals, not tied to specific locations.

Figure II-57: Lake Forest Park WSDOT Freight and Goods Transportation System - 2023 Update



Conditions for Transit

Public transit service is operated by King County Metro and Sound Transit. Table II-39 summarizes the services and routes. Transit routes operate on Bothell Way (SR 522) and Ballinger Way (SR 104), and 35th Avenue NE/NE 190th Street. There is generally good transit service north-south from Lake Forest Park to large employment and shopping centers such as Downtown Seattle, University of Washington, and Northgate. On Bothell Way (SR 522) there is a continuous Business Access Transit (BAT) lane in the southbound direction and an almost continuous BAT lane in the northbound direction with a gap from just north of NE 145th Street to NE 170th St. There is more-limited transit service that operates east-west through the city along Ballinger Way (SR 104). The Town Center transit stops see the city's highest daily transit boardings (390 boardings, based on the average spring 2014 transit data). Many transit riders use the Town Center parking lot as an unofficial park & ride.

Table II-39: Transit Service


Route	Service Area	Service Hours
322	Kenmore P&R – First Hill	Weekday, Peak Hour Direction Only
331	Shoreline Community College – Kenmore P&R	Weekday & Weekends, All Day
372	University District – UW/CC Bothell Campus	Weekday, All Day
522	Roosevelt-Woodinville P&R	Weekday & Weekends, All Day

Source: King County Metro, Sound Transit, Fehr & Peers, 2024.

A map of public transit service in the area is in Figure II-58.

Future transit projects include Sound Transit’s Lynnwood Link Extension of Line 1 light rail with two planned stations west of Lake Forest Park at NE 148th Street and NE 185th Street along I-5 in neighboring Shoreline. This extension of Line 1 will begin service in August 2024. In addition, Sound Transit’s Stride S3 is planned to bring bus rapid transit line (BRT) service from the new Link 1 Line station at 148th Street in Shoreline through Lake Forest Park on Bothell Way (SR 522) to the SR 522/I-405 Transit Hub and connect to Stride S2 which will run from Lynnwood to Bellevue along I-405 and further connect to Stride S1 which will run from further south from Bellevue to Burien.

Figure II-58: Map of Transit Service in Lake Forest Park



Source: King County Metro System Map: Northwest Area

Figure II-59: Planned Stride S3 Route



Source: Sound Transit Stride S3 Project Map.

Conditions for Walking & Biking

There are designated walking routes throughout Lake Forest Park. However, not all walking routes have sidewalks. Pedestrian facilities range from sidewalks with curb ramps to dirt paths along roadway shoulders.

The Burke-Gilman Trail is a well-traveled multi-use pathway. This separated facility runs parallel to Lake Washington and connects with Seattle to the south and Kenmore to the north. It is often used by cyclists and pedestrians. North and South connector bicycle routes exist between the Interurban Trail and the Burke-Gilman Trail. Bicycle lanes are on NE 178th Street from Brookside Boulevard to 33rd Avenue NE.

Lake Forest Park identified the desire to make its streets safer for all users and to improve connection to transit and amenities like the Burke-Gilman Trail, Interurban Trail, Parks, schools, and retail. To achieve this goal, The City authorized three studies to prioritize projects to improve the multimodal network in Lake Forest Park. These studies are the Safe Streets Plan, Safe Highways Plan, and the Safe Streets: Town Center Connections Plan. The lists of prioritized project from each of these studies is listed below, along with a corresponding maps.

Safe Streets Plan Project List

Tier 1 (Highest Priority)

1. Brookside Elementary Safe Routes to School
2. Permanent Speed Warning Signs
3. Lake Forest Park Elementary Safe Routes to School
4. Briarcrest Safe Routes to School
5. NE 178th Street Sidewalk

Tier 2 (Lower Priority)

6. 37th Avenue NE Traffic Calming
7. Perkins Way Pedestrian/Bike Infrastructure
8. North Area Pedestrian and Bike Connections
9. 55th Avenue NE Sidewalk
10. NE 187th Street, NE 184th Street, and 47th Avenue NE Sidewalk

Safe Streets: Town Center Connections Plan Project List

Tier 1 (Highest Priority)

1. Brookside Elementary Safe Routes to School
2. 44th Avenue/178th Street Improvements
3. 35th Avenue/40th Avenue/182nd Street Traffic Calming and Street Improvements
4. Brookside Boulevard Sidewalks and Bike Lanes
5. 47th Avenue/184th Street Traffic Calming and Street Improvements

Tier 2 (Lower Priority)

6. Westside Town Center Trail Connection
7. McKinnon Creet Trail Connection
8. Hamlin Road Sidewalks
9. 39th Avenue Sidewalks

Figure II-60: Safe Streets Project Recommendations




Figure II-61: Safe Streets Town Center Connections Plan - Project Recommendations



Transportation Funding

The City generally spends about \$150,000 per year on street overlays. This amount varies due to the availability of outside funding and annual priorities. It is expected that this amount of funding will continue to be available in the future. Additional funding fluctuates year-to-year for various transportation projects depending on how successful Lake Forest Park is in competing for grants.

Table II-40 summarizes the planned capital projects for the next six years and Table II-41, the funding sources for these projects. Please see the discussion in Volume II, Capital Facilities for additional information.

Table II-40: Transportation Improvement Projects - 2015-2020

Project	Cost
Annual Street Overlay Program	\$884,000
NE 178th Street Roadway Improvements Phase 2	\$2,270,000
ADA Ramps	\$77,400
37th Ave Sidewalk	\$2,800,000
Transportation Master Plan	\$40,000
Total	\$6,071,400

Table II-41: Transportation Capital Improvement Funding - 2015-2020

Project	Cost
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) I	\$60,000
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)II	\$1,011,400
State/Federal Funding	\$5,000,000
Total	\$6,071,400

A new *Transportation Master Plan* is also planned for the next six years. This plan will provide a long-term strategy for the City’s transportation system and detailed information about projected project needs.

Beyond 2020, the City plans to continue the annual street overlay program and identified a number of street and trail improvements, including:

- Bike trail between the Interurban and Burke-Gilman Trails near Perkins Way
- Green street and pedestrian improvements on NE 178th Street
- Sidewalk and crosswalk improvements around the Town Center
- Demonstration green street between 33rd Avenue NE and 35th Avenue NE on NE 158th Street

Potential funding sources include conservation grants, state funding, and federal funding.

Level of Service Policies

The City plans to adopt these LOS standards

- Vehicle: Maintain vehicle LOS C/D
- Pedestrians: Strive to complete the pedestrian networks as prioritized in the Safe Street, Safe Highways, and Safe Streets Town Center Connection plans.
- Bicyclists: Strive to complete the bicycle network as prioritized in the Safe Street, Safe Highways, and Safe Streets Town Center Connection plans.
- Transit: coordinate with transit agencies to improve access to transit stops as prioritized in the Safe Street, Safe Highways, and Safe Streets Town Center Connection plans.
- Ensure that the development provides mitigation measures when required to maintain appropriate levels of service for all modes and to meet concurrency requirements.

DRAFT

Appendices & Attachments



Attachment A: Racially Disparate Impacts Analysis

Introduction

In 2021, the Washington State Legislature passed House Bill 1220 (HB 1220) as an amendment to the state Growth Management Act (GMA). HB 1220 requires that local governments plan for housing at all income levels and assess the racially disparate impacts (RDI) of existing housing policies. Conditions that indicate that policies have racially disparate impacts can include segregation, cost burden, displacement, educational opportunities, and health disparities.

According to state guidance, there are five steps to understanding and addressing racially disparate impacts:

- Step 1: Engage the Community
- Step 2: Gather & Analyze Data
- Step 3: Evaluate Policies
- Step 4: Revise Policies
- Step 5: Review & Update Regulations

This report accounts for both Step 2 and Step 3 – it includes a summary of findings based on data from the US Census Bureau, US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and other sources. These findings then inform the policy evaluations and recommendations found at the end of the report.

Key Findings

- Lake Forest Park is less diverse than King County.
- Census block groups in Lake Forest Park where racial covenants were prevalent are still largely less diverse than other areas of the city.
- Households of color, particularly Hispanic/Latino and Asian households are more likely to be cost burdened than white households. In addition, renting is more common among non-white households and the cost burden for renter households is significantly higher than for owner households. Hispanic/Latino and Black/African American households are significantly more likely to rent than own their homes.
- There is a shortage of housing available for those making less than 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) and those making between 80% and 100% AMI.
- One third of Black/African American households in Lake Forest Park are classified as extremely low-income, making less than 30% of AMI. Just 14% of Hispanic/Latino households earn more than 100% AMI.

Historical Context

Throughout the history of the United States, a combination of laws and practices have impacted where specific groups of people live, what opportunities they have access to, and their ability to build wealth through stable housing. Unfortunately, many of these policies explicitly or implicitly benefited white residents at the expense of all others. The legacy of policies like redlining, which used racial criteria in determining which neighborhoods were suitable for government-backed loans, highway development through predominantly-Black neighborhoods, and racial covenants explicitly excluding certain groups from owning specific properties continues to impact non-white communities today.

While many cities have acknowledged the harms of these policies, many of which are no longer legal, there are still policies in effect today that hold cities back from rectifying systemic harms. These can include policies that reference vague concepts like “neighborhood character,” as well as those that permit only the most expensive homes to be built, thus shutting lower-income residents out of high-opportunity areas.


This section contains a historic review of some of the known policies and programs that caused racially disparate impacts in Lake Forest Park as a starting point in understanding present-day conditions.

Throughout the United States, including in Lake Forest Park, racial covenants were used to exclude certain races and religious groups from residing in specific neighborhoods, creating exclusive areas for white, Christian residents. The map in Figure A-1 below shows parcels in Lake Forest Park and surrounding communities that had racial covenants or deed restrictions. These were legally enforceable from 1927 to 1968.

Figure A-2 shows some of the language used to exclude non-white residents from subdivisions in Lake Forest Park.



Figure A- 1: Racially Restricted Parcels in Lake Forest Park and Surrounding King County Communities



Source: Washington State Racial Restrictive Covenants Project.


Table A- 1: Language Used for Restrictive Subdivisions in Lake Forest

Lake Forest Park	Brookside Addition to Lake Forest	<p><i>The said property, or any part thereof, shall used for residence purposes only, and shall be occupied only by persons of the white race, except that servants not of the white race but actually employed by a white occupant, may reside on said premises.</i></p> <p>Developer: Harper, Guy, Properties covered: 3,</p>
	Chittenden's Terrace Park	<p><i>No person excepting of the Caucasian race shall ever be permitted to own or occupy said premises or reside thereon, excepting the capacity of a domestic servant</i></p> <p>Developer: Chittenden, Clyde and Grace, Properties covered: 5,</p>
	Lake Forest Park	<p><i>said property or any part thereof, shall be used for residence purpose only, and shall be occupied only by persons of the white race except that servants not of the white race but actually employed by a white occupant may reside on said property.</i></p> <p>Developer: Seattle Title Trust Co., Properties covered: 286,</p>
	Lake Forest Park 2nd Addition	<p><i>It is the purpose of the Seller to make and keep said Addition a high-class residence district, and it is further agreed that said premises or any part thereof shall not be sold or leased or permitted to be occupied by any person or persons not of what is commonly known as the White or Caucasian Race.</i></p> <p>Developer: North Seattle Improvement Co., Properties covered: 233,</p>

Source: Washington State Racial Restrictive Covenants Project.

The combination of racially restrictive covenants and redlining impacted the ability of Black veterans to fully access homeownership loan benefits through the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill), which enabled white veterans to buy housing and build wealth in the suburbs. Racial covenants have since been declared unconstitutional, and Fair Housing laws have been put into effect. Lake Forest Park has gone from nearly 100% white in 1960 to 77% white in 2020. While this is a significant improvement, Lake Forest Park is still significantly less diverse than King County overall, which is 58% white. In Lake Forest Park today, Census Block groups where racial covenants were in effect are still largely white today.

Figure A- 2: Race and Ethnicity in Lake Forest Park by Census Block Group (2020)



Assessing Racially Disparate Impacts


Between 2015 and 2020, Lake Forest Park became slightly more diverse, as the population of white residents declined and the population of Hispanic/Latino residents increased. The population went from 81% white to 77% white over the course of five years. Over the same period, King County’s population went from 63% white to 58% white, with Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and multi-racial residents seeing the highest population gains.

Table A- 2: Change in Population by Race/Ethnicity, Lake Forest Park and King County

Race or Ethnic Category	Lake Forest Park			King County		
	2015	2020	Change	2015	2020	Change
American Indian and Alaska Native	9	29	20	11,972	10,307	-1,665
Asian	912	923	11	317,214	405,835	88,621
Black or African American	291	405	114	123,350	141,566	18,216
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	508	857	349	189,808	218,763	28,955
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	45	19	-26	15,681	16,673	992
Other Race	12	28	16	3,756	9,449	5,693
Two or more races	715	878	163	99,291	127,070	27,779
White	10,567	10,316	-251	1,284,684	1,295,401	10,717
Total	13,059	13,455	396	2,045,756	2,225,064	179,308


Source: US Census Bureau, 2011-2015 and 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Table DP05); Washington Department of Commerce, 2023

Figure A- 3: Population by Race/Ethnicity in Lake Forest Park (2020)



Source: US Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Table DP05); Washington Department of Commerce, 2023.

Figure A- 4: Racial Composition of Lake Forest Park and King County (2020)



Source: US Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Table DP05); Washington Department of Commerce, 2023.


Lake Forest Park is a relatively wealthy community with high housing costs. The city includes 4,190 owner households and 1,085 rental households. Of the owner households, 16.6% are cost burdened, with 10% spending between 30% and 50% on housing costs and 6.6% spending more than 50% on housing costs. By contrast, 47% of renter households in Lake Forest Park are rent burdened, with 28% spending between 30 and 50% on housing costs and 19% spending more than 50% on housing costs. This sharp divide in stability between renters and owners can result in racially disparate impacts when renters are more likely to be people of color. In Lake Forest Park, 81% of Hispanic/Latino households and 82% of Black/African American households rent their homes, compared with 16% of white households. While 67% of Hispanic/Latino households are cost burdened and another 8% are severely cost burdened, 81% of white households are not cost burdened.

Table A- 3: Number of Households by Cost Burden in Lake Forest Park (2019)

	White	Black or African American	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Other Race	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	Total
Owner Households								
Not Cost Burdened	3,160	15	205	0	0	75	35	3,490
Total Cost-Burdened	570	0	90	0	0	35	0	695
Cost-Burdened (30-50%)	350	0	50	0	0	20	0	420
Severely Cost-Burdened (>50%)	220	0	40	0	0	15	0	275
Not Calculated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3,730	15	300	0	0	110	35	4,190
Renter Households								
Not Cost Burdened	410	60	50	0	10	40	10	580
Total Cost-Burdened	275	15	70	0	0	15	135	510
Cost-Burdened (30-50%)	140	0	30	0	0	15	120	305
Severely Cost-Burdened (>50%)	135	15	40	0	0	0	15	205
Not Calculated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	685	70	120	0	10	55	145	1,085
Total Households	4,415	85	420	0	10	165	180	5,275


Source: US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 9); Washington Department of Commerce, 2023

Figure A- 5: Lake Forest Park Total Housing Cost Burden by Racial & Ethnic Group (2019)




Source: US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 9); Washington Department of Commerce, 2023.

Figure A- 6: Lake Forest Park Percent of All Households Experiencing Housing Cost Burden (2019)



Source: US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 9); Washington Department of Commerce, 2023.


Figure A- 7: Lake Forest Park Owner and Renter Households by Race & Ethnicity (2019)



Source: US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 9).

The renter cost burden in Lake Forest Park is driven by a 40-unit shortfall of units affordable for households making less than 30% of area median income (AMI) and a 220-unit shortfall of units affordable for households making 80% AMI.

Figure A- 8: Lake Forest Park Renter Households by Income Compared to Rental Units by Affordability (2019)




Sources: US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 15C) & US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 14B).

Despite housing unit shortfalls in the lower- and upper-income categories, Lake Forest Park has a relatively low displacement risk compared with nearby communities. Figure 12 below shows PSRC’s displacement risk map – most of Lake Forest Park is considered “lower risk” compared with Kenmore and Mountlake Terrace, where the risk is “moderate.” However, the southern portion of Lake Forest Park, where the majority of the City’s multifamily units are concentrated, has a higher displacement risk than the rest of the city.

PSRC also considers Lake Forest Park to be a High Opportunity area (Figure A-12), due to its high education and economic index scores.

In Lake Forest Park, 73% of white households make above the median income – the highest share among racial and ethnic groups. Just 14% of Hispanic/Latino households and 54% of Asian households make above 100% AMI. Among Black/African American households, there is a sharp divide – 67% make above the median income, while 33% are considered extremely low-income (making 30% of AMI or less)


Figure A- 9: PSRC Displacement Risk Map for Lake Forest Park and Surrounding Communities



Sources: Puget Sound Regional Council Displacement Risk Map Tool.



Figure A- 10: PSRC Opportunity Index Map for Lake Forest Park and Surrounding Communities



Sources: Puget Sound Regional Council Opportunity Index Map Tool.




Table A- 4: Lake Forest Park Count of Households by Income and Race (2019)

Income Category (% of AMI)	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	Pacific Islander	White	Not Reported*	All
Number								
Extremely Low-Income (≤30% AMI)	-	35	30	15	-	215	45	340
Very Low-Income (30-50%)	-	20	-	10	-	340	5	375
Low-Income (50-80%)	-	75	-	65	-	320	-	460
Moderate Income (80-100%)	-	60	-	65	10	340	5	480
Above Median Income (>100%)	-	225	60	25	-	3,205	115	3,630
Total for published estimates	-	415	90	180	10	4,420	170	5,275
Percentage								
Extremely Low-Income (≤30% AMI)	0%	10%	9%	4%	0%	63%	13%	
Very Low-Income (30-50%)	0%	5%	0%	3%	0%	91%	1%	
Low-Income (50-80%)	0%	16%	0%	14%	0%	70%	0%	
Moderate Income (80-100%)	0%	13%	0%	14%	2%	71%	1%	
Above Median Income (>100%)	0%	6%	2%	1%	0%	88%	3%	

* The category "Other (including multiple races, non-Hispanic)" is suppressed in source data(CHAS 2015-2019 Table 1)

Sources: US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 1) & US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 8)

Figure A- 11: Lake Forest Park Distribution of Households by Income and Race or Ethnicity (2019)




Sources: US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 1).



Between 2015 and 2020, the percentage of households making above the median income increased from 63% to 69%. However, over that same period the percentage of Hispanic/Latino households making above the median income decreased significantly – from 66% in 2015 to just 14% in 2020.

Figure A- 12: Lake Forest Park Percentage of All Households by Income Category and Race (2010-2014 vs. 2015-2019)



Sources: US HUD, 2015-2019 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) (Table 1).



Policy Evaluation

Based on the above analysis, there is room for improvements to policies in Lake Forest Park to reduce racially disparate impacts, and the data was used to inform the next steps of the racially disparate impacts assessment process – evaluating and revising policies that reinforce historical patterns of segregation, displacement, and inequitable outcomes. Taking a proactive approach in shaping policy to address these challenges will benefit all Lake Forest Park households as they City seeks to build a more equitable future.

Based on guidance provided by the Washington State Department of Commerce, the following policy evaluation framework was used to evaluate Lake Forest Park’s existing Housing Element policies:

Table A- 5: Policy Evaluation Framework

Criteria	Evaluation
The policy is valid and supports meeting the identified housing needs. The policy is needed and addresses identified racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing.	S - Supportive
The policy can support meeting the identified housing needs but may be insufficient or does not address racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing.	A - Approaching
The policy may challenge the jurisdiction’s ability to meet the identified housing needs. The policy’s benefits and burdens should be reviewed to optimize the ability to meet the policy’s objectives while improving the equitable distribution of benefits and burdens imposed by policy.	C - Challenging
The policy does not impact the jurisdiction’s ability to meet identified housing needs and has no influence or impact on racially disparate impacts, displacement, or exclusion.	NA - Not Applicable




Table A- 6: Housing Element Policy Evaluations

Existing Goal / Policy #	Existing Goal / Policy	Equity Assessment	Why	Notes
Goal H-1: Housing Supply and Diversity. Ensure that Lake Forest Park has sufficient quantity and variety of housing types to meet projected growth and needs of the community.				
Policy H-1.1	Promote fair and equitable access to housing for all persons.	Supportive	The RDI found disparities in housing tenure and cost burden between racial and ethnic groups in Lake Forest Park. Promoting fair and equitable housing policies should help ensure that these disparities do not result in displacement.	As written, this policy is relatively vague. The City should consider employing more specific language related to housing opportunities and Fair Housing laws.
Policy H-1.2	Provide an adequate supply of land to meet the city's housing growth target, as established in the King County County-wide policies	Approaching	King County's County-wide policies require an adequate supply of housing at a variety of cost levels. While providing an adequate land supply is likely to improve racial housing disparities, this policy does not directly address racially disparate impacts.	As the City works to provide an adequate supply of land to meet its growth target, it should consider that the location and types of housing that can be built are aligned with the needs of households of color.
Policy H-1.3	Provide for a variety of residential densities and housing types.	Approaching	Increasing the density in residential areas and increasing flexibility in the zoning code to allow for more types of housing could potentially help increase opportunities for homeownership and reduce cost burden.	The City should consider working directly with communities of color to understand what types of housing would best meet their needs. This would help the City ensure that the variety of housing types allowed matches community preferences.
Policy H-1.4	Consider the impact on housing capacity and diversity when making land use policy and regulatory decisions.	Approaching	Considering the impacts of policies and regulations on housing capacity and diversity could help steer the City toward more equitable outcomes. However, the City should also explicitly consider the potential impacts of policies on different racial and ethnic groups.	Potentially re-word this to: "Consider the impact of land use policies and regulatory decisions on housing capacity, diversity, and racial equity."



<p>Policy H-1.5</p>	<p>Promote residential clustering as a means to protect environmentally sensitive areas and encouraging infill development.</p>	<p>N/A</p>		<p>Keep</p>
<p>Policy H-1.6</p>	<p>Encourage opportunities for mixed-use development in areas where a mix of commercial and residential uses would promote desired character and economic vitality, including transit-oriented development along transit corridors.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Providing new, high density housing near services and transit can help increase opportunities for those previously shut out of high-opportunity areas due to housing costs or other policies.</p>	<p>[talk about need for density to support affordable TOD]</p>
<p>Policy H-1.7</p>	<p>Create opportunities for housing in a variety of settings, sizes, and affordability levels throughout the City.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Housing is not one-size-fits-all. Different households will need housing of different sizes and with different characteristics and amenities. While apartments near transit may be ideal for some families, others might want to live in intergenerational households where they have more space. By allowing a variety of housing types throughout different neighborhoods, the City will help meet the needs of a diverse population.</p>	<p>Regulations related to this policy should ensure that different housing types are allowed in a wide variety of neighborhoods. This will help prevent wealthier, whiter neighborhoods from becoming enshrined as protected areas and increase integration.</p>
<p>Policy H-1.8</p>	<p>Support flexibility in zoning that responds to the diverse needs of a range of household sizes, incomes, and ages. Consider amending regulations to encourage more accessory dwelling units (mother-in-law units), duplexes, townhouses, and other types of housing.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Middle housing types, including duplexes, townhomes, and small apartment buildings provide lower-cost opportunities for homeownership and can be particularly suitable for intergenerational families. Flexible zoning that allows these housing types can increase opportunities for households of color in historically exclusive neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Regulations related to this policy should ensure that different housing types are allowed in a wide variety of neighborhoods. This will help prevent wealthier, whiter neighborhoods from becoming enshrined as protected areas and increase integration.</p>



<p>Policy H-1.9</p>	<p>Continue to ensure that manufactured housing, as defined in the current building code, is allowed in all single-family zones and regulated the same as stick-built housing.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Manufactured housing is a more affordable option than traditional stick-built housing. It could potentially provide homeownership opportunities for lower income residents and households of color.</p>	<p>Allowing manufactured homes on single family lots could provide a pathway to homeownership, but the limited number of suitable vacant parcels in single family zones in Lake Forest Park indicates that this policy is unlikely to have a significant impact on racial disparities.</p>
---------------------	--	--------------------	--	--


Goal H-2: Neighborhood Character. Preserve and enhance the unique character* of the City's residential neighborhoods.

** The phrase "unique character" is vague and is typically used to signal a preference for preserving the status quo rather than improving policies to increase opportunities for historically excluded communities.*

<p>Policy H-2.1</p>	<p>Continue to incorporate site standards, landscaping, and building design guidelines into land use regulations to ensure that infill development complements surrounding uses and the character of Lake Forest Park.</p>	<p>Challenging</p>	<p>While it is not unreasonable to implement design or site standards aimed at reducing impacts on residents of a particular neighborhood, often these requirements negatively impact feasibility or limit what can be built beyond what is allowed in the City Code. They also communicate to residents that denser housing types are inherently a nuisance.</p>	<p>Ensuring that new development "complements the character" of Lake Forest Park insinuates that the City seeks to preserve the largely white status quo, which was created through past policy decisions. The City should consider a more forward-looking approach that builds toward a vision of Lake Forest Park as a diverse and vibrant community.</p>
---------------------	--	--------------------	---	---

<p>Policy H-2.2</p>	<p>Promote site planning techniques that create quality outdoor spaces and are in harmony with neighboring properties.</p>	<p>Challenging</p>	<p>Outdoor space is an important element in neighborhoods. However, policies that require high quality outdoor space on every parcel can limit what can be built on site. It also privileges private outdoor spaces over community spaces.</p>	<p>The City should ensure that there is adequate park space throughout neighborhoods so that on-site requirements for outdoor space are not necessary to ensure that all residents have equitable access to green space.</p>
---------------------	--	--------------------	--	--


<p>Policy H-2.3</p>	<p>Provide guidelines for transitions and buffers around different types of uses, in order to mitigate any negative impacts associated with higher-intensity uses.</p>	<p>Challenging</p>	<p>Higher-intensity uses, including apartment and mixed use commercial and residential buildings, are not inherently a detriment to a neighborhood or community. The framing of this policy indicates a belief that residents in single-family homes must be protected from those in multifamily housing - a belief often perpetuated by racial stereotypes.</p>	<p>The City should specify what types of uses require a buffer - while a buffer may be appropriate between a residential neighborhood and a light industrial site or a concert venue, the City should not aim to segregate different types of housing from each other.</p>
---------------------	--	--------------------	--	--




<p>Policy H-2.4</p>	<p>Preserve and enhance the condition of neighborhoods and housing through public and private investment and regulations.</p>	<p>Challenging</p>	<p>Public and private investments into neighborhood maintenance and improvements benefit all residents. However, preserving neighborhood conditions is relatively vague, and could lead to regulations aimed at protecting specific neighborhoods from new development.</p>	<p>The City should increase the specificity of this policy to make it clear that this is intended to help residents and homeowners maintain and improve their properties rather than to preserve the status quo.</p>
<p>Goal H-3: Housing Affordability. Provide for a range of housing opportunities to address the needs of all economic segments of the community.</p>				
<p>Policy H-3.1</p>	<p>Preserve and enhance affordable housing stock by investing in existing neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Public investment in neighborhoods, particularly those with concentrations of affordable housing, is a policy that could benefit all residents. However, it is unlikely to decrease racially disparate impacts.</p>	<p>The City should prioritize investment in neighborhoods that have been historically underserved to ensure that this policy addresses racial disparities</p>
<p>Policy H-3.2</p>	<p>Incentivize development of affordable housing, such as density bonuses, height increases, tax incentives, and simplified design requirements.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Incentives aimed at increasing the supply of affordable housing will help provide more opportunities for residents with lower incomes, who are disproportionately in non-white households. However, the location of where these incentives will be available will impact its ability to address racial disparities more directly.</p>	<p>The City should target these incentives in high-opportunity areas connected to services and transit, and where there has not previously been significant investment in affordable housing.</p>
<p>Policy H-3.3</p>	<p>Support non-profit organizations that construct and manage affordable housing.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Supporting non-profit organizations that construct and manage affordable housing is crucial for attracting new affordable housing development. However, while some of these organizations specifically serve local households of color, this is not the case for all non-profit affordable housing providers.</p>	<p>The City should ensure that as it builds these relationships it is not overlooking local, specialized organizations with racial equity and environmental justice goals.</p>
<p>Policy H-3.4</p>	<p>Encourage the location of new affordable housing units near community amenities and services, such as transit.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>	<p>Affordable housing near community amenities and services can increase opportunities for households of color in areas where barriers to housing tend to be higher.</p>	



<p>Policy H-3.5</p>	<p>Support both rental and ownership forms of affordable housing in a variety of locations, types, and sizes.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>	<p>Housing is not one-size-fits-all. Different households will need housing of different sizes and with different characteristics and amenities. While apartments near transit may be ideal for some families, others might want to live in intergenerational households where they have more space. By allowing a variety of housing types throughout different neighborhoods, the City will help meet the needs of a diverse population.</p>	<p>Regulations related to this policy should ensure that different housing types are allowed in a wide variety of neighborhoods. This will help prevent wealthier, whiter neighborhoods from becoming enshrined as protected areas and increase integration.</p>
<p>Policy H-3.6</p>	<p>Encourage energy efficient design features in new affordable housing units.</p>	<p>N/A</p>		<p>Keep</p>
<p>Policy H-3.7</p>	<p>Connect residents to programs providing information on affordable housing, financial literacy, and homeownership counseling.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>	<p>While programs that provide information on housing and financing do not increase the housing supply, they can address barriers to homeownership by connecting qualified households with resources they may not be aware of. The implementation of this policy and the types of resources it connects residents to will determine its impact on racial disparities.</p>	<p>To understand the demand for this type of program and the specific types of assistance needed by those who have historically been shut out of housing opportunities in Lake Forest Park, the City should develop this program with the assistance of groups representing and connected to communities of color.</p>
<p>Policy H-3.8</p>	<p>Consider the impacts of City regulations on housing cost and supply and take steps to address impacts.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Evaluating the impacts of local regulations on the housing supply will help the City plan for better outcomes. However, as written this policy is relatively vague and it is not clear what its impact will be.</p>	<p>The City should ensure that as it reviews its policies it considers each policy's impacts on segregation, racial equity, and displacement along with housing cost and supply.</p>
<p>Policy H-3.9</p>	<p>Collaborate with regional jurisdictions to meet housing growth targets and address housing issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Collaborating and coordinating with regional jurisdictions is essential to addressing the housing crisis. However, while this policy could potentially increase housing options for households of color, it does not directly address racial disparities.</p>	<p>Through the Comprehensive Plan process, cities throughout the region will be conducting racially disparate impact analyses as well as goal and policy reviews. These analyses should be incorporated into regional partnerships to address housing challenges.</p>



<p>Policy H-3.10</p>	<p>Work with community and regional partners, including the King County Housing Authority, to address the demand for special needs housing and affordable housing in Lake Forest Park and the surrounding area.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>	<p>Communities of color that have faced housing discrimination and segregation typically have higher rates of chronic illness, disability, and homelessness. By ensuring there is not only a sufficient supply of affordable housing but also a sufficient supply of housing designed to accommodate residents with specific needs will help address racial disparities.</p>	
<p>Goal H-4: Special Needs. Encourage and support a variety of housing opportunities for those with special needs, including older adults, people with disabilities, and the homeless.</p>				
<p>Policy H-4.1</p>	<p>Support measures that allow those with special needs to remain in the community as their housing needs change, including connecting them with available services and benefits.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>	<p>Allowing people to age in place and maintain ties to their communities can improve health outcomes and reduce social isolation.</p>	
<p>Policy H-4.2</p>	<p>Encourage universal design to maximize building lifecycle and accessibility.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>	<p>Universal design benefits a wide variety of people, including children, the elderly, parents, and disabled residents. It is particularly important for fostering multi-generational communities.</p>	<p>The City should create incentives specifically designed to encourage universal design. It should also connect with households of color to better understand their specific accessibility needs.</p>
<p>Policy H-4.3</p>	<p>Provide housing opportunity for special needs populations through development regulations.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>The City's development regulations should allow for a variety of housing types, including those that serve disabled, homeless, or otherwise vulnerable populations. However, the impact of these regulations on racial disparities depends on the types of regulations that are adopted.</p>	<p>As the City considers development regulations that allow for a wider variety of housing types, it should ensure that these regulations do not exacerbate existing patterns of segregation.</p>



<p>Policy H-4.4</p>	<p>Incentivize the location of special needs housing near services and public transportation.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>	<p>Locating housing for disabled, homeless, and/or elderly residents near transit and services is essential for maintaining social contacts and accessing jobs, medical care, and other necessities.</p>	<p>The location of where these incentives will apply is important to its success. The City should ensure that these types of housing are not allowed only on the busiest streets or corridors near transit.</p>
<p>Policy H-4.5</p>	<p>Support public and private housing services for people who are homeless.</p>	<p>Approaching</p>	<p>Functional services are essential for the success of permanent supportive housing, or other housing types aimed at supporting homeless residents. Offering consistent financial support for these programs will help them maintain an adequate level of service to meet resident needs.</p>	<p>The City should be specific in defining what kind of support it will provide. Monetary support to keep programs running and building capacity is ideal. Moral support is unlikely to improve outcomes for homeless residents.</p>
<p>Goal H-5: Internal Consistency. Balance and maintain consistency between housing needs and related City policies, including land use, environmental preservation, human services, and economic development.</p>				
<p>Policy H-5.1</p>	<p>Provide physical infrastructure and amenities to support vibrant residential neighborhoods, consistent with adopted land use designations.</p>	<p>N/A</p>		<p>Keep</p>



Attachment B: HB 1220 Methodology and Results

Land Capacity to Meet Housing and Jobs Targets, Housing Needs by Income Band, ADU and Middle Housing Capacity, Adequate Provisions

Background


As part of Lake Forest Park’s 2044 Comprehensive Plan update, Leland Consulting Group (LCG) was retained as part of a consultant team led by SCJ Alliance to complete an analysis of land capacity for housing and jobs, including considerations of housing by income band as required by RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c) and adequate provisions for meeting all housing needs as required by RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d). This memo outlines the methodology and results of this analysis, using the process outlined in the Washington Department of Commerce’s 2023 guidebook [“Guidance for Updating Your Housing Element.”](#)

Land Capacity Analysis

Housing and Jobs Targets

Lake Forest Park is required to show land capacity to meet 2019-2044 targets for housing units and jobs based on the Washington Office of Financial Management countywide projections as allocated to jurisdictions through the Countywide Planning Policies. Figure 1 below shows Lake Forest Park’s baseline and target housing units and jobs through 2044.

Figure B- 1: Lake Forest Park Baseline and Target Housing Units, 2019-2044



Source: 2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies (as amended 3/2023)


The housing unit baseline and targets are further broken down by what income band the housing units can serve, expressed as a percentage of the HUD Area Median Income (AMI). For reference,



the AMI for King County is \$146,500. The AMI is determined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and is generally higher than the Census-reported Median Household income for a given city, since it is a countywide metric and adjusted for household size. The HUD AMI is used to determine eligibility and income limits for subsidized affordable housing units.

The housing targets for families earning under 30% AMI are broken down into permanent units (i.e. standard housing units) and permanent supportive housing (PSH), defined in the Department of Commerce guidebook as “subsidized, leased housing for people who are experiencing homelessness or are at risk of homelessness and living with a disabling condition.” Each jurisdiction also receives a housing target for emergency housing, defined as “temporary accommodations for households who are experiencing homelessness or are at imminent risk of becoming homeless.” Lake Forest Park’s housing baseline and 2044 targets by income band are shown below:


Figure B- 2: Lake Forest Park Existing and Target Housing Units by Income Band, 2019-2044




Source: 2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies (as amended 3/2023)

Figure B- 3: Vacant and Redevelopable Parcels in Lake Forest Park, 2023





Vacant and Redevelopable Parcels and Pending



Development

The first step in the land capacity analysis is to determine which parcels could accommodate new development over the 20-year planning horizon. King County provided GIS data from their Urban Growth Capacity Report classifying parcels in Lake Forest Park as vacant, redevelopable (based on low building to land value ratio and other considerations), or constant (not likely to change over the next 20 years). The map of vacant and redevelopable parcels is shown on the previous page in Figure B-3.

Critical Areas

Lake Forest Park contains a large amount of critical areas, including steep slopes, creeks and streams and their buffers, and wetlands. Although some development may occur in these areas through the use of a Reasonable Economic Use Exemption, the constrained parcel acreage was removed for the purposes of this analysis, in order to make a conservative assumption of land capacity and ensure that Lake Forest Park can reach its housing targets without needing to develop in critical areas. The total vacant and redevelopable acreage, constrained, and unconstrained acreage by zone is shown below.

Table B- 1: Critical Area Acreage by Zone in Lake Forest Park, 2023

	Gross Vacant/ Redevelopable Acres	Environmentally Constrained	Net (Unconstrained) Vacant/Redevelopable Acres
Single-Family			
RS-20	118	73.1	44.9
RS-15	57.4	34.7	22.7
RS-10	47.9	16.7	31.2
RS-9.6	124.9	92.3	32.6
RS-7.2	186.4	11.1	175.3
Multifamily			
RM-3600	0.0		
RM-2400	0.0		
RM-1800	0.0		
RM-900	0.0		
Town Center / Southern Gateway			
TC	17.6		17.6
SG-SFR	0.0		0.0
SG-T	0.8		0.8
SG-C	11.7		11.7
Commercial			
BN	2.5	1.4	1.1
TOTAL	567.2	229.3	337.9

Source: King County, City of Lake Forest Park, Leland Consulting Group



Market Reduction Factor

Commerce’s HB 1220 guidance indicates that jurisdictions should reduce the amount of net vacant and redevelopable acreage by a reasonable amount to account for land which may not be available for redevelopment due to the need for new right-of-way, public space, stormwater facilities, or other dedications, as well as a reasonable estimate of the amount of land that will remain unavailable due to the market. The Department of Commerce suggests a minimum reduction of 15% for vacant parcels and 25% for redevelopable parcels. Using these as minimum deductions, LCG calculated an additional market factor for single-family zones based on recent development trends in each zone to arrive at a reasonable estimate of redevelopment capacity in the city without overestimating the potential for redevelopment in these zones. Larger-scale redevelopment has been envisioned through long-term subarea planning processes in both the Town Center and Southern Gateway zones. Therefore, these areas were considered redevelopable and reduced by the Commerce-recommended 25% market factor reduction. The reduction factors are shown below in Table B-2.

Table B- 2: Market Factor by Zone in Lake Forest Park

	Vacant			Redevelopable		
	Gross Acres	Deduction Factor	Net Acres	Gross Acres	Deduction Factor	Net Acres
Single-Family						
RS-20	4.4	89%	0.5	40.5	90%	4.1
RS-15	2.8	86%	0.4	19.9	90%	2.0
RS-10	2.7	93%	0.2	28.5	90%	2.9
RS-9.6	4.4	87%	0.6	28.2	90%	2.8
RS-7.2	7.9	88%	0.9	167.4	90%	16.7
Multifamily						
RM-3600	0.0	15%	0.0	0.0	25%	0.0
RM-2400	0.0	15%	0.0	0.0	25%	0.0
RM-1800	0.0	15%	0.0	0.0	25%	0.0
RM-900	0.0	15%	0.0	0.0	25%	0.0
Town Center / Southern Gateway						
TC	0.0	15%	0.0	17.6	25%	13.2
SG-SFR	0.0	15%	0.0	0.0	25%	0.0
SG-T	0.0	15%	0.0	0.8	25%	0.6
SG-C	0.0	15%	0.0	11.7	25%	8.8
Commercial						
BN	0.0	15%	0.0	1.1	25%	0.8
TOTAL	22.2		2.6	315.7		51.8

Source: King County, City of Lake Forest Park, HUD Building Permit Data, WA Department of Commerce, Leland Consulting Group.



Housing and Job Density Assumptions


Having established the amount of available developable acreage, the next step in the analysis is to estimate the density at which that acreage could redevelop. This was calculated in different ways for single-family and multifamily development:

- Density of development in the Single-Family zones was determined by the minimum lot size in the Lake Forest Park zoning code.
- Density in the Town Center is capped at 17 units per acre by ordinance.
- Density in the Southern Gateway Transition Zone is assumed to be similar in character to the Town Center.
- In the Southern Gateway Corridor, density was calculated based on a mix of townhomes at about 25 units/acre and podium development at about 100 units per acre. Examples of these densities are shown at right for illustration of scale of development (not for architectural or design elements). The table below in Figure 7 shows the density assumptions for housing, for zones which allow housing

Figure B- 4: Redevelopment Prototype Examples for SG-C Zone




Figure B- 5: Housing Density Assumptions for Lake Forest Park Land Capacity Analysis (units/acre)



Source: Lake Forest Park Zoning Code, Urban Footprint, Leland Consulting Group

For **employment density**, various assumptions were used for redevelopable parcels in three areas with potential for commercial development – the BN zone, Southern Gateway, and Town Center:

- In the BN zone, an assumption of 28 jobs per acre was used, based on traditional 1-story retail prototypes developed using Urban Footprint, a scenario planning tool with an extensive database of building statistics and typologies. This job density took into account the BN zone’s maximum lot coverage of 35 percent.
- For the Southern Gateway, an assumption of 33 jobs per acre was used, based on a variety of low-rise mixed-use building prototypes from the west coast, also developed using Urban Footprint.



- For the Town Center, the average of the two action alternative scenarios presented in the Lake Forest Park Town Center DEIS estimated that at full build-out, the area could contain about 256,000 square feet of commercial development (after accounting for square footage lost to redevelopment). Using the Lake Forest Park assumption of 465 square feet per job found in the 2021 King County Urban Growth Capacity Report, this would equate to **552 jobs** in the Town Center, an average of 42 jobs per acre. This job density aligns with regional mixed-use prototypes.

These housing and employment density assumptions were then applied to the net vacant and redevelopable acreage (after critical area and market factor deductions) by zone shown on previous pages in Table B-2, to determine total housing and jobs capacity. Results are discussed below after a discussion of additional ADU and middle housing capacity, which was calculated separately on a parcel level.

Additional ADU Capacity

HB 1337, passed by the legislature in 2023, requires that cities allow two ADUs, detached or attached, on all parcels currently zoned for low-density residential (i.e. single-family). As part of this capacity analysis, LCG considered the additional housing capacity that this new legislation could create in Lake Forest Park. Parcels in the RS-20, RS-15, RS-10, RS-9.6, and RS-7.2 zones were considered for this analysis. The built square footage was first removed from the parcel acreage, and then the remaining acreage within the allowed lot coverage ratio (per the zoning code) was calculated. Critical areas were also removed for this analysis. Assuming at least 1,000 square feet would be required to construct an ADU, this resulted in a total of **2,104 parcels which have sufficient space for an ADU**. Based on Commerce guidance and regional trends, LCG assumed that 2 percent of homeowners might choose to develop an ADU over the planning horizon, resulting in an **ADU capacity of 42 units**. This would average out to about 2.1 ADUs per year, compared to 1.5 ADUs per year which have been permitted on average since 2016, according to city data. This is a reasonable increase given the forthcoming liberalization of ADU standards resulting from HB 1337.

Additional Duplex Capacity

HB 1110, also passed by the legislature in 2023, requires that Lake Forest Park allow at least duplexes on all lots in low-density residential zones. To determine the potential for added units, LCG conducted a high-level feasibility analysis of parcels in the RS-20, RS-15, RS-10, RS-9.6 and RS-7.2 zones. Similar to the ADU analysis, the net buildable area within the allowed lot coverage was analyzed, with an assumption of at least 2,000 square feet of buildable area needed to construct a duplex. Critical areas parcel acreage was also removed for this analysis, as in the ADU analysis. Although HB 1110 does allow cities the option to exclude all parcels which contain any critical area or critical area buffer acreage, Lake Forest Park will not be making a decision on whether to apply that exemption until after the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, since current regulations do allow the development of housing on non-constrained parcel acreage, only the actual constrained acreage, rather than all parcels which contain any critical area acreage, was removed for this analysis.




Next, LCG undertook a high-level feasibility analysis to determine a reasonable subset of parcels based on land value where it may be financially feasible to build a duplex based on the Department of Commerce’s Middle Housing Pro Forma tool and Leland Consulting Group’s study of development costs in the Puget Sound region. This resulted in a total of 53 parcels where a duplex may be feasible. Nearly all of these parcels were classified as vacant or redevelopable in the King County Buildable Lands report. An assumption that 50% of these parcel owners would choose to build a duplex over the next 20 years after the implementation of HB 1110, based on trends seen in other cities who have recently implemented such changes, results in an additional **26 units** of housing capacity in Lake Forest Park’s single family zones.

Results

As shown below in Figure 8, Lake Forest Park has sufficient land capacity to meet both its overall housing and jobs targets, after taking into account critical area constraints, future market factor reductions, and using density assumptions from the zoning code and regional development prototypes. The next section further breaks down housing capacity by income band, as required by HB 1220.


Figure B- 6: Net New Housing and Jobs Targets and Capacity in Lake Forest Park, 2019-2044



Housing Needs by Income Band

HB 1220 requires jurisdictions to analyze their housing capacity by the household income level that new units can serve. Each county establishes income-based targets for each city within the county, and the cities must then demonstrate that they have sufficient land capacity for the number of units allocated in each income band, as well as capacity for emergency housing units. Lake Forest Park’s existing and target housing units for the 2019-2044 period are shown below in Figure B-7.

Figure B- 7: Lake Forest Park Existing and Target Housing Units by Income Band, 2019-2044



Source: 2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies (as amended 3/2023)

Land Capacity by Income Band

The first step in this analysis is to break down the land capacity for future units into income bands that those units could serve. Following Department of Commerce guidance, this is accomplished by grouping zones into **zone categories** based on the housing types that are allowed, and then grouping those categories by the **lowest potential income level that could be served by the housing types in that zone category**. This classification is shown on the following page.



Income Categories

This analysis uses three main income categories:

- **Low-Income** (Households earning under 80% AMI)
- **Moderate-Income** (Households earning 80-120% AMI)
- **High-Income** (Households earning more than 120% AMI)

Table B- 3: Lake Forest Park Zone Category Classification

Zone	Housing Types Allowed	Zone Capacity	Zone Category	Lowest Income Level Served
Single-Family				
RS-20	Single-Family, Manufactured Home, ADU	8	Low Density	High-Income (120% AMI+)
RS-15	Single-Family, Manufactured Home, ADU	5		
RS-10	Single-Family, Manufactured Home, ADU	10		
RS-9.6	Single-Family, Manufactured Home, ADU	8		
RS-7.2	Single-Family, Manufactured Home, ADU	86		
Town Center / Southern Gateway				
TC	Multifamily	224	Mid-Rise	Low-Income (0-80% AMI)
SG-SFR	Single-Family, ADU	0	Low Density	High-Income (120% AMI+)
SG-T	Multifamily, Single-Family (with restrictions), Senior apartments, nursing homes	10	Low-Rise	Low-Income (0-80% AMI)
SG-C	Multifamily, Senior apartments, nursing homes	527	Mid-Rise	Low-Income (0-80% AMI)
Additional Housing Types				
ADUs		42		Moderate-Income (80-120% AMI)
Duplexes		26		

Source: Leland Consulting Group

Finally, the aggregated housing needs for each income band from King County are compared with the total pending units and additional land capacity by income band. The results are shown below in Table B-4. As shown, Lake Forest Park has sufficient capacity to accommodate its housing targets by income band through multifamily development capacity in the Southern Gateway and Town Center, and Middle Housing and ADUs throughout the city, as well as some single-family development on vacant lots and potentially through some subdivision of larger lots.



Table B- 4: Lake Forest Park Housing Targets and Capacity by Income Band, 2019-2044

Income Band (% of AMI)	Zone Category	Housing Needs	Aggregated Housing Needs	Total Capacity	Surplus/ Deficit
0-30 PSH	Mid-Rise, Low-Rise	164	760	761	1
0-30 Non PSH		313			
30-50		143			
50-80		140			
80-100	ADUs, Middle Housing	14	30	68	12
100-120		16			
120+	Low Density	80	80	117	37
TOTAL		870	870	946	76

Source: Leland Consulting Group

Adequate Provisions

In addition to this analysis by income band, HB 1220 also requires cities to show that their housing element “[m]akes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.” This analysis requires a **comparison of the historic rate of housing production to the rate of housing production needed to meet housing targets by income band.** The results of this analysis are shown below in Figure 13, using historic production data from the City, Census building permit survey, and PSRC’s Income-Restricted Housing Inventory. Similar to the analysis above, the income levels are correlated with housing types based on LCG’s analysis of housing prices affordable to various income levels in Lake Forest Park. As shown below, historic production trends indicate a deficit of production of units serving households earning 80 percent of the AMI and below – an average of 3 have been built per year since 2012, compared with 30 per year needed by 2044 to meet the housing target.





Figure B- 8: Historic and Target Housing Production Trends in Lake Forest Park, 2012-2023




Source: King County, City of Lake Forest Park, U.S. Census Building Permit Survey, PSRC Income-Restricted Housing Inventory

In order to address this shortfall, Commerce has developed a checklist for cities to address four categories of barriers to housing production:

- Development regulations
- Process obstacles
- Limited land availability and environmental constraints
- Funding gaps

There is an additional checklist for cities to address additional potential barriers to the construction of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and emergency housing. Cities should document how these barriers may be affecting the production of units at the income level specified using this checklist and document the potential steps they could take to overcome the barriers. Note that cities do not need to implement these steps as part of the comprehensive plan update, but they can help guide goal and policy development and cities will be required to produce a report documenting their progress towards increasing housing production five years after the adoption of the comprehensive plan.

Both of these checklists and potential actions to remove barriers to housing production are found in Attachment C.



Attachment C: Adequate Provisions Checklist

Table C- 1: Low-Rise or Mid-Rise Housing Barrier Review Checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Unclear development regulations	No	Development regulations are clear and easy to understand	
High minimum lot sizes	Yes	While the minimum lot sizes are not particularly high in the City's residential multifamily zones, the minimum lot size per unit significantly restricts what can be built. For instance, although multifamily is allowed in the RM-3600 zone, just two units would be allowed on a 7,200 SF lot because 3,600 SF of lot area is required per unit. The current lot size per unit in multifamily zones results in a range of 12-48 units per acre - this would not allow for anything more dense than townhomes and garden-style apartments.	Regulate density via units per acre rather than minimum lot area per unit. Ensure that the density is high enough to allow for multifamily housing on a typical lot, and that feasible multifamily types are allowed.
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes	Density in the multifamily zones is dictated by minimum lot area per unit rather than typical density or FAR metrics.	See above
Low maximum building heights	Yes	The height in all multifamily zones is limited to 35 feet. This is enough for roughly three stories of housing. This is likely to negatively impact feasibility on smaller lots, especially in zones where higher unit densities are permitted.	Increase building heights to allow for four to five stories, particularly in zones that allow for higher densities, like RM-900.



<p>Large setback requirements</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The City's code requires 20-foot front and rear yard setbacks. Side yard setbacks range from 10 to 20 feet. Large setbacks, especially when combined with other restrictions like height and lot coverage, significantly impact the feasibility of multifamily development.</p>	<p>Consider reducing front and rear setbacks in multifamily zones. Limit side setbacks to no more than 10 feet.</p>
<p>High off-street parking requirements</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>One and a half parking spaces are required for each multifamily unit in Lake Forest Park, regardless of the unit size or number of bedrooms. Structured parking is extremely expensive to build, and surface parking significantly limits what can be built on a site. Requiring parking at this ratio would significantly impact the feasibility of multifamily.</p>	<p>Developers will typically build parking whether or not it is required - lower minimum parking requirements ensure that developers have the flexibility to meet market demand. Lake Forest Park should consider eliminating parking requirements, or at least reducing the minimum to no more than 1 per unit.</p>
<p>High impervious coverage limits</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The maximum lot coverage allowed in multifamily zones ranges from 35% to 55%. Combined with other code requirements like maximum building heights, this is likely to have a negative impact on the feasibility of multifamily construction.</p>	<p>Increase maximum lot coverage requirements to no less than 50%. Consider increasing further for zones targeted for higher density, like RM-900.</p>
<p>Lack of alignment between building and development codes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>There is not a lack of alignment between building and development codes</p>	
<p>Other (for example: ground floor retail requirements, open space requirements, complex design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements)</p>	<p>N/A</p>		



PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Conditional use permit process	No	Multifamily is not a conditional use in the RM zones	
Design review			
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	No	An updated fee schedule is available on the city's website and the Help Topics page is linked there, with information on the permitting process.	
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	No	The permit, impact, and utility connection fees do not appear to be significantly higher than other jurisdictions	
Process times and staffing challenges			
SEPA process	No	SEPA is required in most WA jurisdictions. A planned action ordinance would remove the need for SEPA review and help reduce the cost and uncertainty of development.	
LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	Yes	There are many large parcels in Lake Forest Park, but most of these are built out with high-value homes, or are constrained by environmental issues.	Allow for lot division that would free up additional land for development. Allow multifamily housing in more areas of the city.
Environmental constraints	Yes	There are significant slope and wetland constraints throughout Lake Forest Park.	Increase the number of lots that are zoned for multifamily development, especially in areas with fewer environmental constraints.



Table C- 2: Supplementary Barrier Review Checklist for PSH and Emergency Housing

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Spacing requirements (for example, minimum distance from parks, schools or other emergency/PSH housing facilities) ⁹			
Parking requirements	Yes	The parking requirements for multifamily housing are 1.5 per dwelling unit, while the requirement for rooming houses is one space per four beds (or per two sleeping units). There is no specific distinction for PSH, but if 1.5 spaces are required for each unit, this would be a major barrier to feasibility.	Either reduce parking requirements to conform with rooming house requirements (0.5 spaces per unit) or eliminate parking minimums for PSH/emergency housing.
On-site recreation and open space requirements			

⁹ Note that RCW 35A.21.430 expressly states requirements on occupancy, spacing, and intensity of use may not prevent the siting of a sufficient number of permanent supportive housing, transitional housing, indoor emergency housing or indoor emergency shelters necessary to accommodate each code city's projected need for such housing and shelter under RCW 36.70A.070(2)(a)(ii). The restrictions on these uses must be to protect public health and safety.



<p>Restrictions on support spaces, such as office space, within a transitional or PSH building in a residential zone</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Office/retail uses are not permitted in the RM-3600, RM-2400, RM-1800, or RM-900 zones, where presumably PSH would likely be built.</p>	<p>Ensure that supplementary uses like service providers are allowed in PSH and emergency housing facilities in these zones</p>
<p>Arbitrary limits on number of occupants (in conflict with RCW <u>35A.21.314</u>)</p>			
<p>Requirements for PSH or emergency housing that are different than the requirements imposed on housing developments generally (in conflict with RCW <u>36.130.020</u>)</p>			
<p>Other restrictions specific to emergency shelters, emergency housing, transitional housing and permanent supportive housing</p>			



Attachment D:

DRAFT

