



Bellevue Planning Commission

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

6:30 to 9:30 p.m. ■ 1E-113

City Hall ■ 450 110th Avenue NE, Bellevue

Agenda

Regular Meeting

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 6:30 p.m. | 1. Call to Order
<i>Aaron Laing, Chairperson</i> |
| | 2. Roll Call |
| | 3. Public Comment*
<i>Limited to 5 minutes per person or 3 minutes if a public hearing has been held on your topic</i> |
| | 4. Approval of Agenda |
| | 5. Communications from City Council, Community Council, Boards and Commissions |
| | 6. Staff Reports
<i>Paul Inghram, Comprehensive Planning Manager</i> |
| | 7. Draft Minutes Review <ul style="list-style-type: none">• November 12• November 18• December 10 |
| 7:00 | 8. Study Session
A. Comprehensive Plan Update
Consolidated draft Comprehensive Plan
<i>Paul Inghram, Comprehensive Planning Manager</i> |
| 9:15 | 9. Other Business |
| | 10. Public Comment* - <i>Limited to 3 minutes per person</i> |
| 9:30 | 12. Adjourn |

Pg. 1

Agenda times are approximate

Planning Commission members

Aaron Laing, Chair
Michelle Hilhorst, Vice Chair
John Carlson
Jay Hamlin

Diane Tebelius
John deVadoss
Stephanie Walter

John Stokes, Council Liaison

Staff contact:

Paul Inghram 452-4070
Michelle Luce 452-6931

** Unless there is a Public Hearing scheduled, "Public Comment" is the only opportunity for public participation.*

Wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation available upon request. Please call at least 48 hours in advance. 425-452-5262 (TDD) or 425-452-4162 (Voice). Assistance for the hearing impaired: dial 711 (TR).



February 11, 2015

SUBJECT

Major Comprehensive Plan Update

STAFF CONTACT

Paul Inghram AICP, Comprehensive Planning Manager, 452-4070 pinghram@bellevuewa.gov
Planning and Community Development

DIRECTION NEEDED FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

- Action
- X** Discussion
- Information

The February 11, 2015, study session is an opportunity to see a consolidated draft of the Comprehensive Plan update. No formal action is requested at this study session. The Commission requested this check-in just prior to release of the draft document, which is scheduled for public release this week. It is staff's intent that we accurately captured all the policy edits made by the Commission during your review. If we missed anything, this is the opportunity to let us know.

At the time of the packet, consultant and staff work was continuing to assemble the individual policy sets into the draft consolidated plan. By the end of the day Monday, the draft plan will be sent to the Commission. If the fully formatted version is not complete then, the Monday version may be a partially complete or partially formatted draft, with the complete version following.

Action by the Commission will follow the next round of public input, to occur after the draft is released. The Planning Commission will be asked to make a formal recommendation to the City Council following a public hearing on March 4 and the Commission's subsequent deliberations.

BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission has worked over more than the last year through policy-by-policy reviews of the chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. At the Commission's last meeting the Commission reviewed several items, completing the initial round of reviews of individual chapters. The reviews of the individual chapters entailed dozens of study sessions by the Planning Commission and the city's other boards and commissions to examine the current Comprehensive Plan, last updated in 2004. Reviews considered background information on how the city has changed and staff recommendations for policy changes.

Consolidated Draft Plan

Having completed initial review of each element's policies, the individual chapters have been pulled together in a consolidated draft of the update plan. This full draft allows the Commission to see the plan as whole and evaluate the integration of the individual sections. This draft carries forward the policy changes reviewed by the Planning Commission during previous study sessions, while recognizing that the Planning Commission may identify additional changes as review continues.

As a whole document, the draft plan that will be presented to the Planning Commission includes a number of components:

- The **Vision** and introductory text
- The **Elements**, including the policies, narrative background information and maps
- The Glossary
- A list of long-range transportation projects in an appendix
- Changes to Volume 2, including changes related to Surrey Downs Park, Factoria, Eastgate and Richards Valley

As the Planning Commission hears from other boards and commission and continues to receive input from the general public, it is expected that additional revisions may be made prior to the Commission making a recommendation to the City Council.

The Planning Commission, other boards and commissions, and the public have spent months reviewing the elements' draft policies. These are the "meat" of the plan, the specific wording that provides guidance for a range of city decisions. As noted above, it is staff's intent that we have accurately captured all the Commission's direction to date on the draft policies.

The plan also includes narrative background information for each element and, in some cases, maps that illustrate planning issues geographically. The draft "narrative" has just been completed and the Commission has not yet reviewed. The narrative provides context and background for each element and has been updated to reflect current conditions. The city's consultant has worked with staff to review narrative language and to apply the organization of the template that was previously reviewed with the Commission so that there is a consistent format and voice across all elements. The narrative helps the reader understand the document as a whole and is intended to follow the principle of making the plan more readable and accessible to the public. While it is helpful background, the narrative does not have the effect of setting policy direction. If the Commission has specific suggestions or edits for the narrative, this can be integrated into your final recommendations.

The draft will clearly note that this background information has not been reviewed by the Planning Commission and may be further revised as the review process continues.

Recent Changes

At the previous study session, the Planning Commission reviewed a number of plan and policy questions that have been incorporated into the current draft. Items discussed at recent meetings include:

- A draft Vision document
- The draft Neighborhoods Element

- The Downtown southern boundary
- Follow-up questions regarding the Citizen Participation, Housing, and Utilities elements

Attachment 1 provides a summary of the direction from these recent reviews and how it was incorporated into the draft.

In addition to these recent changes, the progression from the original policy of the current Comprehensive Plan to the Planning Commission's current direction (or that of other boards and commissions) has been documented in a series of tables for each chapter. These tables show the original policy, the comments and suggestions from staff, and the commissions' direction and changes. (Updated policy tables are enclosed.)

As the entire update is viewed as a whole, competing policies may be identified. To an extent, it is recognized that any comprehensive plan will have a dynamic tension between multiple goals and that it is appropriate to read the plan as a whole and to balance competing interests. However, there are times when it is appropriate to ensure consistency of terminology, approach, or areas of policy direction across elements of the plan. With the ability to view the plan as a whole, it will now be key to identify whether additional changes or additions are needed to ensure that the plan works together as an integrated document. As the review process moves forward, staff will work with the Commission to identify and track additional potential changes that may be included in the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Council Feedback

City Council was presented with an update on the project on February 2, with Commissioner Walter in attendance. This provided Council with information about the work completed since their last briefing in September and confirmed the upcoming schedule that provides the Council with multiple study sessions for review in April and May.

Members of the City Council expressed thanks and appreciation for all the work by the Planning Commission and the other boards and commission. They recognized all the hard work that has gone into preparing the draft. Several praised the new Neighborhoods Element for acknowledging the varying character of individual neighborhoods. (One comment raised a similar question as the Planning Commission's regarding draft policy N-2, which is proposed for revision based on Commission direction.)

Some Councilmembers also expressed support for the direction of the draft Vision document, noting that it will work in parallel with the Council Vision. The changes to Utilities policies, urban design maps, and the southern Downtown Boundary were also discussed.

Council asked whether the Citizen Engagement element would include a policy supporting outreach in languages other than English and to address cell-phone only households, which may relate to the new policy on using new technologies. Outreach in non-English languages may be an item to review further during the draft review process.

Councilmembers noted the importance of the housing policy in the plan and wanted to ensure that the plan is brought up to date to meet recent changes to regional policies. It was asked that, in making its recommendation, the Planning Commission consider and address several questions in your Transmittal:

- What are the new countywide planning policy requirements and how does the Element fulfill those requirements?
- What benchmarks are used to demonstrate the existing need and how will the Element address housing affordable to those incomes?
- How does the Housing Element set goals for addressing the countywide need for housing: ranging from affordable to moderate, low, and very low income?

It was appreciated that the draft includes a substantial amount of work of six boards and commissions as well as other groups and the public. As the draft update makes its way to the Council for review, the Council would like to ensure that it has an opportunity to see or hear the input from each board and commission that has helped shape the draft.

NEXT STEPS

This study session will begin a new stage of reviewing the full consolidated draft of the Comprehensive Plan. As noted above, no formal action is requested at this study session. The Commission requested this check-in just prior to release of the draft document, which is scheduled for public release this week. It is staff's intent that we accurately captured all the policy edits made by the Commission during your review. If we missed anything, this is the opportunity to let us know.

Release of the draft plan directly following this meeting provides the public with time to review the document before the public open house and public hearing set for February 25 and March 4 respectively.

A presentation outlining the full draft and the major changes from the current plan will be made to the six boards and commissions on February 25. A public hearing to gather additional input from the public is scheduled for March 4. The Commission may hold that hearing open for multiple meetings to include any additional comment from other boards, commissions, groups and the public in the hearing record.

February 11	Public review draft of entire plan available
February 25	Public open house & joint boards and commissions meeting
March 4	Public Hearing
March 11	Deliberations
March 18/25	Recommendations to Council (depending on timing of other boards and commissions)
April 6	Transmittal to Council
April-May	Council review (set of study sessions are scheduled)
Mid-June	Council final action
June 30, 2015	Statutory deadline for Comprehensive Plan Update

ATTACHMENTS

1. Summary of Recent Changes
2. Policy tables (enclosed)

Summary of Recent Changes

Vision

At the December meeting it was noted that there were too many instances of “extraordinary.” One of these was changed and two instances were removed from the draft included in the consolidated draft plan.

Neighborhoods Element

A slightly revised version of the draft Neighborhoods Element was presented in January. This one included additional policy emphasis on public safety and reorganized the order of the policies. Two policies were called out. N-2 regarding public safety was noted as needing to be more oriented toward the needs of the community. There was also concern that N-11 was broad and could be more focused on neighborhood specific issues. These two policies were revised for the consolidated draft as shown here:

N-2 Ensure police, fire and emergency services provide high levels of public safety that respond to growth and changing community needs ~~through accreditation of public safety services that follow recognized best practices.~~

N-11 Enable neighborhood-tailored solutions to ~~problems~~ localized issues while ensuring that they meet citywide responsibilities.

Downtown Boundary

Continuing the review of the Downtown Boundary, the Commission considered three specific instances where the boundary appears appropriate to adjust in a way that is inclusive of existing Downtown development, makes the boundary more regular, and does not enable Downtown to encroach into the residential neighborhood to the south. At this stage, those three changes will be carried forward into the consolidated draft as a proposed amendment to the Downtown Subarea Plan.

Citizen Engagement

The Commission previously reviewed the policies to the Citizen Engagement Element. A policy on master planning of large public project to support public engagement was further discussed in December and revised based on the Commission’s direction. Select additional policies were brought back for consideration in January following the work on the Vision statement. At this stage the Commission elected to include a change CP-8 to modernize it and to create a new separate policy regarding use of emerging technology in place of the old language in CP-8. These two recent changes, in addition to the revised policy on the master planning process for public projects, will be included in the consolidated draft.

Proposed change to CP 8:

Use a range of public forums and opportunities. Utilize a number of forums including commissions, boards, and the community council, and newer technologies such as the Internet and email to facilitate citizen participation in the planning process.

Proposed new policy:

Use new and emerging technologies for citizen engagement where they are effective and efficient at enhancing citizen understanding and participation.

Housing

The Commission looked a number of potential policy revised and directed including a new policy expressly supporting housing options for seniors.

Encourage a range of housing types for seniors affordable at a variety of income levels.

The Commission also discussed a number of changes to HO-25 and directed merging some aspects of the prior draft new HO-2a with HO-25, including the statement regarding monitoring. Discussion of avoiding unintended consequences led to including that additional aspect to the monitoring clause of the policy.

HO-25 Develop an effective strategy to ensure affordable housing opportunities are available throughout the city at a range of affordability levels. Monitor quantity, types and affordability of housing achieved and for potential unintended consequences.

Utilities

The Commission discussed a number of policies related to electrical and telecommunication lines. Minor changes were suggested for a new policy that addresses telecommunication lines separately from electrical lines.

Allow new aerial telecommunication lines on existing systems provided that they shall be ~~are~~ designed to address visual impacts, and are required to be placed underground at the time of undergrounding electrical distribution lines.

Revised from a previous study session, a new policy will be added to seek additional funding opportunities to support mitigation.

Work with PSE, telecom providers, state regulatory agencies, and other responsible parties to develop funding tools that enable full mitigation of the neighborhood impacts of deploying electrical and telecommunications infrastructure.

In response to public comments, a new policy will be added to the draft that focuses on neighborhood efforts:

Support neighborhood efforts to underground existing electrical distribution lines where neighborhood residents have indicated a willingness and ability to cover the non-utility share of project costs.

Planning Commission direction and additional changes to those shown here have been captured throughout the draft review process and are summarized on the policy issue tables. Additional review and refinement of the policies of the draft plan will occur during review of the consolidated draft and the draft plan may change prior to a formal Planning Commission recommendation.



Planning Commission Schedule

February 11, 2015

The Bellevue Planning Commission meets Wednesdays as needed, typically two or three times per month. Meetings begin at 6:30 p.m. and are held in the Council Conference Room (Room 1E-113) at City Hall, unless otherwise noted. Public comment is welcome at each meeting.

The schedule and meeting agendas are subject to change. Please confirm meeting agendas with city staff at 425-452-6931. Agenda and meeting materials are posted the Monday prior to the meeting date on the city's website at:

<http://www.bellevuewa.gov/planning-commission-agendas-2014.htm>

<u>Date</u>	<u>Tentative Agenda Topics</u>
Feb 25	Joint Meeting of Boards and Commissions
Mar 4	Potential Public Hearing on Comprehensive Plan
Mar 11	Comprehensive Plan Deliberations
Mar 18	Comprehensive Plan Deliberations
Mar 25	Comprehensive Plan Deliberations

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

November 12, 2014
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Laing, Commissioners Carlson, Hilhorst, Tebelius, deVadoss, Walter; Councilmember Stokes

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Hamlin

COUNCIL LIAISON: Councilmember Stokes

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Inghram, Nicholas Matz, Department of Planning and Community Development; Kevin McDonald, Paula Stevens, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:37 p.m. by Chair Laing who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Hamlin who was excused.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Warren Halvorson, 13701 NE 32nd Place, said he served as part of a group of about 100 people put together by the city. The findings with regard to technology and neighborhoods were particularly interesting. Technology is a trend and a driver, not only for neighborhoods but also for businesses and companies like Puget Sound Energy. It took only a few years for wireless technology to take over wired landlines. The same may be the case for the electrical transmission business as solar panels, batteries, wind power and conservation continues to reduce demand. The city neighborhood study showed a deep concern for safety, health, and aesthetics. Undergrounding is a critical issue and deserves more comprehensive dialog and visioning. Electromagnetic fields and the corona effects are concerning to many, particularly when changing from a 140KV to 230KV line. Any new or major utility element beginning with the words "work with" must be suspect and frankly should not be used in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Tebelius told Mr. Halvorson it would be helpful to have his ideas and suggestions relative to the policies written down.

Ms. Heidi Dean, 11661 SE 56th Street, spoke as president of the Newport Hills Community Club. She noted the closure of the Red Apple, Hallmark and the pharmacy in 2009 and Bank of

America in 2011 On November 6 the Chinese restaurant closed its doors after ten years in Newport Hills. Multiple businesses are struggling, including Bill Pace, Cloud Nine, Newport Hills Mailboxes and Shipping Center, and Kumon Learning Center. The community club does the best it can to help direct customers to the Newport Hills Shopping Center businesses through events and social media promotion, but there is only so much that can be done by the organization to combat the real problem, which is the property owner's apathy about the appearance of the center and re-tenanting. From overflowing garbage cans to sporadic landscape upkeep, tired-looking awnings and sign scars, the shopping center simply looks sad. The lack of activity at the shopping center has triggered an increase in graffiti and break-ins over the last couple of years. The community appreciates the support of the Council in approving signs on Coal Creek Parkway announcing the Newport Hills Neighborhood Shopping District. The signs are a nice start but they are not enough. What is needed is a major overhaul of what is there, or redevelopment. The shopping center property manager has assured the community that there are plans for the property, but those claims have been made before. Since 2000 there have been two feasibility studies done on the center, both of which reached the conclusion that the property could be most successful if redeveloped as a mixed use center to include multifamily housing. Over the last year and a half the city has identified and brought forward multiple potential buyers and/or development partners, but the property owners have rejected all offers. The community is being held hostage by a property owner who has no real vested interest in the community, largely because the city does not have codes in place that address commercial blight. Help from city staff is needed to follow up on the suggestion of Councilmember Robertson to use the Municipal Research and Services Center to see how other cities treat commercial blight; that organization only works with city staff. The plight of the shopping center is complicated in light of the recent sale of the Mutual Materials brick factory to a company that intends to put a large mixed use development on the site that is less than half a mile from the entrance to the neighborhood at SE 60th Street. The developer has already approached Newport Hills business owners about moving to their site.

Ms. Catherine Taylor, 10885 NE 4th Street, spoke as senior local government affairs representative for Puget Sound Energy. She said PSE appreciates the relationship it has enjoyed with the city working on long-range planning issues aimed at ensuring that the city's electric and natural gas customers will have safe, reliable and dependable power. PSE partners with the city on multiple projects that contribute to the long-range plans of the city, including growth and development. The Energize Eastside project has been part of the city's Comprehensive Plan since 1994, though not by name, and is one of a number of PSE projects designed to implement the long-range plans of the city. She offered to give a detailed briefing to the Commission on the Energize Eastside project at any time convenient for the Commission.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to revise the agenda by moving item 11 ahead of item 5, and to approve the agenda as amended, was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

5. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW

A. June 25, 2014

A motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

B. July 9, 2014

Commissioner Walter referred to the fifth paragraph on page 6 and pointed out it should read "There also was consensus around the notion of limiting the number of rooms to four and the total number of occupants to four plus one."

Chair Laing called attention to the eighth paragraph on page 12 and asked to have the last sentence revised to read "He also suggested the term "weather protection" be used instead of "rain cover" because it is broader.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

C. July 30, 2014

A motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Commissioner Hilhorst said that along with Chair Laing she attended the most recent monthly meeting of the Lake Hills Community Club. The opportunity was taken to talk about what the Commission does and to explain the work to update the Comprehensive Plan. The meeting was well attended and there were concerns voiced about the redevelopment that is going on in Newport Hills and the loss of tree canopy. The issue of the shopping center came up as well. Time was spent in highlighting the importance of citizens actively seeking to understand and engaging in what is going on in the city.

Commissioner Walter said she attended the November 4 meeting of the East Bellevue Community Council where a presentation was given on the hot lanes coming to I-405. A question was asked about the status of the individual room rentals issue and it was stated that the matter has been forwarded to the City Council.

Commissioner Tebelius called attention to the fact that the city is being sued for not permitting a second marijuana retailer in the downtown. Chair Laing said the newspaper article incorrectly stated that the 1000-foot separation rule is a Bellevue rule; it is actually a state regulation. The proposed location of the suing party is directly across the street from the marijuana retailer that has been permitted by the city and who received its state license in the mail first. The city gave priority to the entity that received its state license first.

7. STAFF REPORTS - None

8. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendments: Mountvue Place

Senior Planner Nicholas Matz briefly explained the annual process for Comprehensive Plan amendments and the role played by the Planning Commission. He noted that the Mountvue

Place application is the sole remaining amendment for 2014 and seeks to amend the Comprehensive Plan designation from BR-CR and BR-GC to all BR-CR on the 4.67-acre site at 14510 NE 20th Street.

Mr. Matz said the recommendation of the staff is to recommend approval of the application. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other goals and policies of the city for urban growth. If approved, the change will enable the goal for the Bel-Red subarea relative to developing a sustainable urban development pattern that dramatically reshapes the future of the subarea while allowing the area to transition gracefully from its past. The proposed amendment addresses the interests and changed needs of the entire city. The applicant has stated his intention to see the split zoning eliminated to allow for a unified development of the site under Bel-Red policy direction, thus advancing implementation of the Bel-Red subarea plan. The application meets the significantly changed conditions criteria in that the split designation was not identified during the Bel-Red planning process, and it was not foreseen that the split designation would prevent implementation of the Bel-Red retail/commercial district on the site. Additionally, historic amendments to the Bel-Red subarea plan never treated the subject site with any consistency.

The adjacent property also has a split zoning, but the split is drawn along an existing property boundary. That question was raised and dismissed during the geographic scoping.

Mr. Matz said a general analysis was conducted with regard to the development potential of Mountvue Place under the existing zoning standards and adjacent land uses. The transportation department was asked to estimate trip generation based on a build out of the site under a unified designation and they concluded that the increase in trips would not create unacceptable traffic impacts at the site's access point on NE 20th Street. Should redevelopment of the site occur, an actual concurrency analysis would be required.

There is a demonstrated public benefit associated with approval of the proposed amendment in that it would align with policies for urban growth areas redevelopment, and it would clarify the relationship between the site's designation and its evolving Bel-Red use.

Commissioner Carlson said he was not aware of any nearby property and business owners having weighed in on the merits of the proposed amendment. Mr. Matz said everyone within 500 feet received notice of the proposed action. No adjacent property owners have commented to date, and only one public comment has been received.

A motion to open the public hearing was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Carlson and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Joe Tovar, 540 Dayton Street, Edmonds, spoke representing the applicant. He said the buildings on the applicant's site were constructed in the early 1980s and are nearing the end of their economic lives. He said the applicant is interested in redeveloping the 4.67 acres. Pictures of the site were shown to the Commissioners. The Bel-Red subarea plan calls for changing the monoculture of commercial uses that have existed there for decades to something with more of a mix, including a residential component. The proposal turns on the vision of the city for the subarea. The staff have it right in saying that the proposal meets all the criteria for approving a Comprehensive Plan amendment. The location is right for including a housing component given the shops, services and restaurants that lie within a five-minute walk of the site and is well served by public transit. The site is certainly suitable for development in general conformance with

adjacent land uses and surrounding development patterns; if it were not, the adjacent property owners would have spoken up. The split zoning does not follow any logical line, and the BR-GC zone does not allow residential uses. The Commission was urged to recommend approval.

Commissioner Carlson asked if there is a development in the Bellevue area that approximates what the applicant has in mind for the Mountvue Place site. Mr. Tovar said the development nearing completion on the old Angelo's site is close to what the applicant has in mind. That site is also designated BR-CR.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked how many residential units can be expected to be put in on the site. Mr. Tovar said the city analysis estimated 180 units along with a combination of retail uses. He stressed that while the applicant has conducted some feasibility studies, no plans have been drawn up yet.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius, Mr. Matz said transportation staff were given numbers based on a build-out of the site under the current configuration and under what could happen if the amendment were approved. The conclusion reached was that development of the site would not create an unacceptable traffic impact. At the Comprehensive Plan stage, calculations are made based on a worst case build-out scenario. A concurrency analysis will be required on the actual development proposal. Mr. Tovar added that under the current designation at full build-out there could be as many as 228 evening peak trips generated; under the proposal, the number of evening peak trips would increase by almost 100. In the grand scheme of things, adding 100 trips to the thousands of trips that occur on NE 20th Street would not be a significant percentage increase.

Ms. Michele Etsekson with Active Investment Company, 14510 NE 20th Street, Suite 205, emphasized her interest in helping to implement the city's vision for the Bel-Red subarea plan and asked for help in removing the split zoning, which is an obstacle to redevelopment of the Mountvue Place site.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner deVadoss, Ms. Etsekson said Active Investment Company purchased the property in December 2012. It was at that time that the split zoning issue was discovered.

Ms. Etsekson confirmed that some 180 housing units could be developed on the site.

Chair Laing reminded the Commissioners that decisions made at the Comprehensive Plan level must be focused on the criteria alone. What a future project on the site might include is not one of the criteria.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Commissioner Tebelius. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Carlson and it carried unanimously.

9. STUDY SESSION

A. Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendments: Mountvue Place

Commissioner Hilhorst commented that the proposal makes sense on its face. Congestion is certainly a concern. In time light rail will help to alleviate traffic in the area, but the line will not be operational for quite some time. Mr. Matz said the trip calculations are based solely on peak

trip generation standards. The analysis is predicated on a worst case scenario of building out to the maximum allowed. The Environmental Impact Statement associated with the Bel-Red subarea study presumed a certain amount of traffic to be generated through redevelopment. For the Mountvue Place application, transportation staff looked at the increment of change that would result from designating the entire site BR-CR. The conclusion reached was that redevelopment of the site under BR-CR would not create traffic impacts that had not been anticipated. The reality of development is always less than the worst case scenario.

Commissioner Carlson asked if redevelopment of the site will occur all at once or will be phased over time. Mr. Tovar said it is too early to say exactly what will happen. The first step to redevelopment of the site is to remove the split zoning that is keeping the site from being redeveloped at all. Commissioner Carlson pointed out that Northup Way is four blocks away; 148th Avenue NE is two blocks away; and SR-520 is eight blocks away. If there is going to be additional traffic, NE 20th Street is a good place to put it.

Commissioner deVadoss asked what the ultimate impact on the school district might be as a result of people buying lots in Bel-Red and looking to convert the sites to designations that allow for residential units. Mr. Matz said the city works closely in sharing land use information with the school district, but they do their own future forecasting.

Mr. Inghram noted that in 2008 the Bel-Red plan was presented to the school district board. There have been a number of conversations with them in the years since then about changes anticipated in both the Bel-Red corridor and in the downtown. The decisions about when to actually build a new school facility are up to the school district, however.

A motion to recommend approval of the Mountvue Place Comprehensive Plan amendment to change the Comprehensive Plan designation from BR-CR and BR-GC to all BR-CR on 4.67 acres at 14510 NE 20th Street was made by Commissioner Carlson. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Matz said the recommendation will be before the Council prior to the end of the year.

6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (CONTINUED)

Councilmember Stokes took a moment to report that the Commission's work on the marijuana ordinance and the Land Use Code amendment were well received by the Council on November 10. He said the retreat on November 18 will be helpful and enjoyable.

****BREAK****

9. STUDY SESSION (CONTINUED)

B. Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Inghram explained that there is no intent to update the subarea plans as part of the Comprehensive Plan update. Some discrete policy amendments are called for, however. The Southwest Bellevue subarea includes a policy that says the primary access to Surrey Downs Park should be from 112th Avenue SE. Over the years that policy language has made perfect sense, but with the development of the East Link light rail line access from 112th Avenue SE will be

completely closed off and the primary access to the park will be from SE 4th Street. The character of the park will change and parks department worked with the community on revising the master plan for the park. That work has been completed but cannot be taken to the Council and the SEPA analysis cannot be completed because the plan is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Tebelius asked if the community is aware of the proposed policy language change. Mr. Inghram said there has been a lot of public engagement in the master planning process for the park. They understand that the Comprehensive Plan amendment is needed in order to fulfill what the community wants to see for the park. Commissioner Tebelius asked if the Southwest Bellevue policy amendment could be approved and moved forward on a track separate from the overall Comprehensive Plan update. Mr. Inghram said the schedule for updating the Comprehensive Plan will be sufficiently timely, though the parks department would love to see the specific policy change happen sooner. If necessary, the Council can be asked to act on an amendment out of sequence. The policy change will be included in the public review draft of the overall Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Laing said he called a couple of active members of the Surrey Downs Community Club to remind them the policy issue would be discussed by the Commission. He noted no one from the Surrey Downs community was present at the meeting.

There was consensus to move forward with deleting Policy S-SW-27 from the Southwest Bellevue subarea plan.

Mr. Inghram informed the Commissioners that the intent is to initiate a process of sequentially updating the various subarea plans following completion of the Comprehensive Plan update process. The subarea plan work may include making some adjustments to subarea boundaries. The city has grown and changed over the past decade and some boundary revisions may be needed to better reflect the way neighborhoods identify themselves and to line up with school district boundaries. Because the individual subarea plans have individual policies, it is not possible to simply change the boundaries on the map; such an action would result in policies not matching with the properties they point to. The proposal is to include the subarea boundaries map in the Comprehensive Plan with explicit direction to consider modification for each individual subarea at the time each subarea plan is updated.

Mr. Inghram stated that over the years the city has heard public comments related to subarea boundaries. People in Crossroads have requested putting the Triangle area of Crossroads back into the Crossroads subarea. The area was considered by the steering committee early in the Bel-Red process prior to the passage of East Link and the determination of station locations; the steering committee also recognized what Redmond was doing on its side of Overlake. The Commissioners were shown the land use map of the area prior to the Bel-Red process and noted that for the triangle area there was a combination of Community Business and Office, with the boundaries following some property lines but splitting others. The Office portion matched the Unigard site across the street and created a lower height limit along 156th Avenue NE. One reason for including the triangle in the Bel-Red subarea is the gap that on the Bellevue map looks like a no man's land but is actually part of Overlake Village, a designated regional growth center in Redmond.

Continuing, Mr. Inghram said the concerns of the community have always been about size and scale of buildings in the triangle area, along with views toward the west, and the transition to the

residential area to the east. After the Bel-Red subarea update was adopted and the light rail station moved a thousand feet to the north, the argument was made that the triangle area was less transit oriented. While less accessible to rail users, the area is still a corner of the overall Overlake redevelopment area. Adoption of the Bel-Red subarea plan allowed for redevelopment of the triangle area properties by creating a more uniform zoning pattern. The use mix under the current plan is very similar to what was previously allowed, and the heights are quite similar as well.

Mr. Inghram suggested four options: 1) leave things as they are currently; 2) redraw the boundary to include the area in Crossroads subarea while maintaining the Bel-Red zoning; 3) move the area into the Crossroads subarea and create a whole new zoning category for the area; and 4) move the area into the Crossroads subarea and go back to the old zoning. In the opinion of the staff, maintaining the current Bel-Red subarea boundaries and zoning will serve the community the best relative to allowing for predictable development and regulating building setbacks, view corridors, and transitioning to Overlake Village. In theory the third option would work fine but would entail a lot of work to get to the point where things stand currently. The fourth option would be problematic relative to the development that has already occurred.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius, Mr. Inghram said the fourth option was proposed by the residents of the Sherwood Forest and Chevy Chase neighborhoods. It is possible they believe going in that direction would help them in their fight against redevelopment of the former Unigard site. During the Bel-Red process there was a deliberate move to retain 156th Avenue NE as a dividing line separating the more intense development to the west from the transition area to the east.

Commissioner Carlson asked what the concerns of staff would be relative to Option 2. Mr. Inghram said the concerns were largely focused on legal and technical issues. Permitting development with Bel-Red zoning by referencing Bel-Red subarea policies would be complicated, and some questions would arise as to whether or not the Crossroads policies would apply to the area. There may be a technical way to fix that by creating the overlapping inconsistency but somehow pointing back to the policies that apply.

Chair Laing suggested that options 1 through 3 are essentially the same; while called something different, they all get to the same place. Options 2 and 3 would create a great deal of procedure aimed at assuring consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning. He said his preference would be to eliminate from consideration options 2 and 3.

Mr. Inghram agreed to seek additional input from the neighborhoods ahead of the next Commission meeting.

Turning to the Transportation Element, Mr. Inghram noted that the policies guide programs and direct how the city invests in different aspects of transportation ranging from pedestrians to bicycles, cars and transit.

Senior transportation planner Kevin McDonald said he was involved in the work to develop and adopt the city's first Comprehensive Plan under the Growth Management Act in 1991. He said he also participated in the first update to the plan in 2004. He noted that over the course of almost two years the Transportation Commission considered three primary drivers in developing policy recommendations for the Transportation Element: 1) consider and incorporate community input; 2) integrate best practices, trends and opportunities; and 3) reduce redundancy and

enhance clarity. A great deal of community outreach was done in which the Transportation Commission participated with other boards and commissions. Through the Bellevue's Best Ideas program, support for improved mobility received a lot of attention, particularly in the form of supporting mobility options and facilities that help people get around Bellevue in ways that are good for their bodies, the neighborhoods, the community and the environment. The Transportation Commission considered updates to the Transit Master Plan and new regional mobility strategies, changing demographics, Bellevue's role in the region, and new tools and techniques, and extracted policy recommendations from those best practices topics for inclusion in the Transportation Element.

Mr. McDonald said the Transportation Element contains 156 policies and has grown over time. Careful consideration has gone into the development of every policy through the years, but less thought has been given to how the policies relate to each other. The Transportation Commission zeroed in on each policy and focused on clarifying language and consolidating similar policies. The Transportation Element also contains numerous maps, tables and charts, most of which are required by the Growth Management Act and the Puget Sound Regional Council; they must be present in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan in order to be certified by the Puget Sound Regional Council, and certification is required in order to be eligible for some grants.

Mr. McDonald noted that the packet material highlighted the major policy recommendations that represent significant changed circumstances considered by the Transportation Commission. The East Link project triggered a shift in the organization of the transit policies. The policy recommendations reflect the fact that the city has acted relative to light rail, and they position the city well in anticipation of a future Sound Transit 3 ballot measure. The Transportation Commission incorporated policies from the recently adopted Transit Master Plan and simplified the transit section substantially to remove redundancies. Several policy recommendations that flowed from the Downtown Transportation Plan initiative were determined to have a citywide application and those policies were extracted from that plan and housed in the Transportation Element.

One of the topics that captured the attention of the Transportation Commission and warranted several study sessions was the notion of developing multimodal level of service standards. The city now considers only the vehicle traffic impacts related to new development, and that fact fell flat with the Transportation Commission which wanted to be able to engage the community in a discussion of how policy and development proposals affect or can be affected by facilities related to getting around by walking, biking and transit as well as by vehicles. Instead of just looking at the function of moving vehicles through an intersection, the Transportation Commission wanted to look at level of service standards for all modes of travel.

The Transportation Commission also focused on the policies in the Transportation Element related to neighborhood protection. The current policies are focused on things like speeding traffic and spillover parking. The neighborhoods wanted the conversation broadened to include a wider range of solutions to match the transportation-related issues that have the potential to adversely impact neighborhood quality of life and safety.

Commissioner Walter said it is obvious the Transportation Commission put a lot of work into the Transportation Element policies. She suggested, however, that it could use one more pass to weed out some inconsistencies and incorrect references. The document is voluminous and not easily read. People began leaving their cars at home when the price of gas rose, but now that the

price has fallen there is a renewed focus on travel by automobile. The policies are forward thinking, but to some degree they must be taken with a grain of salt. Mr. McDonald pointed out that the packet includes the raw materials that show the work of the Transportation Commission. There are some references to tables and figures that no longer exist or that will exist in a different format, and all of that will be addressed.

Mr. Inghram said the work of the Transportation Commission will be used in developing a readable full draft with all policies, tables and maps. He stressed that the packet materials were intended to show the work of the Transportation Commission to date. The draft to be developed will be subjected to additional review by the city's boards and commissions as well as additional public input before it gets tied up into a single package by the Planning Commission and forwarded to the City Council.

Mr. Inghram clarified that the Transportation Commission is charged by the Council with working on transportation issues, and their work will inform the Transportation Element. The Planning Commission has charge of the entire Comprehensive Plan, of which the Transportation Element is one piece. The Planning Commission must take the wider view, including making sure there is consistency between land use and transportation, and to that end some tweaks to the policy language developed by the Transportation Commission may need to be made by the Planning Commission. However, every caution should be taken to avoid developing two separate recommendations for the Council to consider.

Commissioner deVadoss asked which policies in the Transportation Element were the most controversial. Mr. McDonald said there was not so much controversy as there was complexity. The notion of multimodal level of service and concurrency has the potential to be controversial, but currently it is just complex because there are so many different factors to consider. The work program the Transportation Commission will engage in after the policy language is adopted could identify controversies in light of how to evaluate different modes with respect to each other, priorities and public investments. Commissioner deVadoss suggested it would be helpful if the bulleted items on page 51 of the packet were to be prioritized. Mr. McDonald allowed that they are random and could be ordered in some way.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner deVadoss, Mr. McDonald commented that the Transportation Commission was very forward looking in the way it focused on best practices, trends and opportunities. There also was concerted effort put into scraping clean the convoluted policy language to yield the clear intent. Time was spent on making sure the Transportation Element is readable and provides direction to move forward with a strategy of mobility that makes sense for the present and into the future.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if there will be a clear definition of what "multimodal" means. Mr. McDonald said there is no established definition of the term in the Comprehensive Plan. A work program in the future will be required to create a definition, or a series of definitions depending on specific circumstances. Multimodal is a term of art used by transportation planners and means looking at all applicable modes of transportation to provide overall mobility. In the context of Bellevue, the term does not include airports, whereas in the context of the city of SeaTac and Burien it does. In Bellevue it refers to walking, bicycling, transit vehicles and private vehicles. Commissioner Hilhorst suggested that a definition would be of great value.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked what neighborhoods the Transportation Commission reached out to for feedback. Mr. McDonald said the Comprehensive Plan update team reached out to all

neighborhoods in the city. The outreach took many different forms, including community meetings, electronic correspondence and surveys. The Transportation Commission extracted from the feedback the input related to the topic of transportation. There were no separate Transportation Commission-facilitated neighborhood meetings.

Commissioner Tebelius asked how many total trips for all modes of travel are constituted in the city on a daily basis. Mr. McDonald called attention to the table on page 139 that lists number of trips by Mobility Management Area. He said adding up all the trips would total more than 1.2 million. Currently trips by pedestrians and bicycles are not measured so their totals within the total number of trips are unknown. In the downtown at the intersection of NE 4th Street and 108th Avenue NE, during the evening peak there are more pedestrians going north-south than there are cars, but in other subareas there are likely more cars than pedestrians.

Commissioner Tebelius commented that a pedestrian trip includes someone walking from the office to get lunch during the noon hour. Mr. McDonald said it depends on whether or not a walking trip crosses the boundary of a Transportation Analysis Zone. The downtown has 43 Transportation Analysis Zones, each corresponding to a block. If a person walks from their office to a restaurant within the same block, the trip is not counted. Crossing from one block to another does count as a trip. Currently the default mode for any trip across a Transportation Analysis Zone boundary is the car, unless it can be shown that a different mode was used. The 853,000 daily trips in the downtown are all anticipated to be person trips that cross a Transportation Analysis Zone boundary, but it is known that not all of them are by car. The proportions, however, are unknown because the model is not sophisticated enough to yield that information.

Commissioner Tebelius said her suspicion was that trips by other than car are small by comparison. The problem with the term "multimodal" is the reality that people are driving their cars substantially more than they walk or bike. Trips by pedestrians and bicycles will never come close to the number of trips by car and transit, and using the term "multimodal" puts them on the same level. Mr. Inghram clarified that no attempt has been made to put them on the same level or to say they are equal. The focus is on drafting policy language that captures a more complete understanding of the mobility that is occurring in the city. The policy language is clear in calling for identifying a way to figure out trips by individual mode. Mr. McDonald added that in the context of a policy that would advance the notion of multimodal level of service and concurrency, there must be a data-driven model with better data on pedestrians and bicycles.

Chair Laing commented that the predominant land use in Bellevue is low-density single family neighborhoods. The draft transportation plan, however, other than paying lip service to preserving neighborhoods and shielding them from the impacts of light rail, ignores the predominant land use, both in Bellevue and regionally. The focus of the plan is primarily on the urban core within the city. There is massive foot traffic in the downtown to be sure, but little is said about how those people get to the downtown in the first place. The Puget Sound Regional Council has been requiring employers for years to gather data about how their employees get to and from work, so there is data available. From a concurrency standpoint, level of service was focused on emergency response times and the concern was the amount of delay and the length of queues at intersections. There should be no confusion created by including in the level of service issue things that have nothing to do with first responders getting to places quickly. The provision of pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be completely separate from level of service. The idea that a zero-sum game can be created by looking at bicycles, pedestrians, transit and vehicles equally is worrisome given that the city's predominant land use is single family homes.

Commissioner Tebelius pointed out that the economic engine of the city is largely driven by a number of huge employers in the city. It is clear that those businesses make it possible for all city residents to enjoy much lower taxes. Nothing should be done to kill the golden goose. Clearly the major mode of transportation into and out of the downtown is cars. If pedestrians and bicycles are put on the same level by calling it all multimodal, roadway capacity will be diminished and the result will be negative impacts on the economic engine that drives the city.

Commissioner Carlson allowed that there are a lot of people who walk and bike in certain areas of the city, particularly in the downtown. The plans drawn up by the city have been focused on creating a neighborhood of the downtown and the number of people living there has steadily increased, so it is not surprising that there are more people on foot and riding bicycles there. In making transportation recommendations it is necessary to follow the data. If it is not known how many people travel by foot or bicycle, concrete recommendations cannot be made with any degree of certainty.

Mr. Inghram said the comments are well taken. The whole idea behind comprehensive planning is to make sure land use and transportation are interwoven so that the city's economic engine will not be harmed. What is being proposed is an incremental adjustment forward. Currently in the downtown all sorts of modes are in play, and in ten years there will be another mode in the form of light rail. The policies call for collecting and analyzing the data in order to adapt to different modes of travel. That is not to say that the primary mode of travel, even in the downtown, will no longer be the automobile. What is needed is recognition of the entire picture. The policies are not anti-automobile and in fact the vast majority of capital spending for transportation projects is for street improvements; the pedestrian/bicycle improvements represent only a small percentage.

Mr. McDonald said trips to and from work represent only a small portion of the overall number of trips. Those same commuters take additional trips during the course of the day and more needs to be known about what modes they are using. To some degree their trips during the day depend on how they got to work; those in a carpool or bus are more likely to walk for their errands than those who drive alone. There is data related to certain geographies, trip purposes, and times of day, but there is no comprehensive view of all the trips that are taken in the city.

Commissioner Tebelius called attention to policy TR-42 as an example of how using the word "multimodal" has changed the focus. Where the current policy language is clear about expanding the arterial capacities of intersections, the proposed language directs the expansion of arterial capacity in light of multimodal expectations, equalizing modes in a way that does not reflect the real world. It is not unrealistic to believe that before too long there will be driverless cars and the overall system will change dramatically. The future of mobility is not in bicycles and pedestrians.

Mr. Inghram stressed that the draft policies do not seek to usher in a utopian world in which there are no cars at all in the downtown. He agreed that things are changing. In the mid-90s it was normal for downtown workers to drive their cars to Bellevue Square for lunch or to run errands. That is clearly no longer the case. Trips into and out of the downtown either are not going to change or they will change in a different way, but trips by vehicle within the downtown are trending downward and are likely to continue doing so.

A motion to extend the meeting to 9:45 p.m. was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion

was seconded by Commissioner Tebelius and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner Walter called attention to policy TR-11 and commented that she both lives and works in Bellevue but does not have a safe bike route or an available bus route to use. The draft policy is punitive and misses the goal of getting people from far away to come into Bellevue without using a vehicle. She said she drives her car to work, uses it during the lunch hour to do volunteer work, and drives it after work to City Hall for meetings, from which there is no way to return to home by bus. Policy TR-11 is nothing more than a stick rather than a carrot and should be pared way back.

Chair Laing pointed out that housing options are generally less expensive in areas not served by transit. The people who live in those areas must as a matter of course drive to work. To then impose expensive restrictions on those commuters, many of whom are least able to pay for them, is going in the wrong direction.

Chair Laing pointed out policy TR-H and that there is no excess capacity. Throughout the Transportation Element there are policies that highlight the importance of having safe dedicated bicycle and pedestrian facilities, which begs the question of why there is no policy requiring Sound Transit to put a dedicated grade-separated pedestrian/bicycle path along the entire East Link alignment through Bellevue.

Commissioner Tebelius voiced concern over use of the term "multimodal level of service metrics" in the policies. The term refers to the fact that planners think the conventional methods for calculating level of service for a road or intersection only address the experience of vehicle drivers. The term as used would calculate a wider range of roadway users, but there is no evidence to say it will do anything to help resolve transportation issues.

Mr. Inghram said that a pathway along Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue SE will be installed as part of East Link. The proposed pathway may not be as large as desired due to the required right-of-way, which first must be paid for and will remove right-of-way from another use. During the recession there was a shortfall in the projected sales tax revenues and that made it necessary for Sound Transit to cut back on some program elements, including funding for station access improvements. The city has had and is continuing to have discussions with Sound Transit about permitting requirements, all with an eye on getting as much as possible out of the East Link project.

Chair Laing noted that the state Supreme Court ruled in a case involving Sound Transit that the budget would be whatever it costs and the timeframe is as long as it takes. State law says an entity cannot avoid mitigation imposed for an essential public facility just because it would add time to construction or because it would be costly.

Commissioner Walter allowed that the number of people who commute by bicycle is low in the city, but suggested that could be because the bicycle facilities that do exist are not really interconnected, making it very difficult to get from one place to another safely.

10. OTHER BUSINESS - None
11. PUBLIC COMMENT - None
12. ADJOURN

Chair Laing adjourned the meeting at 9:52 p.m.

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
ANNUAL RETREAT MINUTES

November 18, 2014
4:45 p.m.

Robinswood House
2430 148th Avenue SE, Bellevue, WA

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Laing, Commissioners Carlson, deVadoss, Hamlin, Hilhorst, Tebelius, Walter

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

COUNCIL LIASON PRESENT: John Stokes

STAFF PRESENT: Brad Miyake, City Manager; Myrna Basich, Assistant City Manager/City Clerk; Chris Salomone, Dan Stroh, Paul Inghram, Department of Planning and Community Development; Mike Brennan, Department of Development Services

GUEST SPEAKERS: Rhonda Hilyer, Agreement Dynamics, Inc.

RECORDING SECRETARY: Paul Inghram

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The meeting was called to order at 5:20 p.m. by Chair Laing who presided. All Commissioners were present. Chair Laing welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked staff for the work put into setting up the retreat.

2. DINNER

3. SESSION OVERVIEW

Ms. Rhonda Hilyer provided a brief overview of the agenda for the meeting.

City Manager Brad Miyake recognized the abundant work before the Planning Commission and the value of having a retreat meeting.

4. COUNCIL REMARKS

Councilmember Stokes spoke on behalf of the mayor. He stated that the framework for why we are here is to recognize that the city has a lot of work in front of it. He is looking forward to having a positive discussion. The work of the Planning Commission will help the Council move forward with a number of items.

5. COMMUNICATION STYLES

Ms. Hilyer spoke about communication styles and the differences between different “colors.”

6. ROLES OF PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

Councilmember Stokes discussed the roles of the Commission and staff and noted that working effectively together was key to getting things done. The Planning Commission plays an important role in the function of the city. With lots of work to do, the city needs to be able to be nimble and responsive. Bellevue is no longer a traditional suburb with simple planning issues. It is now the major urban center of the Eastside, which calls for more intense planning efforts. People before us invested in wisely planning for the future. We owe it to them to continue to that tradition.

The Council recognizes the value of the Planning Commission. It is a group of volunteers that invest their time because they care about the city. We all want Bellevue to be a great city. Changes will happen, but through planning we can impact how.

Councilmember Stokes referred to the handouts outlining Council's expectations for the roles of the boards and commissions, the roles of staff supporting the boards and commissions, and a draft document of how we will work together.

7. DISCUSSION, SUGGESTIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS TO ENHANCE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

The Commission discussed the process of communicating to Council and transmitting recommendations. Commissioner Walter expressed the need for accurate, reliable information, which will engender trust. Rhonda Hilyer recapped the key points of the discussion:

- Respectful discussions
- No surprises
- Two-way communication
- Accuracy and responsiveness
- Fair, unbiased reporting
- Check-ins and accountability

It was noted that clear expectations from Council can help guide the work of the Planning Commission.

Chair Laing noted improvements that have occurred over the last year, including shorter, more focused presentations, communication regarding the agenda, and making materials clearer about what action needs to be taken. He said he would also like to see transmittals enough in advance to fully review, to see slide shows ahead of the presentation to Council, and greater predictability about when items will go to Council.

Commissioners deVadoss and Walter agreed to work on the list of items that describe how we will work together to create a shorter set of principles.

Councilmember Stokes noted the relationship of the city's multiple boards and commissions and how we also need to consider the working relationship between them.

8. UPCOMING WORK PROGRAM

Planning Director Dan Stroh reviewed the major planning initiatives facing the Commission. The list includes making a recommendation on the Comprehensive Plan update by March so that

Council can act prior to the statutory deadline of June 30, 2015. The planning work program also includes a number of items in the queue, including code amendments for the Eastgate/I-90 project; code amendments to implement the Downtown Livability Initiative; and station area planning. Mr. Stroh talked about the interesting work anticipated for the Grand Connection/Wilburton project that is part of the draft budget. That project may include a visioning process, plan amendments, and code amendments. The city also anticipates work on subarea plan updates and conducting a five –year review of the BelRed subarea plan.

Development Services Director Mike Brennon reviewed the work program of upcoming Land Use Code amendments in addition to those Mr. Stroh mentioned.

9. WRAP UP DISCUSSION

Ms. Hilyer noted the work accomplished at the retreat. Chair Laing thanked everyone for their participation.

10. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

December 10, 2014
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioners Carlson, Hamlin, Hilhorst, Tebelius,
deVadoss, Walter

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Chair Laing

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Inghram, Scott MacDonald, Department of Planning
and Community Development; Kevin McDonald,
Department of Transportation

COUNCIL LIAISON: Councilmember Stokes

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Commission recessed to an executive session on a matter of potential litigation from 6:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Vice Chair Hilhorst who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Chair Laing, who was excused.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. John Haro, 2431 161st Avenue NE, said he serves as president of the Sherwood Forest Community Club. On behalf of the Club he thanked the staff and indicated support for their recommendation relative to the development of the 156th triangle area. He said while there is a preference for returning the zoning to what it was before the GRE building went in, there is acceptance of the fact that that would be a tall order. Option 1, as recommended by staff, has the support of the Club.

Mr. Kent Baumgartner, 5344 153rd Avenue SE, noted that the recent approval of Ordinance 6197 made changes to Land Use Code 20.20.015 relative to lot shape. He suggested that the change will create problems by opening a loophole builders will exploit. A recent short plat in Horizon View Division A allowed two lots from a single lot with a width of 135 feet even though under R-3.5 the minimum lot width allowed is 70 feet. The shape provisions of

20.20.015 was used to justify the action. An appeal was filed but was ruled against by the hearing examiner. If the process used is allowed to continue, the effect will be lots that are too small and a de facto change to a higher density development. The Horizon View Division A residents are happy with the recent rezone from R-3.5 to R-2.5, but the change to 20.20.015 will permit development at the higher density. The code should be restored to the way it previously was, and language should be added to the effect that 20.20.010 takes precedence over 20.20.015 if there is no existing building. There is also no definition of building line and one should be added.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Hamlin. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Walter and it carried unanimously.

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Commissioner Hilhorst said she presented the Commission's recommendation regarding the Montvue Place code amendment to the City Council on December 1. The Council unanimously approved the recommendation.

Councilmember Stokes reported that the Council recently adopted the Bellevue Diversity Initiative that responds to the demographic changes in the city. The Council also approved a contract with a consultant to conduct an independent technical analysis of the Energize Eastside project. The Environmental Impact Statement review process will kick off in 2015 and that is where the choices about alternative energy and different ways to do things will be analyzed.

Councilmember Stokes said the Council conducted a public hearing on extending the interim zoning ordinance relative to marijuana. No one testified at the state-required hearing. Three marijuana production facilities have opened in the city under the interim code.

Councilmember Stokes informed the Commissioners that he would be meeting soon with Planning Commission Chair Laing and Transportation Commission Chair Lampe to discuss how the two commissions can work most efficiently together in updating the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

6. STAFF REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Manager Paul Inghram reported that there are regular meetings between staff, Chair Laing and Vice-Chair Hilhorst, and Councilmember Stokes to pre-plan Commission meetings. He added that will continue to be available to all of the Commissioners on an individual basis. He proposed saving five minutes at the end of each meeting for the Commissioners to provide input on process.

Councilmember Stokes added that at its retreat in February the Council will take up the subject of the city's boards and commissions. The discussion will include process, rules and working relationships.

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Community Vision

Commissioner deVadoss reminded the Commissioners that he and Commissioner Carlson had been tasked with working with Councilmember Stokes and staff to review the Community Vision statement and to provide a brief summary for each section of the Comprehensive Plan. For each section the intent is to identify the key theme, what is uniquely Bellevue about it, and indicate whether or not it is aspirational as opposed to historical.

Commissioner Carlson added that the group intends to dissolve all governmentese and bureaucratese, and to keep it all short, brief and to the point so it can be easily understood. An additional working session is needed to achieve that goal.

Mr. Inghram said the document is slated to be back before the full Commission on January 14.

B. Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Inghram noted that in working through the policies in the various Comprehensive Plan chapters some policies were identified for additional review and discussion. Specific to the Citizen Participation element, questions were raised about the master planning of city projects, how it is done, and should there be more consistency. Interest was expressed in establishing a policy with direction about the master planning process for large projects. The Commissioners were asked to consider as a proposed policy: "Utilize a public involvement program, such as master planning, for large, complex public projects to ensure community engagement and to provide a predictable review process."

Commissioner Tebelius used the Meydenbauer Bay Park master planning process as an example of a recent project that included community participation and asked what the policy language would add. Mr. Inghram said master planning is not currently conducted as a permit process. Under the current approach, a park master planning process is undertaken, with community input, and that is followed up with a conditional use process that includes another round of community input that can result in potential modifications to the master plan. Often members of the public who participated in the first round are confused as to why the final project is different from the master plan project. One option would be to establish a master planning process that would also be the permit process. The intent of the policy is to address a synchronized approach.

Commissioner Tebelius said she was not convinced that a synchronized approach is really necessary. If the Council wants to see it done, it can do it without having the policy in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Hamlin took the opposite view. He suggested the proposed policy will add great value to the process. He added that he would include the policy in the Citizen Participation Element rather than in the Land Use Element.

Councilmember Stokes suggested the proposed policy language needed more clarity with regard to the desired outcome.

Commissioner Carlson agreed and said the policy simply needs to encourage community involvement in large public projects and to ensure a predictable review process.

Commissioner Hilhorst pointed out that the notion of engaging the public is used repeatedly in

the document. She also suggested that the notion of a predictable review process is somewhat vague. If the true intent of the proposed policy is to tie the master planning process to the permit process, the language should be revised to say just that.

There was agreement to direct staff to work on a redraft and to bring it back to the Commission.

With regard to unresolved land use issues, there was consensus in favor of the proposed new language for policies LU-21 and LU-26.

Mr. Inghram noted that there were three outstanding issues related to the environment. The first was the suggestion of the Commission to include a policy addressing the impact of linear projects that result in the loss of many trees. There was agreement to revise the draft policy to read "Minimize the loss of tree canopy and natural environment areas caused by transportation and infrastructure projects and mitigate for losses where impacts are unavoidable."

With regard to policy EN-82, Mr. Inghram noted that the Commission had questioned whether it was needed given that state vehicle emission control testing is set to end. He said staff supported simply eliminating the policy and the Commissioners concurred.

Mr. Inghram said the Commission in discussing policy EN-92 had highlighted a desire to include the notion of preserving vegetation.

Commissioner Walter observed that as drafted the policy would require new residential development to include noise abatement design and materials. She said she would prefer to include a policy requiring transportation projects to include noise abatement to project residential areas. Mr. Inghram said that would be a different type of policy. As drafted, the policy is focused on residential development and the need to design in ways that will not automatically expose residents to noise impacts from existing sources. There are existing transportation policies directed toward noise mitigation.

There was agreement to revise the policy to read "Require new residential development to include transportation noise abatement design and materials and preserve vegetation where necessary to minimize noise impacts from arterials and freeways."

Mr. Inghram stated that there were three unresolved issues relating to urban design, beginning with policy UD-1, line 22, and the comment made by the Commission regarding the need to avoid stark spaces.

Commissioner Walter suggested adding the phrase at the end to read "...durability in building materials and enrich the appearance of their surroundings to avoid stark spaces."

Commissioner Carlson proposed wording the policy to read "Encourage excellence in architecture, site design and workmanship, durability in building materials to enrich the appearance of the surroundings." He suggested that by doing everything right, stark spaces will be avoided.

With regard to policy UD-60, line 8, noted that the original policy was in regard to neighborhood entries. He said the proposed policy would be more broadly applicable.

Commissioner Hilhorst pointed out that policy LU-21 and the proposed UD-60 were essentially

the same. Mr. Inghram said UD-60 is clearly intended to be about neighborhood improvement capital projects, whereas LU-21 is intended to support individual neighborhood actions.

Commissioner Hilhorst allowed that the two policies are not in conflict with each other. Commissioner deVadoss agreed and said it would not hurt to include both policies, each reinforcing the other.

There was consensus to use the same wording for both policies for the sake of consistency.

Mr. Inghram reminded that Commissioners that in reviewing the policies related to the environment there was discussion about natural drainage practices and low-impact development. He clarified that the low-impact development policies span several different elements.

Assistant Planner Scott MacDonald explained that one component of the Urban Design Element that had not yet been reviewed by the Commission was the urban design treatment map, which designates boulevards and intersections for special or enhanced streetscape improvements, landscaping and pedestrian amenities. The map was adopted as part of the previous Comprehensive Plan and has been updated and amended since. He said 148th Avenue is a prototypical example of a boulevard. The Lake Hills Connector is another good example. Designated intersections are important locations such as city entry points and areas that frame neighborhood shopping areas. The designations are intended to go beyond the standard treatments that are called out by Comprehensive Plan policies relative to pedestrian facilities and landscaping.

In early outreach efforts that involved talking with board and commission members as well as members of the public, it was clear that residents value natural and open space areas and believe they define the character of Bellevue as a whole and set the city apart from other cities. Neighborhood shopping centers certainly are important community assets that provide goods and services, can operate as community gathering spaces, and serve as something around which communities form their identities. Aging in place and neighborhood livability are critical issues that have access at their core.

Mr. MacDonald said staff from various departments reviewed the map and provided feedback. They observed that streets and intersections with very different characters have the same designation. Little clarity is afforded as to the current designations, and the designations are focused only on street character and do not take into account neighborhood character. The map identifies enhanced streets but does little to inform street or intersection character.

Using the feedback received to date, the intent is to identify major cross-city corridors, connections along and through parks and open space, streetscapes adjacent to neighborhood shopping areas, key local neighborhood connections, intersections that connect major arterials, key city entry points, and important neighborhood locations as the types of streets and intersections that should receive treatment beyond the standard.

With regard to the map of urban design treatment for boulevards and intersections, Mr. MacDonald said the street designation is largely intended to inform the general design intent to avoid conflicting the transportation designations. City boulevards are primary transportation corridors that connect different parts of the city; they offer a unifying corridor treatment and incorporate the character of adjacent neighborhoods and areas as evidenced by 148th Avenue NE and NE 8th Street. Scenic boulevards are streets that emphasize park-like streetscapes by

integrating elements from their surroundings into their design and allow visual access to natural and open areas; good examples are east end of the Lake Hills Connector, West Lake Sammamish Parkway, and 112th Avenue NE near Bellefield. The map has been updated to identify key city entry points and locations for potentially enhancing neighborhood identity; examples include Newport Hills and Crossroads at 156th Avenue NE and NE 8th Street.

Mr. Inghram commented that design work for individual streets would not be appropriate at the Comprehensive Plan level. The existing map, however, is largely meaningless in the way it picks half the streets in the city and gives them a designation without making any differentiation between them.

Commissioner Hamlin said Bel-Red Road where it borders Redmond has always felt like a key entry point into the city.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Carlson, Mr. Inghram said there have been discussions about NE 4th Street and 120th Avenue NE where some major improvements will be made. All streets must meet the basic standards outlined in the code, but the streets that for one reason or another are truly different warrant enhanced treatment. City boulevards connect across the city and provide entrance into the city, and the scenic boulevards connect green and open spaces. Both NE 4th Street and 120th Avenue NE are vitally important, but they do not serve the city boulevard or scenic boulevard functions.

Commissioner Carlson suggested the title "urban design treatment" evokes images of large and old, neither of which fits Bellevue. He suggested as a title "Bellevue boulevard improvements."

Commissioner Tebelius asked why 140th Avenue and 148th Avenue are not given the same designation. Mr. Inghram said 148th Avenue is a much bigger arterial from a traffic standpoint, and 140th Avenue NE as it works its way north into the Bridle Trails neighborhood functions as a neighborhood access arterial. He said 156th Avenue varies in the functions it provides along its length.

Mr. MacDonald said the third designation is shopping street. He explained that shopping streets are adjacent to neighborhood shopping centers and other commercial areas that serve as important community assets. The shopping street map highlights the streets that have the potential to form the heart of a local area, and only the segment immediately adjacent to the designation in the Comprehensive Plan. Example streets are 119th Avenue SE and 156th Avenue in Crossroads. The proposed New-19 policy calls for enhanced landscaping and pedestrian features and facilities for shopping streets.

Commissioner Carlson called attention to 120th Avenue NE near Best Buy, Home Depot, and the strip mall that extends all the way to NE 8th Street and suggested it should be designated a shopping street.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked about putting a shopping street designation on the area of Lake Hills Connector and 156th Avenue SE that used to front a shopping center but now fronts mixed use. Mr. Inghram said the area still feels like a neighborhood center given the mix of retail, the library and some residential development.

Commissioner Carlson called attention to the small neighborhood business area on Bellevue Way near NE 24th Street and noted that it had not been marked on the map as a shopping street.

Mr. Inghram said the shopping center is not served by any street other than Bellevue Way. Bellevue Way serves as a primary arterial and it would be difficult to call it a neighborhood shopping street. Some streets, like Main Street in Old Bellevue, clearly serve a neighborhood shopping street function, while others, like Bellevue Way, clearly do not, even though they border neighborhood shopping centers. Regardless of the street designation chosen there will not be any change to the zoning of the neighborhood business parcels; the urban design street designation relates only to street design.

Commissioner Hilhorst pointed out that the Northtowne residents are passionate about their shopping center and suggested the shopping street designation should be given to that segment of Bellevue Way.

Commissioner deVadoss suggested that NE 8th Street to the east of 156th Avenue NE does not serve the function of a city boulevard and should be re-designated to scenic boulevard.

Mr. MacDonald said an additional category looked at as part of the update was neighborhood greenway, which would apply to streets that provide local connectivity to parks, trails and schools as well as goods and services. Such streets provide safe and comfortable routes for pedestrians and bicyclists, though they may or may not be on arterials drawn on the maps. It was quickly found that the idea is more complex than a simple designation, thus the recommendation to include policy NEW-20 directing the future development of a system of neighborhood greenways. The best example of a neighborhood greenway is 108th Avenue NE.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius, Mr. MacDonald said the neighborhood greenways in Seattle are existing streets that have very simple improvements, often little more than speed bumps, painted bike symbols and signage, all with the intent of slowing traffic and making the route comfortable for pedestrians and bicyclists. Neighborhood greenways are not about getting people to and from work but rather are focused on getting around local neighborhoods. Commissioner Tebelius voiced concern that the neighborhood greenway policy could lay the groundwork for the conversion of travel lanes to bicycle lanes around the city.

Mr. Inghram agreed it would be better to begin policy NEW-20 with "Work with neighborhoods to identify and develop...." The Commissioners concurred.

With regard to the greenway, Commissioner deVadoss said he liked the definition except for the reference to goods and services, which could be a very large door. He suggested tightening up the language.

Turning to the issue of the 156th Avenue NE boundary between Bel-Red and Crossroads, Mr. Inghram briefly discussed the current and planned development of the area. He offered four options for consideration: 1) maintaining the current Bel-Red boundaries and zoning; 2) redrawing the boundary to include the triangle area in the Crossroads subarea while maintaining the Bel-Red zoning; 3) redrawing the boundary to include the triangle area in the Crossroads subarea and creating new zoning and code provisions specific to the area; and 4) redrawing the boundary to include the triangle area in the Crossroads subarea and restoring the original combination of Office and Community business Zoning. He said Option 1 enjoyed a high level of community support and was the recommendation of the staff as well. He recognized, however, that some Sherwood Forest residents remain concerned about the type of development that may occur on the triangle properties and the Unigard site. One advantage to Option 1 would be the bright line distinction between the development of Overlake in Redmond and the

residential area to the east of 156th Avenue NE.

Commissioner deVadoss said it was his recollection that the Commission had discussed the notion of having the city acquire the Unigard site and development it as a park. In the context of the dividing line, that discussion should be revisited. Mr. Inghram said it may be possible to obtain the functionality of a park on the Unigard site without the city having to purchase the property. Many local residents in fact enjoy having the site as open space, which the current property restrictions require.

Commissioner Walter pointed out that with the site in private ownership the city has little to say about how the open space is maintained. Mr. Inghram agreed and said that would argue in favor of either the city acquiring the land or entering into a practical arrangement with the property owner.

Commissioner Hamlin indicated his preference for Option 1.

Commissioner Walter said if the Unigard site were a city-owned park her vote would be different in that allowing more dense development in the area would be less harmful to the development. If denser development is permitted, the Bellevue Technology Center could come forward with an argument that they should be allowed more density given that everything around their site was developed.

Commissioner Carlson agreed that if the Unigard site were a city park it would serve as a buffer between the commercial development and the neighborhoods more dense development would be less objectionable potentially. Mr. Inghram stated that the Unigard site is in fact acting as a park and regardless of what the property owner proposes, there is no need to open the site to more development. Use of the site is as locked in stone as if the city owned the property.

Commissioners deVadoss and Tebelius voiced support for Option 1.

Mr. Inghram said staff would go forward with Option 1.

With regard to the Transportation Element, Senior Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald called attention to the packet materials and the answers given in response to the questions asked by the Commission at the November 12 briefing. He noted that the Commission's comment regarding the need to recognize the lack of policy language regarding emerging technologies, the Transportation Commission drafted a policy statement regarding autonomous vehicles which will be finalized on December 11. He also called attention to attachment 5 in the packet which contained a clean copy of the Transportation Commission's policy recommendations.

Commenting on the term "multimodal," Commissioner Tebelius said she did not believe that walking and bicycling will ever be sufficient enough to be put in as a means of transportation and said they should not be put on the same level as cars and transit. By including them in the definition of "multimodal" they are in fact put on equal footing. Mr. McDonald countered that "multimodal" as used in transportation planning involves considering all modes of transportation, including walking and bicycling. The term does not carry with it the implication that all modes are to be treated equally in all places at all times.

Commissioner Carlson pointed out that congestion relief does not appear to be a priority in the state. That is the case because the Washington State Department of Transportation took its focus

off of highways and moving cars from place to place and put it on embracing all aspects and modes of transportation. If there is no bias in favor of the automobile, and if the city's conclusion is that the answer to congestion is to get people out of their cars, the result will be incentives such as high parking rates, the removal of parking areas, and narrow streets that force cars to slow down, all of which will lead to more congestion. The definition of "multimodal" raises a red flag by making all things equal.

Mr. Inghram said the city's Department of Transportation is charged with keeping vehicles moving through the city, but it is also charged with improving conditions for pedestrians.

Mr. McDonald added that the policies in the Transportation Element get at the different concepts; there is a section on roads, a section on transit, and a section on pedestrians and bicycles. An attempt is made to define the policy priorities for each mode without assigning priority to any one mode over any other. Prioritization is accomplished within the context of neighborhoods, allocating resources, working with the state to improve the freeways, and working with the transit agencies for more bus service.

Commissioner Walter pointed out that the ratio of vehicle lane space to the throughput in terms of number of person trips far exceeds the ratio of bike lane space to the throughput in terms of number of person trips. The two should not be lumped together and counted just as lanes carrying people. Walking and biking are primarily recreational modes of transportation, whereas cars are used for commuting, getting kids to school, and transporting goods. Mr. McDonald said that is the very reason why multimodal considerations are so important. Some modes can be quantitatively defined relative to purpose and intent and the capacity of the system to move people. Other modes are more qualitative with a focus on comfort and safety and environmental beauty. The strategy embedded in multimodalism involves creating a blended environment that is defined both by metrics and quality and which accommodates people of all ages and abilities.

Mr. Inghram commented that Bellevue's strategy has always been to provide both motorized and non-motorized facilities. As capacity for vehicles is added, pedestrian and bicycle components are included to improve overall connectivity and the landscaped environment.

Commissioner Hilhorst stated that travel by horseback is an established mode of travel in Bridle Trails. Mr. McDonald said it is well incorporated in the policies of the Bridle Trails subarea plan.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if anyone has picked up the suggestion made by Chair Laing for Sound Transit to include a bike path along the light rail corridor. Mr. McDonald said long segments of the East Link alignment will include the provision of bicycle facilities. The portion that will not have continuous facilities is the segment between downtown and Bel-Red. Mr. Inghram added that the Council has budgeted toward advancing a new pedestrian crossing of I-405 at NE 6th Street, which would continue the pedestrian corridor to the east and connect to the multi-use trail planned for the Burlington Northern/Sante Fe corridor. Mr. McDonald added that beginning on December 11 the Transportation Commission will be diving headlong into an implementation strategy for the pedestrian/bicycle plan that will enhance design and promote funding to fill the gaps that currently exist.

A motion to extend the meeting by 20 minutes was made by Commissioner Hamlin. The motion was seconded by Commissioner deVadoss and it carried unanimously.

C. Downtown Transportation Plan Implementation

Mr. McDonald said the Transportation Commission believes several different modes of transportation are needed to keep the downtown moving, vibrant and livable. The Council established the principles to serve as the foundation for development of the plan; the Transportation Commission reviewed the land use and travel demand forecasts for the downtown; and the level of public involvement was extensive and intensive. The strategy for mobility, called the mobility options strategy, is translating into projects on the ground and policies for the downtown subarea plan. The plan has a horizon year of 2030 for which the forecasts anticipate 70,300 jobs and 19,000 residents. The density increases will lead to an increase in the number of daily person trips to, from and within downtown Bellevue.

The Transportation Commission looked at several components of downtown vehicle mobility, including the use of roads to provide access to properties in the downtown; the use of roadways to provide connections between the downtown, the neighborhoods and regional facilities; the capacity of the roadways to accommodate cars, trucks and buses; and the use of technology to make the most efficient use of the roadway infrastructure.

Not all of the proposed strategic roadway improvement projects are located in the downtown. Those situated outside the downtown are intended to provide mobility pressure relief to the downtown by giving drivers more options to get to and from the downtown from the regional system and the neighborhoods. The Transportation Commission recommends building those projects and working with the Washington State Department of Transportation to make the freeways have the necessary capacity.

The Transportation Commission also believes the curbside in the downtown should be used to support both residences and businesses. On-street parking and loading is vitally important and delivery drivers need places to park.

With regard to transit, the Transportation Commission focused on how well the downtown is served; how reliable the transit system is for passengers; how much transit service there is relative to the demand; and how transit passengers feel as they come to and from buses. As of 2010, 86 percent of those living or working in the downtown had access to a bus stop within 600 feet. With the planned increases in transit service, including light rail, by 2030 the projection is that 97 percent of residence and employees in the downtown will be within 600 feet of a transit stop.

The Transportation Commission also talked about bicycle mobility in terms of getting from point to point in the downtown; getting to and from the regional transportation network; the need for bicycle parking facilities; and the components needed to promote commuting by bicycle, including signage and pavement markings.

With respect to pedestrians, the Transportation Commission recognized the need for safe and comfortable crosswalks at intersections and at midblock locations; the need for adequate sidewalks; and the need to be able to make their way through some of the superblocks in the downtown. Three different kinds of intersections were called out, each needing a different type of treatment; exceptional intersections are those needing all the bells and whistles to assure comfort and safety; the exceptional intersections are located along the pedestrian corridor, through the downtown core, and in Old Bellevue. For some locations the Transportation Commission recommended wider sidewalks and different landscape treatments from what is

required by code.

Mr. McDonald said the recommendation of the Transportation Commission was forwarded to the Council on October 7, 2013, and direction was given to implement the provisions. The Council allocated \$5.8 million for projects in the downtown that will enhance mobility. The subarea plan policies included in the recommendation will be folded into the Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked what recourse the public will have if there are issues in the document they would like to see changed. Mr. Inghram said the objective is to have the policies subjected to an initial review by the city's boards and commissions and then prepare a draft of the entire plan, which will also be provided to the public for review and comment. The Transportation Commission and the Planning Commission will take the public comment into account in determining if revisions to the policies are needed.

A motion to extend the meeting to 10:05 p.m. was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner deVadoss and it carried unanimously.

9. OTHER BUSINESS - None

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. John Haro, 2431 161st Avenue NE, commented that with regard to development of the triangle area with mixed uses, the way in which the densities are to be implemented needs to be planned carefully. There should be opportunities for pedestrians to walk, not just blockhouses that will increase traffic.

11. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW

- A. September 10, 2014
- B. September 24, 2014
- C. October 8, 2015
- D. October 22, 2015

There was agreement to move adoption of the minutes to the next Commission meeting.

12. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Hamlin. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tebelius and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner Hilhorst adjourned the meeting at 10:02 p.m.