

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BEL-RED PROJECT
PANEL DISCUSSIONS
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

May 13, 2008
8:00 a.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-109

- Panelists: Mike Yule, Rod Johnson, Roger Parisotto, Harry Quanz, Tomio Moriguchi, Andy Taber, Christine Koch, Berk Biddle
- Moderators: Kevin McDonald, Dan Stroh, Patti Wilma
- Mr. McDonald: Well good morning again and welcome. We have a nice small, workable panel. And we have some coffee coming. Thanks Jean. I will do a quick introduction and then talk a little bit about the format for how we want to run the panel discussion and then get to the really important questions. I'll introduce myself and the other staff that's in the room. My name is Kevin McDonald. I'm a planner in the transportation department. And I've been working on this project for several years now and some of the faces in the room are familiar to me. So welcome new and long time supporters of the Bel-Red corridor project. I'll let other staff introduce themselves and then we'll go around the table and introduce the panelists.
- Ms. Wilma: I'm Patty Wilma. I am with Planning and Community Development. I was one of the authors, architects, of the Land Use Code section that you've got in the booklets.
- Ms. (?): I'm Liz ?, Land Use planning manager. I just started yesterday so Ms. Wilma: is leading me through this.
- Dan Stroh: I am Dan Stroh. I am the head of the planning division in Planning and Community Development.
- Mr. McDonald: So let's do a quick round of introductions around the table so we know who our fellow panelists are at the table so just your name and whether you own a business or property in the Bel-Red Corridor and where approximately that is so we can get an idea for the geography and get an idea of who's here. So, Mike, you want to start?
- Participant: Mike Yule. I'm a property owner. I own the property with the tall trees on 128th.
- Participant: I'm Rod Johnson. I'm right next door with the tall trees. (inaudible) three buildings that look like they are old warehouses.
- Participant: I'm Roger Parisotto representing Bel-Green Developments. The former Angelo's Nursery property.

Participant: I am Harry Quanz. I'm representing the owner in a facility on 130th Avenue and where 16th Street is going to be going through. So we are very curious what's going on.

Participant: Tomio Moriguchi with Uwajimaya 156th and Bel-Red road.

Participant: I'm Andy Taber with Opus Northwest. We are working with Walgreens on their site which is the site where Tomio is, where Uwajimaya is today. and next door to the Angelos property.

Participant: I'm Christine Koch. Owner of property on 132nd, just one property up from Bel-Red Road, next to the old Sweet Bear Mattress Company on 132nd.

Participant: I'm Berk Biddle. I own a business property on NE 20th on 145th immediately below Fred Myer and right Magnolia Hi-Fi. Former site of Good Will, which is now got harbor freight tools in it, among other things.

Mr. McDonald: Alright thank you and welcome again. So the agenda for the next hour and fifteen minutes is to ask a series of questions. We have seven questions, which I think you all have copies of and if you don't maybe we can round up a few. While we are doing introductions.

Ms. Wilma: Does anyone need a copy?

Mr. McDonald: So we have seven questions and we would like to get brief responses to each of those questions from each of you. You may not all of you have responses to all of them and that's fine, but I want to make sure that everybody that has an opinion about one of the questions or components of the project has an opportunity to get on the record stating your opinion, or get on the record asking for a follow-up question. And we can provide information perhaps after the meeting if the question is more complicated than any of us have the ability to answer today. so your comments are being recorded. This machine here is up and running. And we also have opportunity to write comments on the flip chart. Or if you have any geographically specific comments we can put them on the land use or the transportation maps that are on the wall there. These comments will be provided to the planning commission. Both all the written comments plus the transcript of the tape. The planning commission will have that information as they begin to deliberate their final recommendation on the Bel-Red subarea plan to the city council. So when we start the questions, which will be just another second, probably have about ten minutes, maybe fifteen minutes per question. So we will try to finish up at ten. So with respect to everybody's time, I'll try to track of the time as we go along. And maybe if we're going along staff can nudge the conversation

along because I am not seeing the clock as well as other staff might. So if we don't get a chance to go through all of the questions or if you don't get all of your questions answered some staff may be able to stick around after the meeting or you can submit questions in writing and we will try to respond to those. Ok, with that I would like to break into the questions. Unless you have questions about the general format or how this information will be used to make a final decision by the planning Commission. Good to go with questions. Okay. So each of the questions as you have them before you starts with an introductory paragraph, which I will read, so everybody has the same background on the questions. And that will take probably thirty seconds of the questions and then the rest of the time will be devoted to your responses. How we end up doing the responses is up to you. If you have a burning need to respond right away go ahead. Otherwise we may go around the room and see if anybody wants to respond to the question. Ok, the first question deals with land use and zoning, which is transformational for the Bel-Red corridor. And the Bel-Red subarea plan is the implementation of the steering committee's vision, which was two years in the making for a more compact mixed use development pattern that exists out there today. Paul referred to nodes, and the nodal development pattern concentrates future employment and residential growth into smaller compact mixed use pedestrian oriented nodes around potential future light rail stations. Paul mentioned floor area ratio. In the nodes you would be allowed to do up to 2.5 floor area ratio. And for those of you who don't understand floor area ratio it's a simple formula where if you have like a 10,000 square foot lot floor area ratio of one would allow you to have a 10,000 square foot building on that lot. So the ratio of one to one size of the lot ratio to the size of the building. So the floor area ratio of 2.5 if you had a 10,000 square foot lot you could build a 25,000 square foot building. It could all be in one story or it could be stacked. But the limit of the square footage would be dictated by the floor area ratio. Maximum height within the nodes could be 150 feet near the core of the nodes and tapering down to 125 feet at the perimeter. And outside of those nodes building heights and intensity would be less with heights between 45 and 70 feet. The floor area ratio would be about one outside of the nodes. And the land uses would vary in type based on the descriptions that Paul gave you this morning. So the question is, after that introduction, does the proposed pattern of zoning appropriately capture and translate the steering committees preferred alternative as you understand the steering committees vision for the area to be compact mixed use higher intensity development focused on nodes? Does anyone have any responses to that question about the pattern of zoning capturing what the steering committee believe to be their vision for the Bel-Red corridor?

Participant:

I guess the only question that I would have, again my name is Harry Quans, is the grandfathering of existing buildings where you've got a

major shift in the actual zoning. Our facility is currently light commercial, light industrial, and where we are located it is changing dramatically. And I just wondered as far as the grandfathering how long of a period is the committee looking at.

Mr. McDonald: The steering committee was very concerned about the same issue that you are talking about. and they directed us to write code that allowed for existing buildings, existing light industrial uses to stay as long as they wanted to stay. And those light industrial uses could even expand if they wanted to expand. Not beyond the scope of their current property. But within the property they could expand. The transition occurs when the building is destroyed or the use changes over time then that grandfathering no longer exists. But as long as the building is maintained and operating its industrial use it can be retained in that industrial use or even expanded.

Participant: Ok, well as a secondary question to that same one, we're on 130th currently and our building is actually right were 16th Avenue would be coming down through. So if that turns into a major arterial what kinds of easements are going to be required on either sides of those that may jeopardize the future of the building?

Mr. McDonald: Right, well, the specific alignment for 16th hasn't quite yet been defined. Nor has the cross section been defined. And the alignment and cross section vary as you go across the corridor. So it's hard to say precisely what the impacts might be to any particular property along the way. but sufficed to say that some additional land would be required to accommodate 15th and 16th. The type of roadway that will be is a different type of roadway than we've seen elsewhere in the city. It is intended to accommodate east west traffic on four through lanes. Its intended to accommodate high capacity transit, which would be in kind of a median configuration with stations at 130th. Where the stations are you need more land, so it would be wider than the areas in between the stations. So it's hard to say. And how to say how much specific impact it would have to any particular parcel. But in the development of 15th and 16th there is a number of mechanisms that can be used to acquire the land. Whether it is dedication of the land as your own site redevelops, or acquisition of the land by purchasing a portion of the site that is needed for the development. What we want to do at this point is make sure that we understand a little bit more closely what the dimensions are of 15th and 16th so that individual property owners know where that road goes. And so that staff knows also where that road goes. So as future development proposals come online we won't be building a new building right in the path of 15th 16th.

Participant: Thank you very much.

Mr. McDonald: Right. Mike?

Participant: I'm not, I'd have to go back and look at exactly what the steering committee is. But essentially what's happening north of Northup is that your taking a GC zone and you are expanding it to the west. The problem, however with the fundamental underlying GC zone is it was laid out for 30 foot maximum height. And so what you are essentially doing is applying the 30 foot maximum height to what is now 45 foot in the LI zone. The problem I see, the GC zone was primarily set up for spread out buildings and all that shopping. The problem with the area west of 130th is you've got a whole bunch of small lots and a bunch of hillside properties. And I don't think the spread out type of environment in the GC zone really applies and fits to well to the current topography there, so my argument would be, I think that the 45 foot height, the rollback of the 45 foot base height, which is now allowed in the LI zone to 30 foot is inappropriate there. It looks to me like what you are doing with a brief that I saw in the chart is the base zoning now west of 130th where the base height is 30 feet and it be allowed 45 foot under some, I read this yet, but it would be 45 feet. I guess I have a problem with that because I don't know what's required to go from 30 to 45. because at the present height I am 43.5 feet. So I would be non-conforming under your present, under this if it went in to effect.

Mr. McDonald: So you are talking about the zoning category that's called BR-GC.

Participant: Yea BR-GC. And what you've extended it is, you've extended it currently it's about, currently about halfway through the zone. But what you've done is you've taken what's now LI and you've changed it to BR-GC. And under the visual that Paul just showed us that's now a 30 foot base height and a 45 foot height with, I presume, some kind of incentives. So I object to that, and I don't think that that was essentially what the steering committee had in mind.

Mr. McDonald: Okay and I think that Patty, who is much more familiar with the zoning code than I am may be able to respond to that.

Participant: Okay.

Mr. McDonald: No?

Ms. Wilma: Um.

Mr. McDonald: I thought I saw you –

Ms. Wilma: No, no, no. Just making a good point that we are for purposes of height I guess you could use the term downzoning but that reducing that height that you currently have. And if topography is a condition that sort of

constrains or challenges how property is developed we'll look at the heights and consider if that is what we suggest here that the planning commission discuss whether that should be changed or not. So I'll make that note.

Participant: To respond, Patty, I think that one of the things that the planning staff has gotten in to effect is that north of Northrup, north of NE 20th, that we were a buffer zone between there and the neighborhoods of the north. It's difficult to accept that because you've got a row of businesses between the freeway and 24th, you've got a 160 foot freeway and we're way below that. So essentially I think that this rational that somehow we are going to do low buildings to buffer the neighborhoods of the north, I still have real trouble swallowing that as the logical reason.

Ms. Wilma: Okay.

Participant: I would like to add to that, because I am right next door to Mike, and as you know the freeway is probably 50-60 feet above us there, and above the freeway then there is a buffer zone of raw land sloping above that. And if there were a logical place to but a higher building, well I don't know what higher is, but up to the freeway height or something like that, or even to the, above the freeway height so they don't have to look down on the roof. But it's a real concern because it's a place that a high building could go in with absolutely no effect at all. So if you need more space we could give it to you.

Mr. McDonald: Okay we will provide those comments to the planning commission. Maybe there is opportunities to tweak the zoning a little bit to allow for that kind of topography. Okay. Andy?

Participant: Andy Taber, yeah, I'd encourage you to, you get a low density in now and it's get built it's going to take forever for that to age and come to the end of its useful life before you want to go higher. I'd just encourage you to, that whole center corridor, you know, recognizing up against the freeway it's difficult, but down the center corridor, I'd encourage you to let it go up higher just because of they have just been saying. And let it build taller at the begging, instead of low and flat and wait 50-60 years for the useful life to wear out.

Mr. McDonald: Are you suggesting higher than the 150 that the steering committee –

Participant: No I meant mainly just what they are talking about. The GC section in there. I mean I look at that and you are dropping down to 30 feet after you come off of a BRRC1 area where it's tall, you know, that's a corridor that I'd think you would want to develop as long the transit line you are planning along the main road. I compliment you on the not setting an 85

foot number because 85 is a very difficult construction number to hit. 75 feet is fine, because that is where it kicks into high rise construction and you incur a lot more cost. You stay below 75 feet and you get a good product and then, 125 feet is not bad. And 150 you are getting up there to where it makes some sense.

Mr. McDonald: Okay. Does anyone have any more comments on the land use building heights floor area ratios.

Participant: Tomio Moriguchi with Uwajimaya. First of all 90 acres of Bellevue, what percentage of this all city of Bellevue is it, I'm just curious.

Mr. McDonald: Well this is 900 acres.

Participant: Oh, 900 acres. And what percentage of that is...

Mr. McDonald: I have no idea.

Participant: Probably like 4 percent.

Participant: Four percent?

Participant: Something like that yeah.

Participant: The other question was in the last sentence you say this 45 to 70 foot very in the future so I guess I want a little bit comment of how you would update this and what is the term very in the future mean?

Mr. McDonald: The height limits ranging from 45 – 70 feet and with very in the future land use type. I think the map outside of the high intensity nodes has different designations. So I think all that sentence means is that those different designations would have a different height. And there is a chart in the land use code that would describe what those various heights would be depending on land use designation.

Participant: Well I interpreted that to be some mechanism to update and fine-tune this. Did I misinterpret that statement?

Mr. McDonald: I think once the code is established it will probably stay that way for a while. So this at this point is the time to fine tune the height recommendations that are going to the planning commission.

Participant: So there is no fine tuning mechanism that is being built into this system.

Mr. McDonald: I think, you know, as time goes on there are always opportunities to adjust the code. But I think that we probably wouldn't adjust it for a while

because a lot of work and thought has gone into it at this point. So if there is a specific zone that you think should be designated with a different height than is currently being recommended now is the time to talk about that.

Participant: May I comment? That's a very bureaucratic answer. (laughs)

Mr. McDonald: I'm a bureaucrat. What can I say?

Participant: But the point is do these things should be live and fit the changes that happens is the way it should be thought about. that's all I want to say.

Mr. McDonald: So your comment is to be flexible as time goes on as –

Participant: Well a good example would be who would have thought that you would have all of those high rises in downtown Bellevue 15 years ago. I mean the point is you would probably look at it differently today than you did ten years ago. That's all I'm saying.

Mr. McDonald: So there are always opportunities to modify policies and modify code as circumstances change.

Participant: Yeah, but if the bureaucrat system says we spend a lot of time so were are not going to change it, it kills it from the start.

Mr. McDonald: We are trying to get a lot of input in now so we can kind of get it close to right the first time. But sure, there is opportunities to chance it as time goes on.

Participant: Thank you.

Mr. McDonald: So in speaking of time going on.

Participant: Yes, next question should have happened by now.

Mr. McDonald: I have been given the notes to move on to the next question which deals with transportation. So I will read the paragraph and we will move into the question. The existing transportation system as Paul showed you in the slide show, doesn't have the roadway capacity or any of the pedestrian bicycle facilities that would be needed to support land use that is office and residential based. The proposed transportation system employs a number of different modes. Its multimodal. It's got pedestrians, bicycles, cars of course and high capacity transit going through the area. There are some roadway projects, including widening 120th and 124th to five lanes. There is the NE 15th 16th project that includes transit, ped-bike and roadway capacity. And this 15th 16th is and east west boulevard that the

city is recommending to Sound Transit be the alignment for light rail and the station locations as well we will recommend those to Sound Transit. 15th 16th will also be a linear green corridor that links a number of different park nodes along the way. and as I mentioned it will have very high quality pedestrian and bicycle facilities on it. So that is a really important project of Bel-Red. It makes it all work. It's the framework upon which a lot of the Bel-Red land use and some of the other transportation system components are built. So the question is do you feel that the proposed transportation system as I have just described it and is shown on the map adequately address the future needs for mobility in and around the subarea? And when I say mobility it's all different modes, pedestrians, bicycles, autos, and transit. Any comments on the transportation system? Mike.

Participant: Well, basically you may think that I am again staff, but I've got to say I am proud of you people for this transportation plan. As a civil engineer there is nothing that I could say or do that would improve it. Because you do the best job of technical and balancing people concerns.

Mr. McDonald: Excellent. thank you.

Participant: Okay, that is going to be one of our pitches, our slogans.

Mr. McDonald: I just say we have spent at least as much time on transportation as we have on land use. There has been a lot of analysis and a lot of modeling trying to predict how much the transportation system would need to evolve over time as the land use changes. And also trying to predict how peoples mode choice will shift over time. This is a 30 year plan, so to try to plan for a transportation system 25-30 years out that anticipates growth as shown on the map, plus tries to anticipate gas prices and transit use et cetera is a work of art and science at the same time. It's the best shot.

Participant: You are doing well. Okay. Keep it up.

Mr. McDonald: Thanks. Okay. Any other good comments on the transportation system? Andy?

Participant: Well I admire all the work that has gone into it, but I would raise a couple of questions from what I have seen and what we have discovered studying mixed use and high density developments. You get a corridor that's too wide, it's like putting I-5 through Seattle and you separate the communities. And what I see in those sketches it ranges from 170 -200 feet wide through there. And I am just afraid you are going to end up with an I-5 up through the center of this thing and you got a north side and a south side and they are not going to talk to each other. And it's just been a problem in Seattle and I think it is really unfortunate and I would hate to

see it happen over here. On top of that there is so much automobile lanes in there I wonder about the carbon footprint we talked about in this city and thinking of the future I hope there is going to be less cars and we have a better public transportation system. And that's got to happen, but when I don't know. But I would just think about that big wide boulevard down through there. I think it's going to look like a I-5 and separate the communities.

Mr. McDonald: Andy, you are not alone in having that concern. A number of staff, and even the transportation Commission and the parks board are concerned about what 15th 16th looks like. What its physical footprint is, what its carbon footprint is. How its, you know we want it to do all things. We want it to move pedestrians, bicycles, transit. So you have got have enough footprint to do all that without having too much footprint that it begins to destroy the urban character like you are talking about.

Participant: I just suggest, maybe look at a dispersion of those things, and that they are not all concentrated in the same corridor. Maybe bikes come down another side street or something, or pedestrians or whatever. Maybe more grid and less throughway in which it appears to be is trying to move people, like Bellevue way is trying to move people. I encourage you to try and think about that when it comes time to the opposite of moving traffic to moving pedestrians and creating a community. And I'm not sure the two go together very well.

Participant: Did I hear you correctly in that your plan was to widen 20th to five lanes? Or 120th?

Mr. McDonald: 120th.

Participant: Okay. I was curious about 20th since that (inaudible) and that its limited access to get into various business properties depending on which direction you are going. I don't know if there is any plan to deal with that down the road.

Mr. McDonald: Well there actually is on that section of 20th which is Northup Way between 120th and 124th. There is..

Participant: I'm thinking on the far east end of it, but okay.

Mr. McDonald: In that section there is a project to add another lane to that small section. To make that a five lane cross section similar to the rest of 20th. The 120th project would be done in two phases. The southern phase would be first between 15th 16th and Bel-Red road or 12th. And then a northern phase would be done subsequent to that one. Let's get Roger.

Participant: Just to add on to Andy's comments, a pedestrian crossing a street that wide with all that traffic going in the opposite direction I think really inhibits and discourages, for example the senior, trying to get across that many lanes of traffic and so on so forth and watch out for bicycles, cars, trains and planes. I think would really create a real bottle neck, if you will, trying to get across that street. And so if you are trying to encourage walking paths and pedestrians to move about on both sides of the street I think that would be a difficult chore to be successful at.

Mr. McDonald: The transportation Commission has expressed real concerns about the walking distance across. It's not only an urban design issue that Andy points out, but it's the mobility issue. We want to make a pedestrian friendly environment and have good easy convenient access to the transit system that's probably running down the middle. So we have to be aware of the width of that cross section and how comfortable it feels for a pedestrian to cross. The way 15th and 16th is currently designed there's a number of stages that one could use to cross the street if one didn't want to make it all the way across you could go a third of the way, half the way, or all the way, and there is islands and places that you could stop. And if you didn't want to make it all the way you wouldn't have to go all the way, but at least its breaking up the big expanse. Because as was pointed out it at station locations it could be close to 200 feet wide. And to do all that in one cycle is daunting. So, we are very aware of that. Try and break it up so that its more comfortable to the pedestrian. Christine, anyone else with comments on the transportation system? Christine you are at 132nd and close to 15th 16th?

Participant: That's correct. But we are closer to Bel-Red Road.

Mr. McDonald: So you probably wouldn't be effected by...

Participant: I don't think so. I think that is more in the middle of the block. But very close to that area.

Participant: I have one comment because I think that it ties a bunch of these together. My concern is getting across on 120th when the trains are there. Maybe you could look at perhaps depressing the rail lines to go under 120th so basically the traffic could flow. Because if we are going to go with a very frequent train heading between Bellevue and Redmond my concern is that it's going to be a lot traffic congestion because of that.

Mr. McDonald: That's a really good point. The frequency of the trains, as that increases the frequency of the vehicles stopping increases as well.

Participant: If you could depress it, at lease at that one crossing.

Mr. McDonald: you would have a good separation. Transportation is finished at this point. It relates to everything else, so if you have another transportation question as we go along we can bring that back up. Well let's move on to question three now which is zoning. I alluded to this a little bit earlier and we will get into more details now. The Bel-Red steering committee recognized the importance of ensuring that new public infrastructure including streets, parks and open space would be synchronized with development. Meaning that as development occurs these public infrastructure things would be present. Due to challenges inherent with Bel-Red relying on our current concurrency system alone isn't sufficient. The draft plan proposes a three part phasing system whereby the initial zoning capacity increase in the node areas would occur once a financial mechanism is in place to build the public improvements to support. Boy this is a mouthful paragraph here. Development is also subject to the provisions of the BROTS agreement, which is our inter local agreement with Redmond to deal with transportation impacts from both of our cities. And ultimately the city will require a high capacity transit system to be in place in the Bel-Red corridor before the development in the area exceeds 4 ½ million square feet of new commercial space.

Participant: Is that in addition to the existing then?

Mr. McDonald: The 4 ½ million square feet is a net total. So it includes existing plus new development. So the question is do you think the proposed phasing mechanism is sufficient to ensure that adequate infrastructure, transportation capacity and other public amenities will be in place to serve new development? So really what the question is we have a concurrency mechanism which provides for transportation system improvements to be done relatively at the same time or within a few years of when a building project is done. But there isn't the same kind of mechanism for parks or for pedestrian bicycle facilities, for stream enhancements, etc. so what this is saying is that we are going to look at the development and how it progresses, and make sure that all of those different components of public infrastructure are in place through whatever mechanism is available to ensure that those things are in place about the same time the development occurs. Without getting in to any details, does that first sound like a reasonable way to approach development and infrastructure? And if you have any specific comments let us know.

Participant: What kind of a formula could you devise that would tell you that? I don't know how you would do that. Unless you put a termination date which if the grandfather clause is removed well then you got something to shoot for, but otherwise I don't know.

Mr. McDonald: Well it all starts with having a plan and the transportation system map as you see there has a color coded plan for what roadway systems should be

built or expanded first. And there will be a combination of funding for those roadways. We would have the developers pay for some, the city would pay for some. We would try to get some grants to help pay for the rest.

Participant: I forgot about that (inaudible)

Mr. McDonald: Most of the donation would come from people who want to redevelop their property. In exchange for allowing for buildings to go 150 feet and to occupy 2.5 FAR, they would contribute some to the transportation system.

Participant: The 2.5 for 15 feet will contribute.

Mr. McDonald: Okay. Mike?

Participant: The problem here is, usually when in the money, and were talking money here, okay. The problem here is to get the money somebody is going to have to tear down some building and build something new. Because that's when the need to get the money occurs. And that's when some of the money goes to the city. Unfortunately that's got to work financially. Doc Davidson tumbled through this in the council meeting too. The problem with this whole process if you are looking at upfront fees that's an expensive proposition because you got to borrow the money to build. My suggestion is, and the counsel has got the financing, my suggestion is look at a combination of upfront fees and a portion of the revenue string resulting therein. Because if I am going to tear down a building and build something new I've got to borrow it but I've got to take what I'm going to pay you and I'm going to have to fold it back into the rents, and if that doesn't work I don't build. I think you have got to look at this thing it says what portion of what you are going to take from the new is going to be an upfront fee and what are you going to take from the revenue stream?

Mr. McDonald: Good point.

Participant: I got a comment on the too. I think people want to come to a place where it's fun, and the parks and stuff you got, and these are all, I'm just amazed at what you are planning here I think it's fantastic, but I'm not sure people will come if there is a warehouse next door and it might be 20 years before the warehouse comes down. I think you kind of need, maybe you need to think about how you do some of the key things like some parks maybe some stream enhancement or whatever. The roads and then the renters or the condo owners or the businesses will want to come and be there because it is a neat place to be, it's a place, it's a happening place, it's fun. Without some of that stuff in place it's going to be difficult to get people to come and they won't, the revenue or the rents or the condo sales will

not be as high as they are going to be necessary to pay for all the improvements that got to be there. I think, we might have to see a way to get the good stuff there first to make it sweet and encouraging people to come.

Mr. McDonald: Sure, sure. I think that the steering committee was very much embracing that same kind of concept. Making sure that there is some kind of catalyst projects out there, something that maybe is a public investment to ensure that there is the quality of environment that people want to live in or do business in. and I think that's imbedded in a lot of the work that's already been done. It's good to hear it again. We will have for a long time those awkward transition things between existing warehouses that are allowed to stay because of the interest in retaining light industrial in the area, as long as light industrial wants to stay. But at the same time encouraging new development that is vastly different character. So there will be some odd relationships for a while, but as time goes on those relationships will transition out to be more smooth.

Participant: I am just a little bit concerned about the fees that I see on this list of impact fees. Those (inaudible) that this wonderful place to live is already here because that's why more people want to come and the rents will be higher. With lower rents it's difficult to achieve those high impact fees. It won't be there.

Participant: Roger Paris Auto. I think that the question on phasing might be closely tied into the incentive program in that in order to get things going so that people can envision something coming into this corridor I think that in the begging of the process it's kind of like you know planting your garden you start with a seed and you get it going and then people start to see that oh my this could be something that is going to be perfect for Bellevue. But until that point if you make it so difficult, to Andy's point about the fees, or the incentive program is so mandatory that financially people are saying hey we can't really do that. And we have a couple of projects, ours included, that's ready to go tomorrow. But if we are being held back or its too expensive to do you are going to have this f20 or 30 year program last 50 or 60 because nobody wants to, you know the market has to catch up to itself before somebody takes the leap. And financially that's not exactly the way you want to approach it. I think that's something that we might want to consider.

Mr. McDonald: I hear what you are saying and its similar to what Tomio is talking about in terms of building height. Maybe there's some adjustments that can be made as time goes on. maybe adjust the incentive strategy to be less onerous and to help catalyze some of those projects. Is that what you are saying?

Participant: I think so, and certainly that can be one of the considerations. But I think that its critically important here that we get off on the right foot, otherwise people are you know, I mean when you look at the marketplace, I mean, it's difficult to get into the financial market today without seeing into the future as to what things might happen.

Mr. McDonald: Okay thank. Other comments on phasing? Tomio?

Participant: About the public infrastructures, although it will be built on 4% of the land of, but a lot of the people the area will, so what is philosophically do you expect just 4% of this area to carry the burden of new parks and things like that?

Mr. McDonald: Well one of the ways to fund roadways is through impact fees. And generally impact fees can be structured any way the city wants, but generally those who benefit the most from that new infrastructure would pay the most. So what we are trying to do is figure out who is going to use these new roadways. And we have our sophisticated modeling techniques to identify origins and destinations of trips. And we can run the models and they will tell us who is using those roadways. And with that information we can assign responsibility for helping to pay those, proportion to who the model says would be using those roads. So it is a pretty sophisticated tool. I don't know if its...

Participant: Well the roads might be easy, but parks and things like that, yeah, is a little more difficult I would think.

Mr. McDonald: And parks, there is a wide range of park types in Bel-Red. Some of which will be attractive maybe only to the immediate neighborhood and some would be attractive to the residents of the entire city, or even maybe adjacent cities. So the park funding mechanism is something I am not quite as familiar with as maybe Glen Coast, who is representing the parks department here today. but there would definitely be a number of different park types and a number of different mechanisms to pay for those depending on who we think might be using them. If you have any other comments.

Participant: Well I mean that is philosophically correct. I mean the more locally based the projected uses are the more a typically impact fee would require the immediate development and the residents to pay for that. As it gets into greater community wide use and the proportion of immediate fee would be reduced. It's just as much art as it is science as I'm sure we all know.

Participant: The concern I have as a business person is if you front load, (inaudible) for us to expand or to even stay, and so. I don't know. I just want to make that point. I'm sure you are all aware of it, but it think I am going to keep

hammering away on that issue.

Mr. McDonald: It comes up in a lot of the discussion. The who pays discussion is a very important one to have. So we are going to move on to question four. Which is, relates to something we have talked about already. Provisions for existing uses. The proposed plan recognizes existing light industrial type uses in the area. The plan provides land use designations for many of these commercial uses to continue and allows for expansion services that are compatible with future land uses, which means that services that are don't generate a lot of noise and dust and light and glare those would be compatible with some of the new future residential uses that are envisioned. The plan seeks a transition from light industrial type uses in areas where the land use designation would change to support the nodal patten of mixed use and residential development. So as I mentioned before light industrial type uses could stay. They could stay as the E designation. Which means existing uses. But over time its expected they would transition to a mixed use type of land use pattern. So the question is do the proposed plan and land use code provisions appropriately allow for existing uses while supporting redevelopment to new higher density uses? Christine?

Participant: I have a question. What do you consider under business services? Here they talk about personal and business services should be allowed. But what are business services?

Mr. McDonald: My guess, and Ms. Wilma: please help, it would be services that support the ongoing small businesses like copy centers and what else might be a business service.

Participant: An employment agency, copy centers...

Participant: Printer.

Ms. Wilma: Printer. Yeah.

Mr. McDonald: Delivery services.

Ms. Wilma: Delivery services.

Mr. McDonald: Restaurants? No?

Ms. Wilma: H&R Block. You know a tax office. Something that sort of supports the business within the area. Or other businesses. CPA, right yeah.

Participant: You see, right now, LI, for example, is limited as to the number of people who can go there. In other words, its limited as to the traffic that they

bring in. You can't have something that has a high traffic density, like a restaurant for example which would have a lot of people, or retail which would bring in a lot more people. But you can have..

Ms. Wilma: The current LI.

Participant: That's right the current LI.

Ms. Wilma: And the new code loosens that up a little bit in that a broader range of commercial retail kind of uses is encouraged and there would be a mix of that kind of thing. So where you may not be able to have a restaurant in a LI location if that's one of the uses that you would be interested in having that would be something, because it would serve the people, that's a retail use, that's not a business use. And mix use including retail is something that's pretty broadly encouraged. Does that answer your question?

Participant: So actually the two would be compatible for quite some time. Because the retail then actually is a little bit more generous than the LI would be.

Ms. Wilma: Right they would move in and they would start to blend and at some point maybe the business services sort of drop off and it becomes more of a commercial merchandise personal service kind of area.

Participant: But what about the parking restrictions?

Ms. Wilma: New parking requirements suggested, and with that is, based on, the new parking requirements are based, minimums and maximums, based on our experience in other parts of the city as to what those uses need. And with a new street network and on street parking and transit we would be much more sort of mobility and people in the district already using those the new services. So we don't see at this point that there would be an issue with parking in the future. So are you asking about now, what the...

Participant: Well, just in the future if you have businesses that don't require much parking then obviously you don't have to provide that much. But if you have retail quite next then on retail you have a lot more people coming you have a lot more traffic generated than you do with some of these other uses.

Ms. Wilma: So there may be conditions where there is an existing building that you want to re-tenant and there is only parking provided for onsite for what the original use was LI, so low parking on site. So we would look at the minimums and the maximums of the proposed parking, see how that works for you. We would look at, there are also provisions that the parking supply can be you can propose a different parking supply if you think that's a particular use, the new tenant, will have some other use than

what we generically call out in the code, because there is, the comment about sort of retooling and refreshing what the code is, we understand that there, I mean goodness, there is always new uses coming along that we never thought of. I never thought in my wildest dreams that there would be telephone stores that people walk in and buy those tiny phones constantly. So I always thought you got them from the phone company. So, new businesses all the time and so we need to be able to respond to that as entrepreneurial uses come along. So parking will be one way that we will want to accommodate that. So we will look at how parking can be accommodated on older sites. It's not going to be a honeymoon every time. It may not be absolutely yes that a particular use can go where you want. There may be some conditions where it's just not going to work. But we do want to, we want to do what we can to get the district retooled with new tenants.

Participant: Is there going to be any provision for increased parking requirements for the transit center?

Ms. Wilma: Increased parking requirements meaning?

Participant: People driving to take...

Participant: Park and rides

Ms. Wilma: Oh, park and rides?

Participant: Yeah the park and ride and type in the immediate vicinity of the transit center. Or is that going to be off site?

Ms. Wilma: We have expectation that there will be some distance away where park and ride kinds of activities. You know you can walk 200 feet, you can walk a block. That sort of thing may not be right at the station.

Participant: I was wondering in view of that discussion I would like to see language that encourages more jobs. I don't know I don't see any of that here. Because I'm assuming that would be one of your mission is to have provide jobs and easier access and all that.

Mr. McDonald: We think that there will be according to the plan we mentioned about 4 ½ million square feet of commercial developed here. So some of that will be brand new office buildings primarily, but some retail. There is maybe a couple of hotels that might pop up. But it's mostly office type use that is envisioned. Some of that square footage is new some is existing square footage that will be retained for awhile and then transitioned into other types of uses. Os there should be a lot of new employment generated, primarily on the west side of the sub area. The east side would be more

retail and residential type uses.

Participant: No, all I am saying is that there should be language to encourage that type of, I mean just providing physical space is not enough. There are other issues that should be discussed is the point I am making.

Ms. Wilma: So that would be something probably in the comp plan, language in the comp plan would be something that would be that kind of a statement.

Participant: Just to give you example if there is a concentration of people working you may want to have people provide childcare or elderly care. I mean those are issues that probably should be discussed somewhere.

Mr. McDonald: Yeah, I think that's excellent. We don't want to create an enclave where people just come to work. They go back and forth, back and forth and there is nothing there for them once they get to work. There has got to be supportive and complimentary services, such as you mentioned, child care is really important. maybe a gym, maybe a coffee shop, who knows. It's more of the whole concept that the steering committee embraced is trying to mix up uses so that the employment centers are more than just places that people go from 8-5. and I think that you are getting at that point where you want to have those amenities that people look for day to day located pretty close to where they are going to be working. Okay, so I have been given the nod to move on from this question, unless anyone has something else to say about existing uses? I'm sure this is going to be another complicated one and I'll struggle to get through the paragraph, which you guys have probably thought about it. So here we go, amenity incentive system. The Bel-Red plan includes the potential to achieve substantially more intense development within the nodes than under existing zoning and you would achieve that new development through participation in an incentive system. This is a bonus mechanism that will also be a key tool to help achieve those public amenities that we were talking about that benefit not only the immediate neighborhood but perhaps the entire community. A project's floor area ratio would be allowed to exceed the base which might be between 0.5 and 1 up to a maximum of 2.5. Additional height would also be allowed in the nodes for development that participates in the incentive system. The proposed incentive system, as Paul described, has a first tier of public amenities that includes park and open space for commercial development and affordable housing plus park and open space for residential development. The potential incentive that applies outside of the nodes, where those areas that have lower building intensities and heights, will be considered in conjunction with the financial plan for Bel-Red. So do you think the density incentive system provides sufficient incentive to encourage development of public infrastructure and key amenities for sub area and are there specifics of the draft incentives system that are of a concern to you? And I think that we have already heard one of

the concerns is that don't front load it too much because you won't get anybody participating if it's too onerous up front. But any other comments related to the amenity incentive system? Mike?

Participant: I have three comments. One, I'll title "rent a roof".

Mr. McDonald: What is it called?

Participant: Rent a roof.

Mr. McDonald: Rent a roof. Okay.

Participant: Now here is the problem. We are looking for a regional sports center and it's supposed to be covered, it's going to be heated, alright? So if we basically took a big box retailer at about 100,000 or 120,000 square feet and we gave them a flat roof, no skylights, increased the welding a little bit, now we have got a spot for a sports field. And all we have to do is put a roof over the top of that. Now they have got parking on the stuff they use during peak hours so our sports field can use that parking during after hours. The other problem in this thing is you need an incentive so somebody owns the property and that basically should be a developer who owns the property because they have tax advantages, and the city basically could lease the roof, which is I call the "rent a roof" type of situation. That's concept one. Concept two, having been on the parks board and the streams committee there number one problem is money, so try this out. Storm water. Basically storm water requires two things, it requires detention and biofiltration. Biofiltration is almost a deal breaker now because of the requirements for area and topographically restrained conditions, especially on the small sites. So my suggestion is this, for a fee, an ongoing fee, a usage fee, remember you pay metro to take your sewage and treat it. I want to pay the city of Bellevue to take my water and treat it. And I want to pay them to do two things. I want to pay them to biofilter it, they are already doing it now, because my property doesn't require biofiltration, so your stream is biofiltering my water and you aren't charging a penny for it. So the streams automatically function as a biofiltration. So shouldn't I pay a fee for that? Second thing is stormwater retention. Because of the cost of land it doesn't make sense any more to build these open ponds. My detention is under a parking lot. So the basic thing is, that's an expensive thing, so the basic thing is if you could lease land and put underneath somebody's parking lot tanks big enough for multiple properties that's again, that's a fee for services, and there should be a cost in my bill to the city to send it to me. The third thing is the landscaping requirements. I strongly agree that the ten foot front yard landscaping is necessary. But why I should have to landscape my property between Rod and I and we are the same usage. And if Rod bought me he wouldn't have to have that landscaping. So my suggestion

is in the side yard landscaping you basically come up with an incentive system that says okay when you redevelop I don't have to landscape between me and Rod but pay the city some money so they can go buy some parks and some streambed areas somewhere else.

Mr. McDonald: We've got that. Good suggestions. I like your "rent a roof" idea. We've actually been talking about that just internally. You know the metro bus barn is there at the west tributary at about 124th and 18th or so. What if you lidded that thing and put a park on top.

Participant: No, because if I own a building I can depreciation and I have tax advantages. If the city owns it, it doesn't have that usage. So it's better off from a standpoint of money for private people to own it and depreciate it, and it's better off for the government to use it for a different usage.

Mr. McDonald: So if you were a big box retailer, you wouldn't care about a height incentive, you might want a tax incentive if you put this building amenity on top?

Participant: I only need 16-20 feet. I go into Home Depot and Lowes at least twice a week and I'm looking at that roof and I'm thinking what a waste of real estate.

Mr. McDonald: And a contributor to storm water too. Other comments on incentives? Too much? Too little? Right amount? Right type of incentives? Would people use floor area ratio? Would people use height?

Participant: I got comments. Andy Taylor again. I think you need the incentives and you need some sort of fees to pay for all this. I just caution these studies that have been done to date with the consultant that showed a developer making huge profit. It ain't there. If the market was that good as he showed it you would have all kinds of housing out here today. it's not the cost to build these things and the developer, remember there is a land owner whomever has got to get something for the risk and the effort he puts out and it's just really skinny today to try and make these things pencil. And now we're talking about adding huge extra fees on these things and it really needs to be studied and what I think, I suggest you work with the development community and the land owner community to figure out what the right, how to calculate those fees. Because the math that has been done so far is very flawed.

Mr. McDonald: Okay, good point. Others with comments on incentives? This is a big one obviously that affects anybody that wants to redevelop in the area and it's tricky to get it right and it may evolve over time as we see people respond to it.

Participant: Those of us that are on the far edges away from the nodal zones, are the regulations going to be identical for everything? Or are they going to kind of flow downhill from lesser density?

Mr. McDonald: I believe it flows downhill. If you are outside of the node it is not envisioned for those properties to be as tall or as dense as inside of the node. So the incentives that we have to offer and the opportunity for a property owner to take advantage of them would be a lot different than within the node areas.

Participant: Thank you.

Mr. McDonald: Roger?

Participant: I think also, Roger Paris, I think also the consideration should be given to issues like underground parking, even though today people say that its almost an expected thing. But if you look at the cost of going underground, it's a heck of a lot more expensive as you well know. Issues of traffic for example should also be considered when we look at what are some of the amenities that the developer can provide to ease some of the issues that are required in building these new developments. So I think that right now I think that the city almost looks at underground parking as a given. And I think that it shouldn't be a given. I think it should be given some consideration as to relieve some of the pressures on these incentives as to how to go about doing other property development.

Participant: I'll second that. What we found many times is the FAR may be 2.5 but when you show in structured parking, underground parking trying to get that density you turn upside down on your equation and there is nothing there. So there is a point where it doesn't make sense to do structured parking and therefore you don't get the extra density. You'd be better off building smaller and doing less.

Ms. Wilma: Andy are you saying the FAR is too low to finance the underground parking? Is that what you are saying?

Participant: It might be. It needs to be looked at. Because we found that even though the FAR is high trying to achieve that you can't get there because the rents aren't where they need to be or the condo prices. And the cost of building that extra structured parking, going down deep in the ground, if you got to do that, is just a killer. And you will never catch up with yourself. So, I mean, maybe in some cases the FAR won't be achieved that you want to see out there and we are looking at that right now in the Walgreens site. What makes sense.

Mr. McDonald: Thank you. I knew this was an important one and I gave it a few extra

minutes because it is important to hear your comments. The next question deals with design standards and guidelines. So urban design in Bel-Red would be addressed through a series of standards and guidelines as Paul described in his Powerpoint this morning. Design standards would apply to all development and are specific, they are typically quantifiable, and they must be met. Some key aspects addressed by the standards include maximum density and building height, required ground floor uses, requirements for active edges, and for new local streets. Design guidelines represent a desired outcome, maintaining some flexibility in how to achieve that outcome. Guidelines would generally be applied to new development above the point five FAR through design review process. The guidelines which cover elements such as architectural compatibility, pedestrian emphasis, and integrating the natural environment and art provide criteria by which these higher density projects would be reviewed. So a lot of flexibility with an intended outcome from the design guidelines. So the question is what works or doesn't work or isn't clear in the draft design standards and guidelines that you've got before you in the draft land use code? If you had a chance to look at those.

Participant: Is this what's applied to downtown Bellevue now?

Mr. McDonald: This would be unique to the Bel-Red corridor. But it's the same principle that's applied in downtown Bellevue right now and also in other commercial areas like crossroads and Factoria.

Participant: So this is nothing new?

Mr. McDonald: It's not new in concept but the actual provisions would be distinct.

Participant: Is the FAR downtown also point five?

Mr. McDonald: No, it's much, much higher than that.

Participant: The beginning point I guess is what.

Ms. Wilma: Yeah the beginning point is point five. The lowest minimum.

Participant: Andy again. I just caution on, you need the guidelines, no question, you need standards. The streets look better if they have the right kind of trees and the right kind of lamps and street furniture and bulbs on the corners or whatever for pedestrians and some setbacks and jogging the store façade. Sometimes we see a requirement for retail on the ground floor where retail will never survive. It just doesn't work. Either due to traffic patterns or street use or whatever. So I just be cautious on some carte blank thing that says every sidewalk has to have an 80% storefront or something like that.

It doesn't always work. And what it does is it burns the project or it sits empty there for years, sometimes forever.

Mr. McDonald: That's a very good point.

(inaudible) group talking.

Participant: I just want to add it either stays vacant or you have some very undesirable (inaudible) which is probably worse.

(inaudible) Group talking.

Mr. McDonald: Ms. Wilma: on the Bel-Red corridor, the only place where we have a real significant requirement for ground floor retail is on 130th.

Ms. Wilma: Yeah, that little shopping street.

Mr. McDonald: That little stretch between 16th and 20th on both sides of 130th. That's part of the vision that the steering committee had for a pedestrian oriented retail street. So it's like four blocks.

(inaudible) Group talking.

Participant: Let me just comment on that though because what makes a community fun to live is when you do have retail on the ground floor and the distance between the streets isn't so great because then you can cross back and forth between the streets to visit different retail. And with the residential above you begin to have a real fun place. You start pushing those streets too wide and it just doesn't work.

Mr. McDonald: So picture main street in old Bellevue, that's the kind of the street cross section that's expected for 130th. Two lane street, on street parking, wide sidewalks, buildings right to the back of the sidewalk. (inaudible)

Participant: I would hope that you would do that in more areas than just 130th. Then you'll begin to begin to create the Beltown of Bellevue where people want to come and live and enjoy their night life on the street and Saturday morning at the coffee shop. I don't know if you have been to Santana Row, but that's a place where they have attempted to do that and in some ways its worked out pretty well.

Mr. McDonald: What city is that?

Participant: It's down in San Jose. There are other great places to go and visit to see what's gone on. Downtown Portland, that's a great place. And they've got the street trolley running around and they don't have the five lanes of

traffic next to it and two more lanes of bicycles.

Participant: May I add to the Portland, they encourage and give incentive in tax breaks to retailers instead of burdening them with a lot costs. I mean, but I think Oregon laws allow that, but they are very generous in trying to attract retailers, and subsidize those upfront. Is the point is it's a little backward from what you guys are talking about burdening the development which will discourage the type of retail. Which is very important, because ultimately if you do not provide jobs and good (inaudible) you will start to lose the population that you desire.

Participant: And to Andy's point I just wanted to also the 15th and 16th issue, instead of creating a communal retail shopping and activity center what you essentially do is your going to have the retailer trying to decide which side of the street is going to be best to be on rather than encouraging the public shopping both sides of the street. I think that's what's going to happen is they will decide whether it's the sunny side or the dark side of the street and you are going to have all the successful guys hanging around on the left side of the street or the sunny side. Whereas you have a situation that's different on the other side. Of course that changes rents, it changes tax, and all kinds of good things. To that point of 130th I think is a great idea. But we should not lose sight of what's going to be on 15th and 16th because that is going to be an expensive street to develop. I'm just thinking here. I would like to make one more comment to lag on to Tommie's. I think the point that he makes in Portland it was less of a mandatory type incentive program and a little more of a voluntary and an attractive incentive program for the developer or the retailer or whomever. I think in our situation I mean at least, and I'll make my point one more item, at least at the beginning of this process we need to encourage these folks to get going. Now that area, for example in Portland, has been developed people are just clamoring to get into that area. Then that's when you can start ramping up a bit on what's happening.

Mr. McDonald: Okay, one more question folks. We are doing pretty good. This final question is on work force and affordable housing. The Bel-Red plan aims achieve a diversity of housing types and prices among the 5000 new units envisioned for this area. Remember there is like 150 units in there now, and we are expecting 5000 in the next 20-25 years. The draft plan includes targets for various affordability levels to be addressed through a combination of development regulations and incentives, public investments and other public and private strategies. So what are your thoughts about including affordable housing, work force housing targets in the Bel-Red sub area plan, and the list of tools indicated in the plan for helping achieve these targets? I bet there are some housing developers in the room that may have a comment on that.

Participant: Sure.

Mr. McDonald: Okay Andy.

Participant: Well I think I mentioned to the council last night, some place, Bellevue needs affordable housing, or housing that is affordable. And let me change that connotation, because that first one sort of implies you've got the median income and you are trying to hit a target. On the other one it just implies housing that maybe people that are not quite down in that lower bracket still need to live close in to Bellevue. Unfortunately, what I see right now in the incentives and the costs for those things you may achieve some 80% or 100% of median income affordable housing but somebody's got to pay for all that so the rest of the housing is going to be priced so high that only those with super incomes can afford it. We are seeing this in downtown Seattle and I would hate to see that happen over here because we have talked about it for so long. There has got to be a better way. I don't have a good answer, but if we make the impact fees so high, granted we have to pay for the improvements, the roads and the parks, but it just drives housing costs so high that you got to turn around and charge a high rent and I don't think people want to pay that high rent and at some point you have pushed it too far and they won't. And so the development won't get built.

Mr. McDonald: So what do you think about the incentives? If there is a formula providing for additional building height or FAR in exchange for providing affordable units in the building, do those incentives make sense? Or is there a good balance between incentives and being able to provide affordable housing?

Participant: Well, I think the idea of providing incentives helps, but there comes a point where just with the cost of putting parking in these projects, and it comes all back to parking. You know that's one of the biggest problems with all development today. We don't want to sprawl out. We don't want to have surface parking. But yet, when it costs you \$35,000 a stall give or take or more it just is such a burden. And you can't get paid for that. The people who want to rent don't want to pay additional money for parking. It drives up the cost of housing too so high that its next to impossible to make them work. And its why it's been slow over here as it is to get more housing close in. There is property in downtown Bellevue that can be developed but unless you are willing to do what Hanover is doing, saying that are going to charge \$3 or more per square foot for rent I don't think there is a big market for that. And it's going to be curious to see what happens. And those that can afford that what about the guy that can only pay \$2.50 or \$2 or \$1.50. Those are the ones that really need to live close in and that's just not going to happen with today's cost of construction and all of the other impact fees that are being placed on these projects. I don't know what we are going to do for housing. We struggle. We are looking

for it all the time. And I head up the Puget Sound area for OPUS for residential and its tough (inaudible) projects.

Ms. Wilma: Andy there must be some sweet spot about what is the least amount of parking you can provide and still have the project work for you. Is it just sit by site?

Participant: It's really site by site and what is available. Take downtown Seattle, we have good transportation, it's easy walking, you can get by, theoretically you can get by with no parking stalls if its rental. Now if its condo, the condo owners, I don't care who they are they are going to want a stall for their car, at least today. That will change over time, but at least today that's where it is in the foreseeable future. When you start to move away from where you've got transportation and easy walk, take Madison Hill, Madison street, we've got an apartment project on that right now that's up and we got another one we are planning, those are at point five or less parking. But that's because there is a great public transit up and down Madison. You can walk to work on Madison. It is easy to get into the CBD and the retail area. But we start moving away from that and look out here and you know we are not going to build less than one parking stall per condo, and probably not less than one per apartment, just because of the transportation system. So until we develop the mass transit, or we get the housing close to the office, even here I see where you have got the BR-R which has only got a 45 foot height on it and that is right near where the office buildings are. I would encourage you to go higher, just, I don't know if it will get built, but if somebody's, people love to walk their office. We would all give up our car if we could do that. But the way we have designed our cities and our suburban sprawl, which we have inherited this, it started in the 50's, we have got all of this cross traffic. You got to go from A-Z to get to where you work and then back at night. Where Seattle used to be, everybody went in and out of Seattle so you could have had better public corridors. So we can kind of change that and put the housing closer, right up next to the office. And it's great, put some parks around there. and now people will walk to work and they will give up their car if there is zip cars around and light rail and other public transit to get them out to the airport.

Participant: I can be a little facetious I guess. In the city of Seattle some article said that each housing dwelling is burdened with about \$200,000 worth of regulations and so I guess the point is I am sure the city is looking at how you can make it a little less expensive for developers. And incentives are also very important, affordable housing is important, but incentives should be just (inaudible) with this 4% of land should be spread out. Probably beyond Bellevue because Redmond and all this will benefit from a good housing development program.

Participant: Well I know the folks at OPUS have struggled I believe with the Lake Hills Shopping Center up there. Isn't that your project?

Ms. Wilma: That's Cosmos.

Participant: Cosmos, excuse me. You know they have gone around and around on that for some time and I guess at some point something is going to happen. And the Costco trying to get their thing developed up there on 148th and Main. They are struggling with what they are going to do with the stream and on and on. And time is money. Big time.

Mr. McDonald: Well speaking of time being money.

Participant: How was that for a segue?

Mr. McDonald: Perfect. Perfect. I very much want to honor your time and also express my honor and pleasure in helping facilitate this group today. I appreciate your being here and your comments, all of which will be forwarded to the planning commission. Let me just close by giving you some key dates to remember. Tonight the parks and Community services board will be discussing Bel-Red. Thursday, May 15 will be the big open house here at city hall and a joint meeting of all the boards and commissions that are involved in this process. The spring expo starts at four, the joint commission meeting starts at 6:30. Then on May 22, following Thursday, the transportation commission will look very specifically at NE 15th 16th and try to address some of the things we have talked about today, because they are still struggling with that road way as we all are.

Participant: What date was that?

Mr. McDonald: The 22nd. That's the transportation commission. They start at 6:00. I think that item is like at 7:00 or 7:15 on the commissions agenda on the 22nd. And then finally on May 28th the planning commission will hold a public hearing about all the documents we reviewed today. so again thank you very much for your time and for your comments. And please continue to participate in this process. I know some of you have been involved since day one and I appreciate that. And if you have interest there is always an opportunity to provide your comments this process. So thanks very much. And I'll let you get on with your day.