

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BEL-RED CORRIDOR PROJECT  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES

June 12, 2006  
3:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Conference Room 1E-108

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Creighton, Co-Chair; Terry Lukens, Co-Chair; Joel Glass; Doug Matthews; Sue Baugh; Steve Dennis; Norm Hansen; Earl Overstreet; Dean Rebhuhn; Ken Schiring; Pat Sheffels; Faith Rolland, Laurie Tish

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Kurt Springman; Bill Ptacek

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Kevin O'Neill, Matt Terry, Dan Stroh, Michael Paine, Department of Planning and Community Development; Kevin McDonald, Goran Sparrman, Kris Liljeblad, Department of Transportation; Shelley Marelli, Glenn Kost, Parks & Community Services; George Crandall, Don Arambula, Crandall Arambula; Torsten Lienau, Jennifer Young, CH2MHill; Leonard McGhee, Sound Transit

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Gerry Lindsay

**1. Welcome and Overview of Meeting**

Co-Chair Creighton called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

Strategic Planning Manager Kevin O'Neill said the draft land use and transportation alternatives were released to the public and the steering committee on June 1. A series of panel discussions with business and property owners was conducted on June 6, and that was followed by a general community meeting on June 8. He said he hoped that by the end of the meeting staff and the consultant team would have the direction needed for the next round of work to be done before the June 29 meeting.

**2. Report on Results from June 6 Business and Property Owner Panels and June 8 Community Meeting on Draft Alternatives**

Mr. O'Neill said there were two morning discussions and one afternoon panel discussion with business and property owners on June 6. In all, approximately 30 people participated. In the morning panels, there was consensus with regard to the need for flexibility with regard to uses; there was general support for the concept of mixed use developments; and there was agreement consideration should be given to the option of running the high-capacity transit line along SR-520. The groups understood that transportation infrastructure is essential to allowing for land use flexibility.

The afternoon panel also highlighted the need for flexibility in allowing a wide variety of uses in the area. There was general support for the notion of developing a services core and carving out an area in which to permit light industrial uses over the long term.

With regard to the mixed use node shown roughly at 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE in Alternative 1, some supported the notion, while others voiced concern given the fact that Coca Cola has indicated a desire to remain where they are and the fact that King County Metro has expressed no wish to move. Some suggested the services core should be enlarged, though it was explained that service uses could be allowed throughout the corridor.

The node shown in Alternative 2 is in the same general location but has an employment focus. The comments made included the suggestion that a services core could be included in the alternative.

Alternative 3 has the nodes near the hospital, at 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and at 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Some liked the idea of having a node near the hospital. There was general support for the notion of carving out an area for light industrial uses, and there were questions about whether the 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE node would have to be all housing/mixed use or it would work if only part were housing/mixed use.

Some property owners in the panel discussions preferred Alternative 4 because it allows the most potential for redevelopment. Others questioned having a node at 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and asked about the notion of having two retail main streets.

Mr. O'Neill said there were a lot of comments regarding the roadway transportation improvements. Generally speaking, there was support for the notion of extending NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street, though people had questions about how wide it should be, how the connections will work at either end, and how it would work in conjunction with a high-capacity transit corridor. There was support for the idea of improving access to SR-520, and general support for the notion of improving connections across I-405. There was some hesitancy expressed with regard to extending NE 10<sup>th</sup> Street through to 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE given the impacts on Lake Bellevue properties.

Senior Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald said the community meeting on June 8 was very well attended by over 50 people. The meeting started with an open house format and then moved to presentations and questions in the Council Chambers. An attempt was made to focus on what people liked or did not like about, but instead people wanted to have their questions answered regarding land use, the density of housing, how much density is needed in the vicinity of transit stations, the intensity of office development, and how tall the buildings will be. On the transportation side there were questions about high-capacity transit, what the alignments might be, where the stations might locate, if there would be a park and ride lot associated with any of the transit stations, and about connections to SR-520 and how a new connection at 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE would be implemented. There were questions about trip generation and which alternatives would yield the most and least new vehicle trips. In addition, there were questions about protection for the neighborhoods to the north and south of the Bel-Red area from passthrough traffic. There were questions asked about including civic plazas in the vicinity of stations, adding new park lands, and a major recreation facility. There was support voiced for improving the quality of the stream environment, and general questions about how the process of daylighting streams would be undertaken. The issues of coordinating with Redmond and the Crossroads Center Plan study were raised.

Mr. Hansen said he attended the community meeting and was surprised by the number of questions and comments regarding transportation, both the current state and planned future improvements.

Ms. Baugh asked what the general feeling of the public was toward high-capacity transit. Mr.

McDonald said the questions were more focused on how HCT would be implemented rather than on a preference for or against. Mr. O'Neill said there was more specific discussion of the transit options at the business and property owner panels; overall, they were favorable to the idea, but some struggled with the tradeoffs associated with taking it through the middle of the corridor.

Mr. Rebhuhn asked what process will be used to keep alive the thoughts and comments offered by the public and the business and property owners. Mr. O'Neill said all of the comment forms from the scoping process have been preserved, and there have been detailed lists of comments developed. The specific comments from the panels and community meeting will be boiled down and categorized in the same way for reference by the steering committee.

### **3. Initial Committee Discussion and Deliberation on Draft Land Use/Transportation Alternatives**

#### **a. Introduction**

Mr. Creighton explained that the four draft alternatives would be reviewed one at a time.

#### **b. Presentation of Alternatives**

Mr. O'Neill said the no action alternative serves as the baseline against which to compare the action alternatives. He showed the committee a map of the area showing the existing Comprehensive Plan land use designations. The no action alternative assumes the same land use patterns and growth in line with what is projected by the Puget Sound Regional Council for both land use and employment. The no action transportation alternative is limited to the projects already identified in the CIP, with the exception of the notion of turning the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe right-of-way into a major trail and transit corridor, and the notion of running high-capacity transit through the corridor but without any stations other than at the hospital.

Mr. Rebhuhn asked why a high-capacity transit alignment coming from Seattle along SR-520 is not shown on any of the alternatives. Kris Liljeblad, Assistant Director, Transportation Planning, said the SR-520 bridge option is not funded, whereas the I-90 bridge is already in place with a middle span constructed to accommodate high-capacity transit. Downtown Bellevue and downtown Seattle are the two metropolitan centers that will need to be connected, and the I-90 alignment has been part of the long-range plan for more than a decade.

Planning Director Dan Stroh said the adopted long-term transportation visions for Bellevue and the region show high-capacity transit on both I-90 and SR-520. The plan calls for the I-90 alignment to be the first to be brought online. The analyses done to date by Sound Transit have shown that the only Eastside location with the necessary densities to support high-capacity transit is downtown Bellevue, and the easiest connection between Seattle and Bellevue is I-90.

Mr. Rebhuhn suggested that if at some future time there will be high-capacity transit on SR-520, it would make sense to show it running along the freeway in the alternatives for the Bel-Red corridor.

Mr. Lukens said the question to be asked is whether the alignment of high-capacity transit through the Bel-Red corridor would change depending on whether I-90 or SR-520 is used to connect Seattle with Bellevue. Mr. Stroh said Redmond and Bellevue have jointly signed and forwarded to Sound Transit a statement calling for high-capacity transit services. The document includes a statement indicating that downtown Bellevue needs to be one of the connections. The

notion under consideration is using I-90 to connect to downtown Bellevue and then crossing I-405 and passing through the Bel-Red corridor and on to Redmond.

Mr. Schiring noted that the preponderance of Microsoft employees who commute to the campus from Seattle live in the northern part of Seattle, not the southern part. Given that, an alignment on I-90 will not be as beneficial to them. With regard to getting across I-405, he asked if Sound Transit has provided any feedback about the possibility of using NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

Leonard McGhee with Sound Transit said the screening process to be undertaken over the next few months will carefully consider every option that has been proposed over the last ten to twenty years. That will include every possible alignment for crossing I-405.

George Crandall with Crandall Arambula allowed that the alternatives chosen to be analyzed through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process will all be course grained, and as they come out the other end they will likely all be fairly similar because they are all designed to accommodate the established development program based on market feasibility. The intangibles have to do with creating an identity for the corridor as one piece of the overall community, and whether the area is to be considered suburban, with lower densities, or urban, with higher densities. Creating an identity for the area will probably involve a retail main street, plazas and open spaces, and a fair amount of housing so there will be activity. Centers do not happen on their own; they have to be thought about ahead of time. Of all the uses highlighted in the alternatives, the one that is the most sensitive is retail because it needs a certain amount of space, drive-by traffic, and adequate planning. Centers served by high-capacity transit have a much higher possibility of success.

Mr. Crandall said the high-capacity transit alignment with the most potential for creating a full 360-degree center is the one running along NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street. Development in the corridor will occur over time, and it will be important to keep it from impacting the neighborhoods. Accordingly, any traffic generated should be kept away from the outside edge roads. The idea of creating a major east-west road along the NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street alignment is solid in that it pulls the traffic to the center and serves as the relief valve for development. Whatever is developed must be able to find success without the benefit of high-capacity transit, but the setup from the start should accommodate high-capacity transit if it comes to the corridor.

Mr. Crandall informed the committee members that across the country employers are indicating their desire to have employment centers in close proximity to housing. People do not want to spend a lot of time on the road, nor do they want to be impacted by congestion. Bellevue has more employees than it has residents. Looking to the future, the idea of providing space for housing in close proximity to employment centers and including high-capacity transit is good business.

Mr. O'Neill stressed the fact that there are common features to all of the draft alternatives. All of the alternatives assume office uses along 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE that will take advantage of being in proximity to Overlake Hospital. The intensity of the uses there could vary between the alternatives. The alternatives also all assume low-intensity office uses along the south side of Bel-Red Road, and to some extent all of the alternatives have a retail/commercial focus along NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street. The alternatives all assume the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe right-of-way will become a regional trail with possible transit, and all of the alternatives assume a green parks feature along NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street and neighborhood parks developed in conjunction with future housing. Some improvements to the riparian corridors in the study area are assumed by each of the alternatives.

Alternative 1 has a node of mixed use housing and commercial with a retail main street around a transit station located at 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE and NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street. The alternative assumes some housing along the northern edge of the study area where there are some good views. The middle of the area is designated largely for lower scale office and other commercial uses. The alternative carves out a services core in the vicinity of 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. A node with mixed use housing and retail is assumed to the east of 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE in Redmond's Overlake Village.

Mr. McDonald said there are transportation improvements that are also common to each of the action alternatives. He explained that improvements beyond those identified in the no action alternative will be required to support additional higher intensity uses. The NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street alignment for both high-capacity transit and general traffic is shown in each of the alternatives connecting with Bel-Red Road and crossing I-405 to connect with 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, either with a separate bridge or by curving to the south and connecting with NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street. In addition, the alternatives each involve improving 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and completing a new interchange with SR-520 with ramps to and from the east. The alternatives also show improvements to 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, continuing it south of Bel-Red Road and NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street to connect with extensions of either NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street or NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Other improvements include the use of various tools to discourage traffic from travel in the neighborhoods. The alternatives show high-capacity transit running along either Bel-Red Road or NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street. Each alternative shows a more complete street grid in the vicinity of stations, but the grid is representative only and not a fine-grained plan at this point.

Ms. Sheffels asked if any consideration has been given to constructing roads that do not currently exist, such as an alignment roughly along what would be 128<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE near the Cadman site. Mr. McDonald said that particular possibility has not been considered. The thinking has been that there will be sufficient north-south transportation system capacity without establishing an entirely new right-of-way, other than the NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street option which would be an east-west route.

Mr. Hansen said the people he has talked to favor the notion of developing a main street in the vicinity of 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. The 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE location could result in more spillover traffic into the neighborhood to the north. Mr. McDonald explained that main streets need sufficient pass-by traffic to give the retail uses the exposure they need. With pass-by traffic comes opportunities for passthrough traffic. Depending on where the main street is located, there could be more or less need to utilize the tools to prevent passthrough traffic.

Mr. Glass asked if the EIS process will take the three alternatives selected by the committee and develop a fourth alternative by combining aspects of each. Mr. O'Neill said the EIS will not do that, but the committee's preferred alternative may very well be the result of picking and choosing. The EIS will return a finer level of detail with regard to the transportation modeling based on the various land use scenarios.

Mr. Glass asked if it would make more sense to send to the EIS alternatives with a much broader range of possibilities. Mr. O'Neill said land use planning grapples primarily with two issues: the amount of growth, and where the growth is allowed to occur. If the development program for each of the draft alternatives were the same, the EIS would return minimal differences between them. However, different assumptions of 2030 growth are being made across the board, which in the analysis will help assess differences.

Mr. Glass proposed considering some housing along with commercial uses along the south edge of Bel-Red Road. Mr. O'Neill allowed the committee could elect to make that adjustment.

**\*\*BREAK\*\***

**c. Committee Discussion of Components of Alternatives They Like and Do Not Like**

Mr. Creighton invited committee members to express what they liked or did not like about Alternative 1.

Mr. Glass liked the notion of housing near the 122<sup>nd</sup> area, but was concerned about housing close to the Metro base. There were questions about whether Metro should be considered a long-term use. He said he likes the notions of including greenways and extending NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street. He also expressed support for the service core idea.

Ms. Sheffels agreed with Mr. Overstreet but said she would prefer to see two nodes. A single node would not be adequate. She also supported the service core idea.

Ms. Roland said she would not want to see the city move away from the light industrial that current exists in the corridor. Coca Cola serves as the equivalent of an anchor tenant in a retail development, and Alternative 1 appears to disregard that fact. She said she also would prefer to see the retail main street located more in the center of the area.

Mr. Mathews suggested it would make more sense for the node at the west end of the area to be located further to the west to better serve the hospital and medical uses. If that were the case, another mode would be needed in the middle.

Mr. Hanson noted his support for the main street idea at 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. He said it is reasonably close to 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and the medical uses. He said he also likes including housing along the northern boundary of the study area in three- to five-story structures. He asked what the term “retail/commercial” refers to, noting that he would prefer to see low traffic generating uses continued along NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. O’Neill said the area along NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street is zoned LI, but the uses there are not light industrial uses. To some degree, the term “retail/commercial” was crafted to reflect what is there already; no large increase in intensity is contemplated by the alternative.

Mr. Schiring offered his support for the medical office layout of Alternative 1 but voiced concern over the alignment of 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE for the transit node, suggesting that it should be located closer to the hospital campus. A second node should be located more in the center of the area, though not necessarily at 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE where it could send more traffic into the Bridle Trails area. The service core should be expanded beyond what is shown in the alternative. With regard to housing in the area of the Uwajimya triangle, he noted that the Crossroads subarea plan does not permit additional multifamily housing; the area should be limited to retail and commercial uses.

Mr. Lukens agreed that the transit node shown in Alternative 1 should be located closer to the hospital campus to serve both the Safeway site redevelopment and the medical uses. A second node should be included somewhere in the middle portion of the corridor. He supported the notion of including a retail main street, though the location shown in the alternative is not necessarily the right place for it. He said he would like to see parks or public amenities scattered throughout the area and not just in one place, especially if housing is added.

Mr. O’Neill clarified that each of the alternatives assumes a green corridor along NE 16<sup>th</sup> Street,

improvement of the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe trail, and neighborhood park improvements and improvements to some of the riparian corridors.

Mr. Rebhuhn agreed with the need to wed housing to parks and open space amenities. He asked if the package of transportation improvements for the roads running north and south will include additional general capacity lanes for single occupant vehicle to get into and out of the neighborhoods. Mr. McDonald said the vision is for general capacity lanes plus facilities for pedestrians and bicycles. Mr. Rebhuhn said he agreed with that approach, noting that if cars are to be kept out of the neighborhoods it will be necessary to have arterials with more capacity.

Ms. Roland suggested that if possible the Metro bus barn use should be moved to some other light industrial area. She commented that around Lake Bellevue in Alternative 1 there is mixed use, which is good. That same aspect should be used in all of the alternatives. The area could support more mixed uses.

Mr. Creighton noted his support for the general package of transportation improvements, adding that before any redevelopment of the area takes place there will need to be some transportation improvements made. It would be a mistake to allow additional density to occur before improving the transportation system. He agreed the node shown on 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE should be moved closer to the hospital and that there should be another near the middle of the core. He added that the services that are currently existing in the light industrial zones need to be accommodated.

Mr. Lukens observed that one of the alternatives includes a specific light industrial area as the only use. Carving out a specific area for light industrial uses only may not be the best approach; the better method would be to allow light industrial uses and service uses to continue as permitted uses regardless of the underlying zoning. Mr. Stroh said the committee members who toured the Pearl District of Portland saw in action a strategy of allowing warehousing and auto body/auto repair services in a mixed use environment. He said low-intensity buildings can become the ground floor of new mixed use developments. The property owner panels voiced two views on the approach. One group supported the notion as a viable approach, while another group suggested the land values will drive out the services uses unless a specific strategy to keep them is devised; their thinking was that establishing a light industrial sanctuary specifically designed to keep higher value uses out would work the best. Zoning that intentionally keeps land values low can accomplish that vision.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Creighton, Mr. Stroh explained that Bellevue does not have the basic warehouse/distribution uses and transportation facilities that will allow the region to prosper. The light industrial uses in the Bel-Red corridor do not play a critical regional function; the uses there have always had more of a local focus. For instance, the Cadman plant in the corridor makes the cement that goes into building highrise structures in the Downtown. If Cadman were no longer there, the cement would have to come from somewhere else. Cadman probably does not need the full ten acres it owns in order to operate at peak capacity, so one question to ask is what kinds of compatible uses could locate there.

Mr. O'Neill said the Countywide Planning Policies call for designated urban centers and manufacturing/industrial centers; they are intended to be areas of great importance to the region as a whole. Both Kent and Seattle have areas set aside for the long term designated for such uses. The Bel-Red area is not designated as a countywide manufacturing/industrial center.

Mr. Dennis said he understands the notion of establishing a light industrial sanctuary that would not allow higher uses. He asked if Alternative 1 includes areas that would allow both light

industrial and higher uses. Staff responded that existing light industrial uses could stay in the area, but stressed that Alternative 1 does not include an area that favors new light industrial uses in the long term.

Mr. Stroh said the kinds of light industrial uses that currently have a home in the Bel-Red area are not heavy industrial or chemical processing, so could co-locate with an office park, though not all of the uses there would make a good neighbor to residential. One underlying assumption of the Bel-Red corridor project is that the current zoning is not working, so all of the zoning classes are on the table. Zoning is one of the tools that will be used to implement the vision.

Department of Planning and Community Development Director Matt Terry pointed out that the current LI zoning regime in effect creates a light industrial sanctuary. Over the last decade there have been great pressures put on the land uses in the zone as permitted but subordinate uses have moved in and changed the character of the area. The market is speaking very loudly about what it wants to see in the area. That is not to say that light industrial should not be allowed to exist there, like the Coca Cola plant, but the study is focused on what the area should look like 30 years out; if the area should be held exclusively for light industrial uses, the sanctuary idea will need to be brought into play, but if the idea is that light industrial should be permitted along with other types of uses, a different direction will need to be charted.

Environmental Planning Manager Michael Paine said the city is constantly receiving requests to push the zoning envelope in the LI district. Very rarely are the requests for light industrial uses; they tend to be commercial, retail and office uses.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Matthews, Mr. O'Neill said some of the larger light industrial business owners also own the land they operate on: Safeway, Coca Cola and Cadman all own their properties. Mr. Matthews suggested that those who own their properties are pretty much in control of their futures. He said it is a different story altogether for the service businesses, most of whom lease their sites. They could face huge challenges as the property owners come under pressure to redevelop to a higher and more profitable configuration.

Mr. Hansen asked if the EIS can incorporate the notion of having transportation systems brought online in union with new development and redevelopment. Mr. O'Neill said the EIS will yield a picture of what the Bel-Red world will look like in 2030 based on a set of assumptions. It will help inform the decision about the preferred alternative. The implementation plan may very well step back and offer specifics about what will need to be brought online in the first five to ten years.

Mr. Glass asked about locating a major park facility and Mr. O'Neill said if the committee wants to see the concept moved forward, some time will have to be spent determining what it should be located. Mr. Glass noted his support for having a large regional park but said he did not have an opinion as to which alternative would best accommodate it. Mr. Stroh said it is assumed that a regional park facility could happen under any of the alternatives.

On the topic of density, Mr. Matthews agreed that if there are to be transit stations located in the corridor, they will need higher density around them to support them. He suggested the higher density should be in the form of both employment and housing.

Ms. Tish noted her support for the alternatives that have the most housing. She said the reality in 30 years will be that housing will be greatly needed, and the Bel-Red corridor is one of the few places left in the city where there is land on which to put it.

Ms. Baugh said one of the questions to be answered is what it will take to bring about success and whether or not higher density in employment and housing will lead to successful implementation of the program.

Mr. Rebhuhn said the proximity of the Bel-Red area to the downtown area makes it right for higher density in both housing and commercial uses.

Mr. Overstreet said he would prefer to see moved forward an alternative with a mid-range amount of both housing and employment. He added that he hopes the study will provide an opportunity to address the issue of affordable housing in the city. Low-density housing simply will not be affordable.

Ms. Sheffels asked if higher housing and higher employment go hand in hand. Mr. Crandall said the alternative is not up against the wall in terms of densities, which allows for a lot of flexibility. He suggested that a balance of housing and employment could be accommodated in any of the alternatives.

Mr. Dennis suggested an approach with higher densities in both housing and employment may not be achievable in terms of the challenges associated with the transportation needs. A middle of the road compromise will be easier to bring online.

Mr. Hansen said his preference would be for the midrange in both housing and employment as well. He pointed out that much of the new housing being developed in the downtown is only four stories. Community identity will be very important, and having smaller buildings will help in that regard.

Mr. Rebhuhn suggested that affordable housing may not be the right term; available housing would be better. He raised the notion of having special opportunity zones within the area for medical facilities, for housing, for a mixed use, or a sports arena. Within the special opportunity zones the rules would default to the positive rather than the negative.

Mr. Overstreet held that “affordable” should not be a dirty word. The city should build on its strengths in planning for the future. There will need to be both flexibility and diversity in terms of industry and income levels.

Mr. Schiring noted that the City Council principles include the notion of providing for expanding the potential for jobs in forms not well accommodated in other parts of the city. He agreed that there should be a real attempt made at providing truly affordable housing. A large percentage of the homes in Bellevue are no longer affordable to those who work in the Bellevue area, including many who work at Microsoft but who are not millionaires yet. If there is no affordable housing, the high-capacity transit nodes will not be fully supported.

Mr. O’Neill commented that sending a mid-range option to the EIS will not preclude also sending forward an option with higher housing and employment numbers.

Mr. Creighton turned the discussion to Alternative 2, noting that it tilts in favor of higher employment and lower housing. Mr. O’Neill pointed out that the nodes and many of the land uses are in the same place as in Alternative 1. One primary difference is that the node on 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE has an employment focus rather than a mixed use focus. The only place the alternative contemplates housing is along the northern boundary and near the eastern boundary.

Mr. Matthews said his preference would not be for Alternative 2 because it has less housing. He

added that the node should be moved farther to the west and that another should be added near the middle.

Mr. Overstreet said he likes the way Alternative 2 leverages mixed use housing/retail close to Overlake Village. He added, however, that creating a successful retail main street would be very difficult to accomplish without more housing.

There was general agreement among the committee members regarding those comments. Ms. Baugh suggested the elements, both positive and negative, highlighted regarding Alternative 1 should be applied to Alternative 2 as well.

Mr. Glass said the mixed use housing/retail area shown near 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE would not be a good idea at all unless major improvements are planned for the arterial, none of which have been mentioned.

Ms. Roland pointed out that Alternative 2 does not yield a neighborhood but rather a place where people come to work and then leave at the end of the day.

Mr. Creighton held that the alternative simply takes the downtown and stretches it out to Microsoft.

Turning to Alternative 3, Mr. O'Neill said the focus is on higher housing and lower employment. Three nodes are assumed, one closer to Overlake Hospital and a second near the middle of the corridor. The land uses around the nodes are essentially the same as in Alternative 1, but with more intensity. By moving the westernmost node closer to the hospital, an area is freed up in which to have a light industrial sanctuary. The area of the second node near 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE already has a commercial focus and it could be capitalized on in building the main street concept. The alternative lends itself to inclusion of a civic/arts space, and housing frames the area. The node shown on 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE probably would not work unless pushed westward a block or two.

Mr. Overstreet suggested it would be difficult to support a node near 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and another one at Overlake Village; the assumption would have to be for either/or. Mr. O'Neill agreed and pointed out that Alternative 3 assumes there is no node at Overlake Village.

Mr. Dennis said he likes the placement of the main street area in Alternative 3. It is a far more centralized location in an area where there are much smaller properties and just will work better. He allowed that something would have to be done to mitigate impacts on the Bridle Trails neighborhood.

Mr. Schiring suggested he would rather see the civic/arts area used for parks and open space. He said he would not want to create anything that will compete with the civic/arts in the downtown core. Department of Parks & Community Services Director Patrick Foran said the civic/arts idea is intended to play off current land uses. The area shown on the map is in the vicinity of where Northwest Ballet has carved out an adaptive reuse of warehouse space. The idea is similar to creating a protective zone for service uses but with the focus on accommodating many different arts groups in their need for affordable rehearsal and storage areas. Mr. Schiring said that had not been his understanding and said he would not object to having that focus.

Ms. Baugh argued against the notion of creating a light industrial sanctuary. She said Coca Cola should be a permitted use, but not necessarily forever. King County Metro needs to go find another place to park buses; the light industrial area would be much better utilized if allowed to

develop with housing.

Mr. Glass concurred, suggesting that it would be very hard to make housing in the area work if a light industrial sanctuary is established.

Mr. Hansen voiced concern over having the main street area on 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He stressed the need to protect the neighborhoods to the north.

Ms. Sheffels noted her support for having a specific area for service uses. She proposed allowing it in the area to the east of the transit node at 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE in a format similar to what is in place in the Pearl District of Portland. Mr. O'Neill answered that allowing service uses to continue is embedded in the alternative. What is different about the services core notion included in Alternative 1 is that it would be exclusive to those uses and not allow housing or retail.

Mr. Lukens agreed a node should be shown somewhere in the middle of the area surrounded with retail uses. He said he is not particularly wedded to having it as shown at 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, but suggested for purposes of the EIS having it there would show the most impact on the neighborhoods. He cautioned against establishing a light industrial sanctuary, suggesting that the market will desire the area to move away from light industrial uses long before the 30 year horizon arrives. He agreed that 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is not an appropriate location for a transit node; he said he would prefer to see it located in Overlake Village.

With regard to protecting the Bridle Trails neighborhood from having a transit node on 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Mr. Liljeblad noted that on 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE south of Main Street in the downtown area a traffic diverter has been created to keep traffic out of the neighborhood to the south. The approach has proven to be relatively effective. Something similar could be developed on 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to the north of Northup which would allow Bridle Trails traffic to get out but discourage people from going north into the neighborhood. Mr. Crandall said the design of the street itself could be such that it would not be a through street.

Ms. Roland commented that the various areas of use as outlined in Alternative 3 are smaller and blend together better. As such, pedestrian uses might be encouraged and connected with green corridors.

Mr. Overstreet suggested it would wholly appropriate to shrink the size of the current light industrial area, which all of the alternatives do. However, there would be some advantages to preserving areas for light industrial uses. In 30 years, light industrial uses may look very different, but having areas for the uses may provide the city with some unique advantages.

Mr. Dennis held that carving out an area for civic/art uses would only complicate things and would not be necessary. Mr. O'Neill stressed that the intent is to develop a concept supportive of civic and arts uses rather than a specific zoning district for them.

Mr. Creighton agreed that light industrial uses should be accommodated but not by creating a sanctuary for them in which no other uses would be permitted. Some combination of office and housing would make sense in the area where the bus barn is.

Mr. Glass suggested that Alternative 3 envisions the critical mass it will take to bring about restaurants and the like.

The attention of the committee was drawn to Alternative 4, which Mr. O'Neill explained is geared toward both higher employment and higher housing. He said the alternative includes two

nodes, one at 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE and one at 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, which are the two locations in the corridor where it is possible to create full circles of development around them. The two nodes are admittedly quite close together. The alternative primarily focuses the employment opportunities toward the west in the vicinity of the hospital. The 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE node does not include a retail main street, whereas the node at 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE does. The area of transition between the higher density employment and higher density housing would need a green space separating them.

Ms. Baugh asked if having a transit node at 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE would be close enough to the hospital campus to adequately serve it. Mr. O'Neill allowed that it could be moved further to the west, and Ms. Baugh suggested that would need to be done. Mr. Rebhuhn concurred. Mr. O'Neill pointed out that if moved too far to the west, the node would be the same as in Alternative 3 and could not have a full circle of development around it.

Mr. Matthews added his voice to those calling for making better use of the space currently home to the bus barn. He said he otherwise likes the layout of Alternative 4.

Mr. Dennis said he could support not having a light industrial sanctuary provided it is still a permitted use in the area along with higher value uses.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Tish, Mr. Stroh said the notion is that the intensity of the office around the 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE node would be increased to something on the order of 1.5 FAR, which could be as tall as six stories.

Mr. Hansen asked if the transit nodes will require park and ride facilities. Mr. Liljeblad said no park and ride facilities are assumed for any of the transit nodes. He said there are plans to pursue park and ride options further to the east of downtown Redmond to intercept traffic coming from the Sammamish Plateau. Without park and ride facilities in the Bel-Red core, people will not be encouraged to drive into the area to access transit.

Mr. Glass said he does not favor having office uses along the northern boundary of the area; he said he would prefer to see housing there. Some of the best views can be obtained from that location. He reiterated that it would be a mistake to include mixed use housing and retail along 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE unless improvements are made to the arterial.

Mr. Creighton suggested Alternative 4 misses the boat somewhat in that it has no housing at all in the area of 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. There could be some combinations that would permit some housing to locate there along with other uses.

Ms. Sheffels said Alternative 4 would be better if it included housing along the northern border where office uses are shown. In addition to having views, the area also has wetlands and a creek that could serve as a residential amenity.

Mr. Hansen pointed out that the topography to the west of Fred Meyer on 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE would afford good views for mixed use housing.

#### **d. Committee Determines Which Alternative to Eliminate from Further Consideration**

Motion to eliminate Alternative 2 from further consideration was made by Ms. Baugh. Second was by Mr. Hansen and after committee discussion the motion carried unanimously.

**4. Break for Dinner**

**5. Committee Refinements to Alternatives**

**a. Committee Member Motions on Proposals for Specific Refinements to Alternatives**

Mr. Creighton reminded the group that the intent of the alternatives is to ensure a range of options for how the area should grow. He stated that there was a conversation over dinner about not wanting to revise the alternatives to the point that they started to look like three variations of the same alternative. He then asked that committee members make motions regarding proposed amendments.

Ms. Tish proposed a motion that in Alternative 3 the node at 148<sup>th</sup> be moved east into the Overlake Village area, as shown in the other alternatives. There was general consensus among committee members for the idea. Mr. Liljeblad pointed out that staff and the consultants looked at several alternative locations for nodes/station areas. He said Alternative 3 is the only alternative that considers having a station at 148<sup>th</sup>; therefore, if removed from the alternative, having a station at that location would no longer be an option.

Mr. Creighton asked the group to comment. And Ms. Sheffels said she would prefer to keep it in so it can be considered. Mr. Crandall agreed it would be worthwhile to look at it. Ms. Tish agreed to withdraw her motion in the interest of keeping the idea in the mix.

A motion to change the low-density office in the transition area on the south side of Bel-Red Road in Alternative 4 to allow a mix of housing and commercial was made by Mr. Glass. Second was by Mr. Dennis.

Ms. Sheffels argued that the area serves as a buffer between the more intense uses to the west of north of Bel-Red Road and the residential areas to the south. She said no additional housing should be permitted along Bel-Red Road.

Mr. Lukens pointed out that Alternative 4 pushes the density envelope. He allowed that while allowing housing on the south side of Bel-Red Road would put way too much traffic there, the notion should at least be tested.

Mr. Crandall said consideration was given to additional housing south of Bel-Red Road in developing the alternatives. In the end, it was decided to leave the option off the list.

The motion carried.

With regard to the notion of a civic/arts focus, Mr. Lukens suggested preserving old warehouses for the next 30 years does not make much sense.

Ms. Roland pointed out that neither civic/arts or parks/open space is a zoning category. The idea is to establish a sanctuary for civic and arts uses, similar to the notion of a sanctuary for service uses to prevent higher uses from pushing them out.

Mr. Lukens commented that there will be no park land developed by the city without the city acquiring land.

Mr. Glass agreed that preserving warehouse buildings for the next 30 years in order to accommodate arts groups does not make the most sense.

Ms. Sheffels pointed out that the buildings used by cultural and arts groups are not necessarily old warehouses. They are large buildings with tall ceilings that operate very much like schools. There is a general lack of rehearsal and storage space in the city for arts organizations. It would be an asset to the area to carve out a place for them.

Mr. Schiring commented that the uses are allowed in the General Commercial zone and as such can locate easily anywhere in a GC zone.

Mr. Stroh said one of the principles adopted by the Council is to build on existing assets. There are admittedly very few assets in the Bel-Red corridor for cultural facilities to build on, and it might be worthwhile to test in at least one of the alternatives the notion of having a broad attraction for arts and cultural groups.

Motion to retain the civic/arts notion in Alternative 3, and to change the same in Alternative 4 to parks/open space was made by Mr. Lukens. Second was by Mr. Overstreet.

Mr. Dennis pointed out that parks uses are not shown on any of the alternatives on the understanding that they could be included on all of them. He agreed with including civic/arts in Alternative 3 but proposed eliminating the bubble altogether from Alternative 4 and filling in the space with the surrounding uses.

After further discussion, the initial motion carried.

Mr. Hansen proposed including in one of the alternatives lower intensity uses along NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street, similar to what is there currently. Mr. O'Neill said that will be modeled as part of the no action alternative. He also noted that the other alternatives assume a range of retail and commercial uses along NE 20<sup>th</sup>, but at no higher intensities.

Mr. Schiring asked if the committee should make clear its intent with regard to daylighting streams. Mr. O'Neill suggested that the ultimate vision would be to daylight every stream and improve all stream buffers, but that would certainly entail some cost issues. The reality is the committee will have to prioritize at some point based largely on which scenario is ultimately chosen and where the densities will be and where the parks will be. Mr. Crandall said specifics of that sort will be part of the implementation piece later on in the process.

Mr. Dennis said it was his understanding that redevelopment of a property on which a stream is piped would automatically trigger a daylighting requirement. Mr. Paine explained that for streams a sufficient setback must be established to assure the opportunity for restoration. For other streams that are in pipes, there is no specific allowance for that; there is only a minimum setback. Legally the city cannot force developers to daylight streams; it can only be encouraged through incentives.

Mr. Hansen suggested that a glossary of terms used in the land use alternatives would be helpful for the committee to better understand the alternatives, and the proposed intensity of uses. Other committee members agreed. Mr. O'Neill responded that staff could develop a glossary in advance of the next meeting. Committee members directed staff to do so.

**6. Wrap-up and Overall Direction to Staff/Consultant Team on Alternatives Refinement**

Mr. O'Neill informed the committee that staff and consultants would make changes to the alternatives based on the committee's direction and bring them back for review on June 29. He stated that the intent of the June 29 meeting will be for the committee to give final direction on which alternatives to move forward into the DEIS.

Mr. Creighton suggested that the committee had just done that, and asked about the need for another meeting. Mr. O'Neill explained that public comments will likely still come in on the alternatives; they will be forwarded to the committee. It will also be important to give the City Council a briefing on the alternatives. Accordingly, it will be important for the committee not to take any final action on the alternatives until June 29. Mr. Creighton and the other committee members concurred.

**7. Next Meeting**

**The next meeting of the steering committee will be on Thursday, June 29 at 4:00 pm**

**8. Adjourn**

Mr. Creighton adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.