



# Downtown Livability

**Date:** February 12, 2014  
**To:** Downtown Livability Advisory Committee  
**From:** Emil King AICP (425-452-7223, [eaking@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:eaking@bellevuewa.gov))  
Patti Wilma (425-452-4114, [pwilma@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:pwilma@bellevuewa.gov))  
*Project Managers for Downtown Livability Initiative  
Department of Planning & Community Development*  
**Subject:** February 19, 2014 Advisory Committee Meeting

Enclosed you will find the agenda packet for your Downtown Livability Advisory Committee meeting next Wednesday, February 19, 2014. This packet includes:

- Agenda
- Draft minutes from the January 15, 2014 Committee meeting (*Attachment 1*)
- Summary of direction from the January 15 Alternatives Workshop, where the proposed alternatives and strategies include the broadest range of ideas based on direction from the small group exercise (*Attachment 2*)
- Draft Evaluation Criteria for Alternatives Analysis (*Attachment 3*)
- Letter from the Bellevue Downtown Association outlining their presentation on “Creating a Livable and Memorable Downtown” (*Attachment 4; will include time for Committee questions and discussion*)

In addition, a meeting summary of the Downtown Bellevue Residents Association Kick-off Meeting that occurred on January 16 is provided. Many comments are consistent with the issues the Downtown Livability Initiative is addressing. We will continue to engage with this new residents group and look for their feedback as our work progresses.

Packet materials will be posted on the City’s project web site <http://www.bellevuewa.gov/downtown-livability.htm> and we will be sending an email to the interested parties list that this information is available. Paper copies of the packet will be mailed to committee members on Thursday, February 13. Please email Michelle Luce at [mlyuce@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:mlyuce@bellevuewa.gov) if you prefer to pick up your copy at Bellevue City Hall’s Service First desk.

Please let us know if you have any questions about the agenda or attachments. We look forward to seeing you next week.



# Downtown Livability

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, February 19, 2014

6:30-9:00 p.m. • Room 1E-108

Bellevue City Hall • 450 110th Ave NE

## AGENDA

---

- 6:30 p.m.            1.    **Call to Order, Approval of Agenda, Approval of January 15 Meeting Minutes (see Attachment 1)**  
*Co-Chairs Simas and Laing*
2.    **Public Comment**  
*Limit to 3 minutes per person*
- 6:45 p.m.            3.    **Summary of Direction from January 15 Alternatives Workshop (see Attachment 2)**  
*Staff to review direction from the Alternatives Workshop that outlines the evaluation framework (range of alternatives and strategies) to be examined during the Analysis Phase. Agenda item include general calendar on when analysis for individual topics will be brought back to Committee.*
- 7:05 p.m.            4.    **Draft Evaluation Criteria (see Attachment 3)**  
*Review of draft Evaluation Criteria that will help guide the Committee's upcoming work on reviewing analysis and forming recommendations.*
- 7:30 p.m.            5.    **Downtown Livability – Creating a Memorable and Livable Downtown (see Attachment 4)**  
*Presentation by the Bellevue Downtown Association on elements to create a memorable and livable Downtown; includes Committee discussion.*
- 8:45 p.m.            6.    **Public Comment**  
*Limit to 3 minutes per person*
- 9:00 p.m.            7.    **Adjourn**

Next Meeting: March 19, 2014 – 6:30 p.m.

Project web site located at: [www.bellevuewa.gov/downtown-livability.htm](http://www.bellevuewa.gov/downtown-livability.htm). For additional information, please contact the Downtown Livability project managers: Emil King (425-452-7223, [eaking@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:eaking@bellevuewa.gov)) or Patti Wilma (425-452-4114, [pwilma@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:pwilma@bellevuewa.gov)). Meeting room is wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation available upon request. Please call at least 48 hours in advance. Assistance for the hearing impaired: dial 711 (TR).

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
DOWNTOWN LIVABILITY  
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES

January 15, 2014  
6:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Room 1E-120

MEMBERS PRESENT: Aaron Laing, Ernie Simas, co-chairs; Patrick Bannon, Michael Chaplin, Mark D'Amato, Hal Ferris, Gary Guenther, Brad Helland, Trudi Jackson, Loretta Lopez, Lee Maxwell, Erin Powell, Jan Stout

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ming Zhang

OTHERS PRESENT: Dan Stroh, Emil King, Patti Wilma, Department of Planning and Community Development; Liz Stead, Development Services; John Owen, Bob Bengford, Makers

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA, APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Co-chair Simas called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

2. INTRODUCTION TO WORKSHOP

Co-chair Simas said the purpose of the workshop was to look at all of the alternatives that have been discussed over the past several months, and to open the door to new ideas and alternatives that may be sparked by the conversations. He said the desired outcome would be a list of actionable items for the staff to use in moving forward with more detailed analysis and evaluation.

Strategic Planning Manager Emil King said the workshop was a real milestone for the project and represented a lot of hard work to date on the part of the Committee and the public. He noted that the packet materials included a number of draft ideas and said the goal was for the Committee to split into two groups to discuss the ideas, then to come together at the end of the night and provide direction to staff for moving forward. He asked the Committee members to keep in mind two key questions: 1) is the range of alternatives and strategies adequate for the analysis and evaluation phase?; and 2) is there anything missing that should be included ahead of the analysis and evaluation phase? He stressed that the direction to be provided tonight to staff does not constitute a final recommendation from the Committee; there is still a lot of detailed work that needs to happen, including a full discussion of the results of the analysis, before a final set of Committee recommendations can be formulated.

Mr. King said each group had a designated note taker and a person identified to report back key findings. He said the last part of the meeting would be spent in comparing notes, looking for similarities, identifying differences in need of being reconciled, and giving direction to the staff.

Following the workshop, staff and the consultant team will begin the work of evaluating the range of alternatives and strategies. That work will include distilling a set of evaluation criteria for the Committee to use in the coming months in formulating a final set of recommendations; the criteria will be based on the Council principles and existing Comprehensive Plan policy direction.

### 3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bruce Nurse with Kemper Development Company urged the Committee to consider three issues that have a direct bearing on Downtown livability: 1) the installation of skybridges to separate pedestrians from vehicles; 2) the concept of capping intersections, also to separate pedestrians from vehicles while allowing them to cross streets without having to wait for the signal to change; and 3) the notion of a subsurface arterial accessible from NE 6th Street, running underneath the existing transit center connecting to Bellevue Way.

Mr. Jeff Freedman distributed to the Committee members information regarding a project that is currently permitted by the City and set to start construction soon. He said the 10-story building will be located in Downtown Bellevue. The idea of allowing an amenity space to be placed on the roof and have it be exempt from FAR (floor area ratio) calculations was discussed with the staff; the practice is common in some jurisdictions, including Seattle. Bellevue code includes a provision that allows additional height in exchange for rooftop visual enhancements, but tweaks to the code would allow for so much more. Rooftop areas take away from developable residential area and as such they do not generate tax revenues for the City. What has been permitted includes a frame that accomplishes a visual enhancement, but a code change is needed to be allowed to fill in the frame with space and better screening.

### 4. SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

The Advisory Committee divided into two small groups as follows (staff and consultants assisted with notetaking and facilitation):

Group 1: Aaron Laing, Patrick Bannon, Mark D'Amato, Loretta Lopez, Brad Helland, Jan Stout, Emil King (staff), Patti Wilma (staff), John Owen (Makers)

Group 2: Ernie Simas, Michael Chaplin, Hal Ferris, Gary Guenther, Trudi Jackson, Lee Maxwell, Erin Powell, Dan Stroh (staff), Liz Stead (staff), Bob Bengford (Makers)

Each group used the Alternatives Workbook as a guide to engage in a discussion of potential strategies and alternatives to move forward to the analysis phase. Topics included:

- ❖ Building Height and Form
- ❖ Vision for DT-OLB District
- ❖ Major Pedestrian Corridor
- ❖ Public Open Spaces
- ❖ Amenity Incentive System
- ❖ Design Guidelines
- ❖ Downtown Food Trucks
- ❖ Downtown Parking

## 5. REPORT OUT FROM SMALL GROUPS

### Building Height and Form

Mr. D'Amato reported out for Group 1; Mr. Ferris for Group 2. With regard to building height and form, Mr. D'Amato said his group thought status quo provides a good baseline for comparison. He said the group concluded it would make sense to examine pushing building height upward, but wanted to see rationale and criteria established for allowing up to 600 feet or higher in the core area. The group agreed the Perimeter A and B zoning boundaries should be examined, though there was recognition of the fact that such a review could be controversial. The group agreed to examine residential and nonresidential height and FAR equalization, taking into account nonresidential floorplate needs. The group wished to revise common element D so that any modifications to height and form be explored to see if they could be accomplished through design guidelines in addition to the incentive system. An item E was added to the common elements to explore the possibility of transferring FAR across development zones.

Speaking for his group regarding the same topic, Mr. Ferris said they gravitated toward the third alternative. He said they concluded that where the second alternative is primarily focused on increasing heights in the Downtown core, the third option allows height increases in districts beyond just the Downtown core. The group concluded that in addition to height, increasing allowed FAR should also be evaluated. Increasing the development potential is a way to create a greater economic lift that could be translated into the incentive system. The group did not support the notion of equalizing the residential and nonresidential height and FAR. The group agreed there should be an exploration of potential revisions to floorplate and tower configurations provided architectural treatments shy away from large square buildings.

### Vision for DT-OLB District

Mr. D'Amato said his group did not want to see the status quo retained as the vision for the DT-OLB district. The group felt that simply extending the DT-MU district to the entire DT-OLB district (as articulated in the second alternative) is not desirable and

concluded that extending the character of the adjacent districts makes far more sense. The group agreed to move the third alternative forward for analysis. The group desired to add a new common element to examine an open space/park investment that connects Downtown to the Wilburton area across I-405.

Mr. Ferris said his group also landed on the notion of extending the character of the adjacent districts to the DT-OLB district. The group concluded that in some portions of the DT-OLB district close to the freeway, heights greater than allowed in the DT-MU district could be easily accommodated because of the topography. The group supported all three of the potential common elements. The group viewed the DT-OLB as having the greatest potential for change in the allowed height, density and FAR, which would result in leveraging the amenity system. The southern two-thirds of the DT-OLB district has the greatest access to transit and could have different parking ratios to reflect that fact. The group also felt the City should not lose sight of the long-term potential for tying the DT-OLB to the area to the east of I-405 where there is a lot of underutilized land.

### Major Pedestrian Corridor

Mr. D'Amato reported that with regard to the major Pedestrian Corridor his group concluded that both the Land Use Code measures and other City measures should be analyzed. One of the concerns voiced focused on not wanting the Corridor to look piecemeal, thus a City-led initiative should be implemented that will bring the Corridor online as envisioned. That would also free the City from having to wait for adjacent development. Rather than imposing design guidelines on adjacent property owners, the City should allow for payments in-lieu from which the City could draw to complete the grand scheme. Exploring such creative funding options would enable the City to develop the entire Pedestrian Corridor.

Mr. Ferris said his group took a different tack and concluded that the land use mechanism should be enhanced to see the Pedestrian Corridor developed, but also concluded that it does not rise to the level of importance that would have the City jumping in to complete the grand design for the Corridor. The group did indicate that ultimately the Pedestrian Corridor should be the place to be, but because of its narrowness it will never be fully defensible from a safety standpoint.

### Public Open Space

On the topic of public open space, Mr. D'Amato said his group agreed with the range of strategies for evaluation. The group felt there should be a study regarding putting a lid over I-405, and that the City should think about creating a fund to acquire more public open space.

Mr. Ferris said his group also supported the notion of lidding I-405. The group also concurred with the range of strategies for evaluation. The group highlighted the importance of improving the connectivity and visibility between the open spaces but concluded that incentives alone will not be enough and the City will need to get involved in realizing the vision for public open spaces. Some properties may become available as a

result of light rail coming through the Downtown. Wayfinding and signage is important in differentiating between what is public space and what is not. Public open spaces that are only accessible through private property do not feel like public spaces and should not be incentivized; public spaces should feel like public spaces. Landscaping and trees should be included to soften the urban environment.

### Amenity Incentive System

Mr. D'Amato said his group did not add to or take away from the full list of potential amenities. The group voiced support for a shorter and more focused list. Ultimately, some of the items currently shown as amenities should be made development requirements. Bonus rates for FAR should be recalibrated and simplified, and the system should be periodically updated in the future.

Mr. Ferris said his group concluded the status quo should not be carried forward. The group agreed that a shorter and more focused amenity list should be developed, and that many of the items on the current list should be required. However, the group felt that implementation of the incentives could vary by district within Downtown. A mechanism for a fee in-lieu system should be developed. The key to the incentive system will depend on doing the math relative to what the City will gain in return for the incentives offered. There should be a requirement for an automatic periodic review of the amenity system that does not require Council approval to launch.

### Design Guidelines

With regard to the design guidelines, Mr. D'Amato reported that his group concurred with the proposed range of strategies. The members looked at the layout of street enhancements and chose to highlight the need to extend the enhancements along the full length of Main Street, tying the water in with the transit on Main Street. The group also underscored the need to regularly review the design guidelines.

Mr. Ferris said his group did not get into specific street designs but did recognize that the Great Streets study has never been adopted or implemented. Appropriate portions of that study need to be implemented. The group concluded that the street modifications that came out of that study are particularly important. There was discussion about the fact that at times the City has been too prescriptive relative to materials that can and cannot be used, the result of which has been a homogenous and sterile look. He said his group agreed that a regular schedule should be established for assessing and updating the design guidelines.

### Downtown Food Trucks

Mr. D'Amato said his group came down on the side of allowing food trucks to continue throughout Downtown while developing better criteria regarding their operations.

Mr. Ferris said his group had a good discussion about food trucks and also felt they should be allowed. He noted, however, that his group thought the locational criteria could

be overly restrictive. The thinking was that decisions regarding where they can be allowed to locate should be planned and purposeful, an approach that could even allow them to locate in City right-of-way with the proper permits. There was also support for developing requirements to address notification and keeping pedestrian paths clear.

### Downtown Parking

Mr. D'Amato said in discussing the issue of Downtown parking his group concluded that the status quo should be considered as an option. The group expressed concern about reducing parking minimums (in the second alternative). Any reduction in the minimum parking requirements should be accomplished through a site-specific parking study. The group discussed the fact that accessible parking requirements have not been updated for some time and should be reviewed. If accessible parking is created below-grade, there should be strict guidelines for locating the spaces near elevators. The group felt strongly that the City should consider a public parking garage, possibly more than one. Old Bellevue in particular needs a public parking garage to help facilitate bringing people into that area.

Mr. Ferris said his group supported the second alternative to explore reducing minimum parking requirements. He noted that the alternative would not reduce the maximum parking ratios so a developer could still elect to build to the maximum limits. The City's long-term traffic plan requires that there be a 50 percent mode split so the roads are constructed to accommodate that goal. Currently the demand for parking reflects a 70 percent mode split, so if behavior is not changed over time there will be problems in accommodating everyone. There was agreement that the parking usage should be measured periodically to get a handle on the trends. The group also concluded that the third alternative, departing from the minimum requirements via a parking study, should be kept in play.

6. ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT - None

7. DIRECTION FROM COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIES AND ALTERNATIVES TO MOVE FORWARD TO ANALYSIS PHASE

Following the report out, there was agreement that adequate direction was provided by the Small Group exercise for staff to move forward with analysis and evaluation. A summary of Committee direction would be included in the February meeting packet.

8. ADJOURN

Co-chair Simas adjourned the meeting at 10:23 p.m.

# Building Height and Form

Draft Range of Alternatives ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Alternatives to Analyze
<p><b>1. Status Quo</b> – Height and density transitions from Downtown Core out to perimeter areas under current Code provisions.</p> <p>1a. Variation to equalize residential and nonresidential FAR and height</p> <p><b>2. Departure for Extraordinary Amenity(ies) in Core</b> – Potentially increase height in Downtown Core up to a “super-maximum” (600 feet is proposed) to accentuate the “wedding cake”.</p> <p>2a. Variation to equalize residential and nonresidential FAR and height</p> <p><b>3. Departure for Extraordinary Amenity(ies) Downtown-wide</b> – Would evaluate Downtown Core and non-core areas to achieve greater district identity and respond to different conditions (such as topography), including potential for height increases under certain circumstances in Perimeter B/C; would not include study of Perimeter A.</p> <p>3a. Variation to equalize residential and nonresidential FAR and height</p>	<p><u>GROUP #1 (Laing, Bannon, D’Amato, Lopez, Helland, Stout)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status quo provides good baseline for comparison.</li> <li>Alternative 2 should move forward and provide clear rationale for “super-maximum” height in core (may be higher than 600 feet).</li> <li>Alternative 3 should move forward and examine entire Downtown, including Perimeter Areas.</li> <li>Agree to examine residential and nonresidential FAR and height equalization across all zoning districts; take into account nonresidential floorplate needs.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2 (Simas, Chaplin, Ferris, Guenther, Jackson, Maxwell, Powell)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not necessary to move Alternative 2 forward; Alternative 3 includes analysis of the Core area.</li> <li>Agree that Alternative 3 should move forward.</li> <li>Should also examine potential FAR departure/increase Downtown-wide for extraordinary benefit.</li> <li>Should not examine the 1a, 2a and 3a variations that equalize residential and nonresidential FAR and height.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed alternatives and common elements include the broadest range of ideas based on direction from small group discussion. Alternatives below to be analyzed against baseline/status quo for comparison.</b></p> <p><b>Departure for Extraordinary Amenity(ies) in Core</b> – Evaluate potential height and FAR increases in Downtown Core up to a “super-maximum” to accentuate the “wedding cake” (exact “super-maximum” height and FAR to be determined with supporting rationale).</p> <p>a. Sub-element: Variation to equalize residential and nonresidential FAR and height taking into account floorplate needs</p> <p><b>Departure for Extraordinary Amenity(ies) Downtown-wide</b> – Evaluate potential height and FAR increases Downtown-wide to achieve greater district identity and respond to different conditions (such as topography).</p> <p>a. Sub-element: Variation to equalize residential and nonresidential FAR and height taking into account floorplate needs</p>
Draft Common Elements ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Common Elements to Analyze
<p>A. In all alternatives, Perimeter District A and first 150 horizontal feet of Perimeter B are left as status quo; critical neighborhood transition.</p> <p>B. Explore increased height and density for the DT-OLB District on the east side of 112th Avenue NE.</p> <p>C. Explore potential revisions to floorplate and tower configurations (e.g. larger bases if architectural treatment is detailed and pedestrian-oriented).</p> <p>D. Any modifications to allowable building heights or densities would be accomplished through and linked to the update of the Amenity Incentive System.</p>	<p><u>GROUP #1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with common element A; Perimeter Areas should be examined.</li> <li>Agree with common elements B and C.</li> <li>Suggest rewording D as follows: Explore whether modifications to allowable buildings heights or densities could be related to updates of design guidelines and the amenity incentive system.</li> <li>New common element: Explore additional opportunities for FAR transfer.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with all four common elements to move forward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore increased height and density for the DT-OLB District on the east side of 112th Avenue NE.</li> <li>Explore potential revisions to floorplate and tower configurations (e.g. larger bases if architectural treatment is detailed and pedestrian-oriented).</li> <li>Explore whether modifications to allowable buildings heights or densities could be related to updates of design guidelines and the amenity incentive system.</li> <li>Explore additional opportunities for FAR transfer.</li> </ul>

## DT-OLB District

Draft Range of Alternatives →	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) →	Proposed Alternatives to Analyze
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Status Quo</b> – Retain status quo height and density provisions for DT-OLB District.</li> <li>2. <b>Extend DT-MU zoning to DT-OLB District</b> – Under current DT-MU provisions, this would increase maximum allowable non-residential height from 75 feet to 100 feet and retain FAR of 3.0. For residential, it would increase maximum allowable height from 75 feet to 200 feet and FAR from 3.0 to 5.0.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2a. Variation to study the equalized residential and nonresidential FAR/height proposed for DT-MU under the Height and Form topic as it applies to DT-OLB area.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. <b>Extend Character of Adjacent Districts</b> – Apply DT-MU zoning to the DT-OLB District north of NE 8th and south of NE 4th; extend DT-0-2 zoning between NE 4th and NE 8th. The DT-0-2 provisions would increase maximum allowable non-residential and residential heights to 350 feet and 6.0 FAR. Extending DT-MU would be consistent with the description in Alternative 2, above.</li> </ol>	<p><u>GROUP #1 (Laing, Bannon, D’Amato, Lopez, Helland, Stout)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not move Alternative 2 forward.</li> <li>• Agree that Alternative 3 should move forward.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2 (Simas, Chaplin, Ferris, Guenther, Jackson, Maxwell, Powell)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not move Alternative 2 forward.</li> <li>• Agree that Alternative 3 should move forward.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed alternatives and common elements include the broadest range of ideas based on direction from small group discussion. Alternative below to be analyzed against baseline/status quo for comparison.</b></p> <p><b>Extend Character of Adjacent Districts</b> – Apply DT-MU zoning to the DT-OLB District north of NE 8th and south of NE 4th; extend DT-0-2 zoning between NE 4th and NE 8th to cover DT-OLB and intervening area on the west side of 112th Avenue NE. The DT-0-2 provisions would increase maximum allowable non-residential and residential heights to 350 feet and 6.0 FAR based on current zoning.</p>
Draft Common Elements →	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) →	Proposed Common Elements to Analyze
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Revise design guidelines and development standards to ensure an active and attractive pedestrian environment along 112th Avenue NE, and in particular in the vicinity of the light rail stations at NE 6th Street and near Main Street.</li> <li>B. Study views, open space and permeability of the DT-OLB District and establish design guidelines so that the views from I-405 are attractive and the area has the character of a gateway to Downtown.</li> <li>C. Evaluate larger floorplates at lower building levels to take advantage of the area topography.</li> </ol>	<p><u>GROUP #1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New common element: Explore potential for significant open space/park investment with lid over I-405 from Downtown to Wilburton.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New common element: Explore connectivity of OLB District east across I-405 to Wilburton.</li> <li>• Consider DT-OLB as hospitality district.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise design guidelines and development standards to ensure an active and attractive pedestrian environment along 112th Avenue NE, and in particular in the vicinity of the light rail stations at NE 6th Street and near Main Street.</li> <li>• Study views, open space and permeability of the DT-OLB District and establish design guidelines so that the views from I-405 are attractive and the area has the character of a gateway to Downtown.</li> <li>• Evaluate larger floorplates at lower building levels to take advantage of the area topography.</li> <li>• Explore east-west connectivity issues and potential for significant open space/park investment with lid over I-405 from Downtown to Wilburton.</li> </ul>

# Major Pedestrian Corridor

Draft Range of Strategies ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Strategies to Analyze
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Land Use Code Measures</b> – Proposed refinements:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend the corridor to the east to be more integrated with the Civic Center District and the light rail station</li> <li>• Require weather protection along the Corridor</li> <li>• Specify a maximum distance between building entries</li> <li>• Add additional landscaping/green elements</li> <li>• Remove Code barriers, if any, to achieving features that activate the Corridor (e.g. restaurants, outdoor seating, etc.)</li> <li>• Evaluate amenity incentives for off-site developers to contribute to Pedestrian Corridor improvements</li> <li>• Evaluate the integration of bicycles and other wheeled users to coexist with pedestrians (“hand-off” from Downtown Transportation Plan)</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ <b>Other City Measures</b> – The Committee may ultimately conclude that additional measures and public investments are needed (beyond Code changes) to help realize the Corridor’s potential. While not part of the Committee’s charge, these ideas could be noted in the group’s final recommendations. Potential ideas include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public investment in key sections of the Corridor, such as the Garden Hillclimb area, the extension segment between 110th and 112th Avenues, and the bottleneck west of 108th Avenue.</li> <li>• Improve Pedestrian Corridor intersections with wayfinding, weather protection, upgraded pedestrian crosswalks and other features to make the Corridor more inviting.</li> <li>• Development of a partnership between the City and Corridor properties to support a richer array of regular programmed events and activities along the Corridor.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><u>GROUP #1 (Laing, Bannon, D’Amato, Lopez, Helland, Stout)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move strategies relating to Land Use Code Measures and Other City Measures forward for analysis.</li> <li>• Clarify bullet three under Land Use Code Measures to explore maximum distance between building entries, visual access, and other ways to activate building frontages.</li> <li>• Clarify that bullet two under Other City Measures could include areas beyond just “intersections”, and should list lighting as an example.</li> <li>• Add a strategy under Other City Measures to explore creative funding to help construct a City-sponsored “grand” design for the Pedestrian Corridor.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2 (Simas, Chaplin, Ferris, Guenther, Jackson, Maxwell, Powell)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move strategies relating to Land Use Code Measures forward for analysis.</li> <li>• Concern about bullets one and two under Other City Measures; reticent to use City investment on the Pedestrian Corridor.</li> <li>• Explore changing the name/re-branding the Corridor.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed strategies include the broadest range of ideas based on direction from small group discussion.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Land Use Code Measures</b> – Proposed refinements:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend the corridor to the east to be more integrated with the Civic Center District and the light rail station</li> <li>• Require weather protection along the Corridor</li> <li>• Explore maximum distance between building entries, visual access, and other ways to activate building frontages</li> <li>• Add additional landscaping/green elements</li> <li>• Remove Code barriers, if any, to achieving features that activate the Corridor (e.g. restaurants, outdoor seating, etc.)</li> <li>• Evaluate amenity incentives for off-site developers to contribute to Pedestrian Corridor improvements</li> <li>• Evaluate the integration of bicycles and other wheeled users to coexist with pedestrians (“hand-off” from Downtown Transportation Plan)</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ <b>Other City Measures</b> – Committee may ultimately conclude that additional measures and public investments are needed (beyond Code changes) to help realize the Corridor’s potential. Proposed ideas to further analyze:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public investment in key sections of the Corridor, such as the Garden Hillclimb area, the extension segment between 110th and 112th Avenues, and the bottleneck west of 108th Avenue.</li> <li>• Improve Pedestrian Corridor with wayfinding, overall weather protection, lighting, upgraded pedestrian crosswalks and other features to make the Corridor more inviting.</li> <li>• Development of a partnership between the City and Corridor properties to support a richer array of regular programmed events and activities along the Corridor.</li> <li>• Explore creative funding to help construct a City-sponsored “grand” design for the Corridor.</li> <li>• Explore changing the name/re-branding the Corridor.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

# Public Open Space

Draft Range of Strategies ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Strategies to Analyze
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Open Space Expression</b> – Draw from the Downtown Design Charrette and Streetscape Design Guidelines to identify and incentivize different open space expressions for each neighborhood, to help address each neighborhood’s needs and enhance neighborhood character.</li> <li>■ <b>Mid-Block Connections</b> – Strengthen requirements and guidelines for integrating mid-block connections:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both north-south and east-west mid-block connections are essential</li> <li>• Show proposed new connections in general locations on map, but allow flexibility with implementation</li> <li>• Integrate alley and shared vehicle/pedestrian connections</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ <b>Update Design Guidelines</b> – Update guidelines for mid-block connections and publicly accessible open spaces, including provisions for solar access, seating, safe-design principles, and active edges along perimeter of open space.</li> <li>■ <b>Active Spaces</b> – Add incentives and design guidelines for active spaces (e.g. sports courts, community gardens, play structures, etc.)</li> </ul>	<p><u>GROUP #1 (Laing, Bannon, D’Amato, Lopez, Helland, Stout)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move four strategy areas forward for analysis.</li> <li>• Mention the potential for an open space investment that links Downtown to Wilburton District across I-405.</li> <li>• Add a new strategy to explore method for funding open space acquisition and improvement.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2 (Simas, Chaplin, Ferris, Guenther, Jackson, Maxwell, Powell)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move four strategy areas forward for analysis.</li> <li>• Pockets parks should be explored through incentives and public acquisition.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed strategies include the broadest range of ideas based on direction from small group discussion.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Open Space Expression</b> – Draw from the Downtown Design Charrette and Streetscape Design Guidelines to identify and incentivize different open space expressions for each neighborhood, to help address each neighborhood’s needs and enhance neighborhood character.</li> <li>■ <b>I-405 Open Space/Connection</b> – Explore potential for significant open space/park investment with a lid over I-405 from Downtown to Wilburton along roughly a NE 5th alignment.</li> <li>■ <b>Mid-Block Connections</b> – Strengthen requirements and guidelines for integrating mid-block connections:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both north-south and east-west mid-block connections are essential</li> <li>• Show proposed new connections in general locations on map, but allow flexibility with implementation</li> <li>• Integrate alley and shared vehicle/pedestrian connections</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ <b>Update Design Guidelines</b> – Update guidelines for mid-block connections and publicly accessible open spaces, including provisions for solar access, seating, safe-design principles, and active edges along perimeter of open space.</li> <li>■ <b>Active Spaces</b> – Add incentives and design guidelines for active spaces (e.g. sports courts, community gardens, play structures, etc.)</li> <li>■ <b>Funding Mechanism</b> – Explore method for helping to fund Downtown open space acquisition and improvement.</li> </ul>

# Amenity Incentive System

<b>Draft Range of Alternatives ➔</b>	<b>Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔</b>	<b>Proposed Alternatives to Analyze</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Status Quo with Recalibration</b> – Maintain existing list of eligible amenities as is.</li> <li>2. <b>Expanded Amenity List</b> – Adjust amenity list to include all additional items identified by the Committee. Remove very low priority existing items, and identify items to simply require (weather protection).</li> <li>3. <b>Shorter, More Focused Amenity List</b> – Adjust Amenity List to include only a handful of highest priority items (examples: pedestrian-oriented frontage, open space to be expressed differently in each neighborhood, affordable housing).</li> </ol>	<p><u>GROUP #1 (Laing, Bannon, D’Amato, Lopez, Helland, Stout)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanded amenity list (Alternative 2) is not desirable.</li> <li>• Agree to move Alternative 3 forward for analysis.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2 (Simas, Chaplin, Ferris, Guenther, Jackson, Maxwell, Powell)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanded amenity list (Alternative 2) is not desirable.</li> <li>• Agree to move Alternative 3 forward for analysis.</li> <li>• Specific focus should be on district character and what amenities can help differentiate neighborhoods.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed alternatives and common elements include the broadest range of ideas based on direction from small group discussion. Alternative below to be analyzed against baseline/status quo for comparison.</b></p> <p><b>Shorter, More Focused Amenity List</b> – Adjust Amenity List to include only a handful of highest priority items (examples: pedestrian-oriented frontage, open space to be expressed differently in each neighborhood, affordable housing).</p>
<b>Draft Common Elements ➔</b>	<b>Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔</b>	<b>Proposed Common Elements to Analyze</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Identify which current amenities, such as weather protection, may be shifted to be a development requirement; and adjust base height and density accordingly.</li> <li>B. Recalibrate FAR values to reflect updated economics and public priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop cost estimates for potential amenities.</li> <li>• At a future step, prioritize/value amenities with consideration of cost to produce, bonus received, and district needs.</li> <li>• Convert to FAR earned per unit of amenity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>C. Provide mechanism for fee-in-lieu payments.</li> </ol>	<p><u>GROUP #1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move three common elements forward as part of analysis.</li> <li>• Specify that the Code provisions relating to the amenity system will be updated on a set interval.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move three common elements forward as part of analysis.</li> <li>• Specify that the Code provisions relating to the amenity system will be updated on a set interval.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify which current amenities, such as weather protection, may be shifted to be a development requirement; and adjust base height and density accordingly.</li> <li>• Recalibrate FAR values to reflect updated economics and public priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Develop cost estimates for potential amenities.</li> <li>– At a future step, prioritize/value amenities with consideration of cost to produce, bonus received, and district needs.</li> <li>– Convert to FAR earned per unit of amenity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide mechanism for fee-in-lieu payments.</li> <li>• Specify that the Code provisions relating to the amenity system will be updated on a set interval (may be similar in the future to other sections of the Downtown Land Use Code that need routine updating).</li> </ul>

# Design Guidelines

Draft Range of Strategies ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Strategies to Analyze
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Revise Street Classifications in Building/Sidewalk Design Relationship Guidelines to create stronger focus for most concentrated pedestrian activity</b> – Reinforce highest pedestrian and retail activity along Pedestrian Corridor, Main Street in Old Bellevue, Bellevue Way and other north-south streets in the Core. Take into account Great Streets document, Downtown Design Charrette, and recommendations from the Transportation Commission for the Transportation Plan Update.</li> <li>■ <b>Update Design Guidelines</b> – Review and update design guidelines with emphasis on the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased focus on the public realm and pedestrian experience.</li> <li>• Establish neighborhood-specific design guidelines to reinforce character and identity.</li> <li>• Emphasize the importance of site design and dynamic urban architecture.</li> <li>• Adding intent statements, clear minimum standards, and design options.</li> <li>• Use of photos, sketches, and other graphic means to communicate guidelines.</li> <li>• Develop guidelines and criteria that can be applied to potential design departures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><u>GROUP #1 (Laing, Bannon, D’Amato, Lopez, Helland, Stout)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move both sets of strategies forward for analysis.</li> <li>• Specify that the first strategy will “implement” the Great Streets document, Downtown Design Charrette and Downtown Transportation Plan Update.</li> <li>• Specify that the design guidelines will be assessed and refined on a set interval.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2 (Simas, Chaplin, Ferris, Guenther, Jackson, Maxwell, Powell)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move both sets of strategies forward for analysis.</li> <li>• Encourage creativity and eclecticism during the update of the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>• Specify that the design guidelines will be assessed and refined on a set interval.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed strategies include the broadest range of ideas based on direction from small group discussion.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Revise Street Classifications in Building/Sidewalk Design Relationship Guidelines to create stronger focus for most concentrated pedestrian activity</b> – Reinforce highest pedestrian and retail activity along Pedestrian Corridor, Main Street in Old Bellevue, Bellevue Way and other north-south streets in the Core. Implement the Great Streets document, Downtown Design Charrette, and recommendations from the Transportation Commission for the Transportation Plan Update.</li> <li>■ <b>Update Design Guidelines</b> – Review and update design guidelines with emphasis on the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased focus on the public realm and pedestrian experience.</li> <li>• Establish neighborhood-specific design guidelines to reinforce character and identity.</li> <li>• Emphasize the importance of site design and dynamic urban architecture.</li> <li>• Adding intent statements, clear minimum standards, and design options.</li> <li>• Use of photos, sketches, and other graphic means to communicate guidelines.</li> <li>• Encourage creativity and eclecticism.</li> <li>• Develop guidelines and criteria that can be applied to potential design departures.</li> <li>• Specify that the design guidelines will be assessed and refined on a set interval.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

# Downtown Food Trucks

Draft Range of Alternatives ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Alternatives to Analyze
<p><b>1. Continue to allow food trucks throughout Downtown</b> – Per current code, on private property with the owner’s consent.</p> <p><b>2. Locational Criteria</b> – Explore potential criteria for where food trucks can be located, with a possible exception for on-site food trucks associated with sit-down restaurants.</p>	<p><u>GROUP #1 (Laing, Bannon, D’Amato, Lopez, Helland, Stout)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with continuing to allow throughout Downtown consistent with Alternative 1, but want to make sure that code provisions and specific criteria are updated.</li> <li>Be clearer about signage (on-truck and A boards) and health department requirements.</li> <li>Allow on public and private property.</li> <li>Do not support development of locational restrictions that would be explored under Alternative 2. Do not move forward.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2 (Simas, Chaplin, Ferris, Guenther, Jackson, Maxwell, Powell)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with continuing to allow throughout Downtown consistent with Alternative 1, but want to make sure that code provisions and specific criteria are updated.</li> <li>Allow on public and private property.</li> <li>Do not support development of locational restrictions that would be explored under Alternative 2. Do not move forward.</li> </ul>	<p style="color: #0070C0;"><b>Proposed alternative includes the broadest range of ideas based on direction from small group discussion. Alternative below to be analyzed against baseline/status quo for comparison.</b></p> <p><b>Continue to allow food trucks throughout Downtown</b> – Continue to allow with property owner’s consent. In addition, revise Code to develop specific requirements that address issues such as: notification requirements; requirements to keep clear pedestrian paths; signage; trash disposal; health department requirements.</p>
Draft Common Elements ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Common Elements to Analyze
<p>A. Revise Land Use Code to reflect the food truck phenomenon. Develop specific requirements that address impacts such as: notification requirements; requirements to keep clear pedestrian paths; trash disposal.</p>	<p><u>GROUP #1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrate common element into Alternative 1.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrate common element into Alternative 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Integrated with alternative above,</p>

# Downtown Parking

Draft Range of Alternatives ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Alternatives to Analyze
<p><b>1. <u>Status Quo</u></b> – Retain current Downtown parking provisions.</p> <p><b>2. <u>Reduction to Minimum Required Parking</u></b> – Explore reductions to minimum parking ratios in the following instances to allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential development down to 0.5 stalls/unit (minimum currently zero stalls/unit in Core and 1.0/unit in rest of Downtown).</li> <li>• The first 1,500 net square feet of existing or new restaurant space outside the Core be treated as retail (and with it a lower minimum parking requirement by district), with exception for Old Bellevue where parking issues would be explored to better understand dynamics of the area and how the current regulations are playing out.</li> <li>• Office development down to 1.5 stalls/1,000 net square feet in Core (minimum currently 2.0/1,000) and down to 2.0 stalls/1,000 net square feet in rest of Downtown (minimum currently 2.5/1,000). Note: This does not affect maximum office parking ratios.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. <u>Departure from Minimum Requirements via Parking Study</u></b> – Allow departure from minimum (required) parking standards, potentially for all uses, through parking study.</p>	<p><u>GROUP #1 (Laing, Bannon, D’Amato, Lopez, Helland, Stout)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about reducing minimums as of right; wish to have a parking study accompany any reductions. Do not move forward the elements of Alternative 2 relating to straight parking minimum reductions. It is, however, important to explore the Old Bellevue parking issues.</li> <li>• Agree to move forward Alternative 3 for analysis.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2 (Simas, Chaplin, Ferris, Guenther, Jackson, Maxwell, Powell)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move forward Alternatives 2 and 3.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed alternatives and common elements include the broadest range of ideas based on direction from small group discussion. Alternatives to be analyzed against status quo for comparison.</b></p> <p><b><u>Reduction to Minimum Required Parking</u></b> – Explore reductions to minimum parking ratios in the following instances to allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential development down to 0.5 stalls/unit (minimum currently zero stalls/unit in Core and 1.0/unit in rest of Downtown).</li> <li>• The first 1,500 net square feet of existing or new restaurant space outside the Core be treated as retail (and with it a lower minimum parking requirement by district), with exception for Old Bellevue where parking issues would be explored to better understand dynamics of the area and how the current regulations are playing out.</li> <li>• Office development down to 1.5 stalls/1,000 net square feet in Core (minimum currently 2.0/1,000) and down to 2.0 stalls/1,000 net square feet in rest of Downtown (minimum currently 2.5/1,000). Note: This does not affect maximum office parking ratios.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Departure from Minimum Requirements via Parking Study</u></b> – Allow departure from minimum (required) parking standards, potentially for all uses, through parking study.</p>
Draft Common Elements ➔	Workshop Direction (1-15-2014) ➔	Proposed Common Elements to Analyze
<p>A. Develop scope and timeline for comprehensive parking study to include inter-related components such as on-street parking, public parking supply and potential for public garages, and opportunities for coordinated management of existing parking supply.</p> <p>B. Revisit parking Code provisions in 5-7 years to respond to changing needs of Downtown and as East Link light rail nears completion. Would include follow-up on office parking standards as referenced in the Downtown Transportation Plan Update.</p>	<p><u>GROUP #1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore potential updates relating to “accessible” parking.</li> <li>• The timeframe to revisit parking provisions should be tied to completion of light rail.</li> </ul> <p><u>GROUP #2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The timeframe to revisit parking may be closer to 10 years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop scope and timeline for comprehensive parking study to include inter-related components such as on-street parking, public parking supply and potential for public garages, and opportunities for coordinated management of existing parking supply.</li> <li>• Revisit parking Code provisions to respond to changing needs of Downtown and as East Link light rail nears completion. Would include follow-up on office parking standards as referenced in the Downtown Transportation Plan Update.</li> <li>• Explore potential updates relating to “accessible” parking (number of stalls, location, etc.).</li> </ul>

DRAFT Evaluation Criteria	Building Height and Form (incl. OLB)	Major Pedestrian Corridor	Public Open Space	Amenity Incentive System	Design Guidelines (incl. OLB)	Downtown Parking
<p><b>Detailed Factors</b></p> <p><i>What will be evaluated for each topic</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential of added height and FAR to “lift” incentive system</li> <li>Access to light and air between buildings</li> <li>Public spaces – views, shade and shadow impacts</li> <li>Effect of added FAR and height on building massing and form at both pedestrian level and at larger scale</li> <li>Ability to promote variability in building heights and extraordinary design</li> <li>Views within Downtown, from I-405, from surrounding neighborhoods</li> <li>Transition in bulk/scale/height with adjoining neighborhoods</li> <li>Ability to reinforce district identity</li> <li>Effects of any added FAR on transportation system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness in enhancing the Pedestrian Corridor’s character and memorability through:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of an interesting and varied pedestrian travel sequence</li> <li>Human scale</li> <li>Attractiveness</li> <li>Comfort, safety, and amenities</li> <li>Adjacent building design and interface</li> <li>Activities and programming</li> </ul> </li> <li>Responsiveness to emerging changes, including the NE 6th Street light rail station</li> <li>Interim, incremental improvement versus permanent conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness of strategies in promoting higher quality, more usable open spaces that respond to their neighborhood context through:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting distinct neighborhood identities</li> <li>Creating a variety of activities, including opportunities for active recreation</li> <li>Enhancing users’ comfort, safety, and amenities</li> <li>Improving pedestrian access and linkages</li> <li>Providing opportunities for people to gather and socialize</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added “lift” to incentive system through additional height (and FAR)</li> <li>Development economics – economic calibration to ensure amenity system is real incentive</li> <li>Public benefit yielded by amenity system</li> <li>Ability to prioritize and achieve amenities most important to livability</li> <li>Elements that should be required outright versus incentivized</li> <li>Complexity and usability of the system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent to which updated design guidelines succeed in:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing focus on the public realm and pedestrian experience</li> <li>Reinforcing neighborhood character and identity</li> <li>Emphasizing site design and dynamic urban architecture</li> <li>Encouraging creativity</li> <li>Incorporating newer ideas (e.g. Great Streets, design charrette)</li> <li>Allowing flexibility (e.g. design departures based on established criteria)</li> <li>Being user friendly, visual and clear</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on adjacent land uses, including any spillover impacts</li> <li>Market demands of various uses, allows for appropriate flexibility</li> <li>Special parking needs of unique neighborhood conditions (e.g. Old Bellevue)</li> <li>Relationship to multimodal vision for Downtown</li> </ul>
<p><b>Council Principles</b></p>	<p><i>Checked boxes show Council Principles that apply most directly to each topical area.</i></p>					
<p>1. Refine the incentive system to develop the appropriate balance between private return on investment and public benefit.</p>	✓			✓		
<p>2. Promote elements that make Downtown a great urban environment while also softening undesirable side effects on Downtown residents.</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<p>3. Increase Downtown’s liveliness, street presence, and the overall quality of the pedestrian environment.</p>		✓	✓	✓	✓	
<p>4. Promote a distinctive and memorable skyline that sets Downtown apart from other cities, and likewise create more memorable streets, public spaces, and opportunities for activities and events.</p>	✓		✓	✓	✓	
<p>5. Encourage sustainability and green building innovation in Downtown development. Enable design that promotes water, resource, and energy conservation, and that advances ecological function and integrity.</p>			✓	✓	✓	
<p>6. Respond to Downtown’s changing demographics by meeting the needs of a wide range of ages and backgrounds for an enlivening, safe and supportive environment.</p>		✓	✓	✓	✓	
<p>7. Promote elements that will create a great visitor experience and a more vital tourism sector for Downtown.</p>		✓	✓		✓	✓
<p>8. Strengthen Downtown’s competitive position in the global and regional economy, while reinforcing local roots and local approaches.</p>	✓					✓
<p>9. Maintain graceful transitions with adjoining residential neighborhoods, while integrating these neighborhoods through linkages to Downtown attractions.</p>	✓				✓	✓
<p>10. Refine the Code to provide a good balance between predictability and flexibility, in the continuing effort to attract high quality development that is economically feasible and enhances value for all users.</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<p>11. Promote through each development an environment that is aesthetically beautiful and of high quality in design, form and materials; and that reinforces the identity and sense of place for Downtown and for distinct districts.</p>	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
<p>12. Advance the theme of “City in a Park” for Downtown, creating more green features, public open space, trees and landscaping; and promoting connections to the rest of the park and open space system.</p>		✓	✓	✓	✓	



**To:** Downtown Bellevue Livability Initiative Advisory Committee  
**From:** Warren Koons & Stu Vander Hoek  
Co-Chairs, Bellevue Downtown Association Land Use & Livability Committee  
**Date:** February 12, 2014  
**Re:** “Creating a Livable and Memorable Downtown” – 2/19 Presentation

On behalf of the Bellevue Downtown Association, we would like to thank Co-Chairs Laing and Simas and the committee for the opportunity to share a brief presentation about themes, amenities and architectural features found here at home and around the world.

Our hope is that the images spark further thinking and conversation about what makes for great livability and memorability in a downtown and the options and opportunities available for our Land Use Code, the development process and overall community vision for our future.

It’s important to note that the slideshow does not represent the “definitive” set of livable and memorable examples. They draw from recent trips (i.e. Vancouver, B.C., Melbourne, Denver, Pasadena) and experiences and offer a taste of how other cities have prioritized livable and memorable features and strategies.

The association’s work program goals continue to be:

1. Attract and enable the city’s most concentrated development downtown.
2. Optimize development economics in order to generate desired public benefits.
3. Achieve excellent urban design and strong architectural interest.
4. Enhance downtown’s neighborhood identities, character and pedestrian environment.
5. Integrate with transportation, parking and utility planning and support the BDA’s Downtown Access Strategy

Thank you again for your investment of time, knowledge and passion in creating a truly great place.



**Downtown Bellevue Resident's Association  
Winter Kick off Meeting  
Thursday, January 16, 2014  
Meeting Summary**

On Thursday, January 16, over sixty Downtown residents attended the launch of the first Downtown Resident's Association. Mayor Claudia Balducci provided welcoming remarks that recognized downtown as the second largest neighborhood in Bellevue (with over 10,000 residents) and shared about the importance of forming an organization for residents to work together to build community, share common goals and provide a voice for the neighborhood. Joining Mayor Balducci at the meeting were Councilmembers Robinson, Robertson and Chelminiak, as well as the Interim City Manager, Brad Miyake.

Glenn Kost from the Parks Department provided an update on the Downtown and Meydenbauer park projects and Emil King from PCD gave a presentation on the Downtown Livability Initiative. Neighborhood Outreach Coordinator, Julie Ellenhorn spoke to the group about the resources available from the City for neighborhood organizing including the neighborhood liaison program, a web based Neighborhood Organizing Guide and a new training program for neighborhood association leadership, launching in April. This training will provide leaders of new or revitalizing neighborhood associations with training and mentoring from experienced association leadership from other neighborhoods.

Following the presentations, residents were asked to share what they love about downtown and to identify key issues. Residents love living in close proximity to restaurants, shopping, parks and entertainment. They also love the vibrancy of downtown, green spaces and 'special places' in buildings. Residents shared concerns about a range of topics, including improving pedestrian safety and walkability, addressing noise during evening hours, policing traffic infractions and night-time drag racing, and increasing opportunities for community building events downtown. Smaller table discussions continued conversations about Parks, Traffic, Code Compliance, Eastlink and Building Community.

Key themes that emerged at the discussion tables included:

**Parks:** Need for green space, including preservation of Ashwood Park, adding pocket parks and the need for an off-leash dog park. There is also a desire for greater communication regarding upcoming events at Downtown Park and concern about the abuse of amplified sound at Downtown Park during events. Once it is reported, it is often too late for anyone to do anything about it. There was also interest in learning more about the planning for a pedestrian corridor extension over I-405 and the park and open space plan for the Bel-Red Corridor.

**Code:** Residents shared concern about what is permitted under the Noise Code for downtown and wish to explore how to navigate urban noise from sources like garbage and recycling collection, commercial activities such as cleaners, leaf blowers, construction and amplified sound in the Downtown Park. Clearer explanations of current codes would be welcome. Additionally, police enforcement is sought for traffic violations, speeding, and late night drag racing on 110<sup>th</sup>. There was also concern about the increase in homeless and transient activity near the public docks.



**Transportation:** There is a general sentiment that downtown is designed for cars – and that pedestrian safety is a heightened concern among downtown residents. Residents stressed the importance of walkability for downtown. Drivers are not paying attention and there is genuine concern for personal safety among pedestrians. Traffic safety concerns, including more bicycle lanes, increased pedestrian friendliness, timing of crossing lights, need for mid-block crossings and general traffic safety issues dominated the discussions. Residents pro-offered suggestions, such as establishing a circulator bus around the perimeter of downtown for local trips to the grocery store or library, eliminating the free right turns on heavily used pedestrian intersections to increase safety, and increasing the supply of on-street parking in downtown.

**Community Building:** Residents want to create opportunities to gather, have more downtown events, cultural and arts opportunities. We need to improve communication among downtown residents and opportunities for interaction. There is a desire for additional places to host community events, cultural offerings, concerts and performance art centers for downtown. Newcomers are asking, “Why should I move to downtown Bellevue? What is there to do after work?” We should partner with the business community to help host/sponsor community events for downtown residents and make downtown a destination of choice for the region.

**East Link:** This table did not draw attendees. Sentiment was that Downtown residents are excited to see light rail in downtown and would like to see the project completed on schedule.

Over 60 downtown residents attended this first Downtown Residents meeting, with 25 residents stepping up to meet again as a planning group to formally organize an independent association at the next meeting on February 12 at 6pm at City Hall. On February 12, the group will begin to discuss the shape, structure and goals of a Downtown Residents Association and will begin to identify leadership.

For more information or to participate in the planning group, please contact Julie Ellenhorn at 425-452-5372, [jellenhorn@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:jellenhorn@bellevuewa.gov), or Mike McCormick Huentelman, 425-452-4089 [mmhuent@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:mmhuent@bellevuewa.gov).



# Downtown Bellevue Residents Association Winter Kickoff Meeting

Thursday, January 16, 2014

6:00 – 7:30 p.m. • City Hall Room 1E-108

*Come see what's happening in Downtown  
Meet your neighbors*

- ◆ Updates on Downtown Inspiration Park and Meydenbauer Park Projects
- ◆ Resident focused presentation on Downtown Livability Initiative
- ◆ “Table Topics” on Downtown Living

*Help us grow a resident network that will shape downtown issues while building community in the rapidly growing downtown residential core.*

## Questions? Ideas? Email Updates?

Contact Julie Ellenhorn at **425-452-5372** or [jellenhorn@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:jellenhorn@bellevuewa.gov)

RSVP appreciated but not required

