



Bellevue Planning Commission

Wednesday, September 10, 2008

6:30 to 10:00 p.m. ▪ Council Conference Room 1E-113

Bellevue City Hall ▪ 450 110th Ave. NE ▪ Bellevue, WA 98004

Agenda

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 6:30 p.m. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Call to Order
<i>Vicki Orrico, Chair</i>2. Public Comment*
<i>Limited to 5 minutes per person or 3 minutes if a public hearing has been held on your topic</i>3. Approval of Agenda4. Communications from City Council, Community Council, Boards and Commissions5. Staff Reports
<i>Paul Inghram, PCD</i> |
| 6:45 p.m. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. Study Session: <u>Shoreline Master Program Update briefing</u>
Overview of the results of our recently conducted opinion survey
<i>Heidi Bedwell & Michael Paine, DSD</i>
<i>Ian Stewart, EMC Research</i> |
| 7:45 p.m. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">7. Study Session: <u>Neighborhood Character Phase Two</u>
Discuss and respond to City Council questions; finalize Phase Two recommendations
<i>Cheryl Kuhn, PCD & Matthews Jackson, DSD</i> |
| 8:45 p.m. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. Other Business9. Approval of Minutes10. Public Comment* - <i>Limited to 3 minutes per person</i> |

11. **Next Planning Commission Meetings –**

Sept 20

- Shoreline Master Program Update boat tour 1:00 to 4:00 pm on Saturday, Newport Shores Yacht Club at 81 Skagit Key, arrive at 12:30 for boarding

Sept 24 - Tentative agenda topics include:

- Ped-Bike Plan Update Comprehensive Plan Amendments briefing
- Neighborhood Character study session
- 2008 Comprehensive Plan Amendments study session

9:00 p.m.

12. **Adjourn**

Agenda times are approximate

Planning Commission members

Vicki Orrico, Chair
Hal Ferris
William Lai

Pat Sheffels, Vice Chair
Douglas Mathews
Jennifer Robertson

Staff contact:

Paul Inghram 452-4070
Jeanie Christensen 452-7857

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

Wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation available upon request. Please call at least 48 hours in advance. Assistance for the hearing impaired: dial 711 (TR).



MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 10, 2008

TO: Chair Orrico and Members of the Planning Commission

FROM: Cheryl Kuhn, Neighborhood Outreach Manager, 4089
Steph Hewitt, Community Involvement Coordinator, 2564
Matthews Jackson, Neighborhood Development Team Planning Manager, 2729

SUBJECT: Neighborhood Character Phase Two – Follow-up on City Council Questions

The Planning Commission is asked to provide the City Council with certain additional information and clarification of proposed regulatory changes that were presented for Council consideration as Neighborhood Character Phase Two on July 14, 2008. Staff has prepared information to address Council questions and concerns, and the Planning Commission is asked to discuss, modify as necessary, and approve Neighborhood Character Phase Two recommendations for presentation at an upcoming City Council meeting.

Topics to be addressed include: (1) Overall Council reaction to the Planning Commission's Neighborhood Character Phase Two recommendations and (2) City Council questions specifically pertaining to:

- Floor Area Ratio – used as a threshold and used as a standard – compared to alternatives for addressing size and scale concerns;
- “Off-ramps” and alternatives to size and scale regulations for exceptional cases;
- Timing of discussion on guest cottages and accessory structures;
- Lifespan of building permits; and,
- Remodels and additions – approaches to neighborhood concerns.

Planning Commission discussion of Neighborhood Character issues began in April 2007 and culminated in December 2007 with City Council adoption of Phase One regulatory changes and referral of more complex changes for Phase Two study and discussion.

The Commission re-engaged in the Neighborhood Character discussion in February 2008 and worked on Phase Two recommendations over the course of three meetings – March 19, May 7, and May 27. Phase Two recommendations were presented to Council on July 14, and referred to the Planning Commission for further discussion and return to Council in fall of 2008. Per Council direction, staff will return to the Planning Commission for further discussion of Phase Two recommendations and a public hearing of potential Land Use Code Amendments.

BACKGROUND

Neighborhood Character Phase One concluded in December with Council adoption of code and policy changes recommended by the Planning Commission to address three major problems associated with neighborhood redevelopment:

- Loss of trees and greenscape;
- Loss of privacy and sunlight due to size and scale of residential structures; and
- Impacts of construction.

Phase Two deliberations, conducted by the Planning Commission February-May of 2008, addressed the same general impacts of redevelopment on neighborhood character and livability. However, where Phase One involved relatively simple, straightforward solutions, Phase Two delved into more complex, far-reaching, and potentially controversial approaches. After reviewing significant research and public comment, accumulated by staff since January of 2007, the Planning Commission submitted its Phase Two findings and recommendations for City Council consideration. (*Attachment A*)

At its July 14 study session, the Council received the Planning Commission recommendations with generally favorable comments. Mayor Degginger said the recommendations were “on the right track” and commended the Planning Commission’s effort to address real problems effectively while avoiding over-regulation. At the same time, Council members asked for more information on the impacts of certain proposals and, in some instances, discussion of additional options.

The following is a discussion of individual Planning Commission recommendations, with new information, comments, and options added by staff.

DISCUSSION: COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS AND OPTIONS

Recommendations to Address Loss of Trees and Greenscape

The City Council had no major objections to either of the Planning Commission recommendations in this category.

1. Tree retention in subdivisions

Amend code to require 30 percent retention of significant trees in new subdivisions.

2. Referral to ESI

Refer to the Environmental Stewardship Initiative the issue of tree removal immediately preceding or following redevelopment.

Recommendations to Address Loss of Light and Privacy due to Incompatible Size and Scale

1. Development standards over FAR threshold

Council raised two types of issues: whether this is the best approach compared to other options, and whether it acknowledges the unique dilemma of houses already impacted by redevelopment.

Options for addressing Council’s request for additional options, including options for addressing height concerns; responses to Council request for additional data

a. Original Commission recommendation:

For single family homes in existing neighborhoods, require the following when gross Floor Area Ratio exceeds 0.5:

- Minimum side setbacks of 7.5 feet on both sides; AND
- EITHER daylight plane standards (roof pitch of 45 degrees beginning 10 feet above grade at property line), OR second-story setbacks on both sides.

Apply above rules to new single family homes in existing neighborhoods (teardowns and vacant lots), new short plats, and existing single family homes adding more than 20 percent of gross floor area. Exempt single family lots in new neighborhoods where the character of the neighborhoods is just being established.

b. Modified Option a, incorporating height as threshold factor

For single family homes in existing neighborhoods, require the following when gross Floor Area Ratio exceeds 0.5 or when any structures, including new homes, remodels or additions, exceed two stories:

- Minimum side setbacks of 7.5 feet on both sides; AND
- EITHER daylight plane standards (roof pitch of 45 degrees beginning 10 feet above grade at property line), OR second-story setbacks on both sides.

Apply above rules to new single family homes in existing neighborhoods (tear-downs and vacant lots), new short plats, and existing single family homes adding more than 20 percent of gross floor area. Exempt single family lots in new neighborhoods where the character of the neighborhoods is just being established.

c. FAR/Incentive approach – establish single family FAR of 0.5; allow new construction to exceed .5 – up to a maximum FAR of .6 – if they have minimum 7.5’ setbacks and employ either daylight plane or second story setbacks

Note: The above approach imposes FAR restrictions on all new homes regardless of whether they are in a position to affect neighbors’ light and privacy.

d. Height limit approaches –

d-1 Establish maximum height of 35’ to the roof peak

d-2 Establish maximum height of 30’ to the roof peak or 25’ to the midpoint of a pitched roof.

d-3 Prohibit 3-story buildings in single family residential zones.

Note: The above height limit approaches would create significant non-conformities. However, any could be blended into the threshold formula of option “a.”

e. Contextual FAR – Buildings conform to an average of the dimensions of surrounding buildings

Note: Contextual FAR is a solution to neighborhood character disparities. However, it does not address the key issues of sunlight and privacy.

f. No action

Note: The Commission’s recommendation (option a) is most narrowly focused on the actual problems of sunlight loss and privacy invasion, and it is the most successful in avoiding over-regulation. Adding structures over two stories into the group of affected homes (option b) addresses the most extreme instances of building height that are incompatible with surrounding homes. This is the option recommended by staff.

Options for addressing Council's direction to include an exemption or "off-ramp" for the "last house on the block" – the house already impacted by adjacent redevelopment projects.

a. Single family design review / contextual review

Note: This option not only addresses the issue of context; but also it is a certain way to identify every single building project that should be covered by regulations. This approach would have significant impacts on staff, clients, and project timelines. Because of its discretionary nature, it would require a Process Two decision with public involvement.

b. Variance – This administrative Process Two approval could be used to address exceptional cases. Public notice and comment periods would be required.

c. Conditional Use – This Process One approach would require Hearing Examiner review and decision on each case.

d. Performance standard approach – Establish two categories that need not comply: (1) those who can demonstrate that their building does not encroach on neighbor's daylight plane; and (2) those who can demonstrate that their neighbor(s) has already encroached on their daylight plane.

Note: Staff recommends option d. It will require applicants to provide survey data/elevations of neighboring homes.

2. Guest cottages

Council requested additional information on dimensions of the problem, and questioned the need to address setbacks separately from other size and scale issues to be considered as part of the upcoming Innovative Housing Study.

Option a – Commission recommendation:

Amend the City Code to require setbacks for guest cottages of 20 feet from all property lines. Also, refer to the Innovative Housing Initiative proposed proportional requirements for guest cottages and other structures.

Option b – Refer to Innovative Housing Study:

The setback issue occurs infrequently but causes significant concern when it does occur. The proportion issue is of far greater concern to both staff and residents. The Council is correct that both issues – setbacks and size/proportion – can be addressed as part of the Innovative Housing Initiative discussion dealing with accessory structures.

Note: Staff's recommendation is option b.

3. Lot assembly

The Council took no exception to the Planning Commission recommendation on lot assembly:

Commission recommendation: Take no action; practice is rare in Bellevue and public interest is low.

Recommendations to Address Construction Impacts

1. Remodeling construction hours

Council member questioned whether this addresses public issues with remodels and additions, but Council had no objections to the Planning Commission recommendation.

Commission recommendation: Revise hours for remodels and additions: 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. weekdays, and 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. Saturdays and Sundays.

2. Mechanical equipment placement

Council member questioned applicability to corner lots, but Council took no exception to the Planning Commission recommendation.

Commission recommendation: Require new single family homes and homes adding more than 1,000 square feet to locate HVAC in the back yard or, if HVAC units are located in the side yard, require sound screening and prohibit placement within the minimum required side setback.

3. Maintenance of vacant houses, abandoned construction sites

Commission: Establish property maintenance standards specifically applicable to abandoned building sites and vacated houses; enforce on a complaint basis.

Council: No major objections voiced

4. Referral to Innovative Housing Initiative – PUD issues

The Council requested information concerning the timing of the Innovative Housing Study, but took no exception to the Planning Commission recommendation.

Commission recommendation: Refer to Innovative Housing Initiative consideration of code or procedural changes that address community concerns about reduced setbacks and other Planned Unit Development characteristics that may be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood.

5. Building permit lifespan

Council requested options for this item, including reduction of permit lifespan and significant renewal fees. In addition, Council requested information on the magnitude of the problem.

a. Commission recommendation:

Take no action on building permit length. As an alternative, continue to address the negative impacts of construction activity (noise, debris, etc.) through existing regulations.

b. Reduce permit length and establish significant fee for renewal.

Clearly communicate renewal conditions to customers at issuance (and first inspection).

b-1 *Reduce permit length to one year; at first one-year extension, calculate fee based on value of remaining work. Charge 50% of that fee for first extension and the remaining 50% for a second one-year extension.*

b-2 *Reduce permit length to 18 months; charge fee for one-year renewal based on value of remaining work.*

b-3 *Reduce permit length to two years; charge fee for one-year renewal based on value of remaining work.*

- c. Require higher standard of completion before allowing new home occupancy. (This could be combined with above options.)

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Discuss and modify, as appropriate, the Planning Commission's initial Phase Two Neighborhood Character recommendations in light of City Council comments and direction.
2. Submit revised recommendations to the City Council. (Staff recommendations and preferred options are noted throughout the previous discussion.)

ATTACHMENTS

- A Planning Commission Recommendations for Neighborhood Character Phase Two (Attachment A to City Council Study Session Memorandum of July 14, 2008)

Neighborhood Livability Action Agenda – Planning Commission Recommendations for Neighborhood Character Phase Two

INTRODUCTION

The Planning Commission has been engaged since April 2007 in a lively public discussion of neighborhood infill and redevelopment impacts. In June of 2007, the Commission presented its initial recommendations for addressing citizen concerns about the negative impacts of redevelopment on the character and livability of existing neighborhoods. Some of those recommendations – identified by the City Council as relatively straightforward and easy to implement – were written into the City Code and adopted by the Council in December. Other recommendations, involving more complex changes, were referred back to the Planning Commission for additional study and refinement.

The Commission has concluded its discussion of this second phase of potential changes to address three major impacts of redevelopment: (1) loss of trees and greenscape; (2) loss of light and privacy due to incompatible size and scale of new homes on redeveloped lots; and (3) impacts of construction activity.

THEMES AND PRINCIPLES

Staff and Planning Commission identified key themes and principles to guide discussion and decision making in Phase One. These principles continue as appropriate and necessary guidelines to ensure that Phase Two decisions are:

1. *Balanced* – The best solutions balance the legitimate interests of stakeholders, respecting the rights of owners to utilize their property while addressing the needs of surrounding property owners for relief from certain negative impacts of redevelopment.
2. *Targeted* – The City recognizes the significant benefits of neighborhood investment. Bellevue solutions encourage graceful neighborhood transitions; they are not a broad assault on redevelopment, but a thoughtful and focused set of tools to address specific harmful effects, including:
 - a. *Loss of trees and greenscape*
 - b. *Loss of sunlight, privacy and territorial views due to structure size and scale*
 - c. *Construction impacts (noise, dirt, traffic, neglected structures).*
3. *Flexible* – Effective solutions acknowledge special circumstances and conditions, and provide alternatives and work-arounds to accommodate the reasonable use of property.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Based on the above principles, and on the need to limit impacts on City and private resources, the following criteria were applied in the evaluation of potential solutions.

1. Is this tool focused on one of the specific impacts identified by the community and verified by the City as harmful to neighborhood character?
2. Is this tool the least intrusive solution that can be used to address the problem effectively?
3. Can this tool be applied fairly; does it provide for reasonable alternatives when merited by special conditions and circumstances?
4. Does this tool have no, or few manageable, negative impacts or consequences?
5. Can this tool be implemented in a way that keeps City staffing impacts and bureaucracy to a minimum?

Planning Commission Recommendations: Loss of Trees and Greenscape

Intervention goals:

- Preserve green character of Bellevue neighborhoods.
- Prevent unnecessary loss of trees in neighborhoods that value trees as part of community character and identity.

1. ACTION TO PRESERVE TREES IN NEIGHBORHOODS

Amend code to require 30 percent retention of significant trees in new subdivisions.

2. **REFER to the Environmental Stewardship Initiative** – the issue of tree removal immediately preceding or following redevelopment. It is recommended that the City consider any steps to address actions that are counter to the intent of Phase One tree protection code changes (e.g., limitations on tree cutting on private lots prior to and following redevelopment) within the broader context of the Environmental Stewardship Initiative.

Discussion:

The City Council has decided that any broad public discussion of citywide tree preservation should take place in the context of the Environmental Stewardship Initiative. Concerns about greenscape loss, and about tree loss due to redevelopment, were addressed in Phase One with the decision to require 50 percent greenscape in front setbacks and 30 percent tree retention in cases of redevelopment. A remaining issue for Phase Two is the tree retention requirement for infill development. To avoid public confusion and to fulfill the original intent of the Neighborhood Character work, the Commission recommends that the current 15 percent tree retention requirement for subdivisions be increased to be consistent with the 30 percent retention requirement for redeveloped lots.

Planning Commission Recommendations: Loss of Light and Privacy due to Incompatible Size and Scale

Intervention goals:

- Encourage graceful transitions in neighborhoods.
- Address the major negative impacts of out-of-scale development – loss of sunlight and privacy.

1. ACTION TO PROTECT PRIVACY AND ACCESS TO SUNLIGHT

Calculate gross Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for new single family homes in existing neighborhoods. For projects exceeding the FAR threshold of 0.5, establish the following additional requirements:

- a. Establish minimum setbacks of 7.5 feet on both sides; AND,**
- b. Incorporate EITHER daylight plane standards (roof pitch of 45 degrees beginning 10 feet above grade),) OR second story step-back, with step-backs occurring on both sides).**
- c. Apply the above rules to new single family homes in existing neighborhoods (teardowns and vacant lots), new short plats, and existing single family homes adding more than 20 percent of gross floor area. Provide exemption for single lots in new neighborhoods where the character of the neighborhoods is just being established.**

Discussion:

Aside from addressing certain height issues, Phase One left size and scale issues to be considered in Phase Two. The Planning Commission identified several approaches of interest, and staff pursued all of these approaches in various ways:

- By meeting with staff of various cities and discussing at length their experience with these methods;
- By visiting neighborhoods inside and outside Bellevue to view first-hand how various approaches work, or don't work, in practice;
- By talking with Bellevue city staff and seeking their opinions on the effectiveness of these methods, the appropriateness for Bellevue, the potential impacts on staff workload, and the degree of clarity for applicants; and
- By talking with residents and groups – including focus groups, neighborhoods, community meeting attendees, and stakeholders – to ascertain their opinions of these methods.

The majority of discussion focused on tools – FAR standards, daylight plane, setbacks, building articulation – to address the impacts of housing bulk. At the conclusion of Phase One, the Planning Commission asked staff to evaluate single family FAR as an option to imposing development standards for homes over a certain size threshold.

Floor Area Ratio vs. Development Standards – Staff found FAR to be the tool that cities most commonly use (in conjunction with lot coverage and height limits) to address bulk of single family homes. In discussing FAR with various groups:

- The majority of focus group members preferred FAR as the simplest and most reasonable method of addressing size and scale issues. In general, residents were supportive.
- Builders and developers are generally opposed to single family FAR, and claim that it would unnecessarily restrict both size and architectural creativity.
- Other cities facing similar issues see FAR as working well, especially when combined with increased setbacks.
- Some Planning Commissioners expressed doubt that single family FAR is an appropriate tool for Bellevue, and staff agrees that FAR fails to address the two major complaints about size and scale; i.e., loss of light and loss of privacy.

Development Standards Based on FAR Threshold – Initially staff looked into the concept of development standards (daylight plane, setbacks, etc.) for homes over a certain square footage. This approach missed the mark because homes on very small lots may fall below the square footage threshold and still – because they are out of scale with the lot – intrude on neighbors’ sunlight and privacy. Commissioner Hal Ferris proposed establishing a gross FAR threshold, above which building projects would have to comply with certain requirements. Staff agreed that this approach addresses the real problems of daylight loss and privacy encroachment, and focuses on the “outlier” situations without placing unnecessary restrictions on every project. Staff proposed and Commissioners agreed that the regulatory changes should focus on the infill that occurs within mature neighborhoods with established character, and not on new neighborhoods establishing a new character (i.e., new full subdivisions).

2. ACTION TO ENSURE SENSITIVE PLACEMENT OF GUEST COTTAGES
Amend City Code to require setbacks for guest cottages of 20 feet from all property lines. Also, refer to the Innovative Housing Initiative – proposed proportional requirements for guest cottages and other accessory structures.

Discussion:

The proposal to establish separate setbacks for guest cottages received broad public support. Stakeholders and Planning Commissioners agreed that it is a logical step to ensure sensitive placement of these buildings. Staff also favors consideration – at a future time – of a proportional requirement for guest cottages and other accessory structures.

3. NO ACTION RECOMMENDED: LOT ASSEMBLY

Discussion:

One of the options studied was the suggestion to limit the ability to combine lots. However, research has shown lot assembly to be a rare practice in Bellevue. The public has shown no interest in pursuing this approach. The Commission recommends no action.

Planning Commission Recommendations: Construction Impacts

Intervention Goals:

- Mitigate the impacts of construction on the surrounding neighborhood.
- Encourage sensitive development practices and establish disincentives for practices that are both avoidable and harmful to neighborhood quality of life.
- Provide neighborhoods with information about development regulations and procedures for resolving construction-related concerns.

1. ACTION TO REVISE REMODELING CONSTRUCTION HOURS

Revise hours for remodels and additions: 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on weekdays, and 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays

Discussion:

An original proposal was to change the definition of remodels, based on citizen concerns that teardowns for all practical purposes – leaving a tiny remnant of the original building – were being classified as additions. However, Building and Land Use staff pointed out that changing the definition – while possible – would accomplish little of benefit to neighborhoods. Focusing on the actual differences between the types of permits involved, the biggest disparity is in construction hours. Currently, new home construction is permitted from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. on weekdays; 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturdays; and not allowed on Sundays and holidays. Construction for remodels and additions is permitted from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. on weekdays, and 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays.

Some relief from construction impacts can be afforded by revising the permitted hours for outdoor construction on additions and remodels. Focus groups and others agreed that a change is in order, but they concurred with Planning Commissioners' wish to maintain the ability of do-it-yourselfers to improve their homes in their spare time. The Commissioners' recommendation proposes a compromise adjustment – changing the ending time for remodels and additions from 10:00 to 8:00 p.m.

2. ACTION TO REDUCE MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT IMPACTS

Require new single family homes and homes adding more than 1,000 square feet to locate HVAC in the back yard or, if HVAC units are located in the side yard, require sound screening and prohibit placement within the five-foot minimum side setback.

Discussion:

The proposal to establish separate setback requirements for mechanical equipment generated a tepid public response. Residents were generally in favor as long as the regulation is applied *only to new* single family homes. On the other hand, strong support came from:

- Code Compliance staff – Even though the number of HVAC noise complaints is relatively small (six in 2007), staff believes that preventing this very contentious situation is better than trying to fix it later.
- Industry professionals – Experts on HVAC agree that units should be placed in back yards. To quote one of these experts, “the worst placement for an a/c unit is between two houses” because noise reflects off the walls and actually bounces back and forth. Options to back yard placement include insulated jackets, sound barrier fencing, and sound curtains.

Some staff have pointed out that HVAC complaints are currently addressed through the Noise Ordinance. However, research has shown that most HVAC units are not able to meet code requirements. (Residentially generated noise cannot exceed 55 db at the property line.) A realistic answer is to place units away from neighboring properties, or use screening materials to reduce noise to legal levels.

3. ACTION TO LIMIT IMPACTS OF VACANT OR ABANDONED HOMES AND CONSTRUCTION SITES

Establish property maintenance standards specifically applicable to abandoned building sites and vacated houses; enforce on a complaint basis.

Discussion:

This issue was raised in response to concerns about an abandoned single family construction site. Neither residents nor Planning Commissioners strongly identified with the problem – in part because the recent housing market has minimized such possibilities. However, the situation – when it does occur – is a burden on the entire neighborhood.

At the same time, many residents testified that they are far more concerned with previously occupied houses that are left vacant and become both eyesores and attractive nuisances.

With regard to both abandoned construction sites and vacated homes, the City is currently able to address code/safety violations, but has no way to address aesthetic concerns. The City has no abatement fund, should the City wish to pursue abatement proceedings as a remedy. Requiring a bond for project completion would be technically possible, but the addition to bureaucracy would have to be weighed against the infrequency of cases.

Commissioners and staff support a direct approach to addressing the aesthetic affront to the neighborhood that is created by both situations – abandoned construction sites and neglected, vacant homes.

4. REFER to the Innovative Housing Initiative – Consideration of code or procedural changes that address community concerns about reduced setbacks and other Planned Unit Development characteristics that may be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood.

Discussion:

Phase One generated concerns about certain characteristics of Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and Conservation Plats. Again in Phase Two discussions, residents have complained increasingly that PUDs within or adjacent to existing single

family developments often disrupt or compromise the character of the original neighborhood. The Planning Commission expressed interest in exploring these concerns, but decided that inquiry should be pursued separately from Phase Two.

5. NO ACTION RECOMMENDED: BUILDING PERMIT LIFESPAN

As an alternative, continue to address the negative impacts of construction activity (e.g., noise, debris, etc.)

Discussion:

A proposal to shorten the lifespan of building permits was made to City Council by a citizen frustrated by the longevity of a building project in his neighborhood. In Bellevue, all types of building permits are issued for a period of three years – longer than the effectiveness period for permits in most other cities. However, all cities provide for renewal of expiring permits. So limiting the initial effectiveness period would have no effect. Further, staff found that nearly all residential projects in Bellevue are completed within one year of the permit being granted.

6. PROCEDURAL IMPROVEMENT

Publish Guidelines for Reasonable Development

Discussion:

To facilitate communication and positive relationships between residents and representatives of the development community, Land Use and Outreach staff will collaborate on a publication that outlines required and suggested practices for developments in single family neighborhoods.