



City of Bellevue

Meydenbauer Bay: Park and Land Use Plan

Steering Committee Meeting #10

MEETING SUMMARY

DATE: January 17, 2008

TIME: 5:00 PM

LOCATION: Bellevue City Hall

ATTENDEES:

Steering Committee

Doug Leigh
Iris Tocher
Kevin Paulich
Bob MacMillan
Hal Ferris
Merle Keeney
Betina Finley
Rich Wagner
David Schooler
Al Yuen
Marcelle Lynde
Stefanie Beighle

City Staff and Consultants

Patrick Foran, City of Bellevue
Matt Terry, City of Bellevue
Robin Cole, City of Bellevue
Mike Bergstrom, City of Bellevue
Lori Gromala, City of Bellevue
Andrew Kidde, City of Bellevue
Jim Jacobs, Sasaki
Kirsten Hauge, PRR

SUMMARY:

I. Welcome and review of the agenda

Doug Leigh, Steering Committee co-chair, opened the tenth meeting of the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan Steering Committee. He reviewed the meeting agenda and asked those in the public audience to sign-in and indicate whether they wished to provide comment.

II. Review and approval of December 20, 2007 Meeting Summary

Doug asked if Steering Committee members would like to make changes to the summary from the December 20th Steering Committee meeting. No changes were requested and the meeting summary was approved.

III. Land use alternative review and consensus

Mike Bergstrom, Planning and Community Development Project Manager, said the meeting objectives included reaching consensus on the preliminary preferred land use alternative and identifying next steps. At the last meeting, the committee's outstanding questions centered on traffic issues as well as incentives for upper block redevelopment. The City of Bellevue's transportation and fire departments evaluated the traffic concerns and their responses are summarized in the meeting packet. Although the reviews are preliminary, the city did not identify any fatal flaws and found the concepts as proposed are workable, with certain fixes. In regard to the upper block incentives, the city looked at what types of incentives have the most promise, given that there was no support expressed for increasing height allowances. Other possibilities could include setbacks or financial incentives, but the team needs to find out how those might work. Mike said that the team would like to focus more intensively on the technical issues over the next few months and following that would meet again with the Steering Committee. At the next meeting, the team would also have a revised schedule prepared that shows how the land use and park planning process will merge.

Jim Jacobs, Sasaki, said that the Steering Committee meeting in December helped the team to understand the potential implications of the land use concept. The only change to the current version of the concept is that the structure on the west side of 100th is labeled as a "potential building" rather than commercial. Jim noted that the group could revisit the issue as the park planning moves forward. He said that the structure, in whatever form it takes, would play a key role in framing the corner at 100th. Before moving on, he asked the committee if they had any questions about the traffic findings.

- Iris Tocher said she found that the key finding from the report is that they could place electronically controlled bollards at 100th that could move up and down for emergency vehicles. In addition, it is important to place overhead wires underground.
- Hal Ferris and David Schooler both said that they didn't believe the committee agreed to keep the building in the concept drawing.
- Rich Wagner asked if there was something driving the placement of the building. He didn't believe it was consistent with the planning principles because it would block the vista. He shared pictures which he took from the proposed building location. *We are looking at the site in terms of an urban design framework as it embraces the portal to the park and the terminus at Main Street. We picture it as a low story, transparent building that is contemporary in nature and serves a public function related to park use. However, we agree that the location needs to be studied further. It is labeled as a potential building and is considered an item we can defer until we get to the park planning.*

Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan Steering Committee
January 17, 2008 Meeting Summary

- Kevin Paulich commented on the parking plans indicated on the concept drawing. He said that the zoning should reflect that the plan is not providing any public/retail parking other than handicapped accessible parking. Other public parking should be provided at the southeast corner of Downtown Park. He disagreed with providing public parking within the park. *The parking is an open issue that the committee can revisit. It can be resolved through several options or a combination of options.*
- David Schooler asked about the anticipated level of service (LOS) at 101st and Main. We were asked to take a look at the effects of closing the south leg of 100th at Main Street. We modeled different traffic scenarios, including adding a three-way stop at 101st and Main where it is currently difficult to make left turns across Main Street traffic. We also replaced (in the model) the existing signal at 102nd and Main with an all-way stop. We found that, depending on different scenarios, resulting LOS would be in the A to C range.
- David commented that the information was helpful, but the committee should also consider access for service vehicles in addition to emergency vehicles. *Typically if you provide enough access for emergency vehicles, it is also enough for service vehicles. We will look at maneuvering room for a variety of vehicles when we move to the park planning piece, as well as the types of vehicles allowed.* David added that he was in favor of closing 100th, but wanted to make sure private access needs are met. Iris agreed.
- Kevin asked to reopen the discussion of parking, given that the committee could have the opportunity to change the parking codes. He wanted to know how much parking the concept included for retail and residential. He wanted to reduce or eliminate retail parking and have only parking for residential. After some discussion, he recommended changing the code to no minimum requirements for parking and setting a cap on the maximum parking allowed.
- David asked about providing off site parking for retail.
- Al stated that parking within 3 blocks for retail will not work for the type of shops he anticipates would locate in the concept area.
- Hal said that developers usually provide more than the code minimum. *The code provides a minimum and maximum for downtown, but elsewhere only a minimum.*
- Betina Finley said it is important not to discriminate against people with kids living outside the park area who could only access the park by driving.
- Doug Leigh said another important component is providing access through transit or other options.
- Iris Tocher commented that they should strive to provide a balance between making the park a pedestrian experience and ensuring access for all. She pointed out that transit doesn't satisfy all family needs, due to strollers, bags and picnic baskets and so forth.
- Hal Ferris said it seemed as if they should continue to look at the parking issue and whether requirements should be relaxed.
- Bob MacMillan referred back to the transportation issue at 100th and suggested that the city try testing the scenario to ensure it is a viable solution. He stated that he is encouraged by the potential for traffic calming.

Jim Jacobs said given the comments from the Steering Committee, he planned to revise the land use concept and put together a document of findings. He hoped to reach general consensus on

DRAFT – NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY STEERING COMMITTEE

areas of agreement related to land use as well as on the other items to defer until later. The Steering Committee then discussed allowing retail use within the park parcel and agreed that they didn't want to see it excluded, but didn't want to mandate it on the site. Jim then raised the question of whether the city should explore creating incentives to get better development on the upper block parcel.

- Iris Tocher said she was supportive of looking at incentives as long as it is consistent with the streetscape.
- Doug stated he supported reducing the setback requirements
- Hal Ferris said it is critical to knit the whole area together as if it is part of the larger park. He expressed interest in looking at density incentives, though not increasing height, and ways to encourage good design and public benefit.
- Iris said it seemed as if they were looking at a park district.
- Kevin agreed, but encouraged the City Council to reconsider just using market incentives and instead look at the possibility of exercising eminent domain.
- David Schooler said he liked the idea of creating a bonus system for the street edge and asked staff to come up with a few ideas.
- Hal was also interested in a list of incentives, but was not supportive of tax deferrals for modest public benefit.
- Hal indicated that parking should not be reduced in the upper block.
- Rich commented that in residential parking should not be planned for one space to one unit, because it results in on street parking. He asked if the reduced set backs would eliminate existing on street parking in the upper block.
- Doug recommended a 2 hour limit which is used in the West Bellevue neighborhood.

The group then discussed parking requirements within the upper block and believed it was not a significant enough issue to change current regulations.

- Stefanie Beighle wanted to understand what the impacts of reduced setbacks would do to the streetscape. She wanted to address the possibility during the next round of planning.
- Iris said that perhaps an aggregation of incentives is needed.
- Hal noted that if someone had chance to buy a couple of lots and could get a larger area through reduced setbacks, they would have a greater development opportunity.

Jim then turned the committee's attention to a draft list of consensus concepts and deferred issues. The team prepared the list given the committee's input to date. He asked if they had missed anything on the list and if everything was characterized appropriately.

- David Schooler asked to delete "consider/investigate economic incentives" from the upper block concept.
- Iris asked to clarify the reference to coordinating redevelopment for the area south of Main.
- Betina agreed and suggested using stronger language.
- Doug recommended using the term "facilitate" rather than "coordinate".

- David said it the language should make clear that increasing allowable lot coverage would occur only if there is public benefit.
- Merle wanted to ensure that fire and service vehicles could get through 100th.
- Stefanie recommended clarifying the third bullet under South of Main to allowing southerly expansion of retail uses east of 100th.
- Merle added that he would prefer not to see the potential building on the land use concept so there is no misinterpretation that it is endorsed by the committee. *We will address this by changing it to either a dashed line or circle on the drawing.*
- Kevin said he could not support expansion of retail uses without minimum and maximum parking space requirements. He believed retail use expansion had to be linked to limiting parking.
- Marcelle Lynde was interested in the opportunity to change the parking so it is not required on site, but within a certain distance of the site. *Although parking is provided underneath Downtown Park, it cannot adequately serve both parks. Our strategy was to provide more satellite parking as a way to disperse vehicles and congestion.*
- Al Yuen said given that the site would only have small specialty shops and not a shopping mall, maybe only 10 stalls of additional parking would be needed.
- Rich said he would not eliminate the minimum and suggested leaving the issue on the table for now.
- Bob MacMillan concurred and said he didn't want to make it any more difficult for a retailer to survive.
- Kevin said it was the developer's choice, he could use the maximum.
- Iris commented that transitions take time and trying to force change too quickly can create a backlash. The challenge is to plan ahead for it and encourage change. She reiterated that we want to encourage retail.
- Kevin confirmed his original position and stated that he wanted his position concerning parking on the record..
- Hal said to change the fourth bullet regarding density under South of Main in order to register density in terms of bulk, not units.

Mike Bergstrom then asked to confirm the list of deferred issues with the committee. Although it is not an exhaustive list, he wanted to capture the scope of topics that the group would cover as part of the next phase. The committee did not request any additions to the list.

IV. Public Comment

Doug Leigh then invited public audience members to provide comment.

- Aaron Dichter: I appreciate that the drawing for Alternative 1 finally shows the entrance to our building (1000 Meydenbauer Way). The conceptual drawings ignore this feature. I am concerned about cutting off the entrance to my home and maintaining access for service vehicles, the fire department and guests.
- Anita Neil: I'm happy that people are speaking up about parking and retail uses. I think it is less likely that we will see shops and retail, instead we're going to see restaurants and

food services. Restaurants have a parking requirement of 10 to 20 stalls per 1,000 square feet compared to 4 or 5 stalls per 1,000 square feet for other types of retail. Restaurants will have more traffic and parking. Kevin Paulich raises a very valid point about parking when he says that perhaps any retail should not have a parking component. I seriously think somebody will think the smartest use to put here is a restaurant. Regarding any technical studies to be done, can we have them posted on the web?

- Ellie Austin: I represent those who would like to see a rowing facility at the park. I would like to know when planning will begin to finalize the park plans. I would like to see rowing considered as part of day use at the moorage facility. I also invite the committee to see a rowing practice at our current facility.
- Pamela Ebsworth: I also appreciate the indication of the front entrance to our building on Alternative 1. Thanks for Kevin's comments on parking. We also need to ensure service vehicles can get through—it is a small area and very congested. I would like to see the data on the traffic studies. Tonight was a great meeting that brought up the practical considerations related to the implementation of the plan. Thanks to Doug and Kevin for their environmental concerns.
- Kathleen Hodge: I've lived at the Astoria for seven years. I would like to see the views improved by moving telephone poles and wires underground from 100th to the bridge. I'm also interested in the timing of the underground parking in Downtown Park and am concerned about eliminating access through 100th. I can't agree with the study that traffic has not increased. Typically I have to go around using Main and Meydenbauer Way to go north. In three years, there will be 510 more residents on Main Street due to the development of the Essex and other pending development. I love Bob's idea to put in two flashing lights and a four way stop.
- Scott Hannah: I represent the Meydenbauer Yacht Club. We agree that Meydenbauer Way can be a problem. Someone talked about enclaves for pedestrians. In the past Mary Pat Burns worked on a project to set up historical markers, with the first one at the base of 100th. As far as the deferred issues, I wondered how long they will be deferred. We have a deep concern about bay management and water quality issues, so I hope this will not be deferred for too long. A lot of these issues require coordination with the federal government. We want to work closely with property owners and the city to talk about this problem. Scott offered the Yacht Club facility for a community meeting about water quality.
- Terry Greve: According to the memo from the traffic division, it appears that there is a minor inconvenience to residents south of Main. However, there is a problem right now. I like the plan, but the devil is in the details. I suggest a more comprehensive traffic planning element that should factor into the final decision.
- Aaron Laing: I represent the property owner at 9901 Lake Washington Boulevard. I like how the whole process has evolved since last March. It is nice that things have shifted looking at incentives. First of all, when looking at the upper block and vicinity, all buildings currently have non-conforming uses, so incentives are a good route in order to encourage public/private trade-offs. I'm happy to see how the plan is developing. Focus on making the park a positive amenity to the community.

- Donald OHara: As a boat owner, I would like to have the chance to go to restaurants when I boat to Meydenbauer Bay. People need to understand the phasing aspect of this project. The site is relatively small with challenging topography. I don't know why a road couldn't provide a secondary access point. Provide aggressive, not passive communication, about the project so people know what is going on. Don't use eminent domain—the project wouldn't qualify. Think about a case by case analysis of transportation needs for each business. I would like to be able to place a reservation for a slip in the marina—think about float rings. Recreation activities have to show on every drawing.

V. Direction to Staff

Doug Leigh thanked those providing comment. He confirmed committee approval of the schedule proposed by staff, with the next meeting proposed for April. Doug asked staff to ensure that the project web page is updated in the interim and to think about a strategy for providing the results of the technical reports.

Hal Ferris noted he was concerned about keeping momentum during the two-month hiatus. Mike Bergstrom and Robin Cole responded that it was an opportunity for staff to take the time to appropriately scope out the next steps. Staff would also provide committee members with updates and keep them looped in by efficient means so that they are ready to go when regular meetings are planned again. Iris Tocher said she was pleased that a definitive process will be scoped out for committee review by the next meeting.

VI. Adjourn

Robin said they would provide members with the next meeting time at a later date. It was noted that the next meeting should avoid the Bellevue Public Schools spring break during the week of April 7th. The meeting was then adjourned.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Investigate access for service vehicles at 100th (Project team)
- Revise preliminary preferred land use concept (Project team)
- Identify process for registering minority opinion on land use concept (City)
- Conduct technical studies (Project team)
- Update the web page with technical studies (City)
- Update the project and committee meeting schedule (City)

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS (who signed in):

- Mark Williams
- Pamela Ebsworth
- Dick Morris
- Kathleen Hodge
- Russ Blair
- Ron Kinoshita
- Scott Hannah
- D.R. O'Hara
- Ed Sweo
- Greg Itkin
- Marina Itkin
- R.L. Broz

Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan Steering Committee
January 17, 2008 Meeting Summary

- Stuart Kolodner
- Aaron Dichter
- Jean Chase
- Terry Bulfin
- Ray Waldmann
- Rondi Egenes
- David Keyser
- Anita Skoog Neil
- Anil Butail
- Linda Osborn
- Howard Henry
- Ellie Austin
- Shikha Chauham
- Terry Greve
- Peter Littlewood
- Dennis Vrabel
- Aaron Laing

DRAFT