Bellevue Planning Commission

Wednesday, April 9, 2014
6:30 to 10:00 p.m. ▪ Conference Room 1E-108 – *note room change*
Bellevue City Hall ▪ 450 110th Ave. NE ▪ Bellevue, WA 98004

Agenda

6:30 p.m.	1.	**Call to Order** *Diane Tebelius, Chairperson*	
	2.	**Roll Call**	
	3.	**Public Comment*** *Limited to 5 minutes per person or 3 minutes if a public hearing has been held on your topic*	
	4.	**Approval of Agenda**	
	5.	**Communications from City Council, Community Council, Boards and Commissions**	
	6.	**Committee Reports** *Commissioners Laing and Ferris – Downtown Livability*	
	7.	**Staff Reports** *Paul Inghram, Comprehensive Planning Manager*	
6:45 p.m.	8.	**Study Session** **A. Comprehensive Plan Update – *Land Use and Housing policy reviews*** *Paul Inghram and Janet Lewine, PCD*	Pg. 3
9:30 p.m.	9.	**Other Business**	
	10.	**Public Comment*** - *Limited to 3 minutes per person*	
	11.	**Draft Minutes Review** • February 26, 2014	
	12.	**Next Planning Commission Meeting – April 23** • Single family room rentals code amendment • Introduction of Land Use Code Amendments • Eastgate/I-90 corridor plan	
9:45 p.m.	13.	**Adjourn**	

Agenda times are approximate

Planning Commission members

Diane Tebelius, Chair
Aaron Laing, Vice Chair
Hal Ferris
John Carlson
Jay Hamlin
Michelle Hilhorst
John deVados

John Stokes, Council Liaison

Staff contact:

Paul Inghram 452-4070
Michelle Luce 452-6931

** 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).

City of Bellevue

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 04, 2014

TO: Chair Tebelius and Members of the Planning Commission

FROM: Paul Inghram, AICP, Comprehensive Planning Manager
pinghram@bellevuewa.gov, 425-452-4070
Janet Lewine, AICP, Associate Planner
jlewine@bellevuewa.gov, 425 452-4884
Planning and Community Development
Arthur Sullivan, ARCH Program Manager
asullivan@bellevuewa.gov, 425 861-3677
Planning and Community Development

SUBJECT: 2014 Comprehensive Plan Update – Land Use and Housing Element Draft Policy Updates

The April 9, 2014, study session will continue review of the Bellevue Comprehensive Plan as part of the city's major Comprehensive Plan update. Following a series of previous meetings reviewing information about how the city has changed over the last ten years and forecasts for future growth, this study session will be an opportunity to review the development of draft policy updates for the Land Use and Housing sections (or elements) of the Comprehensive Plan.

No formal action is requested at this study session. The Commission is encouraged to review the enclosed discussion papers and draft policy tables. The discussion papers provide information about the changes suggested in the policy tables and include references to the table lines or policy numbers. Comments on the draft policies at this stage will help staff prepare complete draft chapters and ultimately a full draft Comprehensive Plan for the Commission's later review.

At this stage of the update process, the city's boards and commissions are reviewing potential policy updates to the Comprehensive Plan. Early in the process, the city conducted a number of community engagement activities (summary are posted online) and boards and commissions reviewed background information including how the city has changed, demographic information about the community, future growth projections, and information about economic conditions, and other information. The boards and commissions have shifted to reviewing the existing policies of the Comprehensive Plan sections (or elements) to provide staff guidance as the city prepares a draft update of the plan. At the previous study session, the Planning Commission provided feedback on the Economic Development Element policies. The Commission has also directed an approach to updating the Community Vision statement, which will be developed over the upcoming weeks. Meanwhile, the Environmental Services Commission reviewed the Utilities Element policies and the Human Services Commission reviewed the Human Services Element policies. The Parks and Community Services Board and Transportation Commission are in the process of review policies related to parks and transportation, respectively.

NEXT STEPS

Review of draft policy tables is scheduled to continue at the May 12 Planning Commission meeting. Following review of each of the policy sections, staff will develop a complete draft update of the Comprehensive Plan for the Planning Commission's review.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Land Use Element Discussion Paper
2. Land Use Element Policy Table
3. Housing Element Discussion Paper
4. Housing Element Policy Table

Copies of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Housing Elements were previously distributed to the Planning Commission. They are also available online:
http://www.ci.bellevue.wa.us/comprehensive_plan.htm

Additional background information:

1. 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs): http://www.kingcounty.gov/property/permits/codes/growth/GMPC/CPPs.aspx
2. Employment and housing growth information (9-25-2013 Planning Commission agenda materials and presentation)
3. East King County Housing Analysis (3-13-2013 Planning Commission agenda materials)
4. Appendix to East King County Housing Analysis (3-13-2013 Planning Commission agenda materials)
5. Human Services Needs Update and Consolidated Plan (City of Bellevue Human Services Division webpage: http://www.cityofbellevue.org/human_services.htm)
6. King County rapid re-housing pilot program to help homeless families (King County news release: http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/news/release/2013/December/RapidRehousing.aspx)
7. The Ten Year Plan and East King County Plan to End Homelessness (Committee to End Homelessness King County webpage: http://www.cehkc.org/)

LAND USE ELEMENT DISCUSSION PAPER

One of the fundamental parts of the Comprehensive Plan is to anticipate, guide, and plan for future growth. The Comprehensive Plan is a tool that allows the city to look ahead to the growth that is likely to occur and ensure that the city's plans for zoning, infrastructure, and services are aligned. The Land Use Element helps ensure that an appropriate mix of land uses are available to support the city's economic goals, provide services to residents, and provide an array of choices for where to live. The Land Use Element helps protect sensitive uses and the character of established neighborhoods, while allowing the city to change and evolve over time to meet the needs of its citizens.

The Land Use Element is the primary home for the city's policy on directing and managing growth. It is a mandatory element of the Comprehensive Plan under the state Growth Management Act (GMA) and responds specifically to two of the GMA goals:

> *"Urban growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.*
> *Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development."*

The Land Use Element sets expectations for future job and housing growth and it provides a framework for other parts of the plan. City plans for transportation, parks, utilities, and other services are designed to be consistent with the growth identified in the Land Use Element. In addition to the role of framing the city's overall strategy and creating connections with other parts of the plan, the current Land Use Element includes the following sections:

Land Use Section	**Description**
Growth Management Policies LU 2-6	This section recognizes the Growth Management Act, adopted job and housing growth targets and the need for zoning and sufficient densities to meet the targets.
Land Use Compatibility Policies LU 7-11	This section provides the policy framework for maintaining separation between incompatible land uses.
Other Citywide Policies Policies LU 12-18	This section includes a range policies that address other land use issues, including supporting redevelopment, distribution of parks, preserving open space, access to childcare, and land use patterns that promoting walking.
Residential/Neighborhood Policies LU 19-27	This section provides policies about maintaining and improving residential neighborhoods, including protecting their character and enhancing services and connections, and supporting mixed-use development where it is compatible in commercial districts. A key part of this section is policy direction regarding the revitalization of neighborhood

	shopping centers.
Commercial and Mixed Use Areas Policies LU-28-37	This section provides direction for the city's commercial areas. It recognizes Downtown as a designated Urban Center, the hub of the Eastside and as the primary local center for surrounding neighborhoods. The section also addresses other commercial areas and the desired direction for commercial, office and industrial lands.
Subareas	The current plan includes a short discussion about the Subarea Plans included in Volume 2 of the Comprehensive Plan, but no policies.

Land Use Recommendations, Opportunities and Gaps

At the September 25, 2013, meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed the anticipated housing and job growth levels anticipated for the next two decades and the pattern growth is expected to take in Bellevue. The Puget Sound Regional Council projects that over the forty-year period from 2000 to 2040 the region will grow by more than 1.7 million people and that the economy will generate more than 1.1 million additional jobs. Within this regional context, King County and its cities work cooperatively to allocate the state forecast for King County to individual cities and unincorporated areas in the form of housing and employment "targets." These targets, which were most recently updated in 2010, identify anticipated housing and job growth for a 25-year period. During the target setting process, the Bellevue City Council and staff representatives worked with their regional counterparts to align the growth targets for Bellevue with the City's expectations for development activity and economic growth, including plans for Downtown Bellevue and BelRed. In May 2010, the Bellevue City Council ratified growth targets for the 2006-2031 period (Resolution 8088).

2006-2031 Targets	
Housing	Jobs
17,000	53,000

As discussed at the September meeting, about half of future housing and job growth is planned for Downtown Bellevue and the vast majority of the remaining growth is planned to occur in other mixed use centers, including BelRed, Eastgate and Wilburton. A small amount of growth is anticipated to occur in other areas spread throughout the city through natural redevelopment and infill that would be allowed under the current zoning.

The Commission continued its review of the Land Use Element on November 7, 2013, where the Commission discussed the city's growth strategy, coordination with the ongoing Downtown Livability project, and the need to retain the character of existing residential neighborhoods.

Recognizing that the city includes a wide range of land uses and development intensities that the plan must address, it may be helpful to think of a framework of land use categories.

Downtown	Downtown is a designated regional growth center that serves as a major destination for the Eastside and regionally. It has a number of important functions, including being a regional retail destination, employment center, a center for arts, culture and civic services, a multi-modal transportation hub, and a residential neighborhood. Downtown is shaped by the tallest, most intense forms for development in the city.
Mixed Use Centers	Several areas in Bellevue, including locations in BelRed, Eastgate, and Wilburton are transitioning from general commercial areas to local centers that serve the broader community with a mix of jobs and housing. These centers are served by a range of transportation options and include a mix of building types and intensities.
Neighborhood Commercial Centers	These areas provide for shops, stores and services that serve the surrounding neighborhood and may act as community gathering places. Typically, the buildings in neighborhood centers are at a scale and intensity that is context appropriate.
Other Commercial Areas	Other commercial areas include general commercial and light industrial areas that are not located in centers. These areas may continue to be important to provide local commercial services to the community and a diversity of economic opportunities.
Residential Areas	Areas that are predominantly single family and multifamily residential are important parts of the city and make up a number of the city's neighborhoods.

Key Land Use Policy Areas

To address the anticipated growth for Bellevue and to address the key opportunity areas, the topics below are organized by the proposed sections of the Land Use Element and discuss the intended policy direction:

Land Use Strategy

The Land Use Element is the place where the city can clearly explain its strategy for organizing future growth so as to be clear both how and where to support new development and whether and where existing areas should be protected. For many years Bellevue has maintained an approach that rather than allow growth to occur broadly across the city, new development would be focused into key commercial and mixed use centers, principally Downtown. Since the last major update, the city has completed

planning studies for BelRed, Crossroads and Wilburton. In each case the city envisioned how growth, at varying degrees, would help transform and strengthen these centers. Meanwhile the city continues to work to preserve the character of established residential neighborhoods and retain natural open space and park areas to retain its image as a "city in a park."

Staff Proposed Response

- Organize the Land Use policies to recognize the mix and range of uses in the city as illustrated in the table above.
- Further clarify and support the land use pattern that focuses the majority of growth in Downtown and in growth centers. (line 3)
- Maintain the health and vitality of existing residential neighborhoods. (line 3)
  - Retain the city's park-like character. (line 4)
  - Include the concept of integrating land use and transportation planning. (line 5)

Growth Management

Related to the Land Use Strategy section, this group of policies addresses the specific requirements of the Growth Management Act and the Countywide Planning Policies that require cities to plan for job and housing growth. In addition to identifying the adopted targets, this section is proposed to support coordination with school siting recognizing that growing areas like Downtown may influence the need for additional public schools.

Staff Proposed Response

- Update policy to reflect the Council's adopted growth targets and be more consistent with the city's most recent review of buildable lands. (line 7, 9)
- Add a new policy that supports working cooperatively with the school district on new school siting. (line 12)

Residential Areas

Bellevue has traditionally sought to protect the character of its established residential areas. Little change may be needed to the existing Land Use policies that support this protection as this remains an important concept and the existing policy appears largely valid. As the update review occurs, we can look at whether modest changes are needed to support how neighborhoods see themselves evolving over the next two decades. These policies serve as a good foundation for ongoing efforts to address issues around Bellevue College.

Staff Proposed Response

- Continue to support maintaining the stability and vitality of residential areas.

Neighborhood Commercial Centers

The community puts a high degree of value on its local neighborhood centers. People enjoy convenient access to restaurants and services. These local centers help define their neighborhoods, can act as community gathering places and give people an option that doesn't require driving across town. Existing policies provide support for maintaining the

health of neighborhood centers. While the Newport Hills Shopping Center is still in focus for revitalizing its retail spaces, the existing policies continue to provide appropriate support for potential city actions.

Staff Proposed Response

- Continue to support neighborhood shopping centers with minimal policy changes. (lines 19-22)

Downtown and Mixed Use Centers

While Downtown is recognized in the existing plan as an Urban Center, it has taken on a large share of growth over the past decade, has increased its profile regionally, and is anticipated to accommodate about half of future growth in the city over the next twenty years. Over the last decade, the role of other areas for employment and housing growth has developed. Several are now seen as places for a range of city growth, including residential opportunities, cultural offerings, and local services. The community has also expressed interest in seeing these areas develop distinct identities within the city that are different from Downtown.

- *BelRed* – In 2009 the city completed a multi-year planning effort that re-envisioned BelRed as a place of new, urban neighborhoods centered on planned light rail stations.
- *Wilburton* – The city completed a plan update in 2007 that addressed the Wilburton commercial area, but left some questions unanswered. It is anticipated that additional planning for the Wilburton commercial/mixed-use area will be necessary in the future.
- *Eastgate* – The ongoing Eastgate/I-90 plan recognizes the area's role as one of the city's major employment areas while also seeking to increase economic opportunities, support in-fill development, provide local services, and create some additional opportunity for residential development.

These neighborhoods will include a broad mix of uses, an array of housing choices, new jobs and restore ecological functions. With a focus on creating livable communities, these other mixed-use centers will provide the city with different economic and housing opportunities from that found Downtown.

Staff Proposed Response

- Provide amendments that are consistent with Downtown Bellevue's current regional role. (line 23)
- Update policies and add new policies that support new mixed use neighborhoods developed in a compact, walkable pattern that are supported by a range of transportation options. (line 26)

Commercial and Light Industrial Areas

While much of the city's growth is anticipated to occur Downtown and in other mixed use centers, other commercial areas continue to provide the community with convenient local services and economic opportunities.

Staff Proposed Response

- Recognize the need for other commercial uses outside of Downtown and other mixed use centers. (line 32)
- In response to the Commission's review of light industrial zoned lands, update policy to support retaining a critical supply of light industrial land in the Richards Valley area for local needs. (line 33)

Land Use Compatibility

This section of policies has helped guide the development of neighboring land uses in a manner that recognizes the surrounding built environment and seeks to avoid and offset impacts.

Staff Proposed Response

- Maintain and update policies to support compatibility between uses.
- Update policy LU-8 to better address the current context where residential and commercial uses may be developed together or side-by-side. (line 34)

Citywide Policies

This section addresses other land use issues that are applicable citywide. Several new policies are proposed to address issues raised by the community, including neighborhood character, arts and culture, families, and the role of religious uses.

Staff Proposed Response

- Establish broad policies that address citywide issues related to neighborhood character, arts and culture, families, and the role of religious uses. (lines 40-42, 48)

Neighborhood Planning Areas

This section would add two policies supporting the neighborhood planning process and the city investment in neighborhoods through NEP (Neighborhood Enhancement Program). (lines 50-52)

Annexation

This section is proposed to include a reduced set of annexation policies that would replace the existing Annexation Element recognizing that recent annexations largely completed annexation of the city's planned annexation area.

Land Use Element

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
1		Land use vision statement	A new land use vision statement will be drafted through the Vision update process.	
2	Goal	*To develop and maintain a land use pattern that:* *• Protects natural systems and helps realize the vision of a "City in a Park";* *• Maintains and strengthens the vitality, quality and character of Bellevue's residential neighborhoods;* *• Supports the Downtown Urban Center and a variety of other commercial areas serving the city and the larger region;* *• Supports and is supported by a variety of mobility options;* *• Is aesthetically pleasing; and* *• Makes efficient use of urban land.*	Recognizing the recent discussion of the Vision update, it may be appropriate to rewrite the Land Use goal to better tie it to the updated Vision. A revised goal could be presented in a later draft.	

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
		Land Use Strategy		
3	LU-1	*Support a diverse community in an open and natural setting comprised of strong residential communities composed of stable neighborhoods with a variety of housing types and densities; a vibrant, robust Downtown which serves as an urban center; other employment and commercial areas; and distinctive community and neighborhood retail districts. Implement land use strategies by balancing community and neighborhood values, the neighborhood's quality of life, the natural environment, and the economy.*	Maintain the policy intent that establishes a broad citywide perspective for growth and strong communities. However, it would be beneficial to split into several concise concepts that capture the city's overall growth strategy of focusing growth in Downtown and other centers while retaining and enhancing the city's reputation as a "City in a Park." These proposed policies also respond to a number of Countywide Planning Policies, such as directing growth to centers and supporting compact urban development and avoiding sprawl.	*Promote a clear strategy for focusing the city's growth and development as follows:* • *Direct most of the city's growth to the Downtown regional growth center and to other areas designated for compact, mixed-use development served by a full range of transportation options.* • *Maintain the health and vitality of existing single family and multifamily residential neighborhoods.* • *Continue to provide for commercial uses and development that serve community needs.*
4	NEW		Bring concept from LU-1 into a separate policy.	*Retain the city's park-like character through the preservation and enhancement of parks, open space, tree canopy and landscaping throughout the city.*

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
5	NEW	Integrated land use and transportation planning	Include the concept from the Transportation Element that advocates for integrating land use and transportation planning in manner that improves neighborhood livability.	*Promote a land use pattern and an integrated transportation system that supports walking and bicycle access to shops, services, recreation and transit and reduces the negative impacts of vehicle travel, including pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.*
		Growth Management		
6	LU-2	*Support the state Growth Management Act by developing and implementing a land use vision that is consistent with the GMA goals, the regional Vision 2020, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies.*	Minor update to recognize consistency with GMA and other current plans.	*~~Support the state Growth Management Act by developing and~~ Implement~~ing~~ a land use vision that is consistent with the GMA goals, the regional Vision ~~2020~~2040, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies.*
7	LU-3	*Accommodate growth targets of 10,117 additional households and 40,000 additional jobs for the 2001- 2022 period. These targets represent the city's commitment to develop the zoning and infrastructure to accommodate this level of growth; they are not a commitment that the market will deliver these numbers.*	Update target numbers to align with Council adopted 2006-2031 targets and to recognize planning horizon of 2035.	*Accommodate adopted growth targets of 17,000~~10,117~~ additional housing units ~~households~~ and 53,000~~40,000~~ additional jobs for the ~~2001- 2022~~2006-2031 period and plan for the additional growth anticipated by 2035. ~~These targets represent the city's commitment to develop the zoning and infrastructure to accommodate this level of growth; they are not a commitment that the market will deliver these numbers.~~* [Move second sentence to a discussion sidebar.]
8	LU-4	*Encourage new residential development to achieve a substantial portion of the maximum density allowed on the net buildable acreage.*	No change. This policy relates to CPP DP-3.	

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
9	LU-5	*Ensure enough properly-zoned land to provide for Bellevue's share of the regionally-adopted demand forecasts for residential, commercial, and industrial uses for the next 20 years.*	Adjust language of policy to align with the Buildable Lands process that measures available land capacity for jobs and housing and combine with LU-6.	*Periodically update the city inventory of buildable land capacity and evaluate development activity and achieved densities to ensure that the city is able to meet its regionally-adopted housing and employment targets over the next 20 years.*
10	LU-6	*Evaluate household and employment forecasts on a periodic basis to ensure that land use policies based on previous assumptions are current.*	Combine policy with LU-5.	
11	MOVED TR-5		Move from T Element to LU.	*Work with regional partners ~~other jurisdictions~~ to achieve a mix of jobs and~~/~~housing ~~balance~~ that makes it possible for people to live closer to where they work.*
12	NEW	Schools	It is anticipated that Bellevue Schools will need to site additional schools to meet the growing population in Bellevue. This new policy would advocate for taking an active role in working with the school district to help correlate future school sites with anticipated growth. This policy relates to CPP DP-7.	*Work with school districts to identify and plan for future school facility siting that meets community needs.*
		Residential Areas		
13	LU-19	*Maintain stability and improve the vitality of residential neighborhoods through adherence to, and enforcement of, the city's land use regulations.*	No change. Continues to be important, such as in the case of single family room rentals.	

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
14	LU-20	*Promote maintenance and establishment of small-scale activity areas within neighborhoods that encourage pedestrian patronage and provide informal opportunities for residents to meet.*	This policy supports retaining small, individual commercial sites, like the Little Store, that are important to the community.	*Promote maintenance and establishment of small-scale activity areas within neighborhoods that encourage pedestrian patronage and provide informal opportunities for residents to meet.*
15	LU-21	*Develop land use strategies to encourage the maintenance and updating of the city's older housing stock, so that neighborhoods are well-maintained and existing housing is preserved, updated, or modified to meet the evolving needs of residents.*	Minor change	*~~Develop land use strategies to e~~ Encourage the maintenance and updating of the city's older housing stock, so that neighborhoods are well-maintained and existing housing is preserved, updated, or modified to meet the evolving needs of residents.*
16	LU-22	*Protect residential areas from the impacts of non-residential uses of a scale not appropriate to the neighborhood.*	No change.	
17	LU-23	*Provide, through land use regulation, the potential for a broad range of housing choices to meet the changing needs of the community.*	Move to Housing Element.	
18	LU-24	*Encourage adequate pedestrian connections with nearby neighborhood and transit facilities in all residential site development.*	No change.	
		Neighborhood Commercial Centers		
19	LU-25	*Maintain areas for shopping centers designed to serve neighborhoods, recognizing their multiple roles: serving residents' needs, acting as community gathering places, and helping to establishing a neighborhood's identity.*	Minor change.	*Maintain areas for shopping centers designed to serve neighborhoods, recognizing their multiple roles: serving residents' needs, acting as community gathering places, and helping to establish~~ing a~~ neighborhood~~'s~~ identity.*

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
20	LU-26	*Encourage new neighborhood retail and personal services to locate at appropriate locations where local economic demand, local citizen acceptance, and design solutions demonstrate compatibility with the neighborhood. The following concepts should be considered when determining compatibility:* *1. Retail and personal services should be encouraged to group together within planned centers to allow ease of pedestrian movement.* *2. A large proportion of a Neighborhood Business-zoned center should consist of neighborhood-scale retail and personal services.* *3. The location of such retail/service activities within the neighborhood should encourage pedestrian patronage.*	No change.	
21	LU-35	*Maintain a balance of commercial and residential uses within the city. If appropriate, additional neighborhood-serving centers can be identified or expanded through the Comprehensive Plan update process.*	Remove. Policy is fully covered by the language of LU-26.	
22	LU-27	*Encourage mixed residential/commercial development in all Neighborhood Business and Community Business land use districts where compatibility with nearby uses can be demonstrated.*	Update policy to support efforts for mixed-use development, such as at Newport Hills, and to recognize the need for compatibility with adjacent uses.	*Support ~~Encourage~~ mixed residential/commercial development in all Neighborhood Business and Community Business land use districts in a manner that is compatible ~~where compatibility~~ with nearby uses ~~can be demonstrated~~.*

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
		Downtown and Mixed Use Centers		
23	LU-28	*Support Downtown's development as an Urban Center, maintaining it as the financial, retail, and business hub of the Eastside.*	Update policy to recognize Downtown Bellevue as a designated regional growth center.	*Support Downtown's development as a regional growth ~~Urban~~ center, with the density, mix of uses and amenities and infrastructure that maintain ~~ing~~ it as the financial, retail, transportation, and business hub of the Eastside.*
24	LU-29	*Strengthen Downtown as the primary commercial area to provide local goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods and to the residents and employees within the district.*	Move to the Downtown Subarea Plan.	
25	LU-30	*Encourage the development of housing within the Downtown including units targeted to workers who are expected to fill jobs to be created in the Downtown over the next decade.*	Move to the Downtown Subarea Plan.	
26	NEW	Other mixed use centers	Add a policy supporting development of the city's other major growth centers.	*Support development of compact, livable and walkable mixed-use centers in BelRed, Eastgate, Factoria, Wilburton and Crossroads where served by a full range of transportation options.*
27	LU-33	*Monitor trends in Bellevue's job centers and consider land use changes, if needed, to maintain the vitality of these centers.*	No change.	

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
		Commercial and Light Industrial Areas Outside of Centers		
28	LU-31	*Encourage and foster economic development in areas designated for commercial uses.*	No change.	
29	LU-12	*Retain land availability for specific commercial uses which are important to the community.*	Combine with LU-32 below.	
30	LU-32	*Maintain commercial areas outside the Downtown which can provide additional business opportunities and serve other parts of the community*	Recognize the need for a diversity of commercial lands throughout the city. .	*Provide a diversity of ~~Maintain~~ commercial areas outside the Downtown ~~which can~~ to provide ~~additional~~ an array of business and development opportunities and to serve other parts of the community.*
31	LU-34	*Explore the appropriate long-term direction for the location of light industrial businesses such as light manufacturing and warehousing.*	Update policy to capture long-term direction for light-industrial uses and to retain a critical supply of land for local uses such as R&D, small-scale manufacturing and utilities.	*Maintain a critical supply of light industrial land in the Richards Valley area to serve local needs.*
32	LU-36	*Encourage continued development of office uses in designated districts.*	Remove this policy, which doesn't provide significant value and its objective isn't clear. The adopted Comprehensive Land Use map is sufficient in designating locations for office development.	
33	LU-37	*Discourage the creation of additional potential for office development beyond the areas currently designated in the Land Use Plan Map,* *unless an area-wide planning process identifies office uses as appropriate for a nonresidential area under transition from an earlier use that is in decline.*	Remove. The original intent of the policy is unclear.	

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
		Land Use Compatibility		
34	LU-8	*Ensure that commercial land uses are contained within carefully delineated areas.*	Update to focus on avoiding the impacts of commercial areas. Strictly speaking, commercial uses are found in all land use districts. For example, home occupation businesses and day cares may be allowed in residential districts. This policy could be improved by compatibility of commercial uses.	*Address the compatibility of commercial uses and other more intense uses when located in mixed use and predominantly residential areas.*
35	LU-9	*Maintain compatible use and design with the surrounding built environment when considering new development or redevelopment within an already developed area.*	No change.	
36	LU-10	*Access high-traffic generating land uses from arterials whenever possible. If this is not possible, provide mitigation to address access impacts.*	No change.	
37	LU-11	*Encourage the master planning of large developments which emphasize aesthetics and community compatibility. Include circulation, landscaping, open space, storm drainage, utilities, and building location and design in the master plan.*	Minor adjustments to original policy, plus "and large institutions" added to encourage master planning of Bellevue College and other large institutions as a means to address potential impacts.	*Encourage the master planning of ~~large~~ multi-building and multi-parcel developments and large institutions ~~which~~ to emphasize aesthetics and community compatibility. Include circulation, landscaping, open space, storm drainage, utilities, and building location and design in the master plan.*
38	MOVED TR-119	*Minimize spillover parking from commercial areas, parks, and other facilities encroaching on residential neighborhoods, through residential parking zones and other measures.*	Move from Transportation Element	

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
		Citywide Policies		
39	LU-13	*Reduce the regional consumption of undeveloped land by facilitating redevelopment of existing developed land when appropriate.*	Remove. The city actively supports redevelopment, which is encouraged by the above policies on Downtown and other commercial and mixed use areas.	
40	NEW	Neighborhood character	Support local neighborhood efforts to maintain their individual character and recognize that city efforts may need to adapt to the changing needs of the community, such as an aging population.	*Help communities maintain their local, distinctive neighborhood character, while recognizing that some neighborhoods may evolve to meet community needs.*
41	NEW	Arts and culture.	Provide support for the development of arts and cultural functions.	*Recognize the placemaking value of arts and cultural facilities and work to site them throughout the city as a means to enhance neighborhoods.*
42	NEW	Families	Continue to support Bellevue as a city for families even as parts of the city become more urbanized.	*Encourage development of amenities, services and facilities that are supportive of all types of families, including those with children, through investment, incentives and development regulations.*
43	LU-14	*Distribute park and recreation opportunities equitably throughout the city.*	LU-14 and 15 could be merged to better connect to the Parks, Rec & OS Element and to state the general land use strategy of maintaining Bellevue's park-like setting. Other policies on developing the parks system are contained in the Parks, Rec & OS Element.	*Acquire and maintain a system of parks, open space and other landscaped areas to perpetuate Bellevue's park-like setting and enhance the livability of the city's neighborhoods.*

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
44	LU-15	*Encourage dedication of open space and preservation and restoration of trees and vegetation to perpetuate Bellevue's park-like setting and enhance the city's natural environment.*	Merge with LU-14 above.	
45	LU-16	*Promote a variety of techniques to preserve open space and key natural features, such as sensitive site planning, conservation easements, and open space taxation.*	Update policy to include transferring density and land use incentives as potential tools for preserving open space.	*~~Promote a variety of techniques to~~ Preserve open space and key natural features through a variety of techniques, such as sensitive site planning, conservation easements, transferring density, land use incentives and open space taxation.*
46	LU-17	*Support provision of child care equitably throughout the city:* *1. Allow family child care homes in residences in all single-family land use districts through a discretionary review process, unless otherwise required by state law or regulation.* *2. Permit child care centers in all non-single-family land use districts and allow child care centers as part of a community facility as long as the center has been identified as part of any discretionary review permit.*	No change.	
47	LU-18	*Adopt and maintain policies, codes, and land use patterns that promote walking in order to increase public health.*	More work is continuing on assessing how the Comprehensive Plan can encourage physical development that is supportive of health.	[May update and expand policy following the review Community Health.]
48	NEW	Role of faith-based uses	Better address how the role of faith-based uses and institutions in the community has continued to evolve, while recognizing the state and federal legal framework.	*Recognize the traditional and evolving role religious uses play in the community. Allow religious uses in a manner compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and consistent with state and federal laws.*

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
49	MOVED TR-7	*Locate new community facilities near major transit routes and in areas convenient to pedestrians and bicyclists.*	Relocated from Transportation Element.	
		Neighborhood Areas (Subareas)		
50	NEW	Neighborhood area plans	Policy recognizing the value and role of neighborhood area plans (subarea plans).	*Use neighborhood area (subarea) plans to recognize the unique character and objectives of individual neighborhood areas in the city.*
51	NEW	Periodic updates of neighborhood area plans	Policy addressing the need to update the subarea plans in a programmatic manner.	*Periodically assess and update neighborhood area plans to ensure that they reflect the current state of the community.*
52	MOVED HO-4	*Initiate and encourage neighborhood and community involvement to foster a positive civic and neighborhood image through the Neighborhood Enhancement Program, or similar program.*	Retain NEP policy and move from Housing Element to Land Use.	
		Annexation		
53		These new and relocated policies would replace the Annexation Element, which is no longer needed. Nearly all land in the city's planned annexation area has now been annexed.		
54	NEW		New policy that clarifies the city position to support annexation of the remaining planned annexation area.	*Support the comprehensive annexation of the city's remaining Planned Annexation Area.*
55	MOVED	*Require owners of land annexing to the city*	No change. Relocated from Annexation	

	Policy #	*Existing Policy* or New Topic	Analysis /Assessment	Proposed Change
	AN-10	*to be subject to their proportionate share of the city's bonded indebtedness.*	Element.	
56	MOVED AN-7	*Make every effort, whether by interlocal agreement or other mechanism, to ensure that land which lies within King County's jurisdiction, but which simultaneously lies within Bellevue's Potential Annexation Area, develops according to the Comprehensive Plan policies or other development standards the City of Bellevue has developed for these particular areas.*	Move to LU Element, shorten and add in concept from existing AN-18.	*Make every effort~~, whether by interlocal agreement or other mechanism,~~ to ensure that land ~~which lies within King County's jurisdiction, but which simultaneously lies~~ within Bellevue's Potential Annexation Area~~,~~ develops according to ~~the~~ Bellevue Comprehensive Plan policies ~~or other~~ and development standards ~~the City of Bellevue has developed for these particular areas~~. Where possible, joint development review should occur.*
57	MOVED AN-13	*After annexation, transfer all review authority for all land currently undergoing development review in King County to the City of Bellevue.*	No change. Retain in LU Element.	

HOUSING ELEMENT DISCUSSION PAPER

The Housing Element is a mandatory element of the Comprehensive Plan under the state Growth Management Act (GMA). The Housing Element identifies the City's strategy to meet the state GMA housing goal: *"Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock."*

Consistent with the GMA housing goal, Bellevue's Housing Element addresses wide-ranging housing topics within the following four housing sections:

Housing Section	**Description**
Neighborhood Quality & Vitality Policies HO-1-10	This section recognizes the diversity and quality of Bellevue's neighborhoods. It also recognizes that neighborhoods are not static over time and that they evolve to meet the changing needs and lifestyles of the residents and the community.
Housing Opportunities Policies HO-11-21	This section provides the policy framework for increasing the housing supply while protecting existing neighborhoods – a critical challenge for Bellevue.
Affordable Housing Policies HO-22-36	This section includes policies that direct the city's efforts to create housing opportunities for all economic segments of the population through regulatory and incentive approaches.
Special Housing Needs Policies HO-37-41	This section addresses the needs of some members of the community who cannot live on their own due to disability, health, age, or other circumstances that require special accommodations. Unfortunately, the difficulties some people have in finding housing may be so extreme as to result in homelessness. The city supports emergency housing and takes an active role in creating a variety of housing opportunities for those with special needs.

Housing Recommendations, Opportunities and Gaps

At the January 22, 2014, Planning Commission meeting the Commission reviewed Housing Element recommendations from the Human Services Commission and the Bellevue Network on Aging. Michael Yantis, Chair of the Human Services Commission, and Eileen Rasnack, Chair of the Bellevue Network on Aging presented these recommendations and answered the Planning Commission's questions.

Next the Planning Commission reviewed "opportunities and gaps" that staff identified in their review of the existing Housing Element. This list had been previously reviewed with the Planning Commission on July 10, 2013.

1. Clarify policies for consistency with City's downtown planning
2. **Clarify policies for consistency with current direction on shelters and homeless housing**
3. **Greater focus on mixed use neighborhoods**
4. Jobs/housing balance
5. Affordable housing near transit
6. Active /Healthy communities
7. **Universal design and accessibility in new housing / Aging in place**
8. Fair housing
9. **Identifying the need for affordable housing and the steps to take to address the need**
10. Addressing the need for housing affordable to very low income households
11. New implementation strategies and monitoring progress to meet affordable housing need
12. **Student housing** (recently added)

Five Key Housing Issues and Intended Policy Direction
From the list of potential Comprehensive Plan "opportunities and gaps", five topics (in bold, above) were discussed as key issues for Planning Commission review and comment. Intended Policy Direction for each issue was also presented.

1. **Shelters and Homelessness**
   Homelessness is a growing concern in the community. Many aspects of this issue have changed since the last Comprehensive Plan update in 2004. The Comprehensive Plan Policy HO-38 is indirect in its response. We have also heard from the community that current regulation prevents siting shelters in many zones.

   Intended policy direction:
   - Address city position to work towards ending homelessness, including city's role in 10-year plan to end homelessness.
   - Support for strategies that avoid displacement (foreclosure mediation) and that move people out of homelessness (rapid rehousing).
   - Assess code to remove unintended barriers to shelters and group quarters in commercial and mixed use areas, while retaining appropriate land use controls.

   Planning Commission comment:
   - Support for policy that uses clearly defined housing responses, and focuses on responses that work to move people from homelessness to independence.

2. **Mixed Use Neighborhoods**
   Current Comprehensive Plan supports housing in mixed use areas, but the city's residential areas are generally described as being either multifamily or single family. Most of the City's future housing growth will be in mixed use areas, primarily Downtown and BelRed.

Intended policy direction:

- Update policy to better reflect today's conditions and future growth.
- Monitor amount and affordability of housing achieved in mixed use areas.
- Encourage Family Friendly Housing.

Planning Commission comment:

- Include in Comprehensive Plan that Lake Heights /Newport Hills could benefit from mixed-use redevelopment.

3. Affordable Housing

The Comprehensive Plan already includes policy support for ARCH and other partnerships, and for affordable housing funding, incentives, and preservation. The affordable housing update needs to address the updated Countywide Housing Planning Polices that includes a focus on effective strategies, implementation, and monitoring.

Intended policy direction:

- Recognize the range of housing needs of the community, especially the housing needs of lower income households where the greatest housing gap exists.
- Emphasize strategies to increase housing for very low income households, e.g. funding support for non-profit housing providers.
- Better recognize new housing growth will be in MF and mixed use areas.
- Need for affordable housing near transit options.
- Monitor amount and affordability of housing achieved.
- Update ADU policy to support neighborhood compatibility.

Planning Commission comment:

- Implement programs enabled by the state to increase affordable housing.

4. Universal Design and Aging in Place

Studies show that older residents want to stay in their neighborhood as they age. Many seniors find that their homes do not adapt well to their changing abilities, and struggle to find the programs and services that they need.

Intended policy direction:

- Preservation of older homes; ability to adapt homes as people age.
- Universal Design that improves accessibility in public spaces; for private residential development increase Universal Design education to development community.
- Support for programs and services that allow seniors to stay in their homes.
- Support for MF senior housing that allows seniors to stay close to their neighborhood.
- Support for walking, accessibility and safety in neighborhoods.
- Update ADU policy to support neighborhood compatibility.

Planning Commission comment:

- Do not propose added requirements that increase the cost of housing.

5. **Student Housing**

   The issue of single family homes being converted to student housing is a new concern in Bellevue, and has not been previously discussed in the review of the Comprehensive Plan. Balance needs to be achieved between the need for affordable housing and the concerns of neighbors about incompatible uses in single family neighborhoods.

   Intended policy direction:

   - Emphasize maintaining or enhancing the character of residential neighborhoods.
   - Support development of on-campus student housing at Bellevue College that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.
   - Support development of off-campus student housing in adjacent MF and mixed use zones (part of Eastgate plan).
   - Related to success of other strategies to increase affordable housing.

   Planning Commission comment:

   - Policy should not be specific to Bellevue College.
   - Policy should address the housing need of younger adults in general.
   - Need to address other issues that could result from small units e.g. traffic, parking, density.

Comprehensive Plan Policy Development – Housing Element

Attachment #1 lists each existing Housing Policy, along with proposed changes and rationale. In most instances, the rationale refers to the ***Intended policy direction*** and ***Planning Commission comment*** reviewed above. Note that the policy numbering is not updated as new and deleted policies are still under consideration. The following list of key changes by topic will help guide the April 9, 2014 discussion.

Neighborhood Quality and Vitality

- New mixed use neighborhoods and future housing growth targeted to downtown and mixed use areas - edits to HO-2, HO-12 and HO-29.
- Addressing impacts of room rentals in single family areas - new policy #5a.
- Maintaining or enhancing the character of residential neighborhoods - edits to policies HO-3.

Housing Opportunities

- Family friendly housing - edits to existing policy HO-10
- Support for programs that allow seniors to age in place - new policy #4.
- Increasing education about Universal Design - new policy #4.
- ADU direction consistent with neighborhood plans - edits to HO-16.
- Creating a diversity of housing types - edits to HO-12, HO-21, former policy LU-23
- Support for fair housing - new policy #1.

- Student housing - new policy #5b.

Affordable Housing *(including Countywide Planning Policy Housing update)*

- Implementation and monitoring of strategies to address housing need - new policy 2a.
- Removing unintended regulatory barriers to affordable housing - edits to HO-23, new policy 2b.
- The need for affordable housing near transit - edits to HO-25.
- Addressing housing need for low and very low income households - HO-27

Special Needs Housing

- Support for regional efforts to address homelessness - edits to HO-38
- Support for collaborative efforts with social service agencies and other jurisdictions to fund and operate emergency shelters and day centers – edits to HO-39
- Temporary encampments - new policy #8.

Comprehensive Plan Policy Development - Housing Element

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
Housing Chapter Goal *Note: Housing Chapter Goal, Housing Section Goals and Housing Vision Statement will be considered in a subsequent discussion. They are not included in this Housing Element Policy Development table.*				
Section 1: Neighborhood Quality & Vitality				
1	HO-1	Encourage investment in and revitalization of single family and multifamily neighborhoods where private investment patterns are not accomplishing this objective.	*No change*	
2	HO-2	Promote quality, community-friendly multifamily development, through features such as enhanced open space and pedestrian connectivity.	• Support for walking, accessibility and safety in neighborhoods. • Encourage Family Friendly Housing. ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-12	Policy edit: Promote quality, community-friendly single family, multifamily and mixed use development, through features such as enhanced open space and pedestrian connectivity.
3	HO-3	Refine Land Use Code standards to improve the compatibility of single family infill development with the neighborhood.	• Emphasize maintaining or enhancing the character of residential neighborhoods.	Policy edit: ~~Refine Land Use Code standards to improve~~ Maintain the character of ~~the compatibility of single family infill development with the~~ established single family neighborhoods through application of appropriate development regulations.
4	NEW (#5a)	Student Housing	• Support development of on-campus student housing at Bellevue College that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood • Support development of off-campus student housing in adjacent MF and mixed use zones (part of Eastgate plan) **Planning Commission comments**: Policy should not be specific to Bellevue College. Policy should address housing need of younger adults in general. Need to address other issues that could	Policy draft: Monitor and appropriately regulate room rentals in single family areas to balance potential impacts to neighborhood character with need for affordable housing opportunity. *See also New Student Housing Policy #5b in Housing Opportunity section, and New affordable housing policy #2a in Affordable Housing section.*

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
			result from small units e.g. traffic, parking, density. (see HO-3)	
5	HO-4	Initiate and encourage neighborhood and community involvement to foster a positive civic and neighborhood image through the Neighborhood Enhancement Program, or similar program.		Move to Land Use element.
6	HO-5	Assure that site and building design guidelines create an effective transition between substantially different land uses and densities.		Address in Urban Design element.
7	HO-6	Anticipate the future maintenance and restoration needs of older neighborhoods through a periodic survey of housing conditions. Report results of such surveys to residents.	*No change*	
8	HO-7	Provide financial assistance to low-income residents for maintaining or repairing the health and safety features of their homes through the Housing Repair Program, or similar program.	*No change*	
9	HO-8	Protect residential areas from illegal land use activities through enforcement of city codes.	*Address in Land Use Policy LU-19: Maintain stability and improve the vitality of residential neighborhoods through adherence to, and enforcement of, the city's land use regulations.*	Delete. Address in Land Use Policy LU-19.
10	HO-9	Explore opportunities to implement alternative neighborhood design concepts. Involve residents and other stakeholders in this process.	Repeats HO-15.	Delete
Section 2: Housing Opportunities				
11	Move from LU	LU-23 Provide the potential for a broad range of housing choices to meet the changing needs of the community.	• Recognize the range of needs in the community, and in particular the housing needs of lower income households.	Move from Land Use to Housing Element

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
			○ Addresses Housing CPP H-3, H-13	
12	New Policy (#1)	Fair Housing	*Bellevue is one of 14 jurisdictions in the Puget Sound Region that receive federal housing funds (CDBG) and are required to not only abide by fair housing law, but also to go a step further and include real and effective fair housing strategies that affirmatively further fair housing.* ○ *Addresses Housing CPP H-13*	Policy draft: Employ effective fair housing strategies that support the Fair Housing Act and affirmatively further fair housing.
13	HO-10	Support housing with appropriate amenities for families with children.	• Encourage Family Friendly Housing ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-12	Policy draft: Encourage appropriate amenities for families with children in new housing throughout the City through city investments, development regulations and incentives. *Discussion draft: Amenities for families with children may include school access, walkable streets, accessible open space and community facilities.*
14	NEW (#5b)	Student Housing	• Support development of on-campus student housing at Bellevue College that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood • Support development of off-campus student housing in adjacent MF and mixed use zones (part of Eastgate plan) ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-10 **Planning Commission comments**: Policy should not be specific to Bellevue College. Policy should address housing need of younger adults in general. Need to address other issues that could result from small units e.g. traffic, parking, density. (see HO-3)	Policy draft: Work with colleges, including Bellevue College, and private developers to support housing for students on-campus and in adjacent transit served mixed use/ commercial areas. *See also New Student Housing Policy #5b in Housing Opportunity section, and New affordable housing policy #2a in Affordable Housing section.*

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
15	HO-11	Encourage housing opportunities in mixed residential/ commercial settings throughout the city.		
16	HO-12	Provide incentives to encourage residential development for a range of household types and income levels in commercial zones.	• Better reflect that new housing growth will be in MF and mixed use areas. • Update policy to better reflect today's conditions and future growth. ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-9 **Planning Commission Comment:** Include in policy that Lake Heights /Newport Hills could benefit from mixed use redevelopment.	Policy edit: Provide incentives to encourage residential development for a range of household types and income levels in multifamily and mixed use commercial zones.
17	HO-13	Ensure that mixed-use development complements and enhances the character of the surrounding residential and commercial areas.	*No change*	
18	HO-14	Encourage housing development Downtown including innovative, affordable housing.	*Policy HO-14 and HO-29 are repetitious.*	Delete and merge with HO-29.
19	HO-15	Adopt an interim ordinance enabling a demonstration project(s) that would serve as a model for housing choices currently not being built in Bellevue. *Discussion: The interim ordinance would set factors such as number of demonstration projects, size of project, types of housing to be demonstrated, ability to vary from certain standards, compatibility with surrounding development, review by the affected neighborhood, etc.*	For example, feasibility studies for Newport Hills have shown there is potential for mixed use redevelopment including housing. If redevelopment moves forward, an innovative housing ordinance is one tool that could be explored. **Planning Commission Comment:** Include in policy that Lake Heights /Newport Hills could benefit from mixed use redevelopment.	Policy edit: Provide opportunity to allow a demonstration(s) project through methods such as an interim ordinance enabling a demonstration project(s) that would serve as a model for housing choices currently not being built in Bellevue.
20	HO-16	Allow attached and detached accessory dwelling units in single family districts subject to specific development, design, and owner occupancy standards.	• Update ADU policy to support neighborhood compatibility. **Human Services Commission Comment:** ADUs should be allowed where compatible.	Policy edit: Allow attached and detached accessory dwelling units in single family districts subject to specific development, design, location, and owner occupancy standards, where

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
				consistent with neighborhood subarea plans.
21	HO-17	Encourage infill development on vacant or under-utilized sites that have adequate urban services and ensure that the infill is compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods.		Delete; no longer needed.
22	HO-18	Provide opportunities and incentives through the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process for a variety of housing types and site planning techniques that can achieve the maximum housing potential of the site.	*No change*	
23	HO-19	Periodically review land use regulations to assure that regulations and permit processing requirements are reasonable.		Delete. Address in Land Use element compatibility section.
24	HO-20	Evaluate the housing cost and supply implications of proposed regulations and procedures.	*No change*	
25	HO-21	Promote working partnerships with housing developers to help create opportunities for housing in the community.	• Recognize the range of housing needs of the community, and in particular the housing needs of lower income households.	Edit: Promote working partnerships with housing developers to help create ~~opportunities for~~ a diversity of housing types in the community.
26	New Policy (#4)	Universal Design / Aging in Place	• Preservation of older homes; ability to adapt homes as people age. • Support for Universal Design that improves accessibility in public spaces; for private residential development increase Universal Design education to development community. • Support for programs and services that allow seniors to stay in their homes • Support for MF senior housing that allows seniors to stay close to their neighborhood	Policy draft: Support housing options, programs, and services that allow seniors to stay in their homes or neighborhood. Promote awareness of Universal Design improvements that increase housing accessibility.

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
			○ Addresses Housing CPP H-5 **Planning Commission comment:** Do not propose added requirements that increase the cost of housing.	
Section 3: Affordable Housing				
27	HO-34	Address the entire spectrum of housing needs in the city's affordable housing programs.	*Moved to the beginning of the Affordable Housing section.*	
28	HO-22	Work cooperatively with King County, A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH), and other Eastside jurisdictions to assess the need for, and to create, affordable housing.	*No change*	
29	New Policy (#2a)	Housing Strategy Plan	• Recognize the range of housing needs of the community, and in particular the housing needs of for lower income households where the greatest housing gap exists. • Monitor amount and affordability of housing achieved (in mixed use areas). • Emphasize strategies to increase housing for very low income households, e.g. funding support for non-profit housing providers. ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-1, H-2, H-5, H-8, H-16, H-17, H-18	Policy draft: Employ a housing strategy plan to promote housing supply, affordability and diversity, including strategies that address the need for housing affordable to very-low, low and moderate income households and persons with special needs. Monitor amount and affordability of housing achieved.
30	HO-23	Review Land Use Code regulations to remove barriers or unnecessary standards that discourage affordable multifamily housing and to refine affordable housing incentives so they are more successful. *Discussion: The city has spent considerable time revising processes and standards to remove barriers. This policy encourages*	• Assess code to remove unintended barriers in commercial and mixed use areas ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-7	Policy edit: Encourage the development of affordable housing through incentives and by removing regulatory barriers.

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
		continuation of this work with an emphasis on housing affordability.		
31	HO-24	Ensure that all affordable housing development is consistent with currently adopted building codes and design standards.		Delete. Address in Land Use element compatibility section.
32	HO-25	Ensure that affordable housing opportunities are not concentrated, but rather are dispersed throughout the city.	• Need for affordability near transit options. ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-10	Policy edit: Ensure that affordable housing opportunities are available ~~not concentrated, but rather are dispersed~~ throughout the city, including multifamily and mixed use/commercial areas served by transit.
33	New Policy (#2b)	Barriers to group facilities	• Student housing accessibility related to other strategies to increase affordable housing. • Assess code to remove unintended barriers to group facilities in commercial and mixed use areas, while retaining appropriate land use controls ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-7	Policy draft: Remove unintended barriers to group facilities in commercial and mixed use areas, while retaining appropriate land use controls.
34	HO-26	Involve both the public and private sectors in the provision of affordable housing.		Policy edit: ~~Involve~~ Support and collaborate with both the public and private sectors in the provision of affordable housing.
35	HO-27	Re-assess city guidelines approximately every five years for use of the Housing Trust Fund to ensure they are consistent with changing community needs and priorities.	• Emphasize strategies to increase housing for very low income households, e.g. funding support for non-profit housing providers. ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-3	Policy edit: Provide funding to support housing need, especially for low and very low income households. ~~Re-assess city~~ Assess housing fund guidelines ~~approximately every five years for use of the Housing Trust Fund~~ to ensure they are consistent with changing community needs and priorities.
36	HO-28	Provide incentives and work in partnership with not-for-profit and for-profit developers and agencies to build permanent low- and moderate-income housing.	*No change*	

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
37	HO-29	Encourage the building of affordable housing Downtown.	• Better recognize new housing growth will be in MF and mixed use areas ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-9 *See Policy HO-14*.	Policy edit: Encourage ~~the building of~~ new affordable housing Downtown and in mixed use centers planned for housing growth.
38	HO-30	Encourage preservation, maintenance, and improvements to existing affordable housing.	*No change*	
39	HO-31	Encourage the development of long-term management strategies for affordable housing in cooperation with not-for-profit housing organizations.		Delete and address as a strategy (usually a condition of funding).
40	HO-32	Explore all available federal, state, and local programs and private options for financing affordable housing.	*No change*	
41	HO-33	Explore financial incentives to encourage affordable multifamily housing, such as partial exemptions from city permit fees and use of the state property tax exemption program.	• Related to success of other strategies to increase affordable housing **Planning Commission Comment:** Implement programs enabled by the state to increase affordable housing.	Policy edit: Explore financial incentives to encourage affordable multifamily housing, such as partial exemptions from city permit fees, ~~and use of~~ the state property tax exemption program, and other state enabled programs.
42	HO-35	Ensure that all affordable housing created in the city with public funds or by regulation remains affordable for the longest possible term.	*No change*	
43	HO-36	Participate in relocation assistance to low-income households whose housing may be displaced by condemnation or city-initiated code enforcement.	*No change*	
Section 4: Special Needs Housing				
44	HO-37	Plan for housing for people with special needs. Avoid concentrations of such housing and protect residential neighborhoods from adverse impacts. Encourage ongoing stable family living situations for people with special needs. Provide in all areas for the siting of facilities devoted to the care of people with	*Edit Policy HO-37 into policy that supports housing for special needs that is not concentrated (HO-37), and addresses HO-41: Encourage a variety of local incentives and support activities that help provide housing that is affordable and*	Policy edit: Plan for and provide reasonable accommodation for housing for people with special needs. Provide in all areas and avoid concentrations of such housing and protect residential neighborhoods from adverse impacts. ~~Encourage ongoing stable family living situations~~

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
		handicaps.	*accommodates people with special needs.*	~~for people with special needs. Provide in all areas for the siting of facilities devoted to the care of people with handicaps.~~
45	HO-38	Encourage and support social and health service organizations that offer programs and facilities for people with special needs, particularly those programs that address homelessness and help people remain in the community.	• Address city position to work towards ending homelessness, including city's role in 10-year plan to end homelessness • Support for strategies that avoid displacement (foreclosure mediation) and that move people out of homelessness (rapid rehousing). **Planning Commission comment:** Support for policy that uses clearly defined housing responses, and focuses on responses that work to move people from homelessness to independence.	Policy draft: Support regional efforts to prevent homelessness. Provide a range of affordable housing options as well as support to move homeless persons and families to long-term financial independence.
46	HO-39	Assist social service organizations in their efforts to obtain funds and to operate emergency and transitional housing in the community.	• Address city position to work towards ending homelessness, including city's role in 10-year plan to end homelessness. ○ Addresses Housing CPP H-14	Policy edit: Work with other jurisdictions and social service organizations to fund and operate emergency shelters and day centers consistent with regional planning efforts to address homelessness.
47	New Policy (#8)	Direction for Temporary Encampments	Establish direction for temporary encampments consistent with State HB1956. Bellevue's current Temporary Encampment Ordinance includes a Consent Decree that will sunset 1-27-16.	Policy draft: Allow hosting of Temporary Encampments within or outside religious facilities as a form of religious expression and consistent with state law pertaining to religious use.
48	HO-40	Support and plan for assisted housing using federal or state aid and private resources.	*No change*	
49	HO-41	Encourage a variety of local incentives and support activities that help provide housing that is affordable and accommodates people with special needs.	*Repeats edited HO-37.*	Delete.

Housing Element Policies			If action proposed, why?	Proposed Change
50	New Policy (#9)	Adult family homes and special needs housing		Policy draft: Recognize that adult family homes and other state regulated special needs housing provide stable, neighborhood housing options for elderly and disabled residents. Work to address needs for services, emergency response and other potential accommodation.

Planning Commission Schedule

April 9, 2014

The Bellevue Planning Commission meets Wednesdays as needed, typically two or three times per month. Meetings begin at 6:30 p.m. and are held in the Council Conference Room (Room 1E-113) at City Hall, unless otherwise noted. Public comment is welcome at each meeting.

The schedule and meeting agendas are subject to change. Please confirm meeting agendas with city staff at 425-452-6868. Agenda and meeting materials are posted the Monday prior to the meeting date on the city's website at:

http://www.bellevuewa.gov/planning-commission-agendas-2014.htm

Date	Tentative Agenda Topics
April 23	Review of Single Family Rental Housing Introduction of code amendments Eastgate Plan
May 14	Annual Comprehensive Plan amendments public hearing Comprehensive Plan Update Eastgate Plan
May 28	Single Family Rental Housing code amendments Comprehensive Plan Update
June 11	Comprehensive Plan Update
June 25	Single Family Rental Housing code amendments
July 9	Additional code amendments
July 23	Comprehensive Plan Update

From: Danielle Evans <danielle.m.evans@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2014 8:36 PM
To: PlanningCommission
Subject: importance of protecting single family zoning

Dear Commissioners,

I live in the Spiritwood neighborhood with my spouse and two young children. I am extremely concerned about the houses on our block and adjacent blocks that are being converted from single family homes into a business enterprise that seeks to exploit a loop hole in the zoning code. My belief and understanding of the law is that a single family zoned area does not permit or support a residential home housing six, eight or more unrelated individuals each separately renting a single room from a property owner. This is not a situation of a group of students or friends pooling resources and rooming together. (Something that I did during my own college days). This is a deliberate attempt by investors to maximize rental profit by renting each square inch within a single family home. Just around the corner from my house is a 1,300 square foot home that went from three bedroom to eight bedrooms and as many cars and persons coming and going. My understanding from those who have gone inside the building is that the living room and common spaces were converted to these additional bedrooms.

I write to express to you the seriousness of this problem that we have witnessed in Spiritwood. I believe this is the canary in the coal mine. We must continue Bellevue's legacy of careful forward thinking planning development and regulations. The problem I write about is different from apartments or other high density planned housing. Please help us to eliminate these single-room rental "businesses" - we want to protect our single-family character. Turning a blind eye does not address the need for affordable housing in the city and risks undermining the work of the planning commission and goals of the comprehensive plan.

Thank you for giving this matter your attention.

Sincerely,

Danielle Evans
1723 146th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98007

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: Wednesday, April 2, 2014

CONTACT: Tresa Berg, Public Involvement Manager, 425-452-4638 or Tberg@bellevuewa.gov

Public hearing on Transportation Improvement Program

BELLEVUE – The Bellevue Transportation Commission will hold a public hearing April 10 on the city's proposed 2015-2020 Transportation Improvement Program, a kind of wish list of transportation capital programs and projects.

If you are interested in certain transportation projects and think they should be included in the TIP, please attend the hearing.

6:30 p.m., Thursday, April 10
City Hall
450 110th Ave. NE, Room 1E-113

The TIP is a draft work plan for needed transportation capital projects and programs for the next six years. Unlike the Capital Investment Program plan and the Transportation Facilities Plan, the TIP is not limited by available funding; therefore, it represents a comprehensive list of all transportation projects the city may choose to implement within this six-year time frame, if funding were available.

The TIP includes road and intersection work, as well as new or enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities. If a project is included in the TIP, it is also eligible for state and federal grants. The TIP also serves as a transportation program coordination tool with other agencies and jurisdictions.

This public hearing is an opportunity for the Transportation Commission to hear your comments and your opinions on which projects should be implemented if funding becomes available. Following the hearing, the commission will forward a TIP list of recommendations to the City Council.

The council is scheduled to review and approve the plan at their regular session on Monday, May 19, at City Hall. This meeting starts at 8 p.m. and is open to the public.

For more information about the Transportation Improvement Program or to see a list of projects, visit www.bellevuewa.gov/transportation_improvement_program.htm, or contact Kristi Oosterveen, Program Administrator, at 425-452-4496 or koosterveen@bellevuewa.gov.

CITY OF Bellevue

News Release

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: Monday, March 31, 2014

New app puts the city in the palm of your hand

Download MyBellevue and win prizes

Recognizing that tech-savvy residents and workers in Bellevue use their smart phones to do so many other things, the city has just launched a mobile app that makes it possible for them to enter service requests and access city news, jobs and social media easily with their phones too.

See a damaged sign or other problem?
No more need to figure out whom to contact and how. With the app, called MyBellevue, you can notify the city in real time, with a photo and GPS location if you wish. A minute-long animation explains the app in humorous terms.

As part of the launch of this app, a temporary widget will ask users what they like most about "their" Bellevue. Participants can enter their names in a drawing for free passes to the aquatic center and a new zip line, as well as gift cards or passes from the Bellevue Collection, the Bellevue Arts Museum, the 520 Bar and Grill and the Bellevue Downtown Association.

The app even allows you to check for other service requests in the area. If someone else has already entered the problem you're seeing, you can give that request a "thumbs-up" and track when it gets fixed. If you choose, you can submit a request anonymously too.

"People do so much now with their smart phones, it's time to make city services and programs available that way too," said Toni Cramer, Bellevue's chief information officer. "People can still ask for help by phone or online, but this makes service and information as easy to access as possible via whatever is the most comfortable and convenient way for folks living, working and visiting here."

In addition to service requests, MyBellevue offers other widgets (links) for programs people on the go would want to know about, including city news, emergencies, jobs and social media. The widgets take users to mobile-enabled web pages.

MyBellevue is available in the Apple App Store, Google Play and Blackberry World. It will be available in the Microsoft Windows Store soon.

The new mobile app is managed under a contract with New York-based PublicStuff, which has developed mobile apps for more than 30 other cities across the country. In September the City Council approved a three-year, $92,737 contract with PublicStuff for the customer request and management application, following a procurement process.

Contact Information

Chief Communications Officer
450 110th Ave. NE
P.O. Box 90012
Bellevue, WA 98009
Contact: Emily Christensen
Phone: 425-452-4090
E-mail: echristens@bellevuewa.gov

Customer Assistance

People are not obligated to download the app to make service requests and access popular programs. All city programs, including a MyBellevue customer service portal, continue to be available on the city website.

Cramer, who leads the city's Information Technology Department, credited staff for selecting a program that could meet an emerging service need and for carefully testing and preparing the interface between PublicStuff's back-end system and the city's own service tracking software.

Return to News Release Index

© 2006 City of Bellevue, Washington. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

February 26, 2014 Bellevue City Hall
6:30 p.m. City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Chair Tebelius, Commissioners Carlson, Hamlin, Hilhorst, Laing, deVadoss
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	Commissioner Ferris
STAFF PRESENT:	Paul Inghram, Erika Conkling, Department of Planning and Community Development
GUEST SPEAKERS:	Lisa Grueter, BERK
RECORDING SECRETARY:	Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:38 p.m. by Chair Tebelius who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Hamlin, who arrived at 6:47 p.m., Commissioner Carlson, who arrived at 6:54 p.m., and Commissioner Ferris, who was excused.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Laing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None

6. STAFF REPORTS – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Comprehensive Plan Update

Comprehensive Planning Manager Paul Inghram noted that in past meetings the Commission has discussed the issue of light industrial land (LI) in the city. There are also a couple of policies in the current Comprehensive Plan about LI, including one that talks about the need for a general review of the uses and the locations. The Comprehensive Plan update provides the opportunity to take a citywide look at the issues.

Lisa Grueter, a land use planner with BERK, a public policy firm, said her company was retained by the city to help Bellevue with its economic development strategies, part of which has involved taking a closer look at the city's LI lands.

Mr. Inghram said Bellevue's vision to have light industrial and manufacturing uses dates back to the 1920s, but most of it never came about. Factoria's name stems from the notion of locating factories there, though only one factory was ever built there. LI zones were developed over time, however, primarily along the Burlington Northern/Sante Fe corridor. The LI-zoned land adjacent to the airport in Eastgate was rezoned to Office/Limited Business-Open Space as a way of transferring open space density credits to the development site. The western portion of the Bel-Red corridor was originally zoned LI but recently was rezoned to a variety of different Bel-Red zones. The Eastgate/Richards Valley area still has some land zoned LI.

Ms. Grueter said one issue BERK has focused on is where light industrial lands fit in the regional context. In 2012 manufacturing had more jobs than in the pre-recession years, and while most were in aerospace other manufacturing sectors were strong as well. Regionally, the land zoned for manufacturing, warehousing and distribution are recognized in the Vision 2040 plan. As the uses trend more toward distribution, larger parcels of land are needed, most of which are in the Kent valley and in Pierce County. Put into the regional context, Bellevue's light industrial lands do not figure significantly. The largest concentration of light industrial land currently in Bellevue is in the Richards Valley, but as land values rise market pressure is pushing toward changes to other uses.

Chair Tebelius asked if land in areas zoned for LI has lower market value. Ms. Grueter said in talking with brokers she was led to believe that the land in the Richards Valley is encumbered with a network of critical areas and small parcels which make it difficult to access and difficult to assemble the land into sufficiently large parcels. Accordingly, the highest and best use is still LI. For other LI areas in the city that have good visibility and good access, most of which are surrounded by residential, office or other uses, the LI zoning becomes questionable. Bellevue's strength's clearly, are in arenas other than industrial, particularly information and technology, business services, retail, and tourism.

Commissioner deVadoss asked why healthcare was not included as one of Bellevue's strengths. Ms. Grueter allowed that the services category, which includes healthcare, continues to be a strong sector for Bellevue.

Commissioner Laing pointed out that notwithstanding the Bel-Red plan and zoning, the corridor is still predominantly a light industrial area. The only thing keeping new businesses in very affordable existing buildings is the zoning requirements. A five-year look back at the zoning will be undertaken in 2014. He asked why the BERK report did not include Bel-Red as a light industrial area, and how the analysis would change if the look back recommendation relative to the zoning in the corridor were to remove the nonconformity provisions to allow for market-driven redevelopment. Mr. Inghram said the scope under which BERK is working involves only those areas that are zoned LI. He clarified that the uses in Bel-Red are explicitly not nonconforming and as such are free to continue in perpetuity. Many of the buildings that stand empty and which are having a difficult time finding new tenants are in fact in General Commercial (GC) zones. In the Bel-Red corridor, the uses in the LI zones are essentially Coca Cola, Safeway, the International Paper site, Cadman, and the two King County Metro properties.

Commissioner Laing called attention to a statement made on page 22 of the BERK report about light industrial uses not being a focus of the draft economic development strategy and asked if that is as a result of Council direction. Mr. Inghram said it really is tied to the fact that the predominance of economic activity in Bellevue is not in the industrial category. The Council's work is continuing so their direction could evolve. Commissioner Laing allowed that the existing LI uses in the Bel-Red corridor, whether located in LI zoning or GC zoning, are allowed to continue. However, if the city has an interest in having light industrial uses, and if the bulk of the land and facilities suitable to light industrial uses is in the Bel-Red corridor, the fact that the existing zoning in most cases precludes a new light industrial use from opening. Mr. Inghram clarified that the zoning in Bel-Red allows new light industrial uses to locate in buildings vacated by light industrial uses.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if storage businesses are categorized as LI or commercial. Mr. Inghram said they actually can be allowed in either LI or GC zones and that allowed uses for LI are not much different from the GC zone.

Commissioner Hilhorst commented that the city's plans for the future focus on more urban housing. It is unlikely, however, that people are going to want to give up their RVs, boats and other toys even if they live where they can store those things. As a result, people are going to need storage uses nearby, and those uses could need a light industrial zoning in which to locate. Ms. Grueter agreed there will be a local need to preserve opportunities for storage uses and areas in which businesses can form and grow. LI and GC areas will certainly be needed. While their value may not be high from a regional perspective, they certainly have local value.

Ms. Grueter called attention to Exhibit 12 in the BERK report and reviewed with the Commissioners the percentage of building space that houses industrial uses in each of the city's five LI areas. She noted that other uses include office, retail, school and other. She suggested the range of zoning options includes retaining the existing LI zoning; expanding the zone to create more opportunity for industrial uses; retaining the existing areas where there is currently a critical mass; reviewing the uses allowed in the zone and allowing for some additional flexibility; and consolidating the GC and LI areas into a single zone given the similar mix of uses allowed in each zone.

Mr. Inghram commented that even in the Bel-Red corridor there is insufficient light industrial land available to house large warehouse operations, so being competitive at the regional level is unlikely. However, there could still be interest in or demand for small craft manufacturing or warehouse and storage uses. There is no reliable method for calculating industrial and/or manufacturing jobs in proportion to population. Some future companies may have as their primary focus professional services with thousands of high-tech employees but they may want lab space in a light industrial area, and having that option available close at hand may in fact be key in deciding where to locate their main operation.

Commissioner Hilhorst expressed the view that once the LI areas are gone from Bellevue, there will be no getting them back.

Commissioner Laing said there are uses that are typically associated with light manufacturing that provide value to the community in a number of ways. They certainly are one element of a diverse and healthy local economy. In talking about LI uses, however, there is a tension between flexibility and compatibility. The GC zone is more encompassing in terms of allowed uses, but allowing manufacturing uses in it could create compatibility issues. He said of the zoning

options outlined in the BERK report, options 4 and 5 were the most appealing to him. In the end it will all come down to how things are permitted, outright or by conditional use. The focus should be on what should be done to merge the concepts of options 4 and 5 to allow for both flexibility and compatibility.

Mr. Inghram said the zoning options represent the range of possibilities. If the intent is to increase flexibility for the LI zone, that could allow for more of the uses the community wants, such as auto rebuild and storage units, but it could mean a slow withering of space for actual manufacturing uses.

Commissioner Laing said under the Growth Management Act land for uses such as mining and logging can be preserved and when they are neighboring property owners receive notice that they will not be allowed to complain about those activities. If the issue of allowing for light manufacturing uses is that they are not always compatible with other uses, a similar approach could be implemented by the city. Mr. Inghram stressed that where compatibility is the issue, the specific range of issues will need to be kept in mind. Where something like a rendering plant may not be appropriate, a woodworking operation might be.

Commissioner deVadoss stressed the need for the city to retain its investment in the LI zone as manufacturing practices change in the coming years with 3D printers and other new technologies. If 20 years out the city has not preserved areas appropriate to the new manufacturing approaches, there will be challenges to be faced. Space will particularly needed to house companies that do design work.

Chair Tebelius commented that allowing LI uses gives the city character.

Mr. Inghram briefly reviewed with the Commissioners each of the five LI-zoned areas and the mix of uses currently in them.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked about the proposed Sound Transit maintenance operation in the Bel-Red corridor. Mr. Inghram said it is located in an area zoned for office development and is not directly adjacent to any existing LI property and as such will not negatively impact LI properties or uses.

Chair Tebelius asked if Sound Transit can force the city to allow the maintenance operation in a non-LI zone. Mr. Inghram allowed that they can.

With regard to the LI site along I-405 near SE 8th Street, which it was noted is mostly owned by the state, Commissioner Laing suggested that in looking to the future, the Commission should avoid taking any action that would create or perpetuate a nonconformity. Additionally, any action taken should allow for the maximum amount of flexibility. He said he was generally in favor of simply merging the LI and GC zones into a single designation and dealing with any potentially incompatible uses through the conditional use permit process.

Commissioner Hilhorst said her only fear in taking that approach would be in regard to what potential uses might get lost in translation. If the change is made, there will be no going back. Commissioner Laing said rather than rezoning the LI properties to GC, everything allowed in LI and everything allowed in GC should simply be folded into a single zone; nothing would be lost, and any use that could potentially be incompatible would be addressed through conditional use.

Chair Tebelius said her concern was that the approach could 20 years down the line lead to all LI uses being subsumed by GC uses and the city will have no LI uses at all. Commissioner Laing said that may very well occur, but it would be the market that decides.

With regard to the LI property in Richards Valley on which the King County Humane Society is located, Chair Tebelius said the organization is known nationally for the work they are doing. Additionally, they are currently undertaking a fundraising project that will redevelop their facilities at a cost of millions of dollars. The LI zoning on the site should be retained.

Mr. Inghram reminded the Commissioners that the Eastgate/I-90 CAC recommended that the LI zoning for the Richards Valley area should be retained but some flexibility should be added to allow for flex-tech and research and development uses that might be associated with Bellevue College.

Commissioner Hilhorst commented that nearly every building in the area is being fully used, which might be an argument against making any changes. Certainly nothing needs to be done to help full the spaces.

Mr. Inghram said the economic development policies will be before the Commission again at a future meeting. Time could be taken at the same meeting to talk more about strategies for the LI zone. At the Comprehensive Plan level the Commission could include policy direction aimed at assessing the uses, flexibility and compatibility of the Light Industrial zone.

Commissioner deVadoss asked Ms. Grueter what, if anything, surprised her as a result of her analysis. Ms. Grueter said she was most surprised to see just how close the LI and GC zones are relative to allowed uses. There was nothing surprising in terms of the data itself.

6. Eastgate/I-90 Area Plan

Senior Planner Erika Conkling said the Eastgate/I-90 CAC recommended a mix of office and commercial zoning, and a little more building height, for the LI-zoned King County site. The site is not currently housing industrial uses and it is separated from the Richards Valley by the topography. Its proximity to the freeway makes some types of industrial uses undesirable. For the rest of the Richards Valley LI areas, the CAC recommended preserving industrial uses while allowing flex-tech and research and development uses to locate there. Adding zoning flexibility could help the market to be more responsive in the area.

Councilmember Stokes noted that the CAC also discussed enhancing the natural areas that exist because the topography makes them unusable for development. Chair Tebelius said anything that could be done to make the area "softer" would benefit the area.

Ms. Conklin said the LI area that is part of the Lincoln Executive Center has been recommended by the CAC to be part of the transit-oriented development. While the site is zoned LI, the concomitant zoning agreement in place actually strips away most of the allowed LI uses. The site is currently used primarily for offices. The BERK report agrees with the recommendation of the CAC that the site should become part of the transit-oriented development.

Commissioner Laing commented that it would be incompatible with the recommendation of the CAC to expand the LI uses that were stripped away under the concomitant zoning agreement put in place in the 1980s for the Lincoln Executive Center site. Clearly the site was never intended

to develop as LI and obviously it has not. To fulfill the CAC's vision, the Commission should not suggest the site should be retained or treated as LI zoning.

Commissioner Hamlin agreed. He said for all the reasons cited, it makes no sense to try to hold onto the LI designation for those properties.

Chair Tebelius asked what will need to be done to put the CAC's recommendation into play. Ms. Conkling said it will be necessary to change the map for the four parcels in question.

Ms. Conklin noted that the Commission previously touched on the topic of design and site planning policies when it addressed the recommendations for each of the individual areas in Eastgate. She stressed that site planning and design are very important to the character of an area. One of the major recommendations of the CAC was to create a corridor identity; to carry out that direction it will be necessary to incorporate specific policy language for each of the subareas within the corridor. She noted that her memo to the Commission was specific with regard to which policies need to be amended. The general design direction for the entire corridor included incorporation of the Mountains To Sound Greenway and City in a Park elements and themes. The CAC also gave direction that the buildings that face I-90 should be iconic, and that Eastgate should be enhanced as a gateway into the city. The CAC recommendations included pursuing opportunities to enhance the visual quality of the corridor using vegetation, green spaces and building design.

Answering a question asked by Chair Tebelius about the Mountains To Sound Greenway, Ms. Conkling said the greenway itself involves the entire corridor from the beginning of I-90 to Ellensburg and is a scenic byway. The section of the greenway trail that will run through Bellevue is proposed to be located on the south side of I-90 and is just one component of the byway. The segment of the trail between Factoria and 150th Avenue SE is in the early design stage.

Ms. Conkling said one of the CAC's general recommendations was to go through the concomitant zoning agreements of which there are close to two dozen. The agreements range from the 1970s to the 2000s. Some of the design and site planning conditions have been included in the code, but policy language to address them might be in order.

The Factoria subarea has very good design policies that were done as part of the Factoria Area Transportation Study. Some of the policy language should be amended, however, to make sure the area is designed both for visibility from I-90 and to accommodate a pedestrian scale. In the Richards Valley, policy language is needed to promote sensitive building design and buffering from single family uses. A new policy is needed to assure that whatever happens on the King County site should add to the visual quality of the area and be well designed.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Hamlin, Ms. Conkling said she did not include in the matrix the notion of policy language aimed at daylighting streams. Policies similar to those for Bel-Red would be appropriate, as well as language addressing opportunities for enhancement that could include removing culverts or allowing streams to flow more naturally.

Ms. Conkling said the huge transit-oriented development area in Eastgate is going to be something new and as such will need policy language. It will also be important to highlight the need for suitable internal circulation systems for all modes of travel as the larger parcels redevelop, as well the need to ensure connections with regional systems.

Attention was given next to floor area ratio (FAR). In simple terms, FAR is simply the building area divided by the site area, though the building area excludes the parking and mechanical equipment, and the site area usually excludes rights-of-way, though in most easements and critical areas are not excluded. The Commissioners were shown how a an FAR of 2.0 could result in either a low, flat building or a tall, skinny building.

Eastgate is being viewed as a redevelopment area, but that will not necessarily mean tearing down existing buildings; it could mean new infill development, or a partial tear down and rebuild. In thinking of allowing larger buildings, consideration must be given to impacts on views, light and glare, and visual dominance. Topography must also be taken into account.

Ms. Conkling said the base and maximum FAR varies throughout the city, as does allowed height. Currently in Eastgate the maximum is an FAR of 0.5 and a height of 45 feet. The CAC has proposed different FARs for different parts of the corridor. Bel-Red has a maximum FAR of 4.0 and an allowed height of 150 feet, and in the downtown the FAR can be as high as 8.0 and building heights can reach 450 feet.

Mr. Inghram said the city uses FAR to calculate the intensity of the office use, not to calculate the building envelope. He noted that quick mental calculations of building height and massing for a known FAR can lead to the wrong impression of how FAR translates to a building. The Commissioners were shown photos of a number of buildings, including both commercial and residential, and were asked to guess the actual FAR of each; in most cases the guesses were higher than the actual FAR.

7. COMMUNITY VISION

Mr. Inghram noted that the Commission first discussed the issue of community vision in June 2012. He explained that the vision sets a unified tone for the entire city by mapping out what the city wants to be, where it wants to go, and a roadmap for getting there. The vision as stated in the current Comprehensive Plan has served the city well and should not just be thrown away. The community outreach done as part of the Comprehensive Plan update has pointed out that Bellevue residents like the city and moved to it for a reason.

Ms. Conkling said outreach efforts have been under way for well over a year and began with a series of scoping meetings where the focus was on four specific areas: community, environment, family and business. The joint commissions forum served as one of the scoping meetings and the common themes that came out of that meeting had to do with economic growth, recognizing diversity, and environmental protection. The public forum hosted by the East Bellevue Community Council served as another scoping meeting and the common themes that emerged there included affordable housing, managing storm water, increased mobility and transportation, and green spaces/open spaces/parks. The Bellevue's Best Ideas interactive online site generated a lot of discussion about improved mobility, quality neighborhoods, and economic development. People were allowed to vote on other people's ideas, and the top ideas that came out of that exercise had to do with alternative transportation options, creation of a downtown performing arts center, a children's museum, super fast internet connections, and the creation of third place neighborhood gathering places.

A review of the current vision statement yielded 54 potential vision statements in six different categories. Six different workshops were conducted where people were asked to identify which

of the statements is most important to them, what they like about the statements, and what it will take the most effort to accomplish. In the natural and sustainable category, people generally supported broad ideas involving environmental stewardship, retaining natural settings, retaining the City in a Park idea, and having lots of transportation options. In the design for people category, it was clear that the community should be built on both physical and social connections that link people together. They indicated a desire for diverse housing types and housing affordability, and complete neighborhoods with gathering spaces, parks and shops, all within reach.

In the category of strong economic centers, people were in favor of flourishing active centers in the downtown, Bel-Red, Eastgate and Factoria. They also highlighted the importance of continuing the city's high standard of living and quality education, supporting small businesses, having local neighborhood services and shopping centers, and diversity as an economic asset. With regard to the arts, culture and diversity category, the participants said they see Bellevue as a regional and international leader in arts and culture. They focused on Bellevue as being a great place for those who live here, but not necessarily a tourist destination. They also suggested that diversity as a theme should be woven into all areas of the Comprehensive Plan, not just in arts and culture.

The healthy and secure community category generated comments about housing affordability, maintaining a low crime rate, making sure the community is healthy and prepared for emergencies, and continued support for human services in the community. With regard to the aspirational government category, people expressed a desire to have an open, inclusive and accessible government, continued maintenance of existing facilities and infrastructure, and partnerships and collaboration in the way the city conducts business.

Mr. Inghram said the current vision has several different sections. The intent is not to start over with the update, but there should be a recognition of current conditions, interests and values as well as a future orientation. The vision should be both aspirational and realistic. It should be meaningful, representative and memorable. The difficult part will be in finding the balance between being broad and specific to Bellevue. The current version of the vision is overly long and overly descriptive of Bellevue as it currently exists as opposed to being an aspirational statement of direction for the city. There is also not a clear linkage between the vision and the rest of the Comprehensive Plan. Missing from the current vision statement is an emphasis on people; Bellevue response to regional and global environmental issues; any recognition of the non-downtown commercial centers; the issue of neighborhood connectivity; a focus on diversity beyond an arts and culture viewpoint; and an emphasis on schools. The list of challenges to be addressed included the fact that most of Bellevue's future growth will be focused in the downtown; the population is becoming more diverse and the population of older citizens is increasing; the city is globally connected; light rail is coming to Bellevue; the cost of housing continues to be an issue for many; and the desire for residents to preserve and improve the environment and include park opportunities in the fact of a city that is becoming more urban.

Mr. Inghram asked the Commissioners to review and comment on the draft vision statement included in the packet relative to whether or not it generally represents the character of Bellevue, is aspirational, and is unique to Bellevue. He also asked for comments on issues that may be missing from the draft.

Chair Tebelius stressed that words matter when it comes to outlining a vision for the city. She objected to the use of the phrase "…some neighborhoods retain their unique character…" and to

references that families will be living in highrises in the downtown. The fact that Bellevue's population is aging means there will be more homes in Bellevue's neighborhoods available for families with children. Mr. Inghram said the intent is to show there is a wide range to Bellevue's families; there are families living in highrises, and there are elderly living in single family homes.

Commissioner Hamlin said he had no problem with the language as proposed. He allowed that some tweaks may be in order but they should be made only after careful contemplation and additional discussion.

Commissioner deVadoss said the vision statement needs to be very concise. It should focus simply on themes and principles.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Tebelius said the Commission could benefit from having an education class or even a "cheat sheet" relative to the various zoning districts. Mr. Inghram said an orientation guide is provided to new Commissioners. It outlines the work of the Commission and includes the Commission' by-laws, but it does not focus specifically on land use planning terminology and he agreed that something focused on that would be useful.

9. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS - None

10. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

11. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Inghram invited the Commissioners to attend the Transit Master Plan meeting on February 27 and a housing workshop on March 6.

Mr. Inghram reported that he attended a meeting in Lake Hills recently to give an update on the Comprehensive Plan work, with a particular focus on the extent to which the Comprehensive Plan can help address the housing issues that community has been facing. An offer to provide similar updates is being made to other neighborhood groups.

Mr. Inghram noted a number of ongoing developments in the Wilburton area, including a Porsche dealer, the Bellevue School District maintenance facilities building and a new hotel under construction.

12. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW

A. January 8, 2014
B. January 22, 2014

There was agreement to defer approval of the minutes to the next meeting.

13. NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING: MARCH 12

14. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Hamlin and it was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst.

Chair Tebelius adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.