

**BEL-RED BUSINESS AND PROPERTY OWNER PANELS DISCUSSION GUIDE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
**WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2007**

**BUSINESS OWNER PANEL: 4:00 TO 6:00 AM**

Kevin O'Neill, Facilitator

**1<sup>st</sup> q: Participant introduce selves**

Darin Croston: Representative from Coca Cola

Lorna Faxon: Representative from Safeway

Ron Coe: Medical clinic on 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

Suzi Parker-Dixon: Medical clinic on 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

Dave Peek: Office properties along 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

Christopher Lang: Property owner along NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street

Frank Spicer: Business owner, AutoLogic, 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE

In the first question, we'd like you to consider the **land use components** that are essentially *the same* across the action alternatives (for example, the area of Medical Office along 116<sup>th</sup>, or the general fact that development in each of the action alternatives is concentrated in nodes, although the location of the nodes varies). **Are you generally supportive of including these components in the preliminary preferred alternative?**

- Medical office uses along 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue make sense—what would be allowed intensity?
- Having transportation capacity in place is vital—need a commitment to have light rail in the area
- Is there a requirement to develop residential uses in the area?
- Need to focus certain types of uses in the corridor—office and housing
- Retail along eastern end of the corridor, along NE 20<sup>th</sup>, makes sense
- Support for the idea of stream and open space enhancements (generally)

Still on the subject of **land use components**, but moving onto the land use components that *vary* between action alternatives, such as the specific location of development nodes or the concept of a “services core” in Alternative 1, or the “light Industrial” sanctuary in Alternative 2.

**a) Is there any land use component you particularly want to see either included or excluded in the preferred alternative?**

- There is nothing too extreme about any of the alternatives other than the introduction of housing
- LRT nodes are a big issue—are there specific criteria for how much development should be located in this area
- Support a combination of Alternative 1 and Alternative 2—like services core, and like LI area shown in Alt 2
- If middle of the area changed in the future (more mixed use), types of auto service and service uses would also need to change to be more compatible
- There will be increased traffic with office and housing uses
- Service uses will be necessary in the long run to support new office and housing uses
- The services core identified in Alternative 1 does a good job of showing where services are concentrated
- Major issues with combining mixed use with some existing uses—noise, fumes, truck traffic
- Should look at what other communities are doing to combine service uses with more intensive uses (Pearl District in Portland)

- Coca Cola would prefer to keep adjoining development minimal, and are especially concerned about housing next to their operation—done in other places, but issues
- Makes sense to have the housing concentrated on the eastern end of the corridor, have more office/commercial uses on the west
- Civic/arts concept a good one—wondering if Pacific Northwest Ballet is an owner or tenant
- Should Safeway and Coca Cola really be located here 30 years from now?

Shifting to the subject of **transportation components**, the work done to date has identified an ambitious set of transportation infrastructure projects, which are, with slight variations, common to all action alternatives. This set of transportation projects is sufficient to support the land use components outlined in any of the three action alternatives at an acceptable level of service. Omitting any of these projects could constrain the amount land use growth possible or could increase congestion beyond [what, under standard ratings is] an acceptable level of service

**Is there any transportation component you particularly want to see either included or excluded in the preferred alternative?**

- Makes sense to widen 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, but need to be careful of the “dip” in the road—makes it difficult for truck traffic
- On-ramp to SR 520 eastbound needs to happen
- Concerns about widening of 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE—will be right-of-way impacts, impacts to properties. How much congestion will there really be on 116<sup>th</sup> north of the hospital?
- Need to preserve the use of rail transit on the BNSF corridor—a great opportunity in the long term

Shifting back to looking at the **land use alternatives**, when the Steering Committee develops a preliminary preferred alternative, they are not limited to picking an alternative *wholesale*, although they can do that if they wish.

**We’re wondering if there is a land use alternative you would suggest they build from—retaining the basic layout, but perhaps substituting components of other alternatives.**

***In other words, is there one particular alternative you would use as the basis upon which to build a preferred alternative?***

- Generally support the idea of housing on the eastern end of the planning area, industrial/office on the west side
- Support civic/arts center idea
- Housing on the eastern end of the planning area will offer housing opportunities for Microsoft employees

In a few moments, we are going to wrap things up with a request to help us identify—if possible—some areas of consensus to communicate to the Steering Committee. However, before we do that, I want to ask:

**Are there any other comments or ideas not already expressed that you’d like to offer the steering committee as they start their work on developing the preliminary preferred alternative?**

- Question about stream requirements—large setbacks will be required to rehabilitate these streams
- Like the idea of small parks, green spaces in the area (all participants agreed).
- Too bad about the way Lake Bellevue was developed—would be difficult to change now
- Utilize wetland, other critical areas to build green spaces, etc.

As we noted, staff will be the Steering Committee will be working in late March and early April to develop the preliminary preferred alternative.

**Based on the panel discussion we’ve had this [morning/afternoon], are there two or three main areas of consensus that this group would like to convey to the Steering Committee to help them develop the preliminary preferred alternative?**

- Office/hospital uses on the west end, housing on the east end
- Support small parks, green spaces—should be pedestrian-oriented
- Fix eastern transit station in Redmond
- Importance of allowing, preserving service uses