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1) Regarding the various land use components that are contained in the alternatives:

a) Are there land use components that you support including in the preliminary preferred alternative? Are there components you feel should be excluded? Is the “No-Action / Existing Plans” alternative a viable option?

b) Is there input you’d like to provide the steering committee regarding land use components that could themselves be done in varying ways, such as the amount of overall development focused in transit nodes, the character of urban design, or open space enhancements?

Comments:
- Would like to have light rail stop within corridor with No Action Alternative, around 130th
- Land use should drive transportation, not the other way around – rationale for light rail stop within corridor under No Action Alternative
- Should have light rail run along SR 520 with potential stop in the vicinity of 120th/124th or 130th
- Ridership is important for light rail station locations – question how a station at 130th Avenue would work with existing land use
- No reason for stations in corridor under No Action Alternative – need adequate density to justify stations
- A lot of light rail trips would be from Downtown Seattle to Microsoft, passing through the Bel-Red Corridor, so there is no need for stops in the Bel-Red planning area
- If land use changes occur, focus them on the western portion of the Bel-Red Corridor (west of 124th Avenue) with appropriate height limitations—Alternative 1 seems like a reasonable alternative
- Lower scale office and service uses are appropriate for the middle portion of the study area
- Planning in the area needs to adhere to the “City in a Park” philosophy
12-story buildings are too tall (would block views from neighborhoods to the north, and also lead to the loss of sunlight)
Concerned about view blockage from Bridle Trails to Downtown Bellevue
Concerned about light pollution issues for the whole corridor
Some feel that 4-6 stories is a suitable intensity for development
Some feel that 4-6 stories is too dense and too tall
Need to think about where “casual” cultural spaces could occur within the corridor
An “arts district” is appropriate
An “arts district” should ideally be located near a light rail transit stop
Concern about any loss of service uses
Economic pressures on service uses (that might displace them) should be avoided
The lowest rents for artists would be with the No Action Alternative
Incentives for artist spaces could be used
Service uses could be incorporated into new mixed-use development
Many service uses have been in the corridor successfully for the long-term without being displaced by development pressures

2) **Regarding transportation components** that support land use in the alternatives:

Are there any transportation components that you support including in the preliminary preferred alternative? Are there components you feel should be excluded?

**Comments:**
- How would the 124th/SR 520 interchange function with an SR 520 light rail alignment? It seems very tight
- Arterials should be extended to make connections and create a grid for the area
- NE 16th Street is the only significant roadway improvement in the eastern part of the study – this is not enough and will lead to traffic being funneled to the west part of the corridor where improvement are planned
- Worried about noise impacts on Bridle Trails Neighborhood
- Getting to park & rides is problematic from surrounding neighborhoods because of poor bus service
- Bus service should take into account more than just the commuter who uses the park & ride
- Difficult to move around the community by bus – need improvement
- There could be a bus that serves the Bridle Trails area with frequent headways – it would be used
- Feeder transit is needed to get people to light rail transit stations from neighborhoods
- Should Bel-Red be a destination for those in Bellevue and in the region?

3) **Regarding enhancements to streams, parks and open space:**

Do you think these are important? What types of stream corridor enhancements or parks and open space improvements would you suggest, if any?

**Comments:**
Priority should be to open up the streams in the corridor – reference to images at open house of potential stream corridor enhancements

Stream enhancements could be done with existing land uses in Goff Creek area (along 140th Avenue NE a good example)

Existing culverts can actually lead to flooding problems

The portion of Valley Creek near 140th and NE 20th is a good example of how businesses can be located adjacent to stream enhancements

The ability to mass development on a site is sometimes needed to provide adequate green/open spaces amenities (Wright Runstad site as an example)

Parks are very important and need to be distributed throughout the planning area

A combination of public and private parks and open spaces amenities is what is needed

The CADMAN site offers a great opportunity for a park because of its large size and location

4) **Any other comments or ideas** to offer the steering committee?

Comments:

- There needs to be a public comment opportunity between the point of the Steering Committee’s final recommendation and when the City Council begins review of the Steering Committee’s work

- There should be opportunities that help personalize the corridor such as the “buying the brick” idea where names or other inscriptions are incorporated into prominent projects by the community

- The equestrian overlay in Bridle Trails has implications for curb, gutter, sidewalk improvements in that neighborhood