

BEL-RED OPEN HOUSE AND COMMUNITY MEETING
March 20, 2007

Small Group Discussion #1

Participants:

Cindy Ludwig
Patricia James
Nick Barnes
Pete Perkins
Ann Noris
David Plummer
Greg Johnson
Mary Pat Byrne
Michael McKinlay
Michelle McBeath

Facilitator:

Kevin O'Neill

Scribe:

Emil King

- 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:

- o Would like to have light rail stop within corridor with No Action Alternative, around 130th
- o Land use should drive transportation, not the other way around – rationale for light rail stop within corridor under No Action Alternative
- o Should have light rail run along SR 520 with potential stop in the vicinity of 120th/124th or 130th
- o Ridership is important for light rail station locations – question how a station at 130th Avenue would work with existing land use
- o No reason for stations in corridor under No Action Alternative – need adequate density to justify stations
- o 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
- o 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
- o Lower scale office and service uses are appropriate for the middle portion of the study area
- o 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