

BEL-RED BUSINESS AND PROPERTY OWNER PANELS DISCUSSION GUIDE
SUMMARY NOTES
TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2006

Property Owner Panel: 7:30-9:30 AM

Kris Liljeblad, Facilitator

Questions/Comments after Project and Format Background

Does anyone have any questions? No questions.

1st Q: Participants introduce themselves

Please introduce yourselves and indicate where your property or business is located.

- Bill Anspach: Represent At Work! Previously Custom Industries, serving people with disabilities. Located near Trader Joe's at Bel-Red and Northup.
- Igor Chulsky: Own auto repair shop at Bel-Red/130th, a family business for 30 years.
- Richard Foreman: Kobe West Properties with three parcels on 130th, 132nd and NE 20th.
- Joe Schwab: Small family business office in converted single family residence. Bill's neighbor.
- Cornell Petrisor: Own two office properties near 156th & Bel-Red.
- Ron McClure: Representing Star Rentals and Star Industries on 21st and Northup.
- Al Kelly: Have owned Kelly's Eastside Autobody on 130th for 35 years. Igor's neighbor.
- Dana Fick: Own two residences zoned office/residential on NE 21st between 116th and I-405.

Development Opportunities

The Market Study indicated that there is market demand and development opportunities for some uses that are currently not in the corridor, such as mid-rise office and housing. They also thought there would be a market for expanded medical uses, home design-oriented retail and auto dealerships. **We'd like to hear from you about what development opportunities you see and how planning could help accommodate them.**

- Want to see greater building height allowed for existing land uses, esp. 5-story office.
- Interested in the possibility of several stories of residential over ground floor retail.
- Would like 4-stories of combined retail/office/warehousing with incentives to redevelop.
- Consider multi-story automotive buildings to combine the retail, service and storage functions on a more compact footprint.

Light Industrial Uses

As described in the background, the market study indicated that there is more land available for light industrial use than there is market for. This is a key issue in the study. While there are excellent examples of viable uses still there, like Coke, the new development has focused on other kinds of uses, more retail in character like car dealerships and hardware. **We're interested in whether there is an important or unique function that these light industrial uses play in this area of Bellevue.**

- Don't see any inconsistency between general commercial and light industrial uses. They can easily co-exist and even have apartments above.

- Need to retain automotive repair and maintenance businesses here or they will be lost to the city – no other place to go in Bellevue. They serve a large population base and have millions invested in their buildings and businesses.
- Need to provide a market alternative to the larger auto dealerships as well as provide ancillary services for them; upholstery, tires, windshields, parts.
- Area for services support is needed in Bel-Red for the construction industry in terms of suppliers, vendors, contractors and cabinet shops. They get started here.
- Perhaps incorporate industrial with transportation ala Sound Transit, not near residential.

If the light industrial zoning were changed what do you think the impact would be on the city?

- Detrimental to lose independent auto-oriented service uses.
- If they leave the cost of those services will be driven up.
- Dealerships and body shops depend on them.
- Loss of needed incubator small business area, available only here and near Factoria.
- If you open up the zoning there won't be light industrial in the city within 10 years.

Service Uses

One of the principles that the Council gave the steering committee was to try to build on the existing assets of the area, including successful businesses that are already there and to try to identify opportunities to capitalize on change associated with them. **What types of services should we be trying to preserve in the corridor? What suggestions do you have to try to preserve them, and make that happen over time? Anything you would suggest to facilitate the preservation of those businesses that are already there?**

- Envision the same market for services in the future that is there now.
- Allow more height on the main road corridors. Allow retail below and mixed use above and let light industrial stay "in the shadows".
- Allow a transition over time to mixed use of greater height, whatever the market trends would support.

Land Use/Transportation Interrelationship

We've heard frustration that the zoning has been a constraint on growth here. At the same time there is limited transportation capacity available to serve increased land use intensity. The area is dependent on the transportation supply that can be provided. **How could we grow smarter in this area to avoid creating congestion and negative impacts on surrounding neighborhoods?**

- Unless we put apartments along Bel-Red we won't have any passengers.
- We need to create systems so people will go where we would like them to go.
- Develop a 40-50 year transit plan for Bellevue. Consider a transportation system for people who don't own cars.
- Housing here won't be affordable so most will have to come from elsewhere.
- Anticipate that people will want to live and work in the same area, avoid driving, and walk to restaurants and services nearby.

High Capacity Transit

A couple of minutes ago I heard three of you say an investment in transit would help provide the necessary service to help this area change over time. **Is the rest of the group in agreement or are there other views?**

- If the development intensity can be increased a transit system would be a tremendous asset.
- It's absolutely the future. Good examples to move people are Hong Kong and Portland.
- Bellevue is designed for the auto. Without creating some density there will be no ridership to justify a stop; if we create that density we'll drive out the light industry.
- We should build high capacity transit to move people, anticipating future growth and higher density, and consider building park and ride set up like Highlands in Issaquah.

- If I can walk 20 minutes and catch a piece of transportation to get me anywhere from Northgate to North Bend to the airport in 30 minutes, regardless of time of day, if I didn't have to wait more than 7 minutes I'd be all for having it there.
- People are coming here from everywhere in the region to work because they can't afford to live here. This has always been a huge problem we need to solve.

Environment

One of the themes that came up in the public process and through project discussions is green space and environmental amenities in the area. We've identified a number of stream corridors that flow through the area now, Valley Creek, Goff Creek. The steering committee is interested in looking at ways that this plan could support improving those resources in the future. **How should the natural environment be enhanced in the area while adding value that would encourage redevelopment or property improvements?**

- Plant lots of trees.
- Plan for parks and for people to enjoy green space within the area; recognize sensitive area regulation may create some opportunities.
- What we have is not pretty, but trying to go back will add huge costs either in usability of the land or the protection or development of streams.
- The city could offer breaks to property owners that choose to open up streams or benefit the environment. Steep slopes and other constraints lessen the footprint for buildings.
- Although the existing buildings are grandfathered, if they are redeveloped then the new regulations may apply including setbacks and buffers.

Parks/Recreational Amenities

The Council asked the steering committee to look at the potential creation of new neighborhoods. Its pretty clear that if you were to create a residential population here you would also need more parks and open space to support it. **Do you think any parks or improved amenities should be created in this area?**

- Not needed without the residential component that's not there now.
- The property is too expensive to support affordable housing for regular people.
- If intense development occurs parks and open spaces may be roof-top gardens on high rises and schools would be multi-story with inside playgrounds. The traditional 10-acre playground with a pool and parking lot will be tough to carve out of the area.
- The Safeway site offers opportunities for open space creation. Also the BNSF line is a potential recreational trail and the corridor has other park potentials.
- We're already under lots of requirements to landscape our business properties, more than most cities. If the city wants more green space we'll have to put it in, giving up property for landscaping.
- If more growth and development is allowed it could provide the incentive.

Other Suggestions/Ideas

Before we finish, **are there any other ideas or suggestions that you would like to see considered in the land use/transportation alternatives?**

- Preserve private property rights. Avoid displacement of existing businesses.
- Convert single family residential area between 116th and I-405 to campus office use.
- Support for increased intensity west of 124th Avenue – transit-served urban village, office campus, retail and/or higher density residential in the Safeway area. A Sonics arena could support restaurants and high rises if freeway access could be improved.
- Few areas are left for the service type of business; consider creating a core industrial park in the 130th/Bel-Red area to concentrate it in one location (Evans Industrial Park east of Marymoor Park in Redmond was offered as an example).
- Area along Northrup could develop to higher intensity of existing use (including storage). Also could support office, residential or commercial in mixed use form.
- Area east of 140th should continue to be retail and/or higher intensity office use.

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BEL-RED CORRIDOR PROJECT
BUSINESS AND PROPERTY OWNER PANEL
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

May 16, 2006
7:30 a.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-119

PANELISTS: Bill Anspach, Igor Chulsky, Richard Foreman, Joe Schwab,
Cornell Petrisor, Ron McClure, Al Kelly, Dana Fick

MODERATOR: Kris Liljeblad

Mr. Liljeblad: I want to express the City's appreciation for you coming to join us this morning. As we've been talking about here earlier, the idea here is to try and establish a long-range vision for this planning area, and it's the perspectives of the property owners and businesses in the area that today we are intending to try and collect. My name is Kris Liljeblad, I'm assistant director of the transportation department. A lot of what we are going to talk about this morning is more land use oriented, so I'm going to try and stick to the script to make sure that I get all of the messages straight. I'm really here to facilitate the discussion as opposed to imposing my view on you, so I hope you'll try to keep me honest. And also, there are probably many different levels of familiarity with what the process is about, what we're doing, and the corridor itself, so I've got a little introduction and background to share just to make sure we're all on the same page. And then we'll go around and ask you to introduce yourselves and get into the structured questions right after that.

So what we've been talking about in terms of background here is establishing a long-range vision to 2030, or approximately that planning timeframe. This is the most comprehensive planning analysis that the city has really done to date in this area or for light industrial areas within the city generally. There are several reasons we are doing that, the main one of course is the Council directed us to. But the backdrop is that the market has been suggesting to us for some time that the plans for this area are out of date. Like I mentioned, it was planned back in the 80s and things have been changing in a piecemeal fashion around the area. Many non-light industrial uses have been moving in and other fairly established light industrial uses have moved out and left the area. So we feel that an updated vision is really necessary to take advantage of opportunities and help shape the growth in the area.

The other principal reason is that Sound Transit is planning a high-capacity transit route through this area from essentially downtown Bellevue out to downtown Redmond, and that downtown Bellevue link

will come across I-90 from Seattle. While that's just one piece of the overall transportation picture, it's an important one in that it brings potential transportation capacity that otherwise wouldn't be there to serve the area.

So to initiate this planning process, the Council established a steering committee and established ten planning principles to charge that group to identify what it was they wanted them to do to shape that work. And those revolved around establishing a long-term vision, one that would help assure the economic vitality of the area and the city as a whole, and so forth. We may get into some of those principles further as we get along.

In terms of these panels – the property owners this morning and then business owners and tenants this afternoon – the idea here is really to generate input from the groups and to be able to share that with the steering committee and ultimately with Council as appropriate, and to use that input to not only help shape the alternatives that are developed, but then also after the alternatives are presented to the steering committee, to have another round of these panels to get specific input on those alternatives. So we're at really an important point in that process. And the steering committee scheduled for June 1 is the occasion where the land use and transportation alternatives will be first presented. So we're hoping that your input will be helpful in that process.

So those future opportunities for your further involvement will be on June 6, the next series of panels that we're talking about, and that would be again to look the alternative the steering committee will see on June 1, and then there'll be a broader community meeting on that same subject on June 8. After those alternatives are approved by the steering committee, we'll be working through the summer and into the fall to develop a draft Environmental Impact Statement that will evaluate those alternatives in a programmatic way consistent with the Growth Management Act, really to provide the kind of comparison information that will be useful ultimately to the Planning Commission, Transportation Commission and the Council in trying to development this subarea plan.

So, back to the panel here this morning. Our discussion format is intended really to try and get your candid opinions and your ideas and input. And we want it really to be very free flowing. I'm here primarily just to try and make sure everybody gets a chance to talk on the questions we're trying to pose. As you probably noticed, we're trying to get a complete record of the discussion, primarily to make sure the content is preserved so we can share it with the steering committee members after the fact here.

Are there any questions on that background?

I'd like to ask you to go around and introduce yourselves and just mention a little bit about where your property or business is located.

Mr. Anspach: I'll start. My name is Bill Anspach. I represent a company called AtWork! Previously it Custom Industries, and we serve people with disabilities. And our concern is – and we're a property owner there – gosh, I don't even know the address, but you take that Y to go up toward Trader Joe's in that intersection off to the right that's kind of hard to get to as soon as you go through the light. It's where the Bel-Red Road and Northup converge and then it's immediately to the right. So we're providing services to people with disabilities. And so we also provide – it used to be called sheltered workshop services, which is no longer the case, but we provide training. And so our concerns are for community access, certainly, and to listen to what else is going to take place in the corridor. Our position is we're going to change. We want to be a good neighbor in what we do and support the change, but nevertheless we're here to listen today, too. That's it.

Mr. Chulsky: My name is Igor Chulsky. I represent the auto repair shop right on the Bel-Red and 130th. They're in business 30 years. And it was, of course, a surprise because we were planning to keep the business in the family. My son, he works with me; when I started business when he was ten he was coming up. We own the business, we own the property, but we know a lot of landlords they don't want repair shops anymore. If something happens and you don't own the property, you can't even move the repair shop any place because no one wants to talk about any automotive business, just landlords they don't want it. And of course it's a big concern because it's the future of my kids.

Mr. Foreman: Richard Foreman. I'm with Kobe West Properties. We have three parcels in the corridor. One thing I'm confused about, what's driving this interest in the Bel-Red corridor? Is there some direction you want to change to, or are thinking about changing to? I know what it was zoned the way it is because I was on the Council when it was zoned. What's driving it the other way?

Mr. Liljeblad: There are two main drivers for the study that I mentioned a little earlier. One of the first is that there has not been any planning invested in the area for about 20 years now. The conditions staff have observed are that the light industrial/manufacturing/warehousing uses are largely moving out. They comprise a fairly small percentage of the employees in the area, but occupy a big part of the land area. The market conditions seem to be

changing. The Safeway distribution center is the latest big example of that; it's sitting there vacant in a pretty key location. The other driver is the transportation analysis that Sound Transit is prepared to do for the corridor from downtown Bellevue to downtown Redmond. That potentially could introduce new transportation capacity that needs to be evaluated in terms of the future of the corridor. Certainly Redmond has a very high interest in getting high-capacity transit out to their downtown, and we have a very big interest in having it serve our downtown. This area is in between and at this point at least it would be very difficult to identify where to put a high-capacity transit station, if there is a place in the corridor, what purpose it would serve, whether there would be enough demand to make it worthwhile. That's part of what we can talk about as we get further into this.

Mr. Schwab: Joe Schwab, I'm an owner. I'm actually Bill Anspach's neighbor across the street. We have essentially what was a single family residence converted into office space. We operate a small family-owned business out of there, so we also have the family succession interest. In general, I'm here to find out what the city and what people are thinking about this whole thing, where it might be headed, and to try and be more aware of what's going on.

Mr. Petrisor: My name is Cornell Petrisor. I own two properties in the corridor. I do plan to develop the sites. I want to see what will happen.

Mr. Liljeblad: Tresa Berg is in our transportation department. She does most of our community outreach work on capital projects citywide. This is one of those projects that more planning study than capital project, but when you see projects about anywhere in the city that affect the street system, Tresa is usually involved one way or another.

Mr. McClure: Ron McClure. I represent Star Rentals and Star Industries. We have a small piece of property over on 21st, part of the old Northup Way before they put 520 in. Our address is still on Northup but we're just off of it. I'm here for the same reason, just to see what the city has in the way of plans. We are a light industrial use and always will be. We're not as dirty as the rental industry used to be; we're a lot cleaner. We want to be part of the city. The only problem is we do need the light industrial area because we tend to be a little noisy starting and stopping equipment and that kind of thing. But that's the kind of stuff that needs to be around so you can build the buildings that you're building. We're hoping to be part of that and hoping we're not going to get pushed out. So that's why I'm here.

Mr. Kelly: Al Kelly. I own Kelly's Eastside Autobody on 130th. I'm Igor's neighbor at 1500 130th. The area is known as autobody row. There's four fairly large autobody shops in a row. I own the property and have been a business owner there for 35 years. My concern is not keeping it in the family; I did what I did for the sole purpose of profit. The property is worth X amount of money, but the business becomes worth nothing if you can't sell it. In our industry, you have to sell the business first, which is worth as much as the property, in order for the property to have any value. So if you just considered selling the property and moving, you've lost it all, you've lost your whole business value. There is no value to it then. You can't just pick up a collision business that's established. Some businesses lean more toward moving; it's not a problem for them. With ours you lose 30 years of clientele. To me the business is worth every bit as much as the property. My goal at this point in my life would be to sell the business in the very near future. If a potential buyer looks at it, their concern is going to be how long they will be able to be there before being moved out. Everything I spent my life building could all of a sudden become worth possibly less just on the hearsay that maybe something's going to happen in 2030. If we're going to be changing to high density, somebody's not going to want to pay very much for a business existing in industrial.

Mr. Liljeblad: The next round here will be to go through the series of fairly structured questions. The first one is one you'll all have an interest in chewing on. We hired a consultant, Leland, to conduct a market study of the corridor area. The market study indicated that there is a market demand and development opportunities for uses that are not currently in the corridor, including mid-rise office and housing. There was the thought that there would be market also for medical uses, particularly on the western side of the study area, and more home design-oriented retail and auto-related dealerships, that kind of thing. That's what the market study has suggested. We'd like to hear from you about what development opportunities you see and how this land use planning study could help accommodate those kinds of uses.

Mr. Schwab: Maybe I could spin this around a little bit and say if that includes auto and mid-rise office, what does it exclude?

Mr. Liljeblad: At this point we're not excluding anything. I'd say we're here to hear from you. We're interested in what land use opportunities you see there that they don't have now.

Mr. Schwab: From a transportation and planning point of view, I presume there are things that are more consistent, or less consistent with what your analysis

said. I'm still trying to find out if you have a market analysis, it seems rather comprehensive and a lot of things are possible in there, but there must be some businesses that are inconsistent with that overview. Are there or are there not?

Mr. Liljeblad: Well, that was not the purpose of the market study that was conducted. It was really to look at what investors are looking to build that might land in this area that would have a market. Medical office, residential and those types of things were the ones that were identified. For example, right now you see a lot of highrise office happening in the downtown. Yet in this area there really isn't much in the way of office space. Outside downtown Bellevue there has been a demand for some time for a different kind of office product that might have less structured parking, for example, more surface or single level parking with mid-rise, say five stories or less, office development. Right now we don't see much of that in Bellevue, though you see it in the Overlake area with the buildings Microsoft has on their campus. This area is located strategically between downtown Bellevue and the Overlake area, and yet the development character is very different. Really the question is what kinds of uses would you see. This is just the market consultant that identified those things.

Mr. Anspach: What is the height restriction right now on buildings in this area?

Mr. Liljeblad: Height depends on the zoning type, light industrial on the one hand and general commercial on another. It's probably limited to a couple of stories.

Mr. Anspach: About 30 feet tall?

Mr. Liljeblad: Probably.

Mr. Petrisor: On the Bel-Red corridor it's mostly light industrial. Is there 25 feet height restriction, or 50? Does the city allow to increase the height of the buildings at this time?

Mr. Liljeblad: That's part of what we're asking here, not necessarily what the zoning might restrict you to but what kind of changes you would like to see if there were no restrictions there.

Mr. Petrisor: For example, I have a medical buildings right now. What I'd like to do is tear them down and build five levels. It's a perfect site. The buildings are old, so by developing it it will improve the area and supply more office space, which is needed.

Mr. Liljeblad: So you're saying medical office?

Mr. Petrisor: Yes.

Mr. Anspach: We just saw that, and I mentioned that earlier. There's a brand new building there at 130th and Bel-Red that has a medical use. They took a bank and built the three-level building, though it probably does not exceed 30 feet. When you look at the kind of uses that can go up and down Bel-Red corridor, it's really limited by the zoning that's in place today. I think part of what this is is to think outside the box and what would you like to see. Toward NE 8th you've got residential, and then you have light industrial on the other side of Bel-Red Road, so that corridor is really connecting all of downtown as an arterial between downtown going all the way out to Redmond through the Microsoft campus. So they are looking at how you blend in neighborhoods and mixed use businesses, automotive and medical. I don't think the automotive supply – I don't think any of that is going to go away. So how can we make that improved.

Mr. Petrisor: It's needed, it has to be there. Another thing is this: we don't have to change the use of the area, however we can just raise the height restrictions.

Mr. Liljeblad: So, Cornell, I'm hearing you say you'd like to see more intensity allowed for the uses that are already there.

Mr. Petrisor: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Schwab: I would be interested in knowing what the possibilities would be of the mixed use concept of a retail main level and residential above, and the opportunity for that to be done fairly intensively to get some height and some additional value or use out of the land.

Mr. Liljeblad: That's certain a mixed use kind of product that has a market in other parts of the community already. Any other ideas?

Mr. Foreman: Most of my properties are already built. In order for me to redevelop the properties, you're going to have to give me a carrot so I can increase my value. That's either going to be intensity of use or height so I can see a value in tearing down what's there and redeveloping. My properties are on 130th, 132nd and NE 20th.

Mr. Liljeblad: What kind of uses do you have there now?

Mr. Foreman: On NE 20th next to BMW is retail and office, and warehouse in the back.

And then the other two are offices.

- Mr. Liljeblad: You talked about more intensity, for the same type of use you have there or something different?
- Mr. Foreman: All this is market driven. I certainly would look at increasing the height of office, maybe four stories.
- Mr. Liljeblad: Any others?
- Mr. McClure: So a couple of stories wouldn't be enough, you'd need four stories for it to be worthwhile?
- Mr. Foreman: Oh I think so. The problem with that is, the reason there are two stories on the south side is when it was rezoned the people in Tall Firs went bananas. The zoning says if it butts up against single family it has to be no more than two stories and be homey looking. I don't know how you're going to deal with that on the south side.
- Mr. Liljeblad: We're just about ready to move on to the next question, unless somebody has something else.
- Mr. Petrisor: Where the buildings are so close to residential, is there anything from the residential side that the building has to be so high? I mean, how does the city feel about giving the property owner the right to build higher than the rules allow right now? You can't go higher than two levels.
- Mr. Liljeblad: There is a real question about what the zoning would allow, and to some degree how to buffer adjacent uses when they are different. I think there are some provisions that require the provision of some transition between uses.
- Mr. Petrisor: Trees or something to blend in?
- Mr. Liljeblad: Usually a transition in intensity from one classification to another or some kind of space in between. That's going to vary depending on the types of uses that exist. I'm no expert on the land use side so I guess I'd try to stick to the long-range vision and see if we can move to the next question.
- Mr. Anspach: I'll say this about my experience both in Bellevue and in Kirkland, where you have low-density residential and professional retail office zoning you have a setback from the line that divides the zones, which is generally the center of the street, of 100 feet. That limits the height in Kirkland to 25 feet. If you're beyond 100 feet it goes to 30 feet. The same thing I'm sure

applies here in Bellevue, but again we're talking about the future and how you can take what you want to do and let the homeowners maintain their homes, and then you can build a five-story building perhaps. It's a matter of putting it on the table.

Mr. Liljeblad: Another thing we were talking about earlier was the idea of mixed use where we are talking about maybe some uses that are fairly compatible with each other being combined in the same building, or in adjacent buildings. The steering committee took a tour a month or so ago down to Portland and looked at the Pearl District where there are a lot of different uses in fairly close proximity with a lot of apartment buildings with service uses mixed in in the same districts. And that's kind of a change from the traditional kind of zoning that we're used to in suburban communities. Those kinds of things are possible, but it's not probably going to happen given the situation we've got now with fairly uniform zoning over a large area. Those are the kinds of changes that could happen over time.

Mr. Petrisor: So basically we're doing all these meetings and the City Council will make a decision to do what? Make some changes?

Mr. Liljeblad: The process here is focused, like I said, on the long-range vision. The idea would be to come up with a plan that the steering committee and likely the Planning Commission would agree to that really provides the framework for subsequent policy changes on zoning and other things, including transportation changes and other things that would be consistent with the overall plan. The subarea plan is essentially approved first, and then those changes will be incorporated in the citywide Comprehensive Plan. That takes a couple of years to get through that process. This study process is intended to wrap up early next year, and then the subsequent changes would take another year or so after that to get all the different things in motion that would result in changes on the ground.

Mr. Petrisor: So hopefully in a couple of years we'll see some changes.

Mr. Liljeblad: Yes.

Mr. Kelly: Let me just plant some seeds, particularly for the automotive that's in the light industrial. I would challenge you to look out ten to fifteen to twenty years in terms of the industry. Your challenge is you have a footprint of a building right now that services your account base. What I see in automotive repair is generally single story, it's warehousing, shop and storage for the automobiles. So what's going to be different ten years from now in that industry. With a different footprint you'll have to go up

for storage or shop, so you'll want to see some changes there, but what is it you would like to see happen in the future with your businesses. This is the time to put it on the table, I think, so they can take it into the steering committee to consider what changes are needed to serve you.

Mr. Petrisor: Raising the height will help benefit everybody. I think that's just an important issue.

Mr. Liljeblad: I think we've heard some real sympathy for that. I think I saw a lot of heads nodding about that as something that's a needed change.

This next question has to do more specifically with light industrial uses. As I indicated, we've been told by the market study that there is essentially more land available for light industrial use than there seems to be market for it. This is a fairly key issue in the study. We know that there are some very viable warehouse and industrial uses still there in the area. Coke is an excellent example of that, and we heard from them that they really value their location and want to stay there. And yet, within the last several years there's been a lot of new development that's focused on other kinds of uses, including car dealerships, Eagle Hardware that has now become Lowes, and much more on the retail side of things. We're really interested here in your opinions on whether there's an important or unique function that these light industrial uses play in this area of Bellevue.

Mr. McClure: I don't know that those businesses are inconsistent with the businesses that are already there. Autobody shops are certainly not inconsistent with the car dealers. And Lowes being a big box hardware store is certainly not like putting a ma and pa hardware store in the area. I don't see any huge change in that regard. I think you're comparing general public retail, which these guys aren't. It's just a different kind, and they need a place to be and I need a place to be. I do a little bit of general public retail, but very little. Mine's more with contractors. I think we can co-exist with those kinds of businesses. I don't see that there's a problem. I don't see these guys having any problem with having a retail store with apartments above them either, because they're not working nights and they don't make a lot of noise at night.

Mr. Liljeblad: Could you take a second to introduce yourself, please?

Ms. Fick: Sure. My name's Dana Fick. We own two residential houses that are zoned office/residential along 405 between 116th and 405 on NE 21st Street.

- Mr. Liljeblad: The question we just posed was whether there's some important or unique function that light industrial uses play in the area.
- Mr. Schwab: My impression is that the automotive repair, maintenance businesses, other than some of the large dealerships on 116th, is in the corridor. If we lost those, I don't know where there's another resource in the city. They would be lost to the city entirely. I certainly don't think that would be a benefit. I think that would be a detriment if we didn't have those resources as part of our business life here.
- Mr. Kelly: I don't think that the high-density population would want to go to Snoqualmie to get their cars worked on. It would be a long tow if you break down.
- Mr. Chulsky: Or they have to go to the dealers.
- Mr. Kelly: On some of the repair facilities, such as the one next to me, I mean mine is nationally a large facility. Bellevue is like a triangle all unto itself. It's different from Montana, it's different from California. In California there's some very big facilities, but if you take nationally the 60,000, or I guess now 50,000, collision repair centers and you run a comparison of mine to those, in size and in service to the community, probably we rate in the top three percent nationally. So that means because of the high density that we have surrounding us in Bridle Trails, in the whole area around, our facility services a great number of people. Our little strip of industrial 130th with autobody row and the service centers, Igor's, we service a massive amount of people, probably as much in sales if you combined us in square foot to square foot density as the dealership does. And we have millions of dollars invested in our buildings and in our businesses. So it is a big service to the community, and if we were moved out it would be a real hardship on everybody.
- Mr. Schwab: Auto dealers are also dependent on ancillary operations, like upholstery or tires or parts, distributorships, windshields. They send a lot of that business out, and those businesses are in this area. I think there's also in that light industrial in terms of the construction industry from suppliers, vendors, general contractors, specialty contractors, cabinet shops. There's a place for that, and if that's driven out it's going to drive up the cost of providing those services to the city.
- Mr. McClure: That's right, there's a lot of cabinet shops and a lot of small startup businesses that need that kind of space. And other than the lower Eastgate area, I don't know where you'd put them. That's a lot of tax dollars to the city.

Mr. Liljeblad: That's starting to get into the next question, which is if the light industrial zoning were changed, what do you think the impact would be on the city. That's not saying what it would be changed to, but if it were changed from light industrial, what do you think that impact would be?

Mr. Foreman: Well, highest and best use. There are low-rise buildings there, and if a developer wants to come in he's going to tear them down and build to the maximum. But that corridor on the north side of Bel-Red was the only place in the city where this kind of business could exist, both the companies that these gentlemen operate. Without that, you have nothing in the city, no other place to go.

Mr. Anspach: You mentioned change, though. Are you looking at a change in zoning that would be more restrictive or less restrictive than the light industrial?

Mr. Liljeblad: Well that's a good question, and that was not identified here. But certainly the question flows from the earlier question about the market study and what were the uses that were identified as having more market than what's there. And those were office in sort of a five-story or less kind of framework, residential use, and some other retail-type uses that are probably in that same kind of automotive area. That certainly is what has been happening, and that certainly seems to have a market. If zoning were changed to allow those kinds of things, what would you see happening by way of impact on the local economy. I guess what I'm hearing is there is a real concern about whether there would be a place for the types of businesses that are there now to go somewhere else.

Mr. Chulsky: For example, my business. We service used cars for the dealers, 80 percent of the dealers in Bellevue we service their used cars because they don't have the equipment for used cars. They can work on their own product, but their own used cars that they sell they can't do anything. Even the body shops, we probably serve 50 percent of the body shops. And there's not that many repair shops left in Bellevue who can fit with the new technology. The small mom and pop repair shops are gone because the technology, you have to invest a lot of money to service the new cars. You can count them on the fingers. If you eliminate them then we don't have any independent repair shops except dealers.

Mr. Anspach: One of the things I see with this study indicated that there's more land available than what's needed. So there's no demand for an increase in the density of light industrial uses. What I see out of this is how do you use this land that nobody wants to come in and buy and development for other zoning applications, for other zone uses if you will. So that means where

you have a whole area zoned light industrial, you may in the future have pockets of another zone that will allow other uses. That will attract people that will want to maybe build retail or make some other use out of that. I don't think this is about changing the whole light industrial, it's how do we blend this in. If you've got land and nobody wants to buy it, then you have to change the zoning in order to attract people to get higher density.

Mr. Liljeblad: The prime example of what you're talking about is this multi-acre Safeway distribution center. It's been used for wholesale distribution and some manufacturing for many years, but now it's on the market. So the question would be key for that question. Do you see that, for example for more auto-retail types of shops, or something different from that?

Mr. Petrisor: Besides the Safeway site, there is no other land in Bellevue of that type.

Mr. Liljeblad: There's 900 acres within the study area, and we're talking about the Safeway distribution center site being maybe 40-45 acres or more. It's a big chunk.

Mr. Petrisor: Where's the rest?

Mr. Liljeblad: Well it's all in other uses now. What we're talking about would be some kind of redevelopment where current property owners would convert their property to something else over time.

Mr. Petrisor: So there is already building on it.

Mr. Liljeblad: Right. Your example is a good one where you have buildings on your property already that are maybe past their prime and you're starting to think about what other kind of reinvestment could you make. I think that's really what we're talking about here is the long term and what kinds of uses would make sense. We're talking here and trying to focus a bit on just the light industrial side of that, and that's what the majority of this study area is zoned for now.

This next question deals pretty directly with a lot of what we've been talking about here, namely the service uses. As we mentioned earlier, the principles that the Council gave to the steering committee to conduct this study, one of those was to try and build on the existing assets of the area, including successful businesses that are already there, and try to identify opportunities to try and grow those viable business opportunities and capitalize on change associated with those. This next question is what types of services should we be trying to preserve in this corridor, and what suggestions do you have to try and preserve them and make that happen

over time. What we heard previously was try and provide more height and that type of thing. Anything you would suggest the city try to do to facilitate the preservation of those businesses that are already there?

Mr. McClure: The way I see it is on the main road corridors it would be smarter in that area to allow more height. The retail is obviously taken over for most of the light industrial on the corridors, NE 20th or Northup and Bel-Red Road. The retail facing the street has obviously grown considerably. To allow them to do retail below and mixed use above I think would be an excellent idea and still leave allow the existing businesses. It certainly wouldn't have to be everybody on that corridor. I think where the main roads and the main corridors are, let the retail grow there and the housing grow there, and let the light industrial stay in the shadows.

Mr. Liljeblad: Any other ideas?

Mr. Schwab: In the best of all opportunities, Al Kelly's property just for the sake of discussion, which is light industrial, I think in order to preserve his interest in his opportunity there the light industrial zoning needs to be preserved. Now at the same time, if the zoning can be mixed so if the highest and best use for his property down the road is not what he's got going and is what he can sell, and if it can evolve to mid-rise office or whatever so that he can have both opportunities mixed within this area, then I think that's the best compromise all around. If you take this and allow it to development according to the market and trends, but keep the mixed use availability.

Mr. Kelly: I concur with that. That makes sense. Because if it is almost to a transition point for me, so I would want to keep the light industrial at this point, but if I wanted to development to a four-story on my property, I would have that ability to evolve into what the city sees. It would only make sense, but there again there's got to be enough value in it, there's got to be a pretty good reason for it for me. The growth of the city and profit, it's got to fit.

Mr. Anspach: What does the study say for this area, that the uses – it's all market driven, so what other uses does the study indicate would fit into this area?

Mr. Liljeblad: It depends on where in the area, but things they identified were office, more retail, and housing primarily. That covers a pretty broad range, but I think you see a lot of construction happening right now that is in the office and residential arenas. Those things go in cycles and that's what the current market analysis is suggesting.

A follow-up question on this one, looking more long range out 25 years or so, do you envision the same kind of market for services in this area that's there now?

Mr. McClure: Definitely. I think that's what everybody has been saying.

Mr. Petrisor: It's needed, it has to be there.

Mr. McClure: You can't lose this corridor, because there's no place else that you can put those kinds of businesses.

Ms. Fick: You can go to Kirkland.

Mr. McClure: But there's no place else in Bellevue.

Mr. Liljeblad: We've been talking mostly about auto-oriented kinds of uses, but obviously your's, Ron, is different.

Mr. McClure: It's not just mine. I'm talking about light industrial small machine shops, small construction companies, many of which began in small spaces or old single family homes, and warehouses where they can do some fabrication, so on and so forth. The city needs those kind of areas. And as far as I can tell, other than over by Factoria, there's a small area by Factoria, there's no other place in the city of Bellevue that you've got this kind of a corridor. I think you can mix use it by letting the corridors in Bel-Red and NE 20th development higher and put some residential on. And the other thing is, if we're talking about more density residential, I think you also have to look at the residential areas right next door to this corridor. I know there's a lot of resistance to that, but where else are you going to put what you've got right now? Where you going to put them? If the city decides they don't want it, then they're making a mistake, because they need the services that are provided from the businesses that are there.

Ms. Fick: We've not discussed transportation much, Sound Transit or transportation ideas. Perhaps trying to incorporate some industrial with a transportation area, not right next to residential.

Mr. Liljeblad: Is your point different from what Ron said earlier that he'd like to see more intensity along the arterial streets with light industrial in the shadows or in the less well-served transportation areas. Are you suggesting something different than that?

Ms. Fick: I'm just thinking what will happen to the light industrial areas if you do multiuse or office or retail. They do serve a purpose in the city.

Mr. McClure: That's right, and I think as far as the transportation issue, if you look at trying to serve this kind of an area with a transportation it would be difficult. Especially in Bellevue because the majority of the people who work in this area don't live in Bellevue because the affordable housing isn't here for them. They come from other places and they drive in their cars, and it's a two-hour commute if you live in Renton. So I think as far as your transportation is, for those people who are driving here and have to drive here, we'd like to see the guys in the office towers and the high-density areas served by transportation so they're off the roads. Let's be realistic. You've got to put your transportation in the corridors and serve the corridors, downtown Bellevue, downtown Redmond and downtown Seattle. And if you can incorporate it, the corridors like Bel-Red and Northup where the residential and retail is intensified.

Mr. Liljeblad: This is an area the next question starts to get into, and that's much more focused on the land use and transportation interrelationship. It gets at what Ron was just talking about here. We've heard, staff and the steering committee, have heard to a large degree that there is frustration that the zoning has been a constraint on future growth in the area here. At the same time, there is fairly limited transportation capacity to serve change, to serve increased land use intensity in the area. So, to a certain degree the area is dependant on the transportation supply that can be provided. Part of the question here is, how could we grow smarter in this area to try and avoid creating so much congestion or negative impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.

Just to refer you back to that aerial up above there, you see a pretty definitive line around the area. To the south there's residential neighborhoods, a lot of more greenery, cul-de-sac street patterns. And similarly to the north of 520 you see a lot of more residential use, and continuing out further to the east, and also on the western side. It is surrounded, essentially, by single family residential uses. And we've heard from those neighbors in both this study and previous ones that they don't want to try to have to suffer negative consequences of growth in terms of cut-through traffic, people parking on their streets, that kind of thing. Certainly the surrounding neighborhoods are part of the issue, as well as the limited street capacity that exists to serve this area.

Given that, what would you suggest is the smartest way to grow this area?

Mr. Foreman: Other than light industrial, is that what you are talking about?

Mr. Liljeblad: Well, to look at the transportation side of it, how would you suggest we

try to serve the area?

Mr. Foreman: Transportation is driven by density, density population. Unless you try putting apartment houses along Bel-Red Road, you're not going to have any passengers.

Ms. Fick: Does Bellevue have a mass transit plan for 40 -50 years out?

Mr. McClure: I think that's a critical question. The problem that we have in the greater King County area is the fact that we base our transportation upon where the people go rather than creating systems so the people will go where we would like them to go to. The east coast and Europe went where the transportation was.

Ms. Fick: You can't provide low-income housing for the people who serve the area. You will need brand new apartments and multiuse complexes. Some of those people will live there but not the majority because they can't afford it, so they'll still be coming from elsewhere. If you build a transportation system for people who don't own cars –

Mr. Liljeblad: We have not been very visionary about establishing a mass transit system to serve the area. Is that what I'm hearing, that we ought to invest in long-range transit to serve this area? Would that unlock the development potential here?

Mr. Schwab: I would think so. This area has the potential for the intensive type of development that you've seen in any urban area. We jump back to South Lake Union or whatever. But then we've gone from light industrial to the other end of the spectrum. If you just look at the map there, I can see where the planners or the visionaries could take this. You could have highrise residential mixed use.

Mr. Anspach: The market will take care of that if you have the flexibility and the zoning to allow the use that Al wants over there, or for a developer to come in like Richard that sees that he can get high-density multifamily mixed use within the heart of the area, and you have the transportation system to serve it. If we don't get a handle on fuel costs, none of us will be driving cars. We'll need to rely on more community-based businesses where people want to live and work in the same area. We've not talked about restaurants and those types of services and uses, but all that goes hand-in-hand with the urban development that Joe was talking about. For me, when I look at development of the corridors that Ron was talking about, I think that's great. But in the center there you have to open that up to let the market decide what's going to go in there, but still allow Igor here to

keep his family business for as long as they want to. If the market changes, he may say Holy Schmoly I can get \$20 million for this piece of property 20 years out if the zoning is set to allow me to have a developer build a building there. It's really related to zoning and height, because you need to get up.

Mr. Liljeblad: We've got about 15 minutes left here to wrap up and I've still got a couple of questions left. This one that we're on right now is a pretty important one. What I heard a couple of minutes ago was that there are about three of you that sort of said you thought an investment in transit would help provide the necessary service for the area to help it change over time. I wanted to go back to that and see if the rest of the group is in agreement with that or if there are different views about transit. I think I heard Dana bring it up, and Ron agreed, and Cornell you were saying yes you were there too.

Mr. Schwab: I would say that if the intensity of development potential was there, yes you're going to have to be able to get in and out of there in a transportation system. I have no faith in Sound Transit, but nonetheless if it could really happen it would be a tremendous asset.

Mr. Liljeblad: From our perspective, I don't think it matters at this point who the implementing authority is. Right now the area is served by King County Metro, primarily on the edges. There is not a lot of transit service that goes into the area right now, although I see people waiting for buses on Bel-Red Road and NE 20th. But it's very infrequent, and it's primarily peak oriented. If you go out there on a Saturday you're probably not going to find a bus more than once an hour or something like that. The question was whether there's an appropriate role for a mass transit system of some kind, and I'm hearing that there is.

Mr. McClure: I think it's absolutely the future.

Ms. Fick: And I don't think it's just for this specific area, it's for all of Bellevue. This area just happens to provide the land needed without condemning houses and all that. It's a natural place for it. If you open up the zoning, there won't be light industrial in the city within ten years.

Mr. McClure: That's exactly what I'm saying. The city has to decide if they don't want that in their city, that's exactly – I guarantee that's what will happen.

Mr. Foreman: Bellevue is designed for the automobile, without question. Population density is key. You've got to have apartments and people out there who demand transportation. No one is going to build a transportation corridor

and spend hundreds of millions of dollars when there's no ridership. Maybe 20 or 30 years after they build it there'll be ridership. To me, if you rezone the light industrial with higher and better uses, you'll drive it out of the city. Without having apartments density, you are not going to get a transportation corridor. People aren't going to ride it out there for industrial, or even for retail.

Mr. Liljeblad:

To return to the point I made earlier. This area is really pretty strategically located between downtown Bellevue on one side and Overlake on the other. There clearly is a potential for ridership between those two destinations. There are 30,000 or more employees in downtown Bellevue now, and another 20,000 or more in the Overlake area, and this area is right in the middle. Whether that's residential use or whatever it is, the connection between those two areas is going to produce some ridership regardless of what happens within the area. I think part of the question here is really what role this area should play in serving or fitting in with those two generators on either end. Whether this area generates ridership or not becomes not the main point. With activity on either end, there's going to be a lot of transportation connecting the two. Part of the question is going to be what role will this area play in filling up the middle there.

We talked about Sound Transit making a high-capacity transit investment here, potentially. And certainly they're going to be looking at linking those areas. Part of the question here is what are your thoughts on how this planning effort could capitalize on opportunities high-capacity transit could provide. How could this area best fit with high-capacity transit investment?

Mr. Schwab:

The chicken or the egg.

Mr. McClure:

I agree. I agree. I think the high-capacity transit needs to go between Redmond and Bellevue, it needs to go to Seattle. But where it stops in between is going to depend on where the people are. The way it's set up right now in that area there's not enough density of people in that area to justify a stop. If you add apartments and other businesses, that might be different. As the railroads were developed across the United States, when the cities grew up big enough, the train stopped.

Mr. Anspach:

I think we should build for the high-capacity transit system to move people, anticipating future growth and higher density. I get into Hong Kong a lot and I see how well they manage moving millions of people efficiently and effectively at a very reasonable cost to the passengers. We have none of that in our area. Portland does a better job than we do, but

around the United States we are far behind with moving a lot of people. It's incredible. I think we need to invest in that.

Mr. Liljeblad: I think I heard earlier the suggestion that you need more intensity to make the transit functionality work. Part of the question here is where would it make sense for that intensity to be located. With a transit system you have a fairly limited walk radius from the station. For example, if it's a quarter or half-mile walk to the station, if we're talking about high-capacity transit, what makes sense there? Or does it make sense in this area?

Mr. Anspach: Beside the stations you're going to have to have a park and ride lot-type of setup there. I was just in Highlands yesterday in Issaquah. It's amazing what they've got up on top of that hill, a big park and ride and tower garage. They've got lots of market there and they're planning on more people. They've done a marvelous job with that.

Ms. Fick: Does the downtown have any plans for mass transit to serve the highrises and apartments?

Mr. Liljeblad: Downtown Bellevue is expected to be the first extension from downtown Seattle to the Eastside. The expectation is that it would cross on I-90 on the existing I-90 bridge, which was built with adequate capacity to support a high-capacity transit system. It's part of the original Sound Move plan that was passed in the late 90s, in 1996. Although it's been slow to get implemented, the investment from Seattle to downtown Bellevue would be the first leg. And then from downtown out to Redmond is sort of the next piece of that. And Sound Transit initiated a planning effort now to try and flush out this same 30-year planning horizon to identify how that might take shape, what makes sense, how much would that cost, and what would the impacts be. So we're really trying with this study to get ahead of that a little bit so that the city of Bellevue can offer its own take on what would work best for us. This is definitely a part of what we'll have to be looking at there.

Mr. Schwab: If I can walk 20 minutes from somewhere within this area, if I can take a 20-minute walk and catch a piece of transportation that would get me anywhere from Northgate to North Bend to the airport in 30 minutes, regardless of the time of day, if I didn't have to wait more than seven minutes for that to happen, I'd be all for having it there. If that's what's coming, I'm for it.

Mr. Kelly: With the high density in the city – high density living spaces in the city are not for the average worker that's working there. They can't afford it. They're coming from Kent, Renton, Marysville. They're traveling into

the corridor, into the hub of Bellevue, because the average person can't afford to live inside the Eastside zone anywhere, not just Bellevue but for a great distance around. To bring employees into the area has always been a huge problem. You have to almost pay them a huge amount of extra money to get them to come to the hub of the city. They'll come as far as Redmond out of the north, and they'll come as far as Kent or Renton out of the south end, but they don't want to make that extra shot into the hub. Employees are difficult to get into the city, so if you build highrises you are going to have – are they going to be the ones that are jumping on the rail and going anywhere? They're probably already retired, they're probably millionaires or they wouldn't be living there. And so they are not traveling anywhere to go to work.

Ms. Fick: A lot of employees are in the Crossroads area.

Mr. Liljeblad: There's just a couple of additional areas we need to hit on. We've been talking mostly about the development side of things, including land uses and transportation. One of the themes that came up through the public outreach process and through discussions we've had on the project is green space and environmental amenities in the area. We've identified a number of stream corridors that flow through the area now, Valley Creek, West Tributary, Goff Creek. The steering committee is interested in looking at ways that this plan and planning we're doing here could support improving those environmental resources in the future. The question is, how should the natural environment be enhanced in this area while adding value that would encourage redevelopment or property improvements?

Ms. Fick: Speaking of China, they're planting trees left and right, which does a lot for pollution as well.

Mr. Anspach: The green space, particularly when you're looking at sensitive areas such as streams, wetlands, and what's going on there is that the buffers are being expanded to disallow building next to these areas. So there's the issue of how to get the highest and best use of a site that may be next to a stream. There are a lot of restrictions. Part of the planning has to be for parks and for people to enjoy green space within the area.

Mr. Liljeblad: Let me repeat the question: how could the natural environment be enhanced while adding value that would encourage redevelopment or property improvements? What would add value to your property? There are a number of places in the corridor where streams are in a culvert underneath an existing building. There are a combination of different conditions in the area.

Mr. Schwab: If we were to do anything different from what we have here, what would be different would be to have the streams more evident and more featured and what not. That's going to add cost, huge costs, either in terms of usability of the land or the protection or development of the streams. So if we expand the environmental impact of the streams, it's going to cost adjoining areas and adjoining owners' usability of their properties. We may have gone – what has happened to this point has not been environmentally pretty perhaps, but it is what it is. If we go back, it's going to have huge costs.

Mr. Liljeblad: I'd like to point out that we're talking about redevelopment. I think I've heard a number of you say that if there were fewer restrictions on height or other things you may have a different investment in your property than you have now. I agree there's a cost attached to improving the streams, and yet the property owners are looking at a lot of costs to improve their properties. We can assume that there's a potential to invest in improving the environment. I'd like to hear more about any other ideas.

Ms. Fick: This city could offer some breaks to property owners that choose to open up streams, some benefit to the property owner for improving the environment.

Mr. Anspach: One of the things I see there on Bel-Red Road is you have some office buildings, streams and steep slopes. If those buildings are to be torn down to be redeveloped, then the new restrictions would be in place, which is going to displace the building even farther from where it is. That has to be addressed to allow for a building footprint to be rebuilt there. In today's code, the buildings wouldn't exist hardly because they're right next to it and they were grandfathered in before we did these codes. We have to consider that.

Mr. Liljeblad: The next one is a related question. This is really more about creating parks and recreational amenities within the area. The Council asked the steering committee to also look at the potential creation of new neighborhoods, and this goes partly to what Al was talking about earlier in terms of there being a real short supply of housing, particularly affordable housing on the Eastside in general. It's pretty clear that if you were to create more of a residential population here you would also need more parks and open space to support that kind of a use. Right now Highland Park is in the area along Bel-Red, but that's about the only one there. So improved or new amenities do you think should be created in this area?

Mr. McClure: There again that depends on the city's decision with what they want to do with the corridor. As it sits now, it would be a terrible waste of taxpayer's

money, because there's very little residential. If you are talking about adding residential to the area –

- Mr. Liljeblad: It's pretty clear right now that there's no real infrastructure for a residential population in the area. There are no schools and there are no parks. If you were to create a residential population, you would need some parks and open space to support it. That's really the question, what improvements do you think would be needed within the area to make that work?
- Ms. Chulsky: There is some question about how you could build low-income homes when the land is that expensive. It will be even more expensive when the time comes. How are you going to build affordable home or affordable apartment? You are not going to bring regular people.
- Ms. Fick: Lots of places require a percentage of the housing units to be for low income.
- Mr. McClure: If the city is talking about transitioning this area that far, you are going to need parks and schools. That's quite a transition from what it is right now.
- Mr. Schwab: I think if you're talking about parks and open space in the context of intensely developing in the extreme, that will create a need for schools and all sorts of things. I think you'll have to take a different look at what parks and open spaces are. They may be rooftop gardens on highrises. Schools may be multistory with an inside playground. You are talking about having to create a whole new vision. The traditional context of setting aside ten acres or more for a nice playground with a pool and a parking lot will be tough to carve out of the area. I don't have an answer for how to do that.
- Mr. Liljeblad: The area is fairly sizeable, and there is the possibility of taking the more traditional approach. I'm not hearing that it's practical, however. We talked about the area being strategically located. The service uses serve a very large market area, and that could be true for other types of things were location could be important. A large park in the area could serve a large population.
- Mr. Schwab: The Safeway site offers some opportunities. If the Sonics could be brought in there along with restaurants and highrises in a contained area with access to the freeway without having to use the surface streets, part of the overall development could be some open space. The possibility to look out for the long range exists best in the big pieces of land.

Ms. Fick: Are we talking about an urban village concept?

Mr. Liljeblad: Yes, that is one idea. With regard to parks and open space, though, the area is not particularly beautiful in terms of Bellevue standards. One of the questions is what role might there be for partnering with the city to create attractive or inviting places?

Mr. McClure: The question really is are we willing to give up our property for landscape.

Mr. Liljeblad: Well, that wasn't really the question.

Mr. McClure: Yeah it was. We're already under quite a bit of requirements to landscape. The businesses are basically invisible from the street. I'm not sure exactly where that question is going as far as providing more green space. In comparison to other cities, we supply a lot of green space. If the city wants to change that, it's going to be up to the city. If they want to provide more green space, if we want to change our business we'll have to put it in.

Mr. Kelly: If the zoning were changed to allow more growth and development of the individual properties, there could be more desire to provide the extra green space.

((END OF RECORDED PORTION OF THE MEETING))