CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

January 14, 2015
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Chair Laing, Commissioners Carlson, Hamlin, Hilhorst, deVadoss, Walter
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	Commissioner Tebelius
STAFF PRESENT:	Paul Inghram, Nicholas Matz, Mike McCormick-Huentelman, Department of Planning and Community Development; Lori Riordan, City Attorney's Office
COUNCIL LIAISON:	Councilmember Stokes
GUEST SPEAKERS:	None
RECORDING SECRETARY:	Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:36 p.m. by Chair Laing who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Brent Carson, attorney with the firm Van Ness Feldman, spoke on behalf of Alamo Manhattan Properties, owners and developers of a property on Main Street and the contract purchaser of the Par 5 property between 106th Avenue NE and 107th Avenue NE that is the subject of the split zoning discussion on the agenda. Contrary to what the staff report indicates, Par 5 does not own the two lots to the south. Lot 2 in fact has three zoning designations: DT-MU on the north, R-30 on the south, and Office in the middle. Alamo Manhattan is proposing moving the downtown line moved to the south line of Lot 2. The staff recommendation is to move the zoning line to the south line of the Radford property. Changing the zoning will not affect access to the Southwest Bellevue area.

Mr. Sam Chiplana, 11418 NE 19th Street, noted that in 2009 the city made changes to the Bel-Red subarea and increased the FAR from 0.5 to 1.0 and the building height to 70 feet. Under the rules that were established at that time, a review was to have been conducted in five years; to date, that review has not taken place. He presented to the Commission a petition indicating community support for doing the promised evaluation.

Mr. Mike Rogers, 100 Bellevue Way SE, said the property has split zoning, DT-MU on the northern half and Office on the southern half. The property should have a unified zoning with

the DT-MU extended to the south property line. The adjacent property owners have voiced no objection to that solution. The site is not near residential development and is surrounded by Office zoning. Staff has recommended DT-MU for the Radford property. The current split zoning creates both current and future problems.

Comprehensive Planning Manager Paul Inghram briefly outlined the rezone process and the steps involved.

Mr. Norm Hanson, 3851 136th Avenue NE, referred to the proposed change to Policy UT-39 that would allow communication lines to be undergrounded only when electrical lines are undergrounded. He noted that in many places in Bellevue where the electrical power system was put underground, overhead communication lines have been put in. If the policy is changed as proposed, the communication lines will never be undergrounded and a serious inequity will be established.

Mr. Colin Radford, owner of the Radford property in the downtown that is part of the debate regarding split zoning, voiced support for the staff recommendation. He said in talking with neighboring property owners he heard no dissenting voices.

Mr. Hal Ferris, 5531 175th Place SE, addressed the subject of the Housing Element. He stressed the importance of including affordable housing in the downtown and calling it out specifically. The downtown is called out in the current Comprehensive Plan as a neighborhood in which affordable housing is to be included. The fact is the downtown is home to more than 50 percent of the city's increased housing capacity. The argument has been made by some that the downtown is the most expensive place to build and that putting affordable housing there does not make sense, but if that argument carries the day tremendous pressures will be brought to bear on all other areas of the city; in fact, nearly all of the housing in the Bel-Red area would need to be affordable in order to meet the requirements of the city's long-term goals. The downtown should be called out specifically in the housing plan as a place where affordable housing should be one of the goals. He noted his support for the staff's wording on the rest of the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Carlson commented that there are ways to make housing affordable, whether in the downtown or somewhere else. He asked what would be the right way and the wrong way to provide affordable housing. Mr. Ferris responded by saying that across the country the neighborhoods that are the most vibrant and energetic are those that have a mix of affordability. Communities that are either all low-income or all luxury are not classified as healthy communities. Regulations can be drafted to require the mix. Incentives can work provided they do not involve economic burdens that are greater than what the developer will get in return.

Answering a question asked by Chair Laing, Mr. Ferris said he has used the multifamily tax exemption in projects over the past 20 years. It is a great economic development tool that can cause development to happen in neighborhoods where it otherwise would not happen, such as neighborhoods where local retail is dying or has died. In the downtown area it can be used to provide an economic relief to make up the difference between market rates and workforce affordability. The tool does not take away from the city's tax collections in that it only exempts taxes on improvements that have not yet been made, and when the exemption runs out the tax liability is at a higher rate. Overall it is a very good and useful program that has been successfully used in a lot of cities.

Ms. Kim Lovell-Price spoke representing the staff and volunteers of Downtown Action to Save Housing (DASH). She noted her support for the comments made by Mr. Ferris. The organization was founded in 1991 to respond to the changing landscape in downtown Bellevue and the need for affordable housing and since that time has seen over a thousand affordable units constructed. The year 2014 ended with a historic low vacancy rate. As the need for affordable housing increases, the available is becoming more limited, making it difficult if not impossible for homeless families to move into transitional housing and families in transitional housing to find some form of permanent affordable housing. The Commission was asked to take a firm position on affordable housing. Vibrant and diverse communities require affordable housing, and inclusive and welcoming communities desire it. Policies that discuss surplus land should be included given that the cost of land in the downtown makes the development of affordable housing almost impossible. Policies addressing the need to serve special populations should also be included.

Ms. Rachel Vogley, 205 NW 65th Street, Seattle, spoke as operations coordinator for Imagine Housing. She said everyone should have the opportunity to live in a safe, healthy and affordable home, and noted that it is better for the environment and families if people can live close to where they work. Imagine Housing has a wait list of over 3000 individuals seeking affordable housing, which is a clear indication of how great the need is. In September 2014 the average rent for a two-bedroom one-bath unit in West Bellevue was $1875 per month, and to afford that an individual would need to make $36 per hour and work full time. A person earning minimum wage can only afford a housing unit costing $532 per month. The Commission was urged to support the staff recommendations for modifying the Housing Element, particularly with regard to planning affordable housing in the downtown, working to address the housing needs of special populations, and addressing the use of surplus land for affordable housing. Legislation is needed to mandate a broader spectrum of affordability. Transit-oriented development is not only possible but has been shown to transform communities by addressing both housing and transportation.

Mr. Steve O'Donnell, 13945 SE 47th Street, spoke as president of the Somerset Community Association, as a member of the CAC for the Energize Eastside project, and as a co-founder and president of Citizens Coalition of Eastside Neighbors for Sensible Energy. He noted that he along with other members of the CAC produced what amounts to a dissenting report to the final report and said he would make it available to the Commission. Careful consideration needs to be given to the long-term vision for the city and whether or not it should include the inequity of no poles or wires in the portion to the west of I-405 and industrial blight to the east of I-405 brought about by having low-level distribution lines, 40-foot towers, and 135-foot steel towers carrying high-power lines scarring the landscape. As proposed by Puget Sound Energy, nine of the 18-mile line would run through Bellevue, including the Bridle Trails and Newcastle areas. There is no argument to the fact that reliable power is needed at a reasonable cost, and the Comprehensive Plan needs to include policies to that end. It should not, however, be city policy to industrially blight the city. Rather than allowing new lines, the focus should be on embracing new technologies.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS,

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Councilmember Stokes welcomed the Commissioners back following the holiday break. He noted that much was accomplished in 2014. The retreat was positive and will contribute to improvements for all boards and commissions. He praised the work done by Commissioners deVadoss and Carlson on the community vision statement. The Commission has huge challenges in 2015 and it will be interesting to see how the goals are met.

6. STAFF REPORTS - None

7. OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT DISCUSSION

City Attorney Lori Riordan noted that in 2014 the state legislature enacted legislation requiring public officials to receive training in the Open Public Meetings Act. She said all Commission meetings must be open to the public, except for authorized executive sessions. All actions taken by the Commission must be accomplished in meetings open to the public, and under the law the term "action" is broadly defined to include taking public testimony, deliberations and discussions, and final actions involving votes taken on motions.

The conducting of executive sessions by boards or commissions is very rare given the state-authorized list of subjects for executive session, most of which do not involve the work of boards and commissions. A board or commission could call an executive session to discuss a complaint involving a commission member or staff, or to discuss with legal counsel the potential consequences of an action or inaction. Ms. Riordan said her office in the past has provided advice to boards and commissions outside of executive sessions through confidential memoranda.

Ms. Riordan noted that during the Commission's annual retreat held late in 2014 commitments were made, particularly by staff, to provide support to the Commission. She said the commitments made extend to her office as well; where deemed necessary, the Commission will be afforded the opportunity to have an executive session conversation with legal counsel.

Violations of the Open Public Meetings Act can occur in a variety of ways. Electronic communications have triggered violation of the Act by some groups by having a quorum of members involved. The Act can also be violated by conducting an executive session that is not properly noticed or that is on a topic not covered under the exceptions.

Ms. Riordan noted that following the Commission's retreat it was indicated that the Commission might want an executive session to receive some legal advice, so an executive session was scheduled. Upon receipt of feedback from the chair and vice-chair, however, the executive session was cancelled. Unfortunately, the information was not communicated to the Commission members, so at the meeting in December there was a conversation that occurred outside of the public record about the offer to have an executive session. Action occurred at that meeting in that direction was given to staff about what to do with the offer.

Where there is a potential violation of the Open Public Meetings Act, bodies must engage in what is called a cure, a body of law that has been developed by the courts. The manner in which a cure is effectuated is to replicate the action taken in the non-public meeting. The replication must occur in an open meeting.

Ms. Riordan explained that while an action was taken by the Commission in a meeting that should have been held publically, there is no liability attached to the violation because the statute requires the members to have knowledge that an unauthorized meeting is to be held, and an intent to continue in the face of that knowledge. It is clear that what occurred in the potential violation of the Act stemmed from a miscommunication by staff. There was no intention on the part of any Commission member to participate in an unauthorized meeting.

Ms. Riordan said it was her understanding that the Commission's direction was for staff to proceed to the Council with the recommendations made by the Commission in September 2014 regarding single room rentals. She asked the Commission to confirm that direction for the record.

Chair Laing confirmed that he and vice-chair Hilhorst directed that there be no executive session, but somehow it ended up on the agenda. He allowed that he was not present at the meeting where the agenda item appeared and that he would abstain from participating in any cure.

Commissioner Hilhorst said the Commission gave unanimous direction in September 2014 relative to single room rentals. She added that no changes have been made by any Planning Commission member since then.

8. STUDY SESSION

A. Comprehensive Plan Update

A.1 Project Update and Schedule

Comprehensive Planning Manager Paul Inghram briefly reviewed the work done by the Commission over the past couple of months and said the focus is on moving toward getting to a public review draft, a public hearing, and action handing the issue off to the City Council. The intent is to complete the initial review of the components that have been completed in January, and to release the public review draft of the entire plan on February 11. That will pave the way toward holding an open house on February 18, a joint boards and commissions meeting on February 25, and the public hearing on March 4. The testimony taken at the public hearing would then be discussed on March 11, and the Commission's recommendation to the Council would be made on March 18. Final action by the Council would then occur in mid-June ahead of the June 30 statutory deadline for the Comprehensive Plan update.

A.2 Community Vision

Mr. Inghram said the work done over the holidays by Commissioners deVadoss and Carlson in conjunction with staff was intended to both update the vision and make a clearer connection between the vision and the individual chapters while assuring consistency with the Council's vision developed over the past year.

Commissioner Carlson said there was no intent to alter content, rather the focus was on streamlining and clarifying. Several editing sessions were held, both jointly and severally.

Commissioner deVadoss said it was truly a team effort. For each section there is a phrase summarizing the key theme, followed by a sentence or two providing details where required. The principles under which the work was done included having everything be about Bellevue,

and being aspirational.

Commissioner Walter referred to the transportation section and asked if there was any discussion about the order in which the mobility options are listed. Commissioner deVadoss said there was not. Commissioner Walter suggested listing the modes alphabetically and using "auto" in place of "car" to be more inclusive. She also said she saw nothing about the delivery of goods in the transportation section.

Councilmember Stokes commented that the Council's retreat is slated for February 12 to 14 and suggested that if the Commission could essentially finalize the vision statement before then it could be shared with the Council.

Commissioner Hilhorst said she appreciated the degree of succinctness in the document. It is clear and easily readable. Chair Laing and Commissioner Walter agreed.

Chair Laing said he would like to see something said about making sure first responders are able to get quickly to where they need to go. He also noted that Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish are called out in the shoreline management section but Mercer Slough is not called out, nor or any other lakes or streams. Commissioner Hamlin cautioned against getting too wordy but agreed Mercer Slough should be called out.

A.3 Neighborhoods Element

Mr. Inghram noted that in September when the Council was updated on the status of the Comprehensive Plan two Councilmembers asked if the Comprehensive Plan should include a neighborhoods element. In addition to the comments from the Council, staff took into consideration the fact that the Commission previously discussed whether or not the subarea boundaries should be drawn to reflect how the neighborhoods self identify, and the notion of neighborhood leaders coming together to identify issues individual to their neighborhoods and in common with other neighborhoods. The Comprehensive Plan deals with many neighborhood issues, such as housing and transportation, but they are not housed in a single element. Additionally, while the current Comprehensive Plan has general elements and subarea plans for different areas of the city, there is nothing that links the two together. The proposed neighborhood element is intended to show readers how the two link together.

Neighborhood Outreach manager Mike McCormick-Huentelman allowed that the Comprehensive Plan is a plan for the entire city, including Bellevue's neighborhoods. However, the policies that pertain specifically to neighborhoods are not assembled in a single location and are therefore difficult for residents to pull out or index. Additionally, there is no specific framework for the development and growth of Bellevue's neighborhoods, or any effective tool for dealing with neighborhood-specific concerns that might not rise to the level of being citywide issues.

Mr. McCormick-Huentelman shared that in working with neighborhood leaders four things come up most frequently: 1) residents see Bellevue's neighborhoods as distinct and unique places and they highly value their individual characters in need of something other than a one-size-fits-all approach to neighborhood planning; 2) Bellevue's various neighborhoods share certain core needs in common; 3) high value is placed on community connections and social cohesiveness; and 4) the ability of neighborhoods to face change resulting from external pressures or internal issues and the need for the city to support and strengthen the ability of neighborhoods to be

participants in adapting to change, preserving what they care about most while developing and accepting new things.

Mr. McCormick-Huentelman reviewed with the Commissioners the proposed goal statement and policies.

Commissioner Hamlin noted his support for the four themes and suggested the policies should be organized around them. Chair Laing concurred.

Mr. McCormick-Huentelman said the last five policies are focused on the notion of how to use the neighborhood plans as a tool for people to engage in planning on the neighborhood area scale.

Commissioner deVadoss said he liked the proposed framework. He recommended using the word "distinct" rather than "diverse" in the goal statement, and he proposed deleting "demographics and" in policy N-7.

Commissioner Hilhorst commented that Bellevue has always been considered to be a safe city, yet crime has risen lately. The policies address the issue of safety but include nothing actionable with regard to keeping neighborhoods safe. She also commented that relative to preserving the tree canopy there is a gap in the Comprehensive Plan and in the code that allows property owners to cut down all of their trees and then sell the properties to developers, giving them a clean slate to work with. The loophole is making it difficult to preserve neighborhood character. There is nothing actionable that will help to preserve the neighborhoods to be in 20 years what the vision for them is.

Chair Laing said he would like to see the distinction made in the policies about the difference between a subarea and a neighborhood.

Mr. Inghram said there will be an opportunity to brief the Council on follow-up items in February. That would be a good opportunity to seek clarity regarding the concept of a neighborhoods element and to make sure the Council is on board before generally releasing the draft.

Councilmember Stokes said his take was that the Comprehensive Plan would benefit from having a neighborhoods element. He said the policies are generally solid and will serve as the framework for implementation.

Commissioner Hamlin called attention to the heading on page 12 of the proposed neighborhood element and suggested that "neighborhood policies" should read "neighborhood planning policies." Referring to page 14 and the heading "policy connections," he suggested the section actually focuses on policy connections in other Comprehensive Plan elements and said that should be made clear.

Chair Laing proposed substituting the word "businesses" for "stores" in the neighborhood core paragraph on page 8. He also called attention to the fifth sentence in the adaptability paragraph on page 9 and suggested it paints a somewhat bleak picture that many neighborhoods may object to; it seems to suggest that by 2025 the city will have failed on some of the other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. He proposed deleting the sentence. He also suggested using the word "homes" in place of "lots" in the last paragraph on page 10.

To the point that the policies are intended to provide direction around public safety, Commissioner Hilhorst noted that none of the proposed policies in fact address public safety. Commissioner Hamlin agreed and suggested if there is no specific policy, the issue should at least show up in the policy connection section.

Mr. McCormick-Huentelman pointed out that policy N-1 calls for maintaining neighborhoods as safe and welcoming environments and asked direction from the Commission relative to either beefing up N-1 or adding an additional policy. Commissioner Hilhorst said she liked the policy language generally but would prefer it reworded to drive action toward safety.

Chair Laing proposed adding an overall policy something like "The paramount responsibility of the city shall be to protect the public health, safety and welfare."

Councilmember Stokes commented that the desire for safe neighborhoods is a given for Bellevue residents. The question is how to do that. If policy language is written prescriptively, it becomes necessary to make sure everything is addressed and nothing is left out. The inclusion of policy language calling for safe neighborhoods will be followed up with specifics in the associated action plans.

Commissioner Walter suggested referencing safety in regards to police, first responders, fire, lighting and transportation in an overarching policy. Mr. Inghram said he would take the suggestion under advisement. He added that traditionally the Comprehensive Plan has directed facility improvements, in which case the Capital Facilities Element would have a policy about having sufficient city facilities to cover the area. Policies generally refrain from getting into the operations side which is heavily influenced by what the Council decides to fund.

Commissioner Carlson commented that policy N-11 is not written so as to be clear to residents. He propose having it read "Allow neighborhood-tailored solutions to problems while ensuring that it meets citywide responsibilities."

BREAK

A motion to amend the agenda to defer items 8-A.4 and 8-A.5 to the January 28 Commission meeting was made by Commissioner Hamlin. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

A.6 Downtown Subarea Boundary

Chair Laing disclosed that his law firm represents Alamo Manhattan in a separate and unrelated matter. Nevertheless, he recused himself from the discussion of the downtown subarea boundary, turned the gavel over to Vice-Chair Hilhorst and left the meeting.

Senior Planner Nicholas Matz said the question is whether or not adjustments should be made to the southern downtown subarea plan and zoning boundary. During the Downtown Livability Initiative and scoping process for the Comprehensive Plan update, downtown property owners came forward asking the city to examine the circumstances of the downtown boundary location. The Council directed inclusion of the item in the downtown work program. While the other downtown boundaries are drawn with straight edges along existing roadways, the southern boundary is straight in places, follows property lines in other places, splits properties and

buildings in some cases, and in some instances separates properties that are under common ownership.

Mr. Matz explained that the southern downtown boundary is derived from historical platting actions. Rather than an edge, Main Street serves as a spine with development on either side. The first modern zoning goes back to 1953, and by 1971 the historical record reflects that most of the commercial, business and office uses had solidified. The boundary line has also been influenced by topography and a desire to distinguish the downtown from the southern neighborhoods. There have over time been attempts made to reconcile the subarea boundaries to rezone actions and the like. In 1979 when the downtown plan was adopted, the downtown was officially distinguished to prevent its spread into the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

The boundary line review focuses on the six properties where the line splits property parcels, splits buildings, separates properties under contiguous ownership, and where property owners have raised specific boundary issues. The four review factors developed by the staff with the intent of looking consistently at similar properties, were: 1) A change is needed for a property to reasonably develop consistent with the land use pattern; 2) A change would not have undesirable impacts on the quality or consistency of urban design; 3) A boundary change would result in a more logical and rational boundary; and 4) A boundary change has the support of affected property owners.

With regard to the Forum property, the boundary line splits the building without following a property line. It is likely there was historically a property line that no longer exists. The site is fully developed with 29 condominiums and a few businesses. Staff concluded that there is no critical mass of ownership interest to pursue making any change to the existing boundary line.

Mr. Matz said the Vander Hoek property was assembled from smaller parcels and then redeveloped. The density difference between the zones that split the site is roughly double the number of residential units. The boundary line follows a property line. Staff concluded that the site has the ability to redevelop, and changing the property line would yield downtown-type building façades up against Wildwood Park, something that is disconcerting to local residents.

Responding to a comment made by Commissioner deVadoss about the fact that property ownership changes over time, Mr. Matz agreed that at some future time all three properties may be under the same ownership. If that were to occur, having the boundary line where it is would not really matter.

The Rodgers site is developed with a Radio Shack retail use. The boundary line splits the building, though it likely originally followed a property line that no longer exists. The portion of the property within the DT-MU is of sufficient size to be able to redevelopment. The larger concern is that moving the line would extend the DT-MU façade treatment to the south, resulting in the perception that the downtown is being expanded to the south.

The building on the Radford property is split by the boundary line, though it actually follows a property line. Though similar in size to the Vander Hoek property, the Radford property is

developmentally stuck. The properties involved have for many years been under a single ownership. Each of the three properties could be redeveloped individually, but if the line were moved a more linear and rational boundary could be created. Any resulting redevelopment of the site would help distinguish between the downtown and non-downtown areas.

Mr. Matz said the Par 5 property has been under a single ownership for a long time, though Alamo Manhattan has a contract to purchase it. The boundary line splits the middle of the three properties. If the boundary were to be moved, larger buildings would be permitted closer to the street in a way that was not otherwise foreseen. When the site was rezoned through a Comprehensive Plan amendment and a rezone action, the legal description did not account for a portion of it, which means there is some Office zoning in the mix. There are different relief options available, however, including amending the rezone to make the entire site R-30; a change in the boundary would not be needed in taking that approach.

With regard to the Surrey property, Mr. Matz noted that staff had had no response at all from the property owner. There is no apparent immediate pressure to redevelop the site, and redevelopment could occur without a change in the boundary line, which currently runs through a parking lot. If readjusted, the boundary line would be moved further south into a neighborhood.

Commissioner Walter thanked staff for clarifying the issues.

Commissioner Hilhorst concurred. She said she was fully aware of the long history associated with keeping the southern boundary line firm but was unaware that the line in fact was drawn through some buildings.

Mr. Inghram said staff's review of the properties kept in mind the importance that the neighborhoods to the south attach to policy S-SW-8. The language provides assurance that the downtown will not expand over time and swallow up their neighborhoods. At the same time, it was necessary to consider the needs of the property owners in light of the fact that in some cases the boundary line splits buildings. The policy seeks to prevent the spread of the downtown into adjacent residential neighborhoods, but where a building exists, redrawing the line to avoid passing through it is not necessarily the same as extending the downtown southward.

Mr. Inghram said the options are to leave the boundary as it currently exists; to make rational changes to the boundary consistent with the language of the policy; or to change the boundary line, which could require making some modification to the policy.

Commissioner Hamlin pointed out that for any of the properties, changing the line could result in redevelopment, and then the next time the Comprehensive Plan is updated the issue could be revisited and the ultimate result could in fact be downtown creep. Mr. Inghram said there certainly is no intent to create a reward system in which someone buying a property adjacent to the line can ask to have the boundary line moved to accommodate the new acquisition.

Commissioner Hilhorst commented that in moving the boundary line additional assurances could be given to the residential neighborhoods that no future boundary line adjustments will be made even if someone purchases properties next to the line.

Commissioner Hamlin pointed out that to some degree policy S-SW-8 seeks to do exactly that and states unequivocally that the borders of the downtown subarea are to be maintained as they were drawn in 1979.

Commissioner deVadoss voiced the position that no one can say for sure what the needs will be in 25 years. At the time the policy was written there were no neighborhoods in the downtown itself; it was only a business district. That has now completely changed. He suggested the policy should allow for some flexibility.

Mr. Matz said he would bring the issue before the Commission again on January 28 and seek at that time direction for each specific property. The direction given by the Commission will serve as the basis for the public hearing.

9. OTHER BUSINESS - None

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Stu Vander Hoek, owner of the Vander Hoek property, pointed out that the Forum property is not fully built out to the Old Bellevue property lines, which it could do. He requested moving the boundary line to the north end of Wildwood Park for both the Vander Hoek and Forum properties. That would accomplish many Comprehensive Plan policies. Straightening the line makes sense. If the line is not moved to the edge of the park, it will not be possible to build on the Vander Hoek property to the same conditions as the property across the street, leading to inconsistent application and experience on the two sides of the street. The downtown zoning requires a 20-foot setback for landscaping. If the Hogan property develops, it will be required to provide the buffer on the south side. Moving the Vander Hoek property into the downtown would then move the 20-foot buffer down even with the buffer that extends from 101st Avenue SE to approximately 105th Avenue NE. Such consistency should be an important factor in delineating the edge of the downtown.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Hamlin, Mr. Matz noted that the Land Use Code was amended in 1997 to allow for moving the required 20-foot boundary to the farthest south extent to avoid having it stripe across a property. The code also allows for building across the boundary.

Mr. Carl Vander Hoek with Vander Hoek Corporation, said the existing development on the Vander Hoek site is ugly and the desire is to build something nice there. The property has been in the family for many years and will continue to be into the future. Redevelopment will be

made easier if something just a little bigger can be constructed. Moving the line as proposed only makes sense so that development on each side of the street can be the same. The park site is owned by the city so there should be no fear of expanding the downtown in that direction, and the 20-foot buffer could be looked at as an expansion of the park. Access to the park could be opened up. The park is the buffer between the neighborhood and the downtown.

11. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW

A. September 10, 2014
B. September 24, 2014
C. October 8, 2014
D. October 22, 2014

There was consensus to move approval of the minutes to the next meeting.

12. ADJOURN

Commissioner Hilhorst adjourned the meeting at 10:06 p.m.

Paul Inghram
Staff to the Planning Commission

6/24/2015
Date

Aaron Laing
Chair of the Planning Commission

6/24/15
Date

* Approved May 13, 2015