# Planning Commission Correspondence

# Received between September 29 and October 12, 2016

## Cullen, Terry

**From:** bt.livability@gmail.com
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2016 9:42 AM
**To:** PlanningCommission; Slatter, Vandana; Stokes, John; Wallace, Kevin R; Robertson, Jennifer S.; Robinson, Lynne; Lee, Conrad; Chelminiak, John; wherman@moosewiz.com
**Subject:** Concerns about Downtown Livability

Bill Herman wherman@moosewiz.com sent the following message:

Dear City Council Members and Planning Commissioners

There is alot of problems with the latest developments with the downtown livability update.

1. You cannot vote on an update to the zoning rules without knowing their effect on traffic. Once you give the developers additional height and FAR, council won't let you take it back. Your streets are a given. A woman was killed as drivers are racing around trying to avoid traffic. Is it safe to add all those cars? Let's find out before the vote. A study was promised.before the vote.

2. Building heights need real limits, stop adding loopholes where heights and FAR are regularly exceeded. Fund affordable housing within the city budget and incentive system. Stop cheating on the rules to grab more resources.

3. Say no to the extra 15% in height for mechanical screening and "interesting roof line" height exception. It doesn't make any sense to exceed limits. Put the interesting roof lines on the signature buildings in the center while adhering to your 600 foot limit. Allowing the exceptions outside of the center and not in the center violates the wedding cake design principle. Who said interesting roof lines are worth extra height and destroying views?

4. Create a mechanism where additional height and FAR are only awarded if transportation and parking goals are met.

5. Create an incentive system that gets the most for the city while still being a viable place for business. Fix the problems with the old incentive system and not simply layer a new system on top of the old broken system.

6. Come up with a plan on how to use accumulated amenity credits from past projects so that we aren't simply setting up a means for developers to cash in unused credits without paying into the new incentive system.

Rushing this through will just lead to further mistakes.

Sent by the Steegle.com Contact Us Form Google Apps Script

## Cullen, Terry

**From:** bt.livability@gmail.com
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2016 2:38 PM
**To:** PlanningCommission; Slatter, Vandana; Stokes, John; Wallace, Kevin R; Robertson, Jennifer S.; Robinson, Lynne; Lee, Conrad; Chelminiak, John; wherman@moosewiz.com
**Subject:** Concerns about Downtown Livability

Murat Divringi muratd@gmail.com sent the following message:

Dear City Council Members and Planning Commissioners

There are problems with the latest developments with the downtown "livability update".

1. Traffic and Parking studies were promised prior to the vote on upzoning. Once you give the developers additional height and FAR, there is no means to take it back. The streets are a given, building sizes need to fit the streets. A woman was killed as drivers are racing around trying to avoid traffic. When we lower the speed limits, will we shrink the buildings? The zoning decisions need to be consistent with mobility and safety goals!

2. Building heights need real limits. Exceptions to maximum height and FAR defeat the purpose of zoning and are confusing. Affordable housing, mechanical screening, and interesting roof lines must all be achieved within the agreed upon limits. When do the exceptions stop?

3. Create a mechanism where additional height and FAR are only awarded if transportation and parking goals are met.

4. Create an incentive system that gets the most for the city while still being a viable place for business. Fix the problems with the old incentive system and not simply layer a new system on top of the old broken system.

5. Come up with a plan on how to use accumulated amenity credits from past projects so that we aren't simply setting up a means for developers to cash in unused credits without paying into the new incentive system.

It is more important to get this right than to get this now!

Once granted, developers will have their way and move on, while we are left with broken promises.

Sent by the Steegle.com Contact Us Form Google Apps Script

## Cullen, Terry

**From:** bt.livability@gmail.com
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2016 4:00 PM
**To:** PlanningCommission; Slatter, Vandana; Stokes, John; Wallace, Kevin R; Robertson, Jennifer S.; Robinson, Lynne; Lee, Conrad; Chelminiak, John; wherman@moosewiz.com
**Subject:** Concerns about Downtown Livability

Barbara Taylor barb.j.taylor@hotmail.com sent the following message:

Dear City Council Members and Planning Commissioners

There are problems with the latest developments with the downtown "livability update".

1. Traffic and Parking studies were promised prior to the vote on upzoning. Once you give the developers additional height and FAR, there is no means to take it back. The streets are a given, building sizes need to fit the streets. A woman was killed as drivers are racing around trying to avoid traffic. When we lower the speed limits, will we shrink the buildings? The zoning decisions need to be consistent with mobility and safety goals

2. Building heights need real limits. Exceptions to maximum height and FAR defeat the purpose of zoning and are confusing. Affordable housing, mechanical screening, and interesting roof lines must all be achieved within the agreed upon limits. When do the exceptions stop?

3. Create a mechanism where additional height and FAR are only awarded if transportation and parking goals are met.

4. Create an incentive system that gets the most for the city while still being a viable place for business. Fix the problems with the old incentive system and not simply layer a new system on top of the old broken system.

5. Come up with a plan on how to use accumulated amenity credits from past projects so that we aren't simply setting up a means for developers to cash in unused credits without paying into the new incentive system.

It is more important to get this right than to get this now.

Sent by the Steegle.com Contact Us Form Google Apps Script

## Cullen, Terry

**From:** bt.livability@gmail.com
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 12, 2016 12:01 PM
**To:** PlanningCommission; Slatter, Vandana; Stokes, John; Wallace, Kevin R; Robertson, Jennifer S.; Robinson, Lynne; Lee, Conrad; Chelminiak, John; wherman@moosewiz.com
**Subject:** Concerns about Downtown Livability

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Michele Herman michelekherman@gmail.com sent the following message:

Dear Planning Commissioner or City Council Member:

I am a resident of downtown Bellevue and I am concerned about the coming changes in the land use code. I applaud the goal of creating a more livable city. My most pressing concerns are;

(i) Increasing density by 67% in the MU district will increase traffic congestion, compounding what will be an intractable problem.

(ii) There is no rational plan to deal with congestion due to using the wrong measures and not considering diminished capacity,

(iii) Building height rules are nearly impossible to understand. Building height limits are regularly exceeded and it requires a trip to city hall and a spreadsheet to learn why. We suggest that a 300 foot limit mean that the building can not be taller than 300 feet, including everything.

(iv) An incentive system that rewards developers for providing underground parking when they would do it anyway is counterproductive and a waste of resources. Either be silent on underground parking or make it a requirement in an optional bundle of incentives.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent by the Steegle.com Contact Us Form Google Apps Script