

BEL-RED BUSINESS AND PROPERTY OWNER PANELS DISCUSSION GUIDE
SUMMARY NOTES
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2007

PROPERTY OWNER PANEL: 7:30 TO 9:30 AM

Kevin McDonald, Facilitator

Carol Anderson: Design Center on Bel-Red Road
Steve Shennum: Eastside Staple and Nail
Dave Sharp: Legacy Commercial
Gregory Johnson: Wright Runstad
Ellen Glann: Lake Bellevue resident
Patricia Halpin: Leases house she owns on NE 20th to business
Jon Magnussen Sr.: Businesses on [120th? and] 130th and Bel-Red Road
Jon Magnussen Jr.: Businesses on [120th? and] 130th and Bel-Red Road
Robert Messmer: Cascade Commercial Management (assisting Magnussens)
Rodney Johnson: Businesses on north side of Northup Way (Ironworks gym) (124th and also 130th)
Mark Yuhl: Also owns property with businesses on North side of Northup Way
Samir Chudgar: Sherwood Forest resident; has home-based engineering business

In the first question, we'd like you to consider the **land use components** that are essentially *the same* across the action alternatives (for example, the area of Medical Office along 116th, or the general fact that development in each of the action alternatives is concentrated in nodes, although the location of the nodes varies). **Are you generally supportive of including these components in the preliminary preferred alternative?**

- Opposed to retail-only along Northup/NE 20th (commented on this during DEIS process). Density of 75-80 units per acre might be difficult where lot sizes are small
 - Density of 75-80 units per acre might be difficult where lot sizes are small, so put density more toward west where lot sizes are bigger.
- Support adding housing in with commercial in area around Angelo's restaurant .
- Adding density along 116th makes sense, with medical and other office. Biomedical research could generate jobs.

Still on the subject of **land use components**, but moving onto the land use components that *vary* between action alternatives, such as the specific location of development nodes or the concept of a "services core" in Alternative 1, or the "light Industrial" sanctuary in Alternative 2.

a) Is there any land use component you particularly want to see either included or excluded in the preferred alternative?

- Regarding services uses – it is a good idea to provide opportunities for a wide range of uses, including housing. Otherwise limits value of property.
- Don't be too restrictive on land uses, focus more on impacts, and mitigate them (example of auto body repair). Encourage compatible uses. Don't put service uses just/all in one place.
- Zoning designations should not preclude services uses - allow for flexibility as market demand shifts.
- The retail/commercial strip along Northup/NE 20th Street (south of freeway) should include flexibility to allow multi-story housing north of Northup under freeway, for example, a 10-story condo that could take advantage of Mt. Rainier views.
- The development of new housing will also create need for essential services, for example elementary schools and additional Fire protection services.
- Recognize the importance of civic/arts – make it easy for them to locate and flourish in Bel-Red. (It's difficult for arts organizations to get a toe-hold in areas.)
- It will be harder to introduce new housing due to the potential for incompatibilities with existing uses, that may continue – make sure there are good transitions.
- Along Bel-Red Road, allow for more intense retail development along the north side.

Shifting to the subject of **transportation components**, the work done to date has identified an ambitious set of transportation infrastructure projects, which are, with slight variations, common to all action alternatives. This set of transportation projects is sufficient to support the land use components outlined in any of the three action alternatives at an acceptable level of service. Omitting any of these projects could constrain the amount land use growth possible or could increase congestion beyond [what, under standard ratings is] an acceptable level of service

Is there any transportation component you particularly want to see either included or excluded in the preferred alternative?

- If condemnation for right-of-way takes too much parking, you will end up taking the entire parcel because the use may not be viable without the parking. Don't put new NE 16th street through area because it would take too much right-of-way.
- Put light rail on SR 520 with stations at either end of the corridor
- Don't put light rail on SR 520. State Dept. of Transportation has *already* taken property neighboring mine.
- T transportation system improvements serve more than just the corridor.
- Light rail station is needed to serve Overlake Hospital and the medical/office area on 116th Ave NE. Hospital workers tend to be transit users.
- Wright Runstad development would embrace a light rail station at 122nd as we have land area that could capitalize on that infrastructure.
- Make light rail stations convenient for people to walk to. Six blocks is too far to walk to a station.
- Move potential interchange from 124th to 130th. Avoid connections to the north.
- The proposed interchange at 124th and SR 520 is critical to traffic flow. Don't see issue if this does not let traffic go north to Bridle Trails.
- NE 10th extension would take too much property as a 5 lane road, make it 3 lanes at most.

Shifting back to looking at the **land use alternatives**, when the Steering Committee develops a preliminary preferred alternative, they are not limited to picking an alternative *wholesale*, although they can do that if they wish.

We're wondering if there is a land use alternative you would suggest they build from—retaining the basic layout, but perhaps substituting components of other alternatives. In other words, is there one particular alternative you would use as the basis upon which to build a preferred alternative?

- Alternative 3: due to land use program and station location
 - Put housing along NE 20th and north of Northup.
 - Include housing at the 122nd node
 - Include housing south of Bel-Red Road
 - Put density where infrastructure is available – west of the West Tributary. Make sure density planning for is realistic and not too high.
 - Be bolder, because there's probably more future market demand than what's outlined in EIS.
 - Growth reflected in Alternative 3 is about what we would expect.
 - Like office density in Alternative 3, but have big concerns about right of way on the extension of 10th. . Having a five lane street would cut too much into our property. Also, access to our property from 10th would be an issue.
 - Need 120th/124th couplet.
 - Be flexible with zoning, especially so services can stay (several nod in agreement.)
 - Fine that alternative 3 does not have LI sanctuary. The land is too valuable to deny property owners flexibility to do other things with that land.
 - Include civic and arts in Alternative 3.
 - [Add this bullet?: Participant who favored Alternative 1, and made many of comments below supporting Alternative 1, nodded that Alternative 3 works with modifications noted, especially if density moved west.]
 - [Note: In some cases, facilitator had to prompt discussion, by asking specific Q's about whether people wanted a component added, e.g., housing up to 520, whether OK to mix in housing south of Bel-Red, whether there was support for civic and arts component, etc..]

- Alternative 1: mid-range more likely to be successful than higher development option. (Alternative has less chance for error relative to the development program forecast.)
 - Near to hospital and downtown should be where high density occurs, with not as much elsewhere.
 - The transit station at 122nd and one at hospital should be merged onto the BNSF corridor
 - Higher density residential uses along 122nd

In a few moments, we are going to wrap things up with a request to help us identify—if possible—some areas of consensus to communicate to the Steering Committee. However, before we do that, I want to ask:

Are there any other comments or ideas not already expressed that you'd like to offer the steering committee as they start their work on developing the preliminary preferred alternative?

- No specific comments offered by panelists.

As we noted, staff will be the Steering Committee will be working in late March and early April to develop the preliminary preferred alternative.

Based on the panel discussion we've had this [morning/afternoon], are there two or three main areas of consensus that this group would like to convey to the Steering Committee to help them develop the preliminary preferred alternative?

- Flexibility.