

**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 O'Neill, Facilitator

**1<sup>st</sup> q: Participant introduce selves**

Steve Willard: LWR Associates, Northup and 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

Scott Hall: Pine Forest Properties—owns property near Bel-Red Road and 120<sup>th</sup>

Chris Eide: Eide Construction, located near 116<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and NE 20<sup>th</sup> .

TJ Woolsey: Briarwood Center.

Don Pickens: Sherwood Shopping Center

Bill Byers: Crescentview Development (Angelo's Nursery site).

Roger Parasota: Crescentview Development (Angelo's Nursery site)..

Roger White: Owns property on NE 20<sup>th</sup>

Betty Speith: Langton/Speith: Representing Wright Runstad

Dave Robertson: Owns property in the corridor near 130<sup>th</sup>/132<sup>nd</sup> area

Jim Reid: Owns office property near 136<sup>th</sup> and Bel-Red Road

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 116<sup>th</sup>, 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?**

- Questions about stream corridors—are improvements assumed in all alternatives?
- Support office on NE 116<sup>th</sup>, but allow other office uses (not just medical office)
- Change will happen over decades—don't preclude already permitted uses
  - Treat existing, permitted uses as "base", allow new uses as an overlay—in "triangle" area at east end, allow housing/mixed use, but also allow stand-alone retail
- Allow existing and new office development along 116<sup>th</sup>
- Questions/concerns raised about infrastructure financing (deferred to transportation discussion).

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?**

- What types of services do people think are really important?
  - Distinction made between business services and personal services
- Need to have core services in the area, should better clarify this.

- Should deal with services by having them as permitted uses in a variety of zoning districts within the corridor—allow flexibility
- As a property owner in the “services core”, do not like this concept—see it as a downzone. Should permit these uses, but other uses as well. Trade off more intensity with amenities.
- Need to look at the economic viability of all uses. Allowing all existing uses as legal is critical. Should look at “flexible use” zoning.
- Plan should allow for greater heights and densities than are currently allowed.
- Questions about the different density assumptions assumed in the different office categories—need to be clearer about this.
- Briarwood Center should have more opportunity for redevelopment than is shown in 3 of the 4 alternatives.
- Allow market to dictate what happens in the area—a lot of uses that have been there historically have left, and this will continue to happen.
- Favor Alternative 3—allows most development generally. Need to be flexible about what uses come in, and at what intensity. Likes Redmond’s approach being considered in Overlake (use of incentives to allow greater intensity)
- 6-10 story buildings are appropriate in this area—not competing with downtown
- Capacity on I-405 and SR 520 a big issue here—how much of a detriment to development will these be?
- What has been going on in LI areas in Portland is a good model for what could happen in Bel-Red—very high intensities going in former industrial area. Should be prepared to see the same thing happen here.
  - If Wright Runstad plans for Safeway site are successful, will be more demand, market for the same thing elsewhere
- Could be under-assuming development program, forecasts, for this area.
- Need to think bigger in some ways than what’s been shown
- Office/housing mixed together a good way to reduce congestion
  - Believe that this type of development could happen
- Land values/market have constrained ability to develop in the past—some think it’s been zoning.

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?**

- GMA requires us to look at plan every 10 years—I-405 and SR 520 are limiting factors for future development. Major roadways leading to these corridors are at gridlock. Changes to land use along 124<sup>th</sup> will create major congestion on this corridor.
- Concurrency creates need for land use and transportation system to be linked.
- Seems that land use change can’t happen without infrastructure. When will this happen? Who will pay for it?
- Concerns expressed about stream setbacks—don’t want to see more stringent requirements.
- Need to build out the transportation system and improve the grid. Most people will continue to drive, and need the road access. Developers/property owners should be treated fairly when it comes to use of transportation capacity.
- Transportation model should look at longer term (i.e. 2040), and more intensive development than shown
- City needs access point to/from SR 520 at 130<sup>th</sup> and 124<sup>th</sup>
- Question/concern expressed about other infrastructure capacity (sewer/water)
- Don’t sell short need for transportation improvements.
- Need to involve property owners in design solutions for transportation improvements.

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?**

- Alternative 3 the favored alternative. Height flexibility would be beneficial. Wright Runstad wants to trade off more height for more open space. Need to focus on urban design.
- Agree to allow height flexibility.
- Need to look at transportation infrastructure capacity if more growth happens in the corridor than is contemplated.
- Look at public/private partnerships to solve transportation problems
- Area business/property owners should have been on the steering committee
- Focus more on architecture/design standards than on building height specifically

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?**

- Allow existing uses to remain, and also allow new uses as contemplated in the alternatives
  - Need for use flexibility; don't take extraordinary measures to preserve existing uses
- We may be under-estimating amount of future development that could occur in this area.
- Need to be equitable to all property owners and developers about how transportation capacity is used and paid for
- Don't improve streams to the detriment or cost of land owners