

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

June 25, 2014
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Tebelius, Commissioners Carlson, Hamlin, Hilhorst, Laing, deVadoss, Walter

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

COUNCIL LIAISON: Councilmember Stokes

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Inghram, Erika Conkling, Department of Planning and Community Development; Catherine Drews, Department of Development Services, Jim Montgomery, Police Department

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. by Chair Tebelius who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present.

New Commissioner Stephanie Walter was introduced. Commissioner Walter said she resides in the Spiritwood neighborhood and works in the field of healthcare finance.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Blaise Bouchand, 1950 130th Avenue NE, owner of Maison de France, spoke regarding the recreational marijuana business set to open at 1817 130th Avenue NE. He indicated he was speaking on behalf of Blue Sky church, 1720 130th Avenue NE, and Gaude Construction as well as himself. The letter he read into the record from the church stated that it is hard to believe the issue of allowing a recreational marijuana dealer to so close to the church is even being entertained. The church has a large number of children and youth, but also nearby is the Little Gym and Girl Scouts, uses that serve children. It is clearly not healthful to the community. People from the medical marijuana establishment have already been selling their product right behind the church building, right outside the youth room doors, to buyers who do not attend the church. The issue has been reported to the police as a recurring problem. Selling marijuana and increasing drug use will only cause problems and deteriorate the wonderful plans Bellevue has made. The letter he read into the record from Gaude Construction stated that the company was not aware of the existence of a recreational marijuana retailer on 130th Avenue NE. The construction company office houses many items, such as computers and power tools, that can

easily be sold for quick cash to support drug users. The office and vehicles have been hit in the past. All businesses in the area will in fact be targets for drug users who need a quick \$50 to get their high. Speaking for himself, he said several business owners on 130th Avenue NE are concerned and opposed to the opening of a recreational marijuana drug dealer on that street. There are public health and safety issues at stake. The Commission should make its recommendations accordingly and wisely to the City Council.

Chair Tebelius asked Mr. Bouchand what he would like to see done with the interim ordinance that is in place and which will remain so until October. Mr. Bouchand said the city could forbid recreational marijuana uses from locating within 1000 feet of uses that involve children. He said his preference would be to simply ban the use in Bellevue like 50 other cities in the state have done. That would reduce the city's liability risks and would mean less work for the police department.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Carlson, Mr. Bouchand said the list of uses that cater to children in the immediate area of the proposed recreational marijuana retailer include the Little Gym, Girl Scouts, and the Blue Sky church. There is also a park and viewpoint nearby.

Ms. Teri Olson with Unique Art Glass, 1830 130th Avenue NE, said her business is located directly across from the proposed marijuana retail outlet. She noted her opposition to allowing the marijuana business to locate there. In Colorado lawmakers are looking at banning certain types of edible marijuana to protect children who cannot tell the difference between cookies and brownies that have and do not have marijuana. It is just a bad idea all around to allow a marijuana retail store so close to businesses that cater to children, and it is not a good fit with the other businesses along 1309th Avenue NE.

Mr. Fred Charb, 1840 130th Avenue NE, Suite 7, objected to the proposed recreational marijuana shop slated to be located across the street from his chiropractic office, about 400 feet away. He said the Washington State Liquor Control Board recommended that all recreational marijuana shops be located in former liquor store locations, which the 130th Avenue NE location is not. The city ordinance in place requires recreational marijuana shops to be located a minimum of 1000 feet from certain facilities that cater to children; the front door of the Little Gym is located in a direct line of sight from the proposed retail use and about 300 feet away, the GungFu martial arts studio across the parking lot from his business has students as young as four, and the Blue Sky church is located down the street and approximately 600 feet from the proposed marijuana retail shop. Colorado law is similar to the law in Washington, and in Colorado there recently have been numerous robberies and burglaries involving medical marijuana stores in the Denver area. The proposed 130th Avenue NE retailer will also be a target and will put the entire neighborhood at risk. The Commission was asked to not allow a recreational marijuana shop to be located as proposed; it should be located in a former state liquor store.

Ms. Ann Lampman, 3806 130th Avenue NE, said she has worked as a commercial real estate broker on the Eastside for almost 20 years. She said during the last year she has received numerous calls from entrepreneurs wanting to locate a recreational marijuana shop in commercial areas on the Eastside. In every single case, her landlord clients have refused to entertain the notion of allowing such a business in their buildings or complexes. In three cases clients surveyed their other tenants about allowing the use and each time all of the tenants opposed allowing the use in their building or business park. Several tenants indicated they would not renew their leases should such a use be allowed. Recreational marijuana shops could

be a threat to occupancy rates. She said her home is just up the street from the recreational marijuana business proposed to locate on 130th Avenue NE. The arterial is heavily used by children during the school year all the way down to NE 24th Street. Many eyes are on Bellevue right now. The city has the chance to get it right or to get it wrong. One way to get it right would be to allow businesses to have a say in where marijuana retailers are allowed to locate by establishing drug free zones.

Commissioner Carlson said it is possible that when Initiative 502 was on the ballot, many of the tenants that were surveyed may have voted in favor. The City Council has taken the position that because the majority of people in Bellevue voted to make it legal for people to possess and use marijuana recreationally in the privacy of their homes, the city should feel obligated to allow for the retail distribution of the product. The curious thing is that when it comes down to it, those who would be affected by the use are generally opposed to it. He suggested it is entirely compatible and intellectually consistent to support the legal right of the people to possess and use marijuana while saying the product should not be allowed to be sold in Bellevue. Ms. Lampman allowed that while the majority of those voting supported the initiative, it was a minority of voters who showed up to vote. To fully understand where the majority stands, it would be necessary to survey all registered voters in the city. She stated that while the Commission has no say over what people do in the privacy of their own homes, it certainly has a voice in saying where uses and businesses are allowed to locate.

Mr. Chris McAboy, 1817 130th Avenue NE, spoke representing The Novel Tree, the retail marijuana business under discussion. He noted that previous speakers had referred to his business as a drug dealer, which by common definition is an unlicensed person selling illegal drugs. He clarified that the business is in the process of being licensed by the state, all plans have been submitted to the city of Bellevue, a lease has been signed, and all systems are going pending the proposed Land Use Code amendment addressing recreational marijuana. He noted his support for the regulations based on the recommendations of staff. There are arguments in play at the federal level about the legality of marijuana. The US Attorney General has issued a statement that essentially says that so long as the states abide by set terms the federal government cares about, they will not interfere. Currently marijuana is completely illegal in only 21 states. The Novel Tree will be a heavily taxed business. Marijuana users are not junkies and allowing the use will not turn Bellevue into a city of junkies. Surveys indicate that while 40 percent have tried marijuana, only ten percent actually use it. He noted that the issue of edible marijuana products was addressed earlier in the day by the Liquor Control Board and a rule change has been put into place that states the packaging for all edibles must be approved by the Board. The Board wants to make sure no packaging will resemble kids candies or treats, and that all such products will be sized as individual servings. Heavy security measures will be put in place at The Novel Tree to ensure no on-site consumption and to prevent crime. The truth is that pot shops in Denver are not being robbed or burglarized and the crime rates there dropped by nearly five percent. The direct neighbors to The Novel Tree, while initially opposed, are now on board and supportive. The most dangerous thing about cannabis is prohibitions against it which only fuel the black market. The location on 130th Avenue NE is about as far away from parks and schools as one can get in Bellevue, and nearly every corridor in every city is used by kids. Based on the state regulations, recreation centers are defined as supervised centers that provide a broad range of activities or events intended primarily for use by persons under 21 years of age, owned and/or managed by a charitable non-profit organization, city, county, state or federal government. The site on 130th Avenue NE is primarily industrial with such things as wholesale distribution centers, a brewing company and auto uses.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to amend the agenda by eliminating item 7C, and to approve the agenda as amended, was made by Commissioner Laing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Carlson and it carried unanimously.

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None

6. STAFF REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Manager Paul Inghram took a moment to welcome Commissioner Walter. He also urged the Commissioners to review the Item 7C materials and Comprehensive Plan update schedule. He noted that the Council was recently provided with an update and will receive a more detailed check-in with the Council in September while the Commission's process will still be under way. The Council will take the opportunity to identify any specific concerns for the Commission to address ahead of formulating its final recommendation.

Mr. Inghram reported that the Council also recently addressed the fact that members from the Horizon View plat have asked for a rezone from R-3.5 to R-2.5. The Council agreed to move forward with that rezone process so it has been added to the Commission's schedule.

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Land Use Code Amendments to Address Recreational Marijuana

Legal Planner Catherine Drews provided the Commissioners with copies of the emergency rule adopted earlier in the day by the Liquor Control Board addressing the edible marijuana issues.

Police Chief Jim Montgomery explained that over the years the term "zero tolerance" has been used in association with enforcing drug laws. He said the term would seem to imply that no one will be able to get away with anything, but of course that will never be the case. The department has been in contact with colleagues in Colorado, particularly in Denver, Lakewood, Colorado Springs and Boulder, given the notion that they hit the ground first and were further along. That, however, has not turned out to be the case. Most of those cities imposed and have continued with a moratorium, though Denver and Boulder are somewhat ahead of Bellevue. Denver has taken hands-off approach and as a result have experienced a significant increase in certain types of crimes in the neighborhoods where marijuana sales are occurring. That has not been the case in Boulder where the police department says there has not been an increase in crimes; they contribute that result largely to the fact that they put together a fairly aggressive campaign, something Bellevue is likely to emulate.

Continuing, Chief Montgomery said for the short term, Bellevue intends to dedicate a portion of a police staff person's time to get out into the business and residential neighborhoods to make sure everyone has a point of contact. The owners of marijuana retail sales businesses will also be contacted to make sure they understand the rules and all expectations. The police will also be collaborating with the Liquor Control Board which largely has the say-so with regard to governing the retail sales establishments. As a result of the position taken by the federal government with respect to banking, the retail stores will be expected to operate largely on cash only. How that will play out relative to making the stores targets for robberies and the like is not

known but will need to be considered; certainly the retailers will need to take special precautions. Chief Montgomery said he does not anticipate a significant problem with people buying product and openly using it in the parking lot, but a significant police presence will be assigned to discourage such activities. Where such activities are observed, the individuals involved will be cited and prosecuted.

Several cities in Colorado, even some that have moratoriums in place, have dedicate a full-time equivalent police person to spearhead their efforts. The same approach likely will be taken in Bellevue. If it becomes apparent, however, that the approach represents a significant drain on resources, the anticipation is that a conversation with the City Manager will be required to discuss the best use of staff.

Chief Montgomery stressed the need to have everyone on the same page relative to what the voters have actually approved. He showed the Commissioners how much a single ounce of marijuana is. He then said the big issue is marijuana-infused products, including liquid products, and showed the Commissioners brownies that included 16 ounces of marijuana, the amount that can be legally possessed. The liquid product can be infused into virtually anything that is edible and the THC level in up to ten times more potent as the leaves. In addition to legally being able to possess 16 ounces of solid product, it is also legal to possess up to 72 ounces of liquid marijuana-infused product. With marijuana-infused products, there will be no way for consumers to know the potency rate. The liquid product can also be added to leaf marijuana and smoked, significantly elevating the potency.

Commissioner Carlson asked if marijuana-related problems would be less likely, more likely or as likely to occur if Bellevue were to have no retail sales outlets at all. Chief Montgomery said it would be speculative to say. As mobile as the society is, it is likely people would drive to where they could buy products. Proximity certainly makes it more convenient for people to obtain the products. The concerns about locating retail outlets close to schools are absolutely legitimate. Having distance requirements will help but will not completely solve the problems of kids obtaining products.

Commissioner Laing noted that according to the new rule from the Liquor Control Board marijuana-infused products that are designed to be especially appealing to children are prohibited. The list of things that are especially appealing to children includes cookies, brownies and rice crispy treats. Chief Montgomery said it was his understanding that such products will not be allowed to be sold off the shelf at retail establishments. Of particular concern to the police and fire departments is what is the improper use of those products. In fairness, retailers have no control over how their products are used.

Commissioner Laing said the Commission heard during public comment from a potential marijuana retail outlet operator who discussed security measures, most of which are required by the state. The question is why so many security measures will be needed at all if the retail establishments will not impose public health, safety or welfare threats different from any retail establishment selling liquor. Chief Montgomery said only time will tell if the required extra security will be enough. Banks have security measures in place in part to reduce the likelihood of nefarious activities. Banks are not immune from such crimes, and retail marijuana sales establishments will not be either. Both certainly may be attractive targets both when open and closed, so it makes sense extra measures are required. The police department is certainly glad to see the security requirements.

Commissioner deVadoss asked Chief Montgomery what counsel he would give the Commission given the limit of the Commission's mandate and the concerns expressed by the public. Chief Montgomery said the same question asked a few months or a year down the road would be more easily answered. Bellevue hoped to be able to garner some advice from the experience of cities in Colorado, but most of them are not that much farther ahead. Experience certainly was gained from having state liquor stores and the Liquor Control Board certainly has covered all the bases to the best of their knowledge. It is too early to know whether or not 1000 feet of separation from uses such as churches, schools and daycare centers is sufficient or needed at all. A group comprised of representatives from police, fire, code enforcement, parks, the city attorney's office and the Liquor Control Board has been put together and charged with working collaboratively in sharing information and in reaching out to other jurisdictions. As possible tweaks to existing codes are identified, they will be pushed forward through the proper channels.

Commissioner deVadoss asked if plans have been made to conduct outreach to the youth in Bellevue. Chief Montgomery said Bellevue is blessed by having school resource officers in most of the schools. They will have reaching out to students and their parents high on their list of things to do.

Commissioner Laing said one of the issues the Commission is wrestling with is drawing a distinction between parks or other uses that are privately owned and parks and uses that are publicly owned. He asked if there should be a difference between the way the city regulates the dispersion criteria relative to public or private facilities that are for all intents and purposes the same. Chief Montgomery answered that he did not believe from a law enforcement perspective that the distance requirements will make much of a difference, particularly in such instances. The Commission and the Council will need to sort through that issue. The police will act in all cases of folks misbehaving whether the behavior occurs on public or private land that is open to the public.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked what zoning districts allow recreational marijuana retail outlets in Colorado. Chief Montgomery said he did not have that information but could get it.

Chair Tebelius asked how many cities in the state will be allowing retail recreational marijuana stores. Chief Montgomery said his department has not surveyed that.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Carlson, Chief Montgomery said he had not met with the Council as a whole to discuss the issues or to provide input. He said his aim is to remain as neutral as possible about the issue.

Chair Tebelius recognized city attorney Lori Riordin. Ms. Riordin allowed that her office will be responsible for enforcement.

Chief Montgomery was thanked for his insights and observations.

Ms. Drews said the Council has not given the Commission direction to consider a ban. The Council has looked at that issue and has decided not to move forward with a moratorium. She sought from the Commission direction to prepare a draft ordinance for consideration and to schedule a public hearing, preferably for July 30. That would allow for getting the permanent regulations in place before the interim regulations expire on October 21.

With regard to the comment made during petitions and communications about the preference for

locating recreational marijuana retail outlets in previous state liquor store facilities, Ms. Drews said the Liquor Control Board held that approach up as a model. Jurisdictions are being very careful with that notion, however, because alcohol stores are allowed in the Neighborhood Business zone and the Council has made a conscious decision not to allow any marijuana operations in residential areas.

Commissioner Walter noted from the staff memo that churches are not necessarily called out because they are primarily located in residential areas. Ms. Drews said the majority of churches in Bellevue are located in single family zones and therefore are without the scope of the marijuana uses. There are, however, churches in Bel-Red, Factoria and the downtown. If separation requirements were to be drafted to include churches, retail marijuana uses could be barred from all areas in the city in direct opposition to the direction given by the Council to balance the protection of neighborhoods without creating an all-out ban.

With regard to hours of operation, Chair Tebelius noted that the state allows the retail sale of recreational marijuana to occur between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m., and said the staff proposal was for the city to be consistent with state law.

Commissioner Carlson reiterated his preference to ban completely the sale of recreational marijuana in the city of Bellevue.

The consensus was that the hours of operation in Bellevue should match those allowed under state law.

With regard to the separation requirements, Chair Tebelius pointed out that the Liquor Control Board rules require no less than 1000 feet from certain uses. Ms. Drews clarified that the Liquor Control Board has no separation requirement for liquor sales, though there is a notification requirement to all schools, churches and the like within 500 feet. She said the recommendation of staff was to have the city's separation requirement match that required by the state for recreational marijuana sales. She said the Commission could also consider recommending that retail marijuana operations be monitored to determine if adjustments to the separation distances are warranted. The attention of the Commissioners was called to two maps, one showing the quarter-mile and half-mile radii around every high school in the city, and one showing the quarter-mile radii around every grade and middle school in the city.

Chair Tebelius asked how many applications for recreational marijuana sales have been submitted and approved for Bellevue. Ms. Drews said to date the Liquor Control Board has issued a letter of approval to a single producer, otherwise there have been no applications approved by the Liquor Control Board for operations in Bellevue. The state will allow four retail stores in Bellevue, and the city will permit the siting of them only in accord with the Land Use Code regulations, which includes a 1000-foot separation distance between them to avoid clustering and the de facto creation of a marijuana district.

Commissioner Laing said two things characterize Bellevue: that it is a city in a park, and that it has a great school system. While there is insufficient information to say 1000 feet is better or worse than some other distance, the default position should be to increase the separation to a quarter mile for the two things that best characterize what the community is all about until such time as there is sufficient operating experience to make a more informed decision. A 1320-foot requirement would not impact the Novel Tree site. In fact the only site it would impact would be the Par 4 Investments site to the south of Main Street.

Commissioner Hamlin pointed that including parks in the larger separation could potentially eliminate all potential sites.

A motion to increase the separation requirement for schools, both public and private, to one-quarter mile was made by Commissioner Laing.

Mr. Inghram cautioned against making decisions based on motions for items that have not yet been subjected to a public hearing. Commissioner Carlson suggested that nothing gives direction better than a motion.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Carlson. The motion carried 5-2, with Commissioners Hamlin and deVadoss voting no.

A motion to increase the park separation to 1320 feet was made by Commissioner Laing.

Ms. Drews commented that for ease of administration and enforcement purposes the separation requirements should be the same.

Commissioner Laing withdrew the motion.

Chair Tebelius said she would not object to increasing the separation distance so long as all of the specific uses called out in the staff memo were included and treated the same.

A motion to increase to a quarter mile the separation distance for playgrounds, recreation centers, childcare centers, public parks, public transit, libraries and game arcades was made by Chair Tebelius. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst.

Commissioner Hilhorst said it would be helpful to have staff map the areas that would still allow locating a recreational marijuana retail establishment. Councilmember Stokes concurred and suggested there should also be a logical rationale determined.

The motion carried 5-2, with Commissioners Hamlin and deVadoss voting no.

Chair Tebelius stressed that the Commission has been given clear direction from the Council not to establish rules that will effectively ban all retail marijuana sales in the city. If the mapping exercise shows the effect of the motion will be just that, the Commission will need to reconsider.

On the question of whether or not additional uses should be recommended for separation, Chair Tebelius suggested that schools and parks whether private or public should be treated the same.

Commissioner Laing said he felt strongly that the separation requirement should apply to churches and private parks. He agreed parks and schools, whether private or public, should be treated the same. If there is a valid police power reason for regulating the proximity of retail marijuana establishments to a public park, the same reason exists for a private park. The default position should be to require separation from the uses. If going forward the evidence shows the separation is not needed, the separation requirement can be either reduced or eliminated.

Chair Tebelius pointed out the statement of staff that if a separation of 1000 feet is required for all religious facilities, the result will be an effective ban on all marijuana uses from nearly all

areas of the city. Commissioner Laing said he would like to see all religious facilities mapped as well.

Commissioner Carlson suggested that if the public makes no distinction between public and private parks, the city should not either in requiring separation.

Ms. Drews said the public/private park discussion arose in relation to Vasa Park, which is a privately-owned park. With regard to the Bel-Red area, an incentive system is in place that will allow developers to add floor area to their projects by providing park space. All park space thus created will be dedicated to the city and become public parks. Developers choosing to include park space without using the incentive system are free to choose if they want the park dedicated to the city or retained as private.

Commissioner Walter agreed that where there is no distinction made between the use of a private and public park, they should be treated the same. She questioned, however, whether the city actually has a full listing of all private parks in the city, and that could make enforcement of the separation requirement difficult if not impossible. Exactly what constitutes a park is also not spelled out.

Commissioner Laing said it has been his experience that jurisdictions like to require open space and pocket parks, but they also like the idea of not having to pay to maintain them. Developers are often required to create what amounts to private parks and to record easements making them open to the public, while the homeowners association is required to provide all maintenance and upkeep. It would be disingenuous to draw a distinction between those parks and public parks from a police power perspective.

A motion to treat the same all parks open to the public by simply referring to parks in the separation requirement was made by Commissioner Laing. The motion was seconded Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried 6-1, with Commissioner Hamlin voting no.

Chair Tebelius said she had not heard any motion regarding religious facilities and facilities for children and would move forward unless a motion was made.

Chair Tebelius asked for comment on the notion of recommending elimination of the downtown perimeter design district for recreational marijuana retail uses. Ms. Drews said the proposal initially was made by Commissioner Laing. She explained that the purpose of the district is to provide transition between the more intense downtown uses and the residential uses in the areas that border the downtown. The only place where recreational marijuana would be allowed would be on the south end of the district. As a design district, development in it requires a higher level of review focused on design, but not on uses.

Commissioner Laing said he had two reasons for proposing the elimination of the perimeter districts. First, the districts provide a transition function between the higher intensity downtown and the lower intensity single family neighborhoods surrounding the downtown. Second, during the Downtown Livability Initiative CAC meetings, the Committee heard from the Bellevue School District and community citizens that in time it is likely there will be a school located in the downtown.

Commissioner Hamlin pointed out that there is potential for residential and school uses in all areas, including Bel-Red, so the same argument could be applied. He said he did not buy the

argument in the first place.

Commissioner Carlson asked if the Bellevue Downtown Association or the Chamber of Commerce has weighed in on the issue. Ms. Drews allowed that in three public hearings before the Council on the marijuana interim regulations neither organization has offered any comment.

Commissioner deVadoss said the Council has been very clear about what it wants the Commission to do. The Commission can move the pieces around all it wants, but the Council has already made a decision. He agreed the argument for disallowing recreational marijuana uses in the perimeter districts could be made of other land use districts.

Commissioner Carlson noted that recreational marijuana retailers will be the only businesses selling a product that is illegal under federal law. Ms. Drews agreed that new territory is being charted. Councilmember Stokes said the Council considered that fact but concluded it was not a basis on which to make decisions.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked what would happen if the perimeter districts do allow recreational marijuana sale, a retailer chooses to locate there, and then a school gets built in the downtown within the required separation distance. Ms. Drews said the retailer would be grandfathered in.

A motion to exclude the Downtown Perimeter A design district from the table of downtown districts that allow recreational marijuana sales was made by Commissioner Laing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Carlson and the motion carried 4-3, with Commissioners Hamlin, Carlson and Walter voting no.

Chair Tebelius noted that staff has recommended that administrative condition use permits for recreational marijuana uses should not be required.

Commissioner deVadoss commented that because recreational marijuana sales is a gray area and involved unchartered territories, and because the state has acknowledged that there may be special issues associated with the businesses, it makes sense to utilize the conditional use permit process. The conditional use permit exists to allow for placing conditions on uses to mitigate the impacts of the use. It may very well be that compliance with all state regulations will be sufficient to mitigate the impacts, but if a process is not put in place up front that looks at potentially adding mitigation above and beyond strict compliance with state law, the city will lose the opportunity. Churches, parks and a variety of other uses are required to obtain a conditional use permit.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Hamlin, Ms. Drews said the city uses the conditional use permit process where impacts and compatibility issues are not fully known. The conditional use process is the highest level of review the city does and the decision is appealable to the Council. Between the rigorous state law, the interim city regulations, and what is known about how retail uses operate, the staff believes the conditional use approach is not warranted. Mr. Inghram added that the type of things typically addressed through the conditional use process include traffic, parking and landscaping. Churches are required to obtain a conditional use permit because they are often located in single family neighborhoods. Under the interim regulations, recreational marijuana outlets are allowed outright, although a building permit must be obtained for all tenant improvements. It is a change of use so the building permit undergoes land use review where conditions can be imposed. Mr. Inghram clarified that from a land use perspective recreational marijuana retail outlets are just another retail operation, and other retail

uses are not required to obtain a conditional use permit.

Commissioner Walter pointed out that there are some key difference between most retail uses and the recreational marijuana use. The recreational marijuana uses are cash only, require a much higher level of security, and are limited in total number, which may trigger increased traffic for each of the outlets.

Commissioner Hamlin asked if in fact the recreational marijuana uses will be cash only. From the audience, Mr. McAboy explained that his business has a banking account and will be able to accept debit and credit cards.

Mr. Inghram noted that banks house lots of cash and extra security but as a use they are not required to obtain a conditional use permit for that reason alone.

Commissioner Laing commented that there may be things in the state regulations that are incompatible with the land use district requirements. Recreational marijuana uses will, for instance, be required to have a certain amount of transparency and window glazing that will not necessarily constitute pedestrian-oriented frontage. Ms. Drews allowed that anyone seeking to establish the use in the downtown will have to meet all the requirements of the Land Use Code in the same way all other retail uses there must. Commissioner Laing pointed out that one of the requirements of the city's code relative to the perimeter design districts is that retail uses cannot have tinted windows that prevent pedestrians from looking in. The Council has raised questions as well that could be addressed through the administrative conditional use process.

A motion to require recreational marijuana uses to obtain an administrative conditional use permit was made by Commissioner Laing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and the motion carried 6-1, with Commissioner Hamlin voting no.

Councilmember Stokes said the Council has consistently said the city has an obligation to allow for recreational marijuana sales while protecting the community. To that end it would be helpful to know what Boulder has done differently from Denver. He voiced concern over applying special rules to a private business entrepreneurs that are not applied to others. The extra hoops the entrepreneurs must jump through will create barriers for those who are only seeking to do what is legal to do.

Chair Tebelius asked whether the Planning Commission is ready to hold a public hearing on the topic. Mr. Inghram encouraged the Commission to hold the public hearing as scheduled. The city can update the interim ordinance with the proposed changes. The Commission is under no obligation to reach a final decision immediately following the public hearing, and if a follow-up study session is needed one could be scheduled.

There was agreement to conduct the public hearing on July 30.

****BREAK****

A motion to amend the agenda to move item 9, Other Business, election of chair and vice-chair, to follow item 7A was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion was seconded by Commissioner deVadoss and it carried unanimously.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Commissioner Carlson nominated Commissioner Laing to serve as chair.

There were no other nominations.

The nomination of Commissioner Laing to serve as chair carried unanimously.

Chair Tebelius handed the gavel to Commissioner Laing.

Commissioner Tebelius nominated Commissioner Hilhorst to serve as Vice-Chair.

There were no other nominations.

The nomination of Commissioner Hilhorst to serve as Vice-Chair carried unanimously.

7. STUDY SESSION (Continued)

B. Eastgate/I-90 Related Subarea Plan Amendments

Answering a question asked by Chair Tebelius, Senior Planner Erika Conkling explained that the Eastgate/I-90 CAC did not specify changes to the Eastgate subarea plan. The Eastgate subarea plan has not been changed for 20 years or so and there certainly are some things in it that no longer apply. In particular, the recommended approach toward land use in the subarea plan is inconsistent with the vision of the CAC. The staff memo outlines minimum number of changes necessary to effect the CAC's plan; none of the proposed changes are unnecessary.

Ms. Conkling asked the Commissioners to consider during the discussion whether or not the proposed changes capture the recommendations and implement the vision of the CAC. She noted that at the previous meeting the focus was on policies specific to the three subareas but pointed out that some policies cross subarea lines, including those relating to the Mountains To Sound Greenway. Policies are therefore included in both the Eastgate and Factoria subareas focused on developing the trail with pleasant, safe and non-motorized facilities that provide local and regional connections.

Chair Laing asked Commissioner Hamlin and Councilmember Stokes, both of whom served on the Eastgate/I-90 CAC, if anything in the memo was inconsistent with the recommendation of the CAC. Commissioner Hamlin said the only thing that stood out to him was the additional work related to the Factoria subarea. He allowed that while the proposal fits with the spirit of what the CAC intended, it goes beyond the CAC's actual recommendation. Councilmember Stokes agreed with Commissioner Hamlin and said nothing in the packet substantially changes the recommendation of the CAC.

Commissioner Tebelius called attention to Policy S-EG-LU1 and suggested the word "compact" is not necessary and should not be used, and proposed leaving out the reference to greater height and intensity. The policy should call for focusing Eastgate growth into a mixed use center adjacent to the Eastgate transit center.

Councilmember Stokes said the CAC purposely discussed increasing heights in the area near the

transit center. Developers and others addressed the CAC and supported the notion. Commissioner Hamlin added that the CAC held the view that the area is the right choice for greater height and intensity given its proximity to good transit and Bellevue College. He pointed out that the 15-member CAC, comprised of local community members, was in agreement with the final plan.

Commissioner Tebelius called attention to Policy S-EG-LU2 and said she did not support using the term "main street," and pointed out that the specific mixed use center mentioned is not identified. Ms. Conkling said the reference is to the mixed use center adjacent to the transit center. She agreed to include a modifier to make it clearer.

Commissioner Hamlin added that the CAC had not used the term "main street" but did talk about pedestrian access.

There was agreement to have the policy refer to a pedestrian-oriented street.

Commissioner Tebelius asked if Policy S-EG-1 also refers to the area near the transit center. Ms. Conkling said the policy is existing but is proposed to be modified. The policy speaks to the location of Eastgate as having good transportation access, but in the existing plan the reference is only to freeway access. The language revision is intended to link land use to more forms of transportation.

Chair Laing noted that he had previously suggested using throughout the document the phrase multimodal mobility instead of referring specifically to freeway access, transit service and non-motorized transportation alternatives, except where the reference is to a single form of transportation.

Councilmember Stokes suggested that somewhere in the document it should be spelled out clearly exactly what multimodal means.

Mr. Inghram allowed that generally using the word "multimodal" makes sense. However, the original intent of Policy S-EG-1 was to recognize the inherent advantage the subarea has by virtue having access to the I-90 freeway. He suggested making sure the policy language is less generic by specifically referencing freeway access, the park and ride, and the Mountains To Sound Greenway trail. The Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Tebelius asked why Lake Sammamish was not listed in Policy S-EG-4. Ms. Conkling said the existing policy calls for protecting Phantom Lake and the intent of the proposed change is to make the language stronger and clearer.

Commissioner Hamlin said the Phantom Lake folks closely tracked the work of the CAC and provided a great deal of testimony. Lake Sammamish is outside the study area, though that does not mean it is unaffected. Commissioner Tebelius said there is runoff from the area into Lake Sammamish. Commissioner Hamlin said he did not recall that issue coming up but would not oppose adding a reference to Lake Sammamish and Lake Washington. There was agreement to include those lakes in the policy.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius regarding Policy S-EG-ND-1, Ms. Conkling said the specific recommendation is to consider the transfer of development rights (TDRs). She said it was her understanding that the notion came from the Mountains To Sound

Greenway Trust as a way of preserving resource lands outside of urban areas. Staff are currently undertaking an economic analysis on TDRs so "consider" and "if feasible" are used to couch the issue as broadly as possible. Commissioner Tebelius suggested eliminating the policy altogether. If the Council decides it wants to move ahead with TDRs, the specific policy language will not be necessary to make it happen.

Commissioner Hamlin said the CAC did discuss the TDR issue. He agreed, however, that the policy could be deleted. Councilmember Stokes confirmed that the Council is discussing the issue of TDRs separate from the Eastgate/I-90 recommendation.

There was agreement to remove the policy.

Commissioner Tebelius called attention to the staff comment regarding the proposed deletion of policies S-EG-5 and S-EG-6 and asked who determined that the segregation of uses supported by the policies had led to the current auto-oriented development that is no longer an attractive environment for employees. Ms. Conkling said the major change comes from the vision as a whole. Policy S-EG-5 calls for consolidating retail and commercial development into the Community Business and General Commercial boundaries, which is directly opposed to the CAC's vision for the subarea, which calls for commercial and retail uses mixed in with the office areas.

Mr. Inghram said the proposal is to create a new set of land use designations. The currently policy language would be inconsistent with putting commercial and retail uses in any new district that gets created.

With regard to Policy S-EG-10, Commissioner Tebelius allowed that while housing may be appropriate, the word "encourage" is not.

Councilmember Stokes pointed out that the discussion on that point was large at the CAC level. Commissioner Hamlin agreed and noted that the sentiment of the CAC was to encourage multifamily housing.

Chair Laing proposed striking "as a primary means of travel" from Policy S-EG-9.

Commissioner Tebelius asked what the idea is behind Policy S-EG-12. Ms. Conkling said if a project at the development review stage can make the case for having reduced parking by virtue of the fact that parking can be accommodated on-site or by leveraging transit, consideration should be given to reducing the parking requirements.

Chair Laing said his preference was to strike Policy S-EG-12 altogether given that it addresses a zoning level or design review level regulation. Project-related demand can always be accommodated on-site and in fact every developer is required to do just that. The policy is not appropriate at the subarea plan level.

Councilmember Stokes suggested using the far more general language of the second sentence of staff comment CoB14 for the policy instead. Chair Laing said that would make sense.

Chair Laing said Policy S-EG-14 is another policy in which use of the term "multimodal mobility" should be used in place of calling out a variety of transportation modes.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius regarding Policy S-EG-T-1, Commissioner Hamlin said the CAC was very specific about the issue. Traffic in the area is horrendous and part of the answer is addressing the state-controlled entrances to the freeway. The policy language as proposed does a good job of capturing the view held by the CAC that relieving the congestion created by vehicles entering and existing I-90 is critical. The city cannot tell the state what to do so the word "collaborate" is used.

There was agreement not to change the language of the policy.

With regard to Policy S-EG-15, Commissioner Tebelius asked why the policy is needed at all. Commissioner Hamlin said the policy is aimed at getting people to think about alternatives to cars for getting around. There was agreement to retain the policy.

Turning to Policy S-EG-18, Commissioner Tebelius said she has never warmed to use of the term "sense of place." Commissioner Hamlin agreed that the policy as drafted is not clear. What the CAC wanted was policy language aimed at leveraging the Mountains To Sound Greenway. Councilmember Stokes added that the CAC was focused on wanting to see Eastgate turned into a true gateway into the city.

Mr. Inghram proposed simply deleting the "sense of place" phrase from the draft policy. There was agreement to go in that direction.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius, Commissioner Hamlin said it was his understanding that Policy S-EG-CD-1 is focused on the transit-oriented development area of the subarea. Ms. Conkling said in fact the policy is not limited just to that area, though it could be. The idea is that design review should be used for every new building that goes in. The type of in-fill development likely to happen in the corridor will involve the land currently used for surface parking; there likely will be much less surface parking along with some structured parking. Design review is very helpful in those situations.

Mr. Inghram said in order to support a code a requirement for design review, it will be necessary to include policy language in the Comprehensive Plan highlighting the need for design review.

Commissioner Hamlin said comment CoB23 captures what the CAC talked about relative to an incentive system. He said the issue of incentives came up several times.

Chair Laing said he continues to have a concern regarding for form-based codes and incentive systems in that they can be used as tools for mischief. Form-based codes are highly prescriptive. The Council should not tie its hands relative to how it chooses to implement the Comprehensive Plan. It is not necessary to specifically mention form-based codes or design review for the city to choose to adopt either, or even an incentive system. However, if the policy language is included in the Comprehensive Plan, it becomes the way the Council must act. There are a variety of tools cities can use to get to the same place. He recommended against including policy language specifically directing the city to apply design review. He suggested the policy should be redrafted to allow for or consider design review.

Mr. Inghram allowed that the policy language could be written in accord with the suggestion of Chair Laing. He noted that the run-on of items is intended to capture what the CAC talked about, which was that when design review is done, the design features spelled out in the draft policy should be looked for.

Councilmember Stokes said the Council will be looking for any redevelopment in Eastgate to involve more than just boxes. The policy is intended to serve as a heads-up for developers about what the city would like to see.

A motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes was made by Commissioner Tebelius. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamlin and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner Tebelius observed that Policy S-EG-22 is very specific as drafted. Ms. Conkling said the language of the policy comes from the section of the vision that talks about design and fitting into the city's larger idea of a city in a park. Specifically, the Mountains To Sound Greenway is more than just a trail, it is a theme around which to organize. The specific examples spelled out in the policy are examples of ideas that come from the greenway. The existing policy simply encourages the preservation of sufficient natural vegetation to assure amenable views.

Commissioner Hamlin agreed that the policy could be written to be less prescriptive.

Councilmember Stokes suggested, and the Commissioners agreed, that the policy should be rewritten using the more descriptive language used in comment CoB26.

Chair Laing proposed striking "by applying design guidelines" from Policy S-EG-26 to avoid being prescriptive. There was agreement to do that.

Commissioner Tebelius questioned the need to include support for public art in Policy S-EG-28. Ms. Conkling said the list of items in the policy, including public art, includes things that could be included as part of the incentive system. Mr. Inghram added that the policy focus is on art that is part of a development. Art is an element that helps to create a sense of place.

Commissioner Tebelius said she did not understand use of the term "place-making" as used in Policy S-EG-CD-2. Staff agreed to take another look at the language in an effort to simplify it.

Commissioner Tebelius said she also did not understand the intent of Policy S-EG-CD-3. Ms. Conkling said the policy essentially encourages auto dealers to embrace the greening of the corridor. Absent a development permit requiring a land use review, any measures auto dealers take to follow the policy will be discretionary.

Chair Laing questioned the need to include the policy at all.

Commissioner Hamlin said the policy involves a bit of a stretch. What the CAC wanted to do was support the auto dealers that are in Eastgate.

Councilmember Stokes added that there are those in the community who do not want the existing auto dealers to expand. The request by an auto dealer to be allowed to locate on 148th Avenue SE encountered a lot of pushback and the preferred approach was to avoid having rows of autos facing the street by having the dealer utilize a garage.

Chair Laing said at the Planning Commission level the use table was amended requiring auto dealers to go through design review.

Ms. Conkling allowed that auto dealers will be subject to the umbrella policy calling for a general greening of the corridor, obviating the need for Policy S-EG-CD-3.

With regard to Policy S-EG-CI-1, Chair Laing proposed replacing "development partnerships" with "coordinate." He also suggested replacing "regional transit agencies" with "regional agencies" to increase the scope of the policy.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius regarding Policy S-EG-35, Mr. Inghram explained that there are three single family zoning classifications, Single Family-Low, Single Family-Medium and Single Family-High. The Single Family-High referenced in the policy would be R-4 or R-5. He noted that the policy already exists and there is no call to change it, even though using policy language to indicate what color to paint the land use map is not the normal approach. Ms. Conkling added that the site in question is in fact outside of the Eastgate/I-90 study area.

Commissioner Tebelius referred back to Policy S-EG-P-1 and voiced concern about including issues relating to health. She suggested the city should not be in the business of telling its citizens they need to be healthy.

Commissioner Hamlin suggested the policy could leave off everything after the word "subarea." The Commissioners concurred.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius, Ms. Conkling noted that Policy S-EG-D2-4 is also in the Factoria subarea. The policy is intended to support the potential for an incentive system. She said staff took direction from the Commission's previous study to redraft the policy to be less specific and to use the word "consider" in place of "develop."

Councilmember Stokes said the language of comment CoB49 could work very well as the policy.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if Policy S-EG-D2-2 is really needed given that the same sentiment is expressed in other policies. Ms. Conkling agreed the policy language is very similar to other policy language.

Councilmember Stokes said the intent of the CAC was to indicate its desire to see a mixed use area between Bellevue College and I-90.

Chair Laing pointed out that the city will not in fact be the developer so the word "encourage" should be used in place of "develop."

Chair Laing said his preference for Policy S-EG-D2-3 would be to have it read "Retain neighborhood-serving commercial uses through flexible zoning." Councilmember Stokes agreed the draft policy is somewhat prescriptive and limiting.

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None
10. PUBLIC COMMENT - None
11. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW

A. May 14, 2014

B. May 28, 2014

Action to approve the minutes was not taken.


12. NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

A. July 9, 2014

13. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamlin and it carried unanimously.

Chair Laing adjourned the meeting at 10:20 p.m.



Paul Inghram
Staff to the Planning Commission

1/14/15
Date



Aaron Laing
Chair of the Planning Commission

1/14/15
Date

* Approved November 12, 2014