

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION MINUTES

March 8, 2017
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair deVadoss, Commissioners Carlson, Barksdale, Hilhorst, Laing, Walter

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Morisseau

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Cullen, Dan Stroh, Emil King, Department of Planning and Community Development; Carol Helland, Patricia Byers, Mike Brennan, Department of Development Services,

COUNCIL LIAISON: Mayor Stokes

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

CALL TO ORDER
(6:39)

The meeting was called to order at 6:39 p.m. by Chair deVadoss who presided.

ROLL CALL
(6:39 p.m.)

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Morisseau who was excused.

Chair deVadoss took a moment to acknowledge the time, energy and hard work by members of the community, the Commissioners, Mayor Stokes and the staff team that went into the downtown livability Land Use Code amendment.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
(6:39 p.m.)

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Laing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Barksdale and the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT
(6:40 p.m.)

Mr. CourtOlsen, 15817 SE 26th Street, suggested strongly and recommended that the city consider designating if not all at least a part of the Spring District as a special net zero energy district. If not net zero, the area should at least be designated a high-energy efficiency district. Now is the time to take such an action given that most of the area has not yet been built. Other

parts of the country are taking the initiative, which is consistent with the goal of keeping energy usage down and help save the planet.

Ms. Laura Goodwin Hurdelbrink spoke on behalf of the Bellemeade Homeowners Association. She thanked the city and the maintenance staff for their work on the streets during the difficult winter months.

Ms. Betsi Hummer, 14541 SE 26th Street, noted that quite a while ago there was a joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting at the fire training facility. At the meeting one of the Councilmembers mentioned that Bellevue is a very desirable place in which to build and that amenities are wanted for the various neighborhoods, things like public places and affordable housing. In some places developers can just pay a fee in-lieu so they do not have to develop affordable housing, and that is a real disservice to the city. There should be a greater diversity of all different types of people throughout the city, so there should be affordable housing in any kind of residential situation, especially in high rises. She said in her neighborhood Bellevue College is building market-rate student housing, new homes in higher-end developments are being built, there is affordable housing at Hidden Village, and there are apartments that are market rate for the most part but which also take Section 8 vouchers. Imagine Housing is next to that, which is near the Fir Terrace development. Many of the older homes in the area are affordable. The same pattern of mixing housing affordability should be repeated throughout the city.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS BY STAFF (6:46 p.m.)

Department of Development Services director Mike Brennan explained that ahead of the public hearing staff would take a few minutes to provide background and context for the Downtown Livability Initiative, a journey that started in 2013 and has involved a lot of people, time and energy.

Planning Director Dan Stroh explained that the downtown subarea is the subject of the proposed code update. He said the area boundaries are NE 12th Street to the north, 100th Avenue NE to the west, I-405 to the east, and Main Street with a few exceptions to the south. The area encompasses some 410 acres, which is only about two percent of the city's overall land area but which is the area in which the majority of continued residential and non-residential growth is expected to occur. The public hearing is a milestone date for the draft code package. Once a final recommendation is formulated by the Commission, it will be forwarded to the City Council for review and final adoption.

Mr. Stroh said the Council launched the work by establishing a scope and project principles to guide the effort. A Land Use Code audit was conducted to look at what has been achieved so far, how the code has been working since its adoption in 1981, and determining where there is room for improvement. The Downtown Livability Initiative CAC worked with the audit and developed fairly broad level recommendations that were handed to the Council which in turn formally initiated the code amendment process.

The Planning Commission provided some initial direction. Some items were gleaned and detailed and became a set of early wins. The package of early wins included a requirement for every building to provide weather protection. One of the more complicated pieces of the update involves the amenity incentive system. It was subjected to quite a bit of economic analysis that was peer reviewed by the Urban Land Institute. All of the work to date has been incorporated

into the draft Land Use Code amendments package that is the subject of the public hearing. Following the public hearing, the Commission will continue its work of refining its recommendation.

Public engagement has been key throughout the process. There are close to 1400 persons on the email interest list and information is continually shared with them proactively. There have been focus groups, walking tours, open houses throughout the process, as well as small groups and one-on-one meetings with various stakeholders and interested parties. There were a large number of CAC meetings and there have been a large number of Planning Commission meetings at which the public has been allowed to offer comments.

Mr. Stroh said the current code was for the most part developed in 1981. From time to time it is a good thing to step back and make detailed reviews to make sure the code, which has a huge impact on leveraging billions of dollars of private investment, is up to date. The theme of the work to update the code has been building on success. Downtown Bellevue is the envy of many cities and the focus has been on working from that base in taking things to the next level going forward in creating a competitive and livable environment for the 21st Century. Much attention has been paid to the need for a stronger and more vibrant pedestrian environment that is convenient and attractive. The residential community in the downtown is the fastest residential neighborhood in the city, and a code is needed that will work well in supporting those residents. As the downtown has matured, it has developed distinctive neighborhoods, so one objective of the update work has been to enhance the character of the different neighborhoods. There was a parallel effort undertaken that involved transportation planning, and the code update is intended to incorporate the outcome of that work, called the Downtown Transportation Plan.

Mr. Stroh said the code update is just one part of a broader livability agenda for the downtown. A series of other work items is under way, including a focus on enhancing pedestrian crossings, completing Downtown Park, and developing a vision for the Grand Connection stretching from the Meydenbauer Bay waterfront through the heart of the downtown and across I-405 to Wilburton.

Land Use Director Carol Helland explained that the details of the code are intended to fulfill the reality of the vision. She said staff have worked hard with the Commission to receive direction and translate it into code language that can be applied over time to achieve the vision of the CAC, the Commission and the Council for the downtown.

Code Development Manager Patricia Byers said the zoning map serves as the foundation for the code. She said the perimeter overlay districts are intended to create a gentle transition into abutting residential districts, thus the zoning in those areas is a bit more restrictive.

With regard to how the code relates to livability, Ms. Byers said the first factor is walkability. The proposed code makes improvements to the through-block connections, increases sidewalk widths for multiple streets, and seeks to make all downtown streets more pedestrian oriented. Neighborhood character is a livability factor and a map in the code shows how the downtown is divided into distinct neighborhoods. In neighborhoods where an outdoor plaza is needed, the value of the amenity bonus system points are bumped up in the proposal.

How urban form is addressed plays into livability as well. Urban form dictates such things as the amount of light and air between the towers, variability in the built environment, and memorability in the skyline.

With regard to urban form, Ms. Helland noted that the proposed code touches on things like tower setbacks, tower separation, diminished maximum floor plates as buildings get taller, outdoor plaza requirements, and a range of sections that address urban form characteristics aimed at ensuring implementation of the vision of the CAC, the Commission and the Council.

Ms. Byers reiterated that the perimeter zoning districts serve the purpose of creating graceful transitions between the urban forms of the downtown and the adjacent residential neighborhoods. There is a requirement for a linear 20-foot landscape buffer from the downtown boundary. Buildings within the perimeter districts are required by the proposed code to step back above a certain height, the intent of which is to avoid creating a wall of buildings overshadowing the adjacent neighborhoods.

Strategic Planning Manager Emil King explained that the amenity incentive system is a discrete section of the code. The proposed code makes a number of significant changes to the existing amenity system. Through the process, the stakeholders, the Commission and the staff have all learned a lot about the details that go into successfully examining an incentive system that is more than 30 years old and updating it. The joint Commission/Council workshop in November 2015 was guided by a set of Council principles that were specific to the incentive system. The amenities have been subjected to a great deal of analysis by the consulting firm BERK, the staff, and by a third-party review conducted by a panel from the Urban Land Institute. The desired outcomes include having amenities that make sense for the downtown, and having a list of things that will be true incentives for development.

Mr. King explained that the code is structured to outline overall development standards for things like floor plates, weather protection, landscaping, and a full set of design guidelines. Under the proposed code, development wanting to go above and beyond the base heights and FARs will be required to participate in the incentive system. The Commission spent considerable time looking at the areas in which additional height and FAR may be warranted. The draft code includes a list of 18 amenities, some of which are in the current code, and others of which came out of the CAC process and were vetted by the Commission. In the latter category are things like enhanced streetscapes, alleys with addresses and freestanding canopies. The flexible amenity was a key part of the discussion and allows developers to propose something that is not on the amenity list and have it taken through a process aimed at establishing an appropriate bonus. The code is structured to focus heavily on the open space and public realm; 75 percent of all points are to be earned in that category. A fee in-lieu provision has been added that allows developers an option to on-site performance.

Mr. King noted that the Downtown Livability Initiative CAC and the Commission have served in the role of station area planning, unlike South Bellevue and East Main where there were separate station area planning efforts. All of Bellevue has transit-supported densities and uses, but the CAC and the Commission focused in specifically on the things that can be done in and around the downtown station as well as the portion of the downtown that is adjacent to the East Main station, which lies just outside the downtown boundary. The groups looked at things like upgrading sidewalks and the pedestrian realm around those areas. Substantial density and height increases are proposed for the DT-OLB, Civic Center and A-3 and B-3 overlay districts. The proposal also looks at ways to better connect the pedestrian corridor and the existing bus transit center to the downtown station.

Ms. Helland said one area that is new in the proposed code is the green and sustainability features. The city has historically had land use features and as part of the early wins they were bumped up. The green and sustainability factors enhance the city's focus on sustainability and

ecological performance, seek to soften the urban environment and increase green features in the public realm.

With regard to the mixed use downtown provisions, Ms. Helland noted that the code update accommodates a broader range of uses and seeks to be more flexible. The Land Use Code tends to peg uses very specifically. Urban uses may essentially trend in different directions and the intent was to make sure the code is flexible to capture those trends. The provisions also seek to level the playing field between residential and non-residential uses in the DT-MU.

Ms. Helland stated that the affordable housing provisions are reserved in the Land Use Code. The city is currently looking at opportunities to promote affordable housing for a broad range of populations. The list of ideas that have surfaced include allowing an FAR exemption of up to 1.0 for affordable housing. That provision is not in the proposed code but would be added based on the recommendations of the citywide affordable housing strategy effort.

The need for flexibility and departures was heard throughout the CAC and Commission processes. Specifically, it was noted that the code needs to be nimble in able to incorporate architectural designs and departures that are not contemplated by the code. The code should not be a barrier, rather it should foster unique and high-quality designs while at the same time being transparent enough to understand what the outcomes will be. The proposed code includes a range of departures, some of which are administrative and some of which require development agreements and Council action.

The proposed code seeks to incent more slender buildings in the downtown to promote and facilitate light and air. The proposal also seeks to foster distinct architecture and memorable skylines. The amenities to achieve taller buildings have a livability premise in that the taller and more slender buildings will be spaced further apart and will accommodate more plaza space at the ground level.

Ms. Helland said the Commission at its March 1 meeting identified several key topics to be resolved, including the calculation of base FARs and base building heights; the scope of administrative approvals; consideration of a downtown-wide super bonus; the timing for inclusion of the affordable housing FAR exemption; consideration of additional height flexibility in perimeter areas not adjacent to single family districts; tower separation and tower setbacks; the exchange rate for paying a fee in-lieu of providing amenities; and administrative modification of the parking ratios. The list of site-specific topics included the maximum height limits in the DT-O2; increases in the FAR above the maximum in the DT-OLB through a Council-approved departure; height increases above the maximum in the DT-MU and B-2 perimeter overlay districts through a Council-approved departure; appropriate code provisions for the A-3/B-3 perimeter overlay districts; and ownership of 101st Avenue NE.

Mr. Stroh said the public hearing is a key step in the ongoing public involvement process. Following the public hearing the Commission will continue its deliberations in follow-up study sessions. The target date for the Commission to conclude its efforts is the end of April. Once the Commission hands its recommendation off to the Council, the Council will begin its review and adoption process.

Commissioner Hilhorst said at the joint Council/Commission session and again in 2016 she had called for an amenity to provide a function such as a fire station or other official city function. She asked why it was not included on the list of amenities. Ms. Helland said the flexible amenity was intended to capture that idea and other notable ideas that might be brought forward. No

particular examples were included so as not to limit anyone's creativity.

PUBLIC HEARING

(7:23 p.m.)

Comprehensive Planning Manager Terry Cullen welcomed the public and briefly explained the rules governing public hearings. He said the testimony and information presented would be deliberated by the Commission in future study sessions.

A motion to open the public hearing was made by Commissioner Carlson. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Brian Brand spoke representing the Bellevue Downtown Association (BDA). He said he serves as co-chair of the Land Use and Livability Committee, and is a partner with Baylis Architects which is currently celebrating its 45th year in Bellevue. During that time, the firm has worked on many projects in Bellevue, including in the downtown. He acknowledged the excellent progress made by the CAC, the Commission, the Council and the staff in getting the proposed amendment to where it is. It has been 35 years since the current code was written and the update work is critical to shaping a strong, healthy and livable city. BDA members have been engaged throughout the process, and the organization has over the years served as a partner in creating a vibrant downtown. The draft code is almost there; it is certainly headed in the right direction. Consensus has been reached by the Committee members in regard to several key issues that should be added to the code. The Commission was urged to adopt the recommendations. The BDA favors the targeted increase in building heights to encourage thinner towers, distinctive and memorable architecture, less bulky buildings and more light and air. Additional flexibility, improved guidelines and updated code tools will help create a better code. Except for a few targeted areas where additional density is encouraged, the maximum FAR or density in the downtown districts will remain unchanged. The result will be better designs that will respond to the market and anticipate the needs of the community. Ultimately, the new code will help guide where and how growth will occur. The Commissioners were thanked for their time, leadership and commitment to the process.

Mr. Patrick Bannon, president of the BDA. He said the organization has been working in the community for the past 43 years and has as its mission strengthening the economic and cultural vitality of the downtown. He presented to the Commission an updated version of the core recommendations from the BDA that he presented to the Commission on March 1 and stressed that there was Committee consensus for each item. He asked the Commission to set the base FAR and building height in the code at 90 percent of the new maximum FAR and building height to provide a uniform and predictable standard across the districts. He encouraged administrative approval of the flexible amenity within the maximum height and FAR. An option for projects to apply for a super bonus of additional FAR and height beyond the maximum through a Council departure development agreement should be included in the code; the super bonus should not exceed 1.0 FAR. With regard to affordable housing, the Commission was strongly encouraged to recommend or seek Council direction to advance the affordable housing exemption into the Land Use Code package for consideration. Considerable thought has been given to the A perimeter district in proximity to the single family residential neighborhoods and the BDA believes there is additional opportunity around height flexibility, specifically allowing up to 70 feet within the A-1 perimeter to achieve housing. The 40-foot setback from internal property lines requirement for towers should be eliminated in favor of retaining the current 20-foot setback. The fee in-lieu exchange rate should be reduced from the proposed \$28 per square foot to \$25 per square foot, and the rate should be benchmarked and adjusted over time as the

market evolves. The Commission should call for a thorough transportation study to determine how the proposed Land Use Code amendment will affect the transportation network in the downtown. The code should memorialize the expectation to come back to the code within a five-year timeframe. Additional process flexibility should be incorporated around the 80-foot tower separation requirement, and the city's design review process should include digital street views. Concepts brought forward by the Committee for further review include looking at density around light rail stations, and looking at possibly reducing parking around light rail stations for residential uses. Two pages of additional comments, critiques and clarifications identified by the Committee were presented to the Commission for review.

Commissioner Carlson commented that according to the BDA, the justification for setting the base FAR and heights at 90 percent of the new maximums was to establish a clear, consistent and predictable standard. However, the call for including an option for projects to get a super bonus of additional FAR through a Council departure process appears to be just the opposite. He asked for an example of what might qualify for a super bonus. Mr. Bannon answered that if an applicant wants to be encumbered with a Council departure process and work through a development agreement in consideration for an extraordinary amenity, whatever it might be, they should not be precluded from doing so. Those wanting to stick to the predictable path should have a predictable path to follow. In other markets, super bonuses have been allowed for things like affordable housing. One potential super bonus in the downtown could be related to the Grand Connection.

Chair deVadoss asked if the call for a transportation study can be inferred as a belief that the BDA believes the city has not yet done such a study. Mr. Bannon said the BDA and the community will want additional confidence to know the full and potential impacts associated with incorporating the proposed changes into the Land Use Code. The existing study may show a similar result, but the study should be done so that whatever land use changes are made in the next iteration of the Downtown Transportation Plan are fully understood and planned for.

Mr. Robert Wallace, PO Box 4184, said he is the managing partner of entities that own ten parcels in the downtown, primarily in the DT-MU and DT-OLB districts. He commended the Commission for the volume of work accomplished to date. He presented the Commission with a letter summarizing a few concerns that in some instances could preclude the kind of development the city and the property owners envision. He said he looked forward to seeing the Land Use Code amendment process reaching a conclusion, and agreed that the code should be reviewed every five years.

Mr. Jim Hill spoke representing Kemper Development Company, 575 Bellevue Square. He said he serves as a member of the BDA livability committee and that he supported the comments made by Mr. Bannon. He added his appreciation for the work done to date by the Commission and the staff. Setting the base FARs and heights at 90 percent of the new maximum FARs and heights is an important step and a good way to go. The proposed 40-foot setback requirements should be removed in favor of the current setback requirement. More flexibility for the tower spacing requirements should be included. The proposed 80-foot spacing will severely limit feasibility for many sites. A thorough transportation study should be conducted to determine what is needed to support the planned growth of the downtown. A parking study should also be conducted before there is any action to reduce the parking ratios in the downtown. The pedestrian corridor standards should not create arbitrary or unnecessary burdens to development. The current standard says the pedestrian corridor should average 60 feet wide and in no case be less than 40 feet. Sixty feet is the equivalent of five highway lanes and seems a bit ambitious. The standards for the corridor should not create uncertainty or be subject arbitrary decision

making. Artwork is something that could fall into that category. Outdoor dining and café spaces should be encouraged along the pedestrian corridor.

In response to Mr. Hill's comment about artwork being subject to arbitrary decision making, Commissioner Barksdale asked what the alternative should be. Mr. Hill said everyone can live with certainty and predictability. Where there are open-ended ideas about what constitutes significant art, there can be problems. He allowed that while on one hand it is nice to have flexibility, getting to predictability is always important.

Mr. Todd Woosley, 10633 SE 20th Street, said he serves on the Transportation Commission but was present representing only himself. He thanked the Commission for the tremendous amount of work done to date on something that is critically important to the city. The downtown is a remarkable place. It is about halfway built out, has gotten nicer in every development cycle, and has become a far more livable place. The Commission was encouraged to adopt everything having to do with livability other than increases in densities. He said he was concerned about the lack of understanding about the impacts on the transportation system from any increases in density, let alone from the currently zoned densities. The city simply does not know how the system will function at the build buildout under either the current densities or the proposed densities. He supported the BDA's call for a complete traffic study. The traffic study that has been done shows only a snapshot of what the downtown might be like in 2030 and it shows it will take twice as long as it currently takes during the evening peak period to get through the downtown. Adequate capacity is needed to accommodate those who live and work in the downtown. The city is looking at investing in a new fire station, and one criteria being looked at is response times. The impacts on the response times for all emergency service providers should be included in the traffic analysis needed prior to making any changes in density. The downtown represents less than three percent of the city's land mass and there are many other single family neighborhood areas in Bellevue that are perfectly capable of accommodating growth.

Commissioner Carlson asked if the Commission would be better served by holding off making a recommendation relative to building heights until a traffic analysis, possibly with a parking component, is completed. Commissioner Woosley said his concern was not with building height rather with building densities. A building that is taller but has the same FAR will generate the same number of trips. Where additional FAR is allowed, additional trips will be generated. The information a traffic study would offer should be part of making a more informed decision.

Commissioner Carlson asked where in Bellevue more growth should be allowed to happen. Commissioner Woosley said there is room for growth in the neighborhoods. In the Spring District and in Eastgate there is room to handle growth graciously. A thorough analysis on the economic viability of the code provisions should be done for those areas.

Mr. Dave Meissner, 16541 Redmond Way, Redmond, expressed his support for leaving the tower setback at 20 feet. He reminded the Commission that he had previously shared his plans for a revised project for the Conner building under the proposed new downtown code. Given the uncertainty and timing of the new code, the decision was made to move forward under the current code. Issues of light and air are addressed through the International Building Code. Mandating a setback greater than what is currently required will significantly compromise future development. Tweaks and changes that result in making FAR more expensive will ultimately make things less affordable, not more affordable.

Mr. Andrew Miller with BDR Homes, BDR Capital Partner, 11100 Main Street, thanked the Commissioners for their time and perseverance. He said it was with great disappointment that he

was not able to offer his support for the proposed code. In the southeast corner of the downtown, there are a lot of changes going on. He said his property is located on one leg of a gateway/front door site. Of the four corners of the intersection, heights in the DT-MU are set to be increased, height and density increases are planned for the Wig property, and a park will be constructed on the property across the street, leaving only one corner not addressed in the proposal. The code as presented will breed mediocre design solutions adjacent to a light rail station. Bellevue should not settle for it and deserves better. The Downtown Livability Initiative CAC recommendation includes three entire pages dedicated to the light rail station to be located at City Hall; there is only one passing reference to the other light rail station that will affect the downtown. There is much wrong with the proposal, including the 40-foot tower setback, the 20-foot buffers applied to his property for reasons that no longer exist, specific uses and heights with rationale that no longer exist, a code and incentive system that assumes everything is flat, and a new incentive system that will make projects harder. The BDR and John L. Scott property representatives believe they have put in extraordinary effort to demonstrate a vision for the future. What was proposed was a stepped project, a welcoming grand stairway and a grand concourse, in short a project that really fits the context. The code as currently written points toward squatty, wood frame structures that will serve as unwelcoming buttresses against the street. It is shocking that the code as proposed will not allow for bringing forward a great responsive vision. The Commission can still save the day, however, by changing the code to include the changes recommended by the group. The proposal represents the first code rewrite in 30 years but it is still hamstrung by precedent in the East Main area, the very shackles that should be thrown off. The code certainly does not represent a leap into the future, which makes the work of the last few years meaningless. The East Main area deserves to be part of the future of Bellevue.

Mr. Phil McBride spoke representing the owners of Bellevue Main LLC, the property at 11040 Main Street that houses John L. Scott, a company that just celebrated its 85th year. He said the building houses 200 employees and there is a need for more room, which the proposed building would provide. There is a \$3.7 billion taxpayer investment that is going to stop right in front of the building, and if that fact is not addressed, something will be missed. Most of the recommended code changes reference the areas within a quarter mile of a light rail station. There is a clear need for transit-oriented developments near the light rail stations to boost ridership. The vision provided for the properties along Main Street will not be cheap to build, but it is inspirational and something to be excited about. There are restrictions on the property because of elevation changes, but the proposed project offers a lot of amenities, including a through-block connection, a walk corridor, and amenities for the neighborhood. There have been many visits with the Commission and many public and private conversations, but in none of those conversations has the answer been no; in fact, all that has been heard is encouragement to keep going. It is disappointing that the code as written will not allow the project as outlined. As written, the code as drafted supports a five-over-two building, which is not what Bellevue needs. The Commission was asked to instruct the staff to include the requested code changes.

Mr. Alex Smith, 700 112th Avenue NE, spoke representing 700 112th LLC. He thanked the Commission and the staff for diligence that has gone into the proposed amendment. He voiced support for the recommendations made by the BDA, and echoed the comments of Mr. Stroh about what the code objectives are trying to achieve. It is not density for the sake of density. The desire is to build a better and more livable downtown. Density is a very important component of making the downtown more livable. The super bonus, while possibly not well named, should be supported as a departure process for adding more density or height where appropriate. The super bonus does not necessarily contradict the need for other properties, especially in the DT-OLB, that need predictability to support their business models.

Mr. Jeff Taylor with the Keldoon Group said one of the unintended consequences of the proposed 40-foot setback is that property owners with large sites will have a huge incentive to subdivide their properties into 30,000 square-foot sites and sell them. The result would be a bunch of independent projects as opposed to a well thought out master plan development over larger parcels. Allowing for flexibility in regard to the 80-foot tower separation requirement also makes sense. As drafted, 75 percent of what it will take to get from the base to the max must come from open space. He said he did not know who would want to exercise the flexible amenity if it requires going to the Council to bridge the gap in some form. The code should be drafted to allow flexibility through administrative actions instead. With regard to the BERK analysis, he said it was very extensive and thorough. It is not possible, however, to analyze every potential outcome given elements such as specific site soil conditions, market conditions, location, access points and water table issues. Every property owner would like to be allowed to fully build out their sites without having to provide any amenities. For those on the lower tier, however, for 60 percent of their FAR they will either have to write a check or provide some public benefit; even so, it will be difficult for them to get from the base to the max. Seventy percent of the zones are at 75 percent, and there are some below 50 percent. The range from 41 percent to 100 percent does not make sense. Another fundamental challenge is that for the exact same office building, someone in the DT-OLB South would have to write a check for \$3.125 million or provide public amenities in that amount, while someone in another zone would pay nothing at all. Given that both buildings would be chasing the same tenants, the property owner in the DT-OLB South would be fundamentally at a disadvantage. The same applies to height. All of that goes to why the BDA and about every downtown property owner supports setting the base at 90 percent of the new maximum for both FAR and height.

Mr. Larry Martin with Davis Wright Tremaine, 777 108th Avenue NE, spoke representing Mr. Smith and 700 112th LLC. He said the amenity system as proposed is an unlawful tax on development. He noted that he had submitted his explanations in a letter to the Commission to become part of the record. There are many aspects of the incentive system that are unsound, but the most telling point is that it puts the greatest monetary burden on the owners of property who will receive the greatest increase in development capacity as a result of the proposed zoning changes. The required amount of amenities is tied to rezoning, not to the impacts of development. The impacts of a given building will be roughly the same regardless of the zone it is constructed in. By crossing a zoning boundary, the cost of the required public amenities changes as a result of pegging the base FAR to 85 percent of the maximum allowed under the current zoning. Under the proposal, zones that already have a relatively high maximum FAR are required to provide fewer public amenities as compared to zones that currently have a low maximum FAR. The amenity system is thus a tax on the reclassification of land, a tax on constructing buildings, or a tax on development. Whichever term is used, a tax or charge, direct or indirect, on any of those activities is prohibited by state law. The problem can be fixed by following the recommendation of the BDA to set the base FAR and height at 90 percent of the new maximums for all zones, though it is unclear why the city would want to impose a charge on height when taller and skinnier buildings is exactly what the city wants to see. The approach would go a long way toward eliminating the unfairness by spreading the burden more fairly and coming closer to actually dealing with impacts. It would also be consistent with the fact that about ten percent of the FAR for downtown development has been earned through the bonus amenity system. He also urged the Commission to encourage density near light rail stations. There are many reasons why that is a best practice in other communities throughout the country that have light rail. He provided for the record a ULI study from December 2016 of nearly 10,000 apartment units, both transit-oriented development and non transit-oriented development in which it was found that people in transit-oriented development apartments commute by public transit at a rate five times greater than non transit-oriented development residents. The study also

found that local governments reap substantial fiscal benefits from transit-oriented development, including higher net tax revenues and lower impacts on public services. Also submitted was copies of an email from Senior Planner Kevin McDonald along with a transportation analysis that was done to look at the zoning proposed by the downtown livability amendments. In the email, Mr. McDonald confirmed that there will be less impact on traffic congestion downtown with the zoning changes than without them due to the shift of future development to the DT-OLB sites that have excellent access to and from I-405 and other transportation corridors to the east. More development can be accommodated at the OLB locations with less impact than the same development located on sites closer to the downtown core. The benefits of excellent vehicular access at the OLB sites will be enhanced by proximity to the light rail stations. He suggested the Commission should consider exempting some quantity of transit-oriented development from the calculation of FAR as a way of encouraging the use.

Commissioner Walter referred to the chart offered by Mr. Taylor and noted that it showed the maximum FARs in the 85 percent range. She also noted that Mr. Martin had stated that 90 percent lines up with past practices and asked how that percentage can be justified. Mr. Taylor responded by saying that historically getting to the maximum FAR has been achieved almost exclusively by providing below grade structured parking. Typically, that brought developments to the point of only needing about ten percent more. One could make the argument that taking the credit for below grade parking off the table equates to a downzone. Mr. Martin pointed out that the staff report includes a review of a large number of past projects and outlines how bonus FAR has historically been earned. That is where the 90 percent figure pops up.

Ms. Brittany Barker with the Fortin Group, 10112 NE 10th Street, Suite 202, said the organization is focused on positioning its 11-acre site in Northwest Village to accommodate redevelopment over the long term in a way that will achieve many of the goals and ideals articulated in the downtown livability study. She thanked all those involved in the work that has gone into the downtown Land Use Code updates. Fortin Group has played an active role throughout the Downtown Livability Initiative process; it worked closely with the CAC and continues to work closely with staff and community members. Meetings, open houses and one-on-one discussions with neighbors have been held over the past five years to collaboratively develop a future vision for what will be a truly exemplary mixed use project on the site. The result will be neighborhood amenities, active streetscapes, open space, retail and more. The updated code amendments and the amenity incentive system will help facilitate the realization of the shared goals. The proposed dimensional standards appear to be feasible as they apply to the vision. Fortin Group is looking forward to confirming the detailed calculation method that has been referenced by the BERK study, the assumptions, and the use of the flexibility amenity option with staff, hopefully before the legislation is put through to the Council. With regard to the podium typology, the floor plate trigger height should be increased by five to eight feet to allow for taller retail and more feasible and appropriate podium forms within the current height recommendation.

Mr. John Stout with Webber Thompson Architects, 225 Terry Avenue North, Seattle, focused on the 40-foot setback and 80-foot tower separation proposed requirements. He shared with the Commission an image showing how difficult development would be under the 40-foot setback requirement, along with an indication of the existing projects in the downtown that would not comply. He noted that the Bravern would lose two of its towers under the proposal. That site, which is well over 30,000 square feet, is irregularly shaped. Bellevue Towers are not as close to the property lines as they appear but are not set back 40 feet and would likely only have a single tower. Avalon Towers would also probably be only a single tower on the northeast corner. For smaller projects like Elements, the buildings are right up next to the property line, so a 40-foot

setback would kill all development on that site. The proposed setback diagram included in the draft code supposes an imaginary super block that is cleanly divided into four big parts, but sites in the downtown in reality are much different. The block between NE 2nd Street and NE 4th Street, even with some assemblages assumed, has six different parcels. The 40-foot setback would remove much of the developable area. Two of the sites would lose 55 percent, and another would lose 71 percent of the buildable tower area. Using another sample block, he noted that only one of parcels falls under 30,000 square feet, qualifying it for the 20-foot setback. The small and narrow sites would all have to develop with midrise structures, which is essentially a downzone. The proposed 40-foot setback, 80-foot tower spacing, and 20-foot street stepback proposals will greatly reduce the development potential of the downtown, by as much as 50 percent on many parcels, leaving them undeveloped and without public amenities. The desire to provide open space at the street level will inherently be ignored due to interior setbacks pushing all tower developments to the street frontage. The new setback protects sites that may not develop for decades at the expense of sites that are ready to develop, which is not a formula for growth and transformation. Reducing the setback to 20 feet and including an incentive for tower spacing in the FAR bonus system would be a good way to ensure that current and future development will have a path forward.

Mr. Wayne Webber with Webber Thompson Architects, 1521 2nd Avenue, Seattle, said he began his architectural career in Bellevue in 1971 working for El Baylis. He said he has worked on many Bellevue projects over the years. He endorsed the letter from the BDA and expressed his admiration for the planners who have worked very hard to development the proposed code. With regard to the proposed 40-foot setback, he said the outcome will be a severe downzone for many sites along with a diminution of property values and a significant loss of potential tax revenue. It will also reduce the density and preclude the kind of development everyone envisions for the downtown. The list of salient and important suggestions and proposals from the CAC included reducing sprawl, achieve the vision of the downtown as a vibrant mixed use center, encourage the Great Place strategy, accommodate a residential population of 19,000 by 2035, and improve the area's residential setting. All of those goals would be precluded by the 40-foot setback. The 40-foot setback would result in building pads that are too small and impractical for tower development. Two-tower projects would be subject to the 40-foot setback at the side lots as well as the 80-foot setback between towers, resulting in killing the project outright and relegating the site to only midrise developments. A 40-foot setback is unheard of in an urban setting, particularly in cities that are trying to reduce sprawl, incentivize a regional growth center, and encourage the Great Place strategy. The stringent setback will have the opposite effect by devaluing property and discouraging or killing development that would otherwise achieve the goals.

****BREAK****

Mr. Scott Matthews with Vulcan Development, 505 5th Avenue South, Suite 900, Seattle, thanked the Commission and the staff for the sustained and extraordinary effort that has gone into the planning process. He said Vulcan seeks to provide a rate of return for the owner but also seeks to be thoughtful about engaging the local neighborhoods and community stakeholders in addition to having a soft footprint on the environment. When things are done right, they stand the test of time. Vulcan is very much attracted to the arc of Bellevue's future but regrettably has been slow in identifying opportunities. Bellevue is poised to compete on a local and national basis, as well as on an international basis. He concurred with the comments made by the 40-foot setback and the 80-foot tower separation proposals, and agreed with the need to be flexible with regard to parking. Many of the fast-growing companies in the region started off in buildings under 200,000 square feet. Proving opportunities on the Eastside for companies to grow

incrementally is very important, and what they need is predictability. The proposals regarding the crosswalk connections could use a bit more study and consideration. Consideration should also be given to the grade conditions relative to the pedestrian corridor and how it might impinge on being able to meet the goals. He said Vulcan looks forward to working with the city and in seeing Bellevue keep its place relative to growth in the region.

Mr. Craig Davenport with MZA Architects, 600 108th Avenue NE, voiced support for the recommendations outlined by the BDA. He said the firm has been working on projects in Bellevue over the past year and a half that have been on hold waiting for the code update. The proposed 40-foot setback was not made known until recently and will severely impact several projects. The structural requirements for towers at the allowed heights, especially the core size, reduces the amount of leasable space, and in many cases the 40-foot setback will leave very little site to work with; the requirement will mean many projects will simply not go forward. The 75-foot tower limit spread over the entire downtown core does not feel right. Tower separation makes sense when going beyond 450 feet to 600 feet, but not at 75 feet. The Grand Connection vision is very existing for the downtown, yet the bonus points for providing for the corridor is proposed to be reduced from 16 times the square footage to 13.3 times. The cost of bringing the Grand Connection online will be very high, and while it is something everyone wants to provide, developers could lose a lot of otherwise developable land, for which they will receive a reduction in the amenity bonus. It is a super bonusable area, an area where FAR can be added to the top of the maximum FAR which if not used can be sold into the downtown core and transferred to another site. In effect, property owners will see the value of their property reduced by reducing the multiplier. The bonus should be kept at 16 times the square footage or increased. With regard to parking, he agreed provision should be made for reducing the parking requirements within a certain distance of light rail transit stations. Parking is quickly becoming a project driver as the towers go higher. Where the Elevate project is concerned, below level six there are water table issues and the costs go up astronomically. The parking requirements are serving to limit project size and density. The city needs to take a close look at the downtown parking requirements, what can be done with shared parking, and how much having transit will help.

Mr. Tim Jackson with PMF Investments, 15015 Main Street, suite 203, thanked the Commissioners for the time put into updating the code. He said organizations like Futurewise and NAIOP that think about smart growth and planning are weighing in on the process. Their findings are remarkably consistent with each other and with the points raised by the BDA. Most of the work done to develop the proposed code is encouraging and will assure a strong future for downtown Bellevue. There are, however, a few things that need to be addressed, including the tower spacing and setting the base FAR at a fair level. In the current real estate market, things that are not incentivized are difficult to bring online. In most cases, it is the incentives that make it possible to achieve the financing necessary to make projects happen.

Mr. Ian Morrison, 701 5th Avenue, Suite 6600, spoke on behalf of PMF Investments, echoed the points made by the BDA and by some of the other property owners in the DT-OLB district. PMF's interest is in the Sheraton site, which is a gateway site on Main Street and 112th Avenue NE. The request for the potential for additional FAR to support transit-oriented development around the future East Main station should be considered. The transportation study already done by the city recognizes that around light rail stations there is an opportunity to achieve some density that will not have the same level of impact on the transportation network. The Sheraton gateway site is a perfect place to think about strategic opportunities for density while respecting the placemaking reflected in the Council principles, the neighborhood context, and minimizing the impacts on the transportation system. The Commission should recommend the approach to the Council.

Mr. Mike Yellam, 10655 NE 4th Street, spoke representing the Fana Group of companies. He added his support to the comments made by the BDA. He said it appears the proposed code update splits the DT-O2 zoning into maximum heights that are different. It is unfair to bifurcate the different zones, and a single height increase should apply to the DT-O2 zone. He said the 80-foot tower separation proposed requirement is unrealistic. The small lot exemption should be encouraged and maintained. The 20-foot setback from internal property lines should be retained.

Ms. Katherine Crouch-Hughes, 10203 NE 31st Place in the Northtowne community, said the local neighborhood group has been closely following the livability of Bellevue for a couple of decades. She said the allocation of amenities tied to open space is the right thing to do. The fees in-lieu should be tied to projects rather than paid into a central money pot. The fees should flow back to the specific development site. If the fees do not stay with the property, nothing will have been solved. The 80-foot tower separation as proposed should be approved along with the proposed 40-foot setback to achieve the goals regarding light and air. The base height and FAR should be set at 80 percent rather than 90 percent. No super bonus of any kind should be allowed.

Mr. Mike Neilson, 10650 NE 9th Place, said the 40-foot setback, had it been in place 20 years ago, would have resulted in a much different downtown, one without many of the current developments. He said the Washington Square superblock, which he represents, will support about one million square feet of development along NE 8th Street. The problem with increasing height without increasing the FAR is that unless for-sale products are developed, the additional height will not be used. Office developers are not going to choose smaller floor plates in exchange for taller buildings because there would be no real return on the investment and no financier will loan on it. The approach will work for condominium developments that are to be sold. The problem with that is that in the state of Washington the condominium legislation is very onerous, the result of which has been developers shying away from building that product. Under the proposal, tower heights can be increased, but if the site will not accommodate the amenities required for the increased height, the development will have to pay a fee in-lieu. That is counterintuitive. The existing DT-O1 zone has no restrictions on residential. At the end of the day, residential living in the downtown will create vibrancy. More needs to be done to stimulate downtown living and to encourage developers to build condominiums.

Mr. Jonathan Kagle said he serves as director of the Vuecrest Community Association, Box 312, said the association is celebrating its 70th year in Bellevue. He thanked the Commissioners and staff who have worked with the organization over the past few years, and for considering the adjacent neighborhoods around the perimeter of the downtown. The perimeter overlay district has done much to reduce the concerns of the Vuecrest neighborhood and to preserve the transition from the urban area to lower-density single family homes. The call for super bonuses and the suggestion to increase the allowed height in the perimeter district by ten feet is somewhat disconcerting. He said he understood the justification for the fee in-lieu issue, but the neighborhood would like to see the collected fees will go toward developing amenities in the areas impacted. He noted that 20.25A.E talks about sunlight and shadows but is limited to public spaces and neighboring developments; it should be expanded to include adjacent neighborhoods. The proposed code talks about alleys with addresses but says nothing about alleys that are used as alleys. Developments such as the one on the corner of 100th Avenue NE and NE 10th Street have no garbage service because there are no alleys; instead, a 36-square-foot garbage area is located right next to the street and it serves the development that has more than 100 apartment units. There are no guidelines in the code about where to put recycling, dumpsters and the like that used to be located in alleys. He noted that there are a lot of numbers and abstract concepts that have been talked about relative to the economics of the incentive system; it would be helpful

to see some examples. Another issue that should be addressed is how to deal with old credits from the incentive system that is currently in place.

Mr. Arnie Hall, 17227 SE 40th Place, thanked the Commissioners for their hard work. He said he shared the aspirations of the Downtown Livability Initiative and the work of the CAC. He said as an architect, builder and developer, it is imperative to support the recommendations of the BDA, including the 90 percent baseline, not deferring the affordable housing issue, and retaining the 20-foot setback requirement. There are many creative design professionals who have practiced in Bellevue for years who are smart enough to figure out how to create public amenities if the restrictions imposed by the new Land Use Code amendment are removed. Two things are inevitable: prices are not going down, and Bellevue fees are not going down. Seattle is a friendlier place than Bellevue to develop in from a developer's standpoint

Mr. Andy Lakha, 500 108th Avenue NE, said he owns approximately three acres of the site where the Cost Plus World Market is located at Bellevue Way and NE 8th Street. He said he has been a resident of Bellevue for 20 years and has been looking for a dream project. The project proposed for the site in question will define his commitment to the city. He thanked the Commission for all their work and said he has been having conversations with the Commission for more than a year. The message all along has been the same, that no more FAR is needed, and that no more parking is needed. The intent is to provide great pedestrian open space and iconic buildings. What is needed to make the project work is just a little more height. The Commission has already proposed increasing height for the Fortin site to the west, the modest height increase requested will fit in nicely with the gentle rise of heights in the downtown core. The site is unique and deserves attention. The block is north of Bellevue Square and is far from the edges of the downtown. It can accept more height. The dual midblock connectors on the site dictate the need for more height. The location deserves an iconic design with greater height. The project as planned will set a new benchmark for high-quality pedestrian space in the downtown. Additional height will provide the opportunity for better tower spacing and better pedestrian access areas. The citizens of Bellevue want and need more iconic architecture and better amenities in the downtown. The Commission was reminded that the CAC endorsed building height up to 300 feet for the location. The request can be accomplished by adding to the Fortin footnote. The Commission was urged to support the request. He said the 40-foot setback should be eliminated as it will kill many projects, including his. He noted his support for all nine points listed in the BDA letter to the Commission.

Mr. Jack McCullough, 701 5th Avenue, Seattle, said the request for the Lakha site has been consistent over the months. Some of the feedback has been that the request represents a radical proposal. The fact is the code amendment process has already led to height increases to the west and east of the site. The footnote incorporated into the code for the Fortin site, completely appropriately, allows building height up to 264 feet on the 11-acre site to the west, which is much closer to the Vuecrest neighborhood. To the east in the DT-O2 zone, building heights under the proposal are allowed up to 460 feet. Mr. Lakha is asking for 300 feet, a request that is in line with the downtown wedding cake. Making a simple addition to the Fortin footnote is one approach to solving the problem. If the city truly wants to see taller slender towers, the Lakha site will serve as the poster project. With regard to the 40-foot setback, he pointed out that size site is less an issue than site dimensions. Many downtown sites are not neatly rectangular. The 40-foot setback requirement runs counter to how Bellevue has approached development in the downtown. For the last 35 years, the city has been clear about allowing projects that are ready to be built to go forward. There has not been any attempt to protect sites that may not be developed. The effect of the 40-foot buffer will be to protect sites that may not be developed, possibly for a generation, while punishing sites that are ready to develop. Had that approach been taken 35

years ago, the current downtown skyline would not exist. The first draft of the proposed code came out three and a half months ago. Despite all the visioning work that has been done, the code is where the rubber hits the road. The public hearing represents the first time the Commission has been able to hear comments on the document from a broad swath of the development community. Codes and plans are wonderful things, but unless things actually get built, they exist only in a book. The people who are going to build what the code envisions are those who have addressed the Commission during the hearing. He suggested the work of the Commission may just have begun. The time should be taken to get it right, even if that means the work will carry on for a few more months. Exogenous features like SEPA review or the BERK report should not become handcuffs to the Commission's ability to do the right thing.

Ms. Pamela Johnston, 3741 122nd Avenue NE, said she is a resident of Bridle Trails. She suggested that more important than the downtown skyline is the human scale for those in the downtown. She said Guangzhou China is a 24-hour city. Downtown Bellevue should also be a 24-hour city. Currently too many of the places in the downtown are dead both during the night and during the day. The north side of Bellevue Square should be compared to other cities; the side is dead and it is hard to walk down the street to get to Starbucks. Bellevue should be not only livable but lovable. With regard to the incentives, she said she could envision having bubble canopies everywhere. Some incentives may get overused and it is unclear how they will be controlled. If there are going to be lots of canopies, there should be order to what comes first and what comes second versus canopies. Many people are moving into the downtown and the city needs to make sure it keeps play spaces, and not just in the park. It is unclear about how the public process plays into the incentives. Along with keeping the amenities in the same area as the buildings, the city should deal with keeping the utilities needed in the downtown in the downtown and out of the neighboring areas. If the fee in-lieu process is used, the funds should be used appropriately for projects and not allowed to just flow into a general fund for projects in other neighborhoods. It is not clear how the growth cycle will pace itself out. It is unclear how the mix of retail will be addressed. Development in the downtown should allow for room to grow. Parking at the mall is good because it is easy to find a place to park, shop and then go home. The mall, however, is all focused on the interior rather than outwardly. It is unclear if there are incentives to make the roofs of shorter towers pretty for the benefit of those living in taller towers looking down on them. It is unclear if there are any incentives for LEED certified buildings. The public needs to be involved in every process along the way.

Mr. Scott Douglas, 304 112th Avenue West, Seattle, said the current code was written in 1981, the year he graduated from college and began his architectural career. He said the code is a bit like the property in the neighborhood that has become a bit run down and needs an influx of new energy. He pointed out that building height in Bellevue is based on the finished average grade. That means the architects and planners must calculate what the base of a building will be in its final form two years down the road. Seattle keeps it simple and height is measured from the midpoint of a major street elevation, a factor that can be known from day one. He said he was aware of a commercial office building in downtown Bellevue where some games were played with the finished average grade in order to elevate the measuring point that is beyond the intent of the code. He said he was also aware of a residential project that exploited the approach to the point of at least six extra feet beyond the intent of the code. It would be much easier if Bellevue would implement an approach similar to Seattle's. When it comes to calculating FAR, there is a provision in the Bellevue code that allows for the mechanical spaces to be excluded. Accordingly, architects must anticipate the final mechanical design that in many cases is not determined for years after design on a building begins. Seattle has a flat rate of about 3.5 percent of square footage that can be excluded from the FAR calculation.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Commissioner Laing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and the motion carried unanimously.

STUDY SESSION
(9:49 p.m.)

Downtown Livability – Downtown Land Use Code Amendment

Chair deVadoss proposed taking time to internalize the feedback before digging into the details.

Commissioner Walter noted that much was said about the fee in-lieu proposal and accountability for it. What some other jurisdictions do with fees in-lieu is put the money into a fund. Fees in-lieu for an open space are kept separated from fees in-lieu for affordable housing. She said the Commission should recommend establishing a policy for how to treat fee in-lieu payments to create both transparency and accountability.

Commissioner Barksdale said he would welcome seeing some alternatives to discuss.

Commissioner Hilhorst said it was clear during the public hearing that there is a desire to retain the current 20-foot setback and to not go forward with the proposed 40-foot setback. She allowed that the 40-foot proposal grew out of the proposed requirement for 80-foot tower separation, which the Commission has been discussing for a year. Nothing was said about the 80-foot separation issue until the 40-foot setback issue was raised. She said she would like to see from staff some options for staying close to the 20-foot setback while achieving the desired tower spacing. Ms. Helland said the Commission has the latitude to recommend a different outcome. She said the staff will do any analysis that would be helpful in making a decision.

Commissioner Carlson suggested the Commission had not heard much feedback about the 80-foot separation rule because there had not been discussions with those directly affected. The approach looks great conceptually but may present problems operationally. He said it would be good to know what tower separation requirements are for the top ten cities in Washington state by population. Ms. Helland said staff would bring some information back to the Commission.

Commissioner Walter said she would like to see some charts comparing base FAR and height at 85 percent and 90 percent. She said she also wanted to know which approach fits best with the analysis done by the consultants.

Ms. Helland commented that some of the testimony offered had been heard before, but some was new. She said staff would bring the information back grouped by themes for the Commission's review.

Commissioner Laing noted that the comment was made by one member of the public that through-block connections not associated with super blocks are in fact alleys. He said he would like information about the proposed connections to determine if some of them should be called alleys. Ms. Helland staff could provide additional information on the topic. With respect to the specific through-block connection referenced, it was mistakenly included on the map and the correction has been added to the errata sheet.

Mr. Cullen said the next Commission meeting was on the calendar for March 22. He noted that the meeting on April 12 was during school break and said he would contact the Commissioners individually to determine if a different date should be identified.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Pamela Johnston, 3741 122nd Avenue NE, pointed out that not many cities in Washington state have towers. She suggested the staff should research the requirements of Seattle, Portland, San Diego, Sacramento, Phoenix, Vancouver, Calgary and Edmonton.

ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Barksdale and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair deVadoss adjourned the meeting at 9:58 p.m.



Terry Cullen
Staff to the Planning Commission

5/11/17
Date



Stephanie Walter
Vice Chair of the Planning Commission

5/10/17
Date