CITY OF BELLEVUE
DOWNTOWN LIVABILITY
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

November 20, 2013 | Bellevue City Hall
6:30 p.m. | Room 1E-108

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Aaron Laing, Ernie Simas, co-chairs; Patrick Bannon, Michael Chaplin, Mark D'Amato, Gary Guenther, Brad Helland, Trudi Jackson, Loretta Lopez, Lee Maxwell, Erin Powell, Jan Stout
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Hal Ferris, Ming Zhang, David Sutherland (resigned as of 11/14/2013)
OTHERS PRESENT:	Dan Stroh, Emil King, Patti Wilma, Department of Planning and Community Development; Camron Parker, Department of Parks and Community Services; Jack McLeod, Melissa DeVita, Bellevue School District; Shannon Bingham, Western Demographics
RECORDING SECRETARY:	Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA, APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 16, 2013, MINUTES

Co-chair Simas called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Co-chair Laing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stout and it carried unanimously.

A motion to approve the October 16, 2013, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Maxwell. The motion was seconded by Mr. D'Amato and it carried unanimously.

It was noted in that committee member David Sutherland (absent from the meeting) had taken on an expanded role with his employer that now precludes him from continuing on as part of the Downtown Livability Initiative.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Dwight Schrag, 1106 108th Avenue NE, asked the committee to keep in mind the factors that have in the past allowed for Bellevue's vibrant growth. People want to come to Bellevue to do business and to enjoy the Downtown amenities; they also want to live and work in Downtown Bellevue. Positive living conditions and work experiences will assure that the future will be strong. The committee should not be misled by advocates of keeping residences in the Downtown core only for the wealthy. Some think having

affordable housing options will diminish the value of properties in the core, but the truth is just the opposite. There are small parcels in the Downtown that are not suitable for large shopping malls or office towers but which are ideal for quality affordable housing and small neighborhood businesses. The Downtown will benefit from seeing those locations upgraded. Green space is needed in the Downtown, especially in the Ashwood neighborhood. Local residents and park patrons would like the City to reconsider the future community center with underground parking at the Ashwood Park site.

Mr. Bruce Nurse, 575 Bellevue Square, spoke on behalf of Kemper Development Company. He said in the 1980s an idea arose from the Bellevue Downtown Association regarding a subsurface arterial serving the Downtown. He said the notion involves an east-west tunnel under NE 6th Street. He noted that NE 6th Street connects to an already built access to I-405 and brings in multiple-occupant vehicles and transit. The tunnel idea would require a portal somewhere between Meydenbauer Center and City Hall; vehicles would enter and exit the underground passageway from the portal. Preliminary analysis shows that as many as 40,000 people per day would use the subsurface arterial to access parking garages and the Pedestrian Corridor.

3. OVERVIEW OF BELLEVUE SCHOOL DISTRICT'S "GROWTH AND PLANNING" PROCESS

Planning Director Dan Stroh noted that the committee had asked for a presentation from the Bellevue School District to better understand how their plans include the growing population of children living in the Downtown.

Mr. Jack McLeod, Director of Facilities and Operations for the Bellevue School District, introduced Melissa DeVita, Deputy Superintendent for Finance and Operations, and Shannon Bingham, demographic consultant with Western Demographics. He said since 2002 the district has embarked on a program to upgrade its school facilities. Eleven of the 17 elementary schools have been demolished and rebuilt. The second middle school demolition and rebuild is underway, and significant modernizations and additions have been completed at three of the four high schools, with work on the fourth currently underway. The district has for the last 25 years enjoyed a fairly static student population of about 15,000, but in the last four or five years steady growth has been experienced to where the enrollment currently stands at 18,600. The capacity being built into the system is intended to accommodate the student enrollment for the next 30 to 40 years.

Mr. Bingham said he was contracted by the School District to develop a report on the educational needs of the district and noted that his report would be presented to the School Board on December 3. The community is composed of developing areas where there will be new housing, and many areas where there is existing housing. Generally, new housing accounts for less than three percent of the total housing issues; the existing and established housing that makes up the balance is also changing.

Mr. Bingham said the district's instructional initiatives are always at the forefront. The district is all about academic success, getting students ready for college and careers, and

facilitating positive and productive lives. The programs are very broad and address a variety of sub-curriculums and programs that need space placed appropriately so they can be best accessed. The programs include general and special education as well as specialized curriculums aimed at gifted students, dual language students, and international students. The district's early childhood and high need population programs also need space in which to operate.

Annual growth over the past five years has averaged 2.45 percent. That can be interpreted to mean that people want to live in Bellevue and want their children to have access to the district's programs. Some of the developing areas of the City are going to change the trend. There will be a significant increase in the number of dwelling units in the Downtown core and the Bel-Red corridor in the coming years, and the introduction of light rail transit to the City will create a shift in work patterns.

Mr. Bingham said the number of children per home is a question the district is routinely interested in. He explained that dwelling density directly correlates to the number of children per dwelling unit, with single family homes yielding more children than multifamily units, particularly highrise apartments. The ratio of housing units per school-aged child is as follows: single family, 2.5:1; multifamily with two to eight units, 3.5:1; multifamily with nine to 199 units, 8.6:1; multifamily with 200 or more units, 14.4:1; and highrise apartments, 40:1.

Within the Bellevue School District there are: 29,246 single family detached houses; 1,294 multifamily units in developments having two to eight units; 18,244 multifamily units in developments having from nine to 199 units; and 9,837 multifamily units in developments having 200 or more units. Single family units make up 50 percent of the total number of units in the district and multifamily dwelling in developments with two to eight units make up about two percent. Multifamily dwellings in developments with between nine and 199 units make up 31 percent of the total number of units in the district, and the balance of 17 percent comes from multifamily dwellings in developments having 200 or more total units. Interestingly, of the total number of units in the district, half are single family or multifamily in developments having from two to eight units, and half are from the higher density multifamily developments. However, 81 percent of the total number of students come from the single family and low-density multifamily developments, and only 19 percent come from the high-density multifamily developments. Traditionally, families have chosen to live in a house with a backyard and that continues to be their predominant choice, though a lot of families are choosing to live in highrise structures as evidenced by the kids catching the school bus in front of highrise buildings in the Downtown.

Within Downtown Bellevue, just shy of 2,500 dwelling units are under construction, permitted, or otherwise in the development pipeline. If multiplied by the units-to-students ratio for multifamily developments with nine to 199 units, the units in the Downtown can be expected to yield 290 students, about half or two-thirds of which will be elementary students. The recent planning for the Bel-Red corridor has also provided opportunities for new multifamily housing which will generate additional students, a large portion being

elementary kids. Taken together, the new developing units will add to the district enough students to need two new elementary schools, one serving the Downtown core along with the Enatai and Clyde Hill students, and one serving the Bel-Red corridor. No determinations have been made with regard to where the schools should be sited. The needs of the middle and high school students are still under review.

Ms. Stout pointed out that Medina Elementary currently serves the Vuecrest Neighborhood, but it could be viewed as part of Downtown for school planning because the residents identify more with Downtown than with Medina. Mr. Bingham said he has been looking at what he calls the apron of the Downtown. He noted that single family detached homes all around the fringe are being scraped off and redeveloped, or in some cases significantly renovated. Many of the homes have children. Ms. Stout commented that on the south side of the Downtown the Surrey Downs Neighborhood is home to a lot of children who are a long ways from Enatai Elementary. She said her point was that areas outside the formal Downtown boundary should be counted as part of the Downtown when it comes to siting a new school. Mr. Bingham said no boundary lines have been drawn yet.

Co-chair Laing asked Mr. Bingham why he had chosen to use a ratio for the Downtown that is higher than what highrise units typically produce in terms of school-aged children. He also pointed out that the projects coming out of the ground or planned for the near future in the area near the intersection of Main Street and Bellevue Way are creating housing units that are focused on workforce housing with relatively few one-bedroom or larger units and asked how that will affect the generation of students. Mr. Bingham said there is no equilibrium yet relative to what is happening in and immediately around the Downtown, so it is too early to identify a trend. He said he assumed that 20 to 25 years out, the average unit will be in developments with less than 200 units, but as the profile of what is essentially a new community changes, the outcomes will change. He said he used the higher ratio in part to accommodate the unknown.

Mr. Helland asked what the timeline is for bringing the two new elementary schools online. Ms. DeVita said the answer to that question is dependent on the outcome of the election in February 2014. The School District Board on November 19 voted to put three measures on the February ballot, one of which is the third phase of the construction program that includes two new elementary schools at some $25 million each. The District recognizes how crowded the Clyde Hill and Enatai schools are. Building a new school does not require moving those kids elsewhere, but offering relief to those facilities is high on the priority list. The School District Board has discussed moving forward with upgrades to Enatai ahead of some of the other schools.

Mr. Bannon asked if there are alternatives to spending $25 million to build a new school to accommodate the Downtown population, such as converting an office building to an urban school. Mr. Bingham said some urban school districts have used the highrise approach, especially for high schools. Elementary students, however, need some sort of outdoor space which would require some innovative thinking.

Mr. D'Amato said people who become parents automatically begin to look outside the urban core at areas where they can be near a school. If a school were to be constructed within the core, it is very likely that those living in the Downtown would choose to remain in the core and send their kids to that school.

Ms. Stout said the City is engaged in all sorts of efforts aimed at ecological sustainability. She said having a school in the Downtown core would mean fewer children on buses in furtherance of those goals.

Co-chair Laing suggested the site of the district court facility in Surrey Downs would be a reasonable location for a school. Ms. Stout pointed out that the facility in fact was previously an elementary school. There also was an elementary school on the site where the library currently sits, and there was at one time a junior high school where Downtown Park now is.

Ms. Maxwell commented that a site of 11 to 14 acres for an elementary campus is not practical for an urban community. It must be recognized that Downtown Bellevue is highly urbanized and a different approach will need to be utilized. A highrise approach could be made to work.

4. RECAP OF AMENITY INCENTIVE SYSTEM DISCUSSIONS TO DATE

Strategic Planning Manager Emil King called attention to the memo contained in the packet that summarized the key points brought out through discussions by the committee to date regarding the amenity incentive system. He noted that the committee clearly has ideas about how the amenities need to add to the livability of the Downtown. The amenities need to be tangible things the public can see and use. There is a sense that the amenity system could help to reinforce neighborhood identity within Downtown. Certain current amenities could potentially be made requirements. There has been discussion of adjusting the bonus rates, and the idea of a superbonus has been raised relative to extraordinary or iconic design features. It is clear the committee wants to see a system that is economically viable and that is updated more frequently. The committee also believes any fees collected in-lieu should be spent on projects in the area or district where the development project occurs.

Mr. King explained that the third page of the memo contained the distilled homework assignment. It included the full list of existing amenities and a refined list of new ideas for consideration. He noted that it was ranked and consolidated based on input from the committee members.

Mr. Helland commented that in addition to the committee talking about the incentive system being efficient, predictable and not overly complex, the committee talked about the need for the system to be amenable to change and new ideas. He also suggested that there should be some performance metrics around how the amenities are used, if they are working or not, and if they need to be updated.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Maxwell, Mr. King reminded the committee that it previously discussed some of the issues with having "specific uses" in the existing amenity system and whether or not they should continue to be incentivized. He said most of the specific uses ended up on the chart under the heading "Support Services," but he said they could also be referred to as "Neighborhood-Serving" uses.

Mr. Bannon called attention to midblock crossings under the "Connectivity" category and asked if it could be defined to include skybridges. Mr. King said midblock crossing is a defined term that involves at-grade crossings at the midpoint of a Downtown superblock. Pedestrian bridges often occur at similar points in the superblocks, though they are not specifically a subset of a midblock crossing. He suggested that if pedestrian bridges are to be included, they should appear as a separate line item in the list.

Co-chair Simas commented that skybridges offer a solution that is almost equal to at-grade crossings. He said he would support including pedestrian bridges as a line item on the list. Co-chair Laing concurred.

Mr. Helland asked if feedback was obtained from the development community about why some of the items on the current list have never been used and if they might be used in the future. He said he was reticent to leave off the list anything someone might find useful in the future.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Stout, Mr. King pointed out that none of the existing 23 amenities is missing from the matrix. He said the recommendation of staff is to keep everything on the existing list as part of the analysis and to supplement them with the new ideas.

Ms. Maxwell raised the issue of whether or not there should be an amenity partnership available to have a school in the Downtown. Ms. Powell supported the notion and added that it would not be out of the realm of possibility for children in a Downtown school to use Ashwood Park for their outdoor recess time. Alternatively, developers could collectively donate land for use as a playground/park. Co-chair Simas agreed the concept is an interesting one and he suggested keeping it in mind for the alternatives discussion.

Ms. Lopez asked who owns the property in Surrey Downs on which the courthouse is located and she was told it is owned by the City. Ms. Maxwell said the local neighborhood has been told the courthouse use will be relocated and the building will be demolished as part of the park master plan. Surrey Downs is a typical single family neighborhood with the average number of school-aged children, but the site is going to be developed and maintained as a park, not a school.

Ms. Lopez pointed out that the committee has been clear about the value of green space in the Downtown and asked what the plan is for developing the Ashwood Park site with a community center. Mr. King said the existing Ashwood Park master plan, which is 20 years old, includes the notion of developing a community center. The plan is admittedly outdated and will be looked at with fresh eyes in the near future.

Mr. Bannon noted that nothing is included on the list about preserving cultural and historical resources. The issue certainly is called out in both the Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Subarea Plan. Mr. King said the 2004 update to the Subarea Plan included policies relating to historic preservation. He said historic preservation and cultural resources could be added to the list of potential amenities. Mr. Bannon said he could not see how the issue would translate into a specific amenity, but if historic preservation is something to be valued, it certainly should be given its due as part of the work program.

Ms. Maxwell proposed asking Stu Vander Hoek to comment on how historic preservation could be seen as an amenity. Mr. Vander Hoek said his project at the northwest corner of Bellevue Way and Main Street will include 370 apartments, 25,000 square feet of commercial/retail, and just under 600 parking stalls. He said in working with the City a non-sign/non-commercial display will be included that will have representative images of Bellevue's past. A pedestrian arcade leading from the parking garage to Main Street will also visually reflect the City's history. No amenities will be utilized for that element of the project.

Mr. D'Amato asked where such historic preservation activities would fit on the list of amenities. Mr. Vander Hoek said it certainly falls into the arts and culture category.

Co-chair Laing asked if the project will be able to use all of the density bonuses achieved from including underground parking stalls and the residential units. Mr. Vander Hoek said the project will not be able to use them all.

BREAK

5. NE 6TH STREET PEDESTRIAN CORRIDOR AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Senior Planner Camron Parker said the Pedestrian Corridor follows NE 6th Street between Bellevue Way and 110th Avenue NE. It includes a major public open space at the midpoint and open space anchors at each end. The corridor has three segments going west to east: Street as Plaza, Garden Hillclimb, and Transit Central.

The committee was shown a map of the corridor indicating the areas that have been developed and the areas that have not yet been developed. In all, about half of the frontage along the corridor has been developed per the guidelines. As the new Downtown light rail station is developed, the Pedestrian Corridor will be extended east of 110th Avenue NE to 112th Avenue NE. The City also has plans to extend NE 6th Street over I-405 and that extension would include a multipurpose path, effectively extending the pedestrian corridor to the east side of the freeway.

The vision for a Bellevue artwalk includes using a portion of the Pedestrian Corridor, which would then make its way south on Bellevue Way to Downtown Park. The plan for Downtown Park includes creating a pedestrian connection between the park and Meydenbauer Bay.

Answering a question asked by Mr. D'Amato, Mr. Parker said the corridor averages 60 feet in width, except where the major public open spaces are located, the width is greater than 60 feet.

Mr. Parker noted that the committee had previously concluded that the pedestrian corridor continues to be an important element of the Downtown. There also was agreement that more needs to be done to activate the corridor. The corridor has been constructed in a piecemeal fashion to date, and the committee members said they hope the next round of development will fill in some of the gaps. The committee also talked about using the incentive system to encourage developers and to engage in public/private partnerships in other instances to get the corridor completed.

The committee was asked to provide feedback on the key themes that should be explored in updating the vision for the Pedestrian Corridor, the activities or experiences that are important to encourage along the corridor and in the public spaces, and what physical design elements are missing or should be improved.

Mr. D'Amato noted that the committee has made it clear it places a high value on open space. It is open space that makes urban areas livable and memorable. Bellevue has a fantastic park in the heart of its Downtown core, but it does not have a hardscaped town square. The Pedestrian Corridor can serve as a linear town square with "rooms" or segments along the way that foster different activities residents can enjoy participating in. If necessary, additional density bonuses should be offered to adjacent property owners to add more "rooms" to the linear town square.

Ms. Stout agreed that the Pedestrian Corridor adds to the livability of the Downtown. She allowed that making it inviting will attract all sorts of people and added that if fully activated the less desirable elements will find it less attractive.

Co-chair Laing said the way the corridor is set up, its completion is contingent on redevelopment. Cities develop over time, and while it may appear it is taking a long time for the corridor to develop, it may be premature to expect it to be completed sooner rather than later. The Pedestrian Corridor may not have yet realized its full potential for the simple fact that the City itself is not yet mature. The question to be asked is what is there about the zoning code, if anything, that is prohibitive to having an artwalk, or outdoor dining, or activated storefronts, or a green oasis. If there is nothing prohibitive, then it may be necessary to simply let development run its course.

Mr. D'Amato pointed out that when people talk about plazas and outdoor spaces, the pictures they show are often from sunny climes. Bellevue does not fit that category so one issue to address is how to make the outdoor spaces in the City viable throughout the year. Mr. King said a number of interesting ideas flowed from the design charrette and great streets workshops. One idea involved expanding the Compass Plaza area; another was to build in programs to better activate the spaces.

Mr. Bannon suggested it would be helpful for the committee to be shown visual and aspirational images of plazas and public spaces that are pedestrian oriented. He agreed with the idea of extending the Pedestrian Corridor along NE 6th Street and with creating a pedestrian connection between the Downtown core and Meydenbauer Bay. It will also be important in time to create a walkway connecting to the Tateuchi Center and other key destinations in the Downtown. To some degree the Pedestrian Corridor should be seen as a place for experimentation around seating, art displays, and weather protection aimed at making the corridor a place for all seasons for people of all ages. Wayfinding should be a strong element. All that may call for greater partnership among the property owners along the corridor.

Mr. Helland questioned the assumption that the corridor will only be built in conjunction with redevelopment. He asked what latitude the City might have to engage in public/private partnerships to move toward completion. Mr. Chaplin pointed out that the majority of the land is in private ownership, but suggested the City might be able to acquire some of it through purchases.

Co-chair Laing said to some degree he is less concerned about the properties that have not yet developed than about what has not happened on the properties that have developed. He asked why the brewery at the Galleria has not included more outdoor seating directly along the corridor. Community Development Manager Patti Wilma explained that the code includes a minimum sidewalk width for the Pedestrian Corridor and if seating were provided on the north side of the brewery the sidewalk width would be reduced below the required minimum. Co-chair Laing agreed that the Pedestrian Corridor involves a confined space. He said he could envision an approach that would involve something akin to an overlay for the corridor that instead of imposing restrictions would open the door to opportunities.

Mr. King reiterated that about fifty percent of the properties along the corridor will be developed at some time in the future, some sooner rather than later. There are, however, some properties that consideration should be given to retrofitting where development has already occurred.

Mr. Bannon highlighted the need to maintain flexibility when it comes to programming the various sections of the corridor. He also questioned whether or not the name "Pedestrian Corridor" is set in stone and must be lived with for eternity.

Mr. D'Amato said it would be a political thing for the City to walk up to some of the property owners and ask if their portion of the Pedestrian Corridor could be "borrowed" until such time as they are ready to develop their sites. The City should not have to just sit back looking the other way while waiting for development to occur. A carrot of some sort likely would need to be used, possibly density credits.

Ms. Lopez voiced her support for the notion of viewing the Pedestrian Corridor as a linear park. What it will need to make it really successful is people walking it. Improved

signage would certainly help, including mileage markers Downtown workers on a break could rely on to know how much exercise they are getting.

Co-chair Laing invited David Schooler to comment on the Pedestrian Corridor. Mr. Schooler agreed that some segments of the corridor that have been developed have been done better than others. Some of the fronting buildings were built without heeding the notion of use of space. The corridor is seeing an increase in the number of people walking it, but even more will use it when activities along the corridor are increased. Over the last 20 years there have been public investments made in various forms, of which the transit center, signage, lighting and outdoor art are examples. Part of the original idea was to include programmable spaces; accommodating the arts and crafts fair and a farmers market were considered early on. In another 10 or 20 years after the next round of development, the corridor will look far different and will be a far livelier place. If by that time the City is not getting what it wants, it may be necessary to take a different approach.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Maxwell, Ms. Wilma said the drive lanes between Bellevue Way and 106th Avenue NE is City right-of-way. Ms. Maxwell said she would like to see vehicular traffic stopped from going any farther east than the alley behind the Westin (105th) and opening what is now roadway to pedestrians. She agreed the City should patiently wait for development to complete the corridor. However, it should be marketed and giving it a name other than Pedestrian Corridor would be appropriate. Public money should be put into improving the corridor by adding such things as artistic canopies, wayfinding and children's play areas, even if the latter are only temporary uses. Though the City does not own the land on which the corridor runs, it should have a role in programming the spaces.

Mr. Chaplin agreed that some sections of the corridor that are already developed did not develop in the way they should have. He raised the notion of allowing developers to get points for contributing to improvements or enhancements to sections that are not adjacent to their properties.

Mr. D'Amato said calling the corridor a park and putting it under the management of the City would make a lot of sense. He also agreed cars should not be allowed in the corridor; it is hard to see the corridor as a place for pedestrians when it is necessary to stay alert to keep from getting hit by a car.

With regard to public open spaces, Mr. Parker said parks, recreation and open space function together as a system to reinforce the notion of Bellevue as a "city in a park". He explained that there are four categories of open space. Public parks is an obvious category; such spaces are designed and owned by the public and managed by the City. Major public open spaces are associated only with the pedestrian corridor; they include the anchors at each end and the Compass Plaza in the center and they are specifically defined by code. Minor publicly accessible spaces and outdoor or enclosed plazas are closely related to each other in function, though the City has the say about the siting of

minor publicly accessible spaces, which is different from outdoor or enclosed plazas which are left to the discretion of developers.

In previous discussions the committee has discussed the fact that as more families move into the Downtown, additional places to play and recreate will be needed. There has also been discussion about the need for a variety of amenities in order to attract younger and more technical talent, and the notion that having an iconic structure and green space would have appeal. The committee also has talked about outdoor plazas as being a key part of the open space system and the need for them to feel like they are open to the public; that it would be in keeping with the "city in a park" theme to have a linear park in the Downtown; and that developers alone are not responsible for creating open space in the City.

Ms. Maxwell said she would like to see open spaces created to be destinations. Wayfinding or marketing would be needed to help people find their way to them. That likely would need to be a public project.

Mr. D'Amato said landscape architects can come up with some pretty amazing spaces. The role the City should play is making sure the spaces are available and assuring that there will be some consistency with regard to components.

Ms. Jackson stressed the importance of keeping Ashwood Park green and not building on the site. A recreation center is something the Downtown would benefit from having, but it could be housed in a highrise.

Mr. Chaplin asked if there are plans for open space in the southeast quadrant of the Downtown. Mr. Parker said the Downtown Implementation Plan and the charrette ideas consider a park block element on the NE 2nd Street/NE 2nd Place area where the properties are fairly constrained in terms of new development because of their size.

Mr. Bannon commented that in his tenure with the Bellevue Downtown Association two surveys of Downtown residents have been conducted. The most desired residential amenity has to do with dogs. Residents want dog parks and off-leash opportunities.

Co-chair Laing agreed with Ms. Jackson regarding Ashwood Park and keeping it as a park. He said the fact is there are very few remaining green spaces in the Downtown and few opportunities to have a redevelopment include any sort of meaningful park. Unless or until the City wants to float a levy and do some significant condemnation in the Downtown core, existing green spaces should be preserved and every opportunity should be taken to get small plazas constructed. None of the spaces will be able to be all things to all people. Downtown Park is a gem, but unless one is close enough to it to be able to walk to it, accessibility is a problem. Accessibility will be an issue for all of the open spaces in the Downtown for the same reason.

Mr. Chaplin said designers use terminology to describe specific plaza types. He explained that a "pass-through plaza" typically is something like an entrance to an office building,

whereas a “linger longer plaza” typically has amenities or activities that encourage people to stay a while. There have been a number of studies on plazas and one of the things identified is the fact that people want to feel like they can create their own personal space within a plaza. Fixed seating can make one feel as though they are being forced to sit and look in a specific direction. In plazas where the seating is movable, people often leave the chairs in the same spot but turn them in a different direction, effectively creating their own personal space. With regard to dogs, he added that some forecasts indicate that within three or four years half of all occupants will have a dog.

Mr. D’Amato commented that the opportunity to create open space primarily lies within future development. Such spaces tend to be used by the building occupants. Anything that can be done to encourage green space in every project, including above grade and on rooftops, should be done.

Mr. Stroh said the City will continue to carry the responsibility to identify additional public space for parks. He agreed that much of the new green space will flow from private development, but the Downtown Subarea Plan does include the idea of creating park space in both the southeast and northwest quadrants.

Ms. Maxwell asked if an enabling incentive could be developed that would help the City acquire park property. Mr. Stroh said such an incentive would have to be significant. He said one issue to be addressed at the alternatives workshop will be the fact that there is a limited amount of potential for development to contribute to the amenity system; how best to pursue the range of desired amenities will need to be discussed.

A motion to amend the agenda to move Item 7 ahead of Item 6 was made by Ms. Jackson. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stout and it carried unanimously.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

6. ADVISORY COMMITTEE SCHEDULE FOR FALL/WINTER

Mr. King said the next regular meeting of the committee is scheduled for December 18 where parking will be the main discussion item.

8. ADJOURN

Co-chair Laing adjourned the meeting at 9:34 p.m.