

2016 PLANNING COMMISSION



BELLEVUE

Meeting
6:30 pm October 26

Location
Commission meetings are held in the Council Conference Room unless otherwise posted.

Public Access
All meetings are open to the public and include opportunities for public comment.

425-452-6800
planningcommission@bellevuewa.gov

www.bellevuewa.gov

OCTOBER 26



Bellevue Planning Commission

AGENDA

Regular Meeting

October 26, 2016

6:30 PM - Regular Meeting

City Hall, Room 1E-113, 450 110th Avenue NE, Bellevue WA

6:30 PM – 6:35 PM Call to Order

6:35 PM – 6:40 PM Roll Call

6:40 PM – 6:45 PM Approval of Agenda

6:45 PM – 6:50 PM Communications from City Council, Community Council,
Boards and Commissions

6:50 PM – 6:55 PM Staff Reports

6:55 PM – 7:10 PM Public Comment

7:10 PM – 9:10 PM Study Session

1

*Downtown Livability – Land Use Code Amendment
Package, including a briefing on the inter-relationship of
the Wilburton-Grand Connection projects to Downtown
Livability.*

Land Use Code Amendments

Staff: Emil King AICP, Strategic Planning Manager, Planning &
Community Development Dept.

Staff: Bradley Calvert, Community Development Program
Manager, Planning & Community Development Dept.

Staff: Trish Byers, Code Development Manager,
Development Services Dept.

General Order of Business – Staff will present the proposed code amendments. The Planning Commission will ask questions and discuss the consistency of the amendments with the overall policy direction of the Bellevue Comprehensive Plan.

Anticipated Outcome – Based on this policy discussion, the Planning Commission will provide staff direction for any additional information needs for the Commission and staff to consider as part of the overall code amendment package.

9:10 PM – 9:15 PM Draft Minutes Review
September 28, 2016

9:15 PM – 9:30 PM Public Comment

9:30 PM Adjourn

Please note:

- Agenda times are approximate only.
- Generally, public comment is limited to 5 minutes per person or 3 minutes if a public hearing has been held on your topic. The last public comment session of the meeting is limited to 3 minutes per person. The Chair has the discretion at the beginning of the comment period to change this.

Planning Commission Members:

John deVadoss, Chair

Stephanie Walter, Vice Chair

Jeremy Barksdale

John Carlson

Michelle Hilhorst

Aaron Laing

Anne Morisseau

John Stokes, Council Liaison

Staff Contacts

Terry Cullen, Comprehensive Planning Manager 425-452-4070

Emil King, Strategic Planning Manager 425-452-7223

Janna Steedman, Administrative Services Supervisor 425-452-6868

Kristin Gulledge, Administrative Assistant 425-452-4174

* Unless there is a Public Hearing scheduled, "Public Comment" is the only opportunity for public participation.

Wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation available upon request. Please call at least 48 hours in advance: 425-452-5262 (TDD) or 425-452-4162 (Voice). Assistance for the hearing impaired: dial 711 (TR).



October 19, 2016

SUBJECT

Downtown Livability Initiative – Wilburton-Grand Connection Briefing; Continued Review of Downtown Land Use Code Issues

STAFF CONTACTS

Emil A. King AICP, Strategic Planning Manager 452-7223
eaking@bellevuewa.gov *Planning and Community Development*

Bradley Calvert, Community Development Program Manager, 452-6930
bcalvert@bellevuewa.gov *Planning and Community Development*

Patricia Byers, Code Development Manager 452-4241
pbyers@bellevuewa.gov *Development Services Department*

DIRECTION NEEDED FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| <hr/> | Action |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Discussion |
| <hr/> | Information |

BACKGROUND

Focus of October 26 Study Session

The Commission has been reviewing Downtown code topics over the past year and staff is now forming the consolidated package. On October 12, staff reviewed Installments 1 and 2a of the Land Use Code Amendment Package. Installment 2b of the Land Use Code is anticipated to be released in mid-November for public review.

The Planning Commission's October 26 Study Session will cover the following items:

- Wilburton-Grand Connection Briefing
- Follow-up on specific items that have been raised at recent Commission meetings relating to the Downtown Land Use Code, including:
 - a. Application of the Green and Sustainability Factor, including areas of flexibility
 - b. Details on the current 20-foot linear buffer that applies to the north, west and south edges of Downtown
 - c. Maximum building height for single tower projects in Perimeter Overlay B-2 (Deep B District) east of 102nd Avenue NE
 - d. Overview of the upcoming Urban Land Institute (ULI) Technical Assistance Panel for the incentive zoning system

DISCUSSION:

Wilburton-Grand Connection Briefing

The Planning Commission will be briefed on the Wilburton-Grand Connection planning initiative. The focus will be on work to date on the Grand Connection visioning and the upcoming work for the Wilburton Commercial Area. The majority of the Grand Connection runs through Downtown and is a significant component of the City's broader livability agenda for the urban core. This briefing is for information only; no action is requested at this time.

The Wilburton-Grand Connection planning initiative was launched on December 7, 2015 as a Council priority. The project includes two primary elements, a re-visioning of the Wilburton Commercial Area and the visioning of the Grand Connection.

Grand Connection: The Grand Connection is envisioned as a non-motorized corridor that will begin at Meydenbauer Bay, connecting with Old Bellevue, the Downtown Park, Downtown Bellevue, and crossing I-405 into the Wilburton Commercial Area, and interfacing with the Eastside Rail Corridor. Work is well underway to develop a high level vision, including an overarching identity for the route, cohesive design strategies; including but not limited to paving, vegetation, and weather protection; improvement of existing public spaces, and to provide alternatives to cross I-405 into the Wilburton Commercial Area. The work is separated into two phases; Phase One from Meydenbauer Bay to the Transit Center, and Phase Two from the Transit Center to Eastside Rail Corridor, including the I-405 crossing. The project has included robust community and stakeholder engagement to help prioritize and inform the design. For example, in April the City partnered with Bellevue Arts Museum to host a three-day design charrette where over 70 architects, planners, engineers, and artists infused concepts and strategies into the project. To date, about 90% of Phase One is complete. The full visioning for the Grand Connection is expected to conclude in the second quarter of 2017. There is currently a placeholder in the Planning Commission's preliminary list of bonusable amenities in the Downtown Incentive System for the Grand Connection.

Wilburton Commercial Area: Historically referred to as "Auto Row" the Wilburton Commercial Area rests at the confluence of a number of planned transportation and infrastructure improvements. By 2023 the Wilburton light rail station will provide service at the northern side of the study area. Additionally, the East Main, Downtown, and Spring District stations will ensure that the entire study area will be within a transit walkshed. In addition to transit service the Eastside Rail Corridor will provide a non-motorized north-south spine. The Grand Connection is anticipated to interface with the Eastside Rail Corridor and provide an east-west connection to Downtown. The Wilburton Commercial Area is positioned between Bellevue's two high growth areas of Downtown and BelRed. This unique context encourages the Wilburton Commercial Area to become the next urban neighborhood of Bellevue. The City will be launching a land use, urban design, transportation, and environmental analysis of the study area to create a new vision that capitalizes on the Wilburton Commercial Area's unique context. This process will include analysis and recommendations to zoning, urban design, transportation, and parks and open space. As part of the public engagement, the City will form a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to recommend a preferred alternative. The analysis and CAC process are expected to be completed in the first quarter of 2018.

Follow-up on Specific Topics – Downtown Livability

a. Application of the Green and Sustainability Factor

The Planning Commission was provided an overview of the Green and Sustainability Factor on October 12. Since this is a newly proposed element of the Downtown Land Use Code, staff will run through two examples of its application to sample projects and answer any Commission questions. No action is required at this time.

The intent of the Green and Sustainability Factor is to offer developments a menu of elements that all contribute to the livability of Downtown. Collectively, these elements improve the overall walkability and pedestrian experience, reinforce the character of Downtown and Bellevue as a “City in a Park”, and help soften and mitigate impacts that often come with dense urban development. Additionally, these elements all contribute towards improving the sustainability of Downtown by increasing tree canopy and the infiltration of stormwater runoff, promoting walking and biking, the use of native and drought tolerant plants, and pea patches, and encouraging green building certifications, among other elements. Staff will review two sample projects on October 26 highlighting the mechanics of the worksheet and flexibility options. One sample project will be shown pursuing a green building certification along with other elements; and the second sample project will not pursue green building certification but will focus on other elements.

b. Details on the current 20-foot linear buffer on the edges of Downtown

On October 12, property owners in Perimeter Overlay A-3 commented regarding the combined implications of required sidewalks and a 20-foot linear buffer on the north side of Main Street near 112th Avenue NE. Staff will review the proposed code elements and answer any Commission questions. No action is required at this time.

Installment 2a of the Consolidated Land Use Code includes carryover provisions from the current Downtown Land Use Code for a 20-foot linear buffer applicable to development in Perimeter Overlays A-1, A-2, and A-3 (north, west and south edges Downtown). The purpose of this feature is to produce a green buffer that softens the visual impact of larger buildings from adjacent neighborhoods. The design standards in the Code are minimum requirements for the size and quantity of trees and other linear buffer elements. The specific design of the linear buffer for each project is determined through the Design Review Process. On October 26, staff will provide details of how this linear buffer would be considered in Perimeter Overlay A-3 (near the East Main light rail station) along with required sidewalks and other design elements.

c. Maximum building height for single tower projects in Perimeter Overlay B-2 (Deep B District) east of 102nd Avenue NE

The Commission will review options for the maximum allowable building height in Perimeter Overlay B-2 (Deep B District) for single tower projects east of 102nd Avenue NE. If the Commission wishes, they may change their preliminary recommendation in advance of the public hearing of 160 feet (plus a potential 10% increase of 16 feet – which is how the 15%/15' rule applies to Perimeter B Overlay areas).

On October 12 and at previous Commission meetings the maximum building height for single tower projects in the Perimeter Overlay B-2 (Deep B District) east of 102nd Avenue NE has been discussed. The Commission's preliminary recommendation is for multiple tower residential projects to be allowed 160-240 feet with a 200-foot average (each of these has the potential for a 10% height increase as well - which is how the 15%/15' rule applies to Perimeter B Overlay areas). The preliminary single tower project recommendation is 160 feet (plus a potential 10% increase of 16 feet). Based on staff analysis, the portion of Perimeter Overlay B-2 east of 102nd Avenue NE has the potential for 3 or 4 single tower projects based on the existing small lots and fragmented land ownership. Staff believes three possible alternatives are available to the Commission: (1) retain current preliminary recommendation of 160 feet; (2) use the 200-foot average for multiple tower projects; or (3) allow single tower projects the same maximum height as multiple tower projects of 240 feet. Staff will review each of these options with the Planning Commission on October 26.

d. Overview of the upcoming Urban Land Institute (ULI) Technical Assistance Panel

Based on Councilmember interest, staff is arranging for third-party review of the forthcoming Downtown incentive system economic modeling. Staff will provide an overview of the planned ULI Technical Assistance Panel to occur in December and answer any Commission questions. No action is required at this time.

ULI Technical Assistance Panels are intended to provide expert advice to local government entities and other organizations facing specific land use and real estate challenges. For this effort, a panel of experienced professionals will be selected by ULI Northwest from their membership base. This Bellevue panel will convene for about 1.5 days' worth of meetings and engage private and public stakeholders to assess the issues at hand. The panel will review economic modeling done by the City's consultant, consider stakeholder input, and ultimately forms a set of recommendations for City consideration and visual presentation at the end of the session, with a full written report composed thereafter.

NEXT STEPS FOR DOWNTOWN LIVABILITY

It is a Council priority to complete the work on Downtown Livability Land Use Code amendments. A multi-departmental staff team has been working hard to support this effort and engage with stakeholders. Based on some consultant delays, the current schedule is leading towards the formal transmittal of the Planning Commission's recommendations to Council in Q1 2017 rather than the end of this year as previously targeted.

Staff's schedule for Downtown Livability Commission meeting time for the remainder of 2016 is:

October 26	Commission Study Session: Grand Connection, Outstanding Code Issues
November 9	Commission Study Session: Outstanding Code Issues
December 7	Commission Study Session: Review of Consolidated Code Package
December 14	Commission Study Session: Review of Consolidated Code Package

Based on Commission direction to staff, the formal public hearing on the Consolidated Code Package including the Incentive Zoning System may be scheduled to occur in January 2017.



Bellevue Planning Commission

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

Mtg #	Date	Agenda Items	Priority	Agenda detail
21	9-Nov-16	Standard Items	2	Roll Call, Agenda, Minutes, Public Comment, Staff Reports, etc.
		Downtown Livability Land Use Code		Commission Review of Draft Code Package
		2016 CPAs Final Review		Public Hearing and Study Session - Nicholas
22	16-Nov-16	Planning Commission Annual Retreat	1	Location TBD 5:00 PM to 9:00 PM
	23-Nov-16	NO MEETING - Thanksgiving Week		
23	7-Dec-16	Standard Items	2	Roll Call, Agenda, Minutes, Public Comment, Staff Reports, etc.
	New Date	Downtown Livability Land Use Code		Commission Review of Draft Code Package
24	14-Dec-16	Standard Items	2	Roll Call, Agenda, Minutes, Public Comment, Staff Reports, etc.
		Downtown Livability Land Use Code		Commission Review of Draft Code Package
	28-Dec-16	NO MEETING - End of Year.		
1	4-Jan-17	To be determined.		
2	18-Jan-17	To be determined.		

Priority-1 (Red) Public Hearing; 2 (Yellow) PC mandated item; 3 (Green) Information only.

Gulledge, Kristin

From: Jonathan Kagle <jonkalist@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 9:52 PM
To: PlanningCommission
Cc: 'Vuecrest Directors'
Subject: Downtown Livability plan for trees

On p. 109 of last night's packet, there is a listing of trees used for planting areas. The Vuecrest Board is concerned that the planting of these trees and related planting areas along 100th Ave NE would impact the brick wall that borders our neighborhood. Could you please confirm that these areas would be only on the east side of 100th, and not on the west side?

Thanks,

-Jonathan

**CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION MINUTES**

September 28, 2016
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair deVadoss, Commissioners Carlson, Barksdale, Hilhorst, Morisseau

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Commissioner Laing, Commissioner Walter

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Cullen, Nicholas Matz, Gwen Rousseau, Department of Planning and Community Development

COUNCIL LIAISON: Not Present

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

CALL TO ORDER
(6:39 p.m.)

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 Commissioners Laing and Walter, both of whom were excused.

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None
(6:40 p.m.)

Chair deVadoss reported that following the Commission's meeting on September 14 where low-impact development was discussed, Assistant City Attorney Catherine Drews reached out to him with a draft of the communication to the City Council. He said he took the liberty of asking Commissioner Laing to review it and provide feedback. He offered the Commissioners the opportunity to review the draft as well and provide feedback.

With regard to the Commission's annual retreat, Chair deVadoss said he and Commissioner Walter met with Mayor Stokes and staff and discussed the interest expressed in discussing the

role and responsibilities of the Planning Commission, and how the Commission can be most effective. He pointed out that the Commission, the Council, the staff and the public make up the four pillars of the system. Taking a look at only the Commission will put the Commission in a box in terms of the engagement mechanisms. The conclusion reached was that the full system should be discussed, but that it will not be possible to have the pieces in place by the scheduled retreat date of October 5. In line with the discussion, Comprehensive Planning Manager Terry Cullen is working on a straw man proposal to frame the discussion and the retreat will be rescheduled.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked how much time staff and the other parties will need to draw up the straw man proposal. Mr. Cullen said the challenge lies less in putting the straw man proposal together than in finding a date on which all parties can agree to meet. He said the likelihood is that the retreat will not be on the calendar until early to mid November.

Commissioner Morisseau asked who will be representing the public. Chair deVadoss said that piece has yet to be worked out.

STAFF REPORTS (6:47 p.m.)

Mr. Cullen briefly reviewed with the Commissioners the list of upcoming agenda items.

Mr. Cullen called the attention of the Commissioners to the Neighborhood Leadership meeting scheduled for October 4. He noted that Community Outreach meets with neighborhood leadership quarterly to engage in a continuing dialog on different topics of interest. The upcoming meeting is focused on picturing the future of Bellevue's neighborhoods. An artist illustrator will be brought in to diagram what the neighborhoods represent as their visions and values. He clarified that the meeting will not serve as the launch of the neighborhood area planning process.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked when the subarea planning process will be initiated. She said neighborhoods are struggling to solidify their identities, and the subarea planning is something that is supposed to occur on a regular basis. Mr. Cullen said the issue has been discussed with senior executive management, but a decision is still pending going to Council to discuss guiding principles. There is no date set for launching the process. The intention to start the program earlier was clear but other priorities drew away the available resources, including Eastgate and Downtown Livability.

Commissioner Hilhorst commented that earlier in the year the Commission had proposed to the Mayor that the Commission should be allowed to provide guidance and feedback as to which neighborhoods might benefit from being the first in line. The Mayor was open to having the Commission provide that information. She asked how the Commission should go about forwarding a formal recommendation to the Council urging that the process be launched. Mr. Cullen said the Commission is free to make such a recommendation at any time. He recommended, however, holding off making a recommendation relative to specific sequencing until the Council is slated to establish the guiding principles and give direction for the project.

Commissioner Morisseau asked Commissioner Hilhorst what recommendation she would forward to the Council and if it would include criteria on how to select the neighborhoods to study. Commissioner Hilhorst said the Commission has heard from specific neighborhoods over the past two years about potential identity crises resulting from significant development changes.

Lake Hills, Bridle Trails, Eastgate and the outlying downtown neighborhoods have all commented before the Commission. The Commission should share with the Council which neighborhoods have been heard from the most and recommend that they be addressed first.

Chair deVadoss asked Mr. Cullen to formally follow up with the Council liaison and provide the Commission with his feedback. Mr. Cullen said he would do that.

Mr. Cullen informed the Commission that staff has been working diligently over the past several months to find software that would make the online Comprehensive Plan much more user friendly. He asked Senior Planner Nicholas Matz to share with the Commissioners the preferred package and how it works.

Mr. Matz said staff has been struggling since the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update with how to make the document more usable in an online format. He said a program called "Flipping Book", which is an online magazine-type format, was deemed to be the best option. The Commissioners were given a quick demonstration and noted that Volume 1 has already gone live.

PUBLIC COMMENT

(7:06 p.m.)

Ms. Betsy Hummer, 14541 SE 26th Street, thanked the Commissioners for their service on behalf of the residents of the city. She noted that work on the dorms at Bellevue College has started. However, a stand of trees that would have screened the new development from Sunset Ranch is no longer there. The city's tree canopy needs to be given careful consideration, especially since the city says it is so important. She said she was encouraged to hear Lake Hills mentioned as one of the primary subarea neighborhoods. Because of the lawsuit against Bellevue College for building various things on their site, it was deemed that they can do anything they want. That could mean that the state patrol can also do anything it wants on its property. Bellevue College is all zoned R-5 and it would be nice to see it given a more appropriate zoning to reflect its use. Larson Lake, which is the heart and soul of Bellevue as a city in a park, is zoned R-1. What happened with the Mercer Slough relative to the South Bellevue park and ride garage should not be allowed to happen in any of the city's parks just because of the underlying zoning. That issue should be taken under consideration during the subarea process. Another concern that not yet gone away is the adult family homes. The state claims the facilities can be sited anywhere. The concern with that is that existing smaller homes are often torn down to make room for a 7000 square foot building out of which a nursing home is operated, even though the structure qualifies as a single family home. Consideration should be given to having a more transparent system. There are about 12 such facilities in Lake Hills and four in the 98004 zip code area.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked why Bellevue College is allowed to build a dormitory for multiple dwellers in an area that is zoned R-5. Ms. Hummer said the college is allowed to build anything it wants on its property. Commissioner Carlson said the college operates as its own little city and can pretty much do whatever it wants.

Commissioner Carlson commented that adult family homes are not necessarily a bad thing. The use is typically very quiet and parking is not usually an issue. The homes afford the residents much better living situations than nursing homes provide, and the owner usually lives in the premises. Ms. Hummer agreed but stressed that her concern is with the need to make the process more transparent. The structures are built to house a number of people, not a single family, and there is usually a lot of business-like traffic in the form of deliveries and caregivers coming and

going.

Mr. Ian Morrison, a land use attorney with McCullough Hill Leary, 701 5th Avenue, Suite 6600, Seattle, thanked the Commission for the vote to move ahead to substantive review the Eastgate area plan amendment. He said the issue is still at a high level and the time for getting into the details will come. As the city went through the Eastgate/I-90 study process in 2010, consideration was given to the Eastgate Office Park site on 156th Avenue SE and concluded that it would probably retain its current economic use. Time has passed, however, and the property owner believes the opportunity exists to take a look at the goals of the Eastgate subarea plan and see how they could be applied to the site. From the Commission and the community, three key components have been heard, the first of which is traffic. A traffic engineer is currently working on an analysis of what the future could look like. Second, neighbors to the north in the community that uses Robinswood Park have raised the issue of wildlife, including owls. A wildlife biologist has been retained to survey and identify the resident wildlife species. Third, the community has highlighted the importance of the buffers and transitions between the office and residential uses. The design team has been directed to respect those key fundamental characteristics of the Eastgate area, particularly the relationship with the properties to the north.

Mr. Jeff Bates with CollinsWoerman, 710 2nd Avenue, Seattle spoke. He said the architectural firm has done a lot of mixed use residential infill over the years. For all the reasons mentioned by Mr. Morrison, the site represents an exciting opportunity in terms of infill development. He said consideration is being given to increasing the density on the site, though there is as yet no concrete vision. There are a lot of conditions associated with the site, including commercial to the east that is quite different from the single family to the north. The nuances of the edges will be considered and respected going forward.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked how dependent redevelopment of the site is on ST-3 passing. Mr. Morrison said no one has a crystal ball to say just how ST-3 will go. For purposes of the transportation analysis, there will be no reliance on ST-3.

Commissioner Hilhorst noted that the office park in its current configuration is amazing in the way it has been set in the middle of a woods. She asked if there will be any focus on trying to preserve the woodsy nature of the site. Mr. Bates said existing trees and landscaping should be retained to the degree possible, especially mature trees on the exterior boundaries. Mr. Morrison said the owner has heard the message from the community that the trees and vegetation should be retained. The site offers a real possibility for enhancing the pedestrian connections with Robinswood Park and getting people into nature.

Ms. Linda Nohavec, 3273 163rd Place SE, read from a letter submitted by Michelle Wanamaker who was unable to attend the meeting. The letter outlined a consistent non-regulated growth mandate to approve land use changes without first implementing both transit and traffic congestion relieving improvements to accommodate the growth. The recommendations by the CAC follows the Council principles related to vision and compatibility with adjacent neighborhoods, and the implementation concepts and strategies report. However, several policies in the Eastgate subarea plan are in direct violation of the CAC's recommendations, as well as the objectives and goals the Comprehensive Plan has defined for Eastgate expansion. The concern is that reports and information presented to the Commission and Councilmembers by planning staff are inaccurate. Recently a plat-protected forested greenbelt was cut to the ground by a resident because a senior planner did not check the plat map. The same thing has happened before. There is no mapping accuracy and that is something that needs to be addressed to keep other greenbelts from being eradicated.

STUDY SESSION
(7:29 p.m.)

Eastgate Area Plan Amendment – 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Mr. Cullen said his years of experience in working with planning commissions has confirmed the important role the commissions play in local governance. The institution is comprised of the City Council, the planning commission, the staff and the public that provides input. In order for the institution to function well, all of the pieces must be in balance and working together, with all expectations and needs being met in a reasonable fashion. All of the work centers around the comprehensive plan, which is the core, and all discussion needs to come from that central place. Every action taken must be consistent with the comprehensive plan. Like the city's budget, the Comprehensive Plan is one of the few documents that actually encompasses the entire city by setting vision and policy. It takes longer to put together a comprehensive plan than it does a budget, and it involves every city department along with a tremendous amount of resources and citizen engagement. The Planning Commission, as part of the institution, must always keep the comprehensive plan front and center in everything it does. Absent that, this piece of governance will fall apart.

Mr. Cullen said he has not been feeling very comfortable over the past several months with the direction the Commission has taken and has recognized the need to be more fully grounded in the Comprehensive Plan.

Plans made by parents to send their kids to college, or plans made by people for their retirement years, are not unlike personal comprehensive plans. Any deviations from the plans trigger tradeoffs and consequences. All decisions must be made consciously and purposefully and with an eye on the ultimate outcome.

Mr. Cullen said his observation of the most successful planning commissions as an institution has been that all of the players are functioning in some capacity purposefully and consciously as policy analysts. All recommendations and actions made are carefully considered in light of how well they mesh with the long-term direction of the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The role as policy analyst goes beyond mere discussions. There are many structured ways to approach policy analysis.

Mr. Cullen invited Mr. Matz to present the study session in more of a policy format and to provide some updates about the amendment. He said the presentation would not represent any value judgments or recommendations, and would not purposely lead the Commission down the path toward a recommendation. He said nothing was intended in terms of changing the existing format. He said the presentation would represent a test of a new approach, and if it is of interest to the Commission, exploration can be made of the different options available for how to make it work.

Commissioner Hilhorst said whenever the Commission conducts a public hearing, there should be an associated study session or report from staff ahead of the public hearing. That approach allows for getting the facts and data on the table before the public speaks. Mr. Cullen said there was no intent to change that approach. The study session will be less about engaging in a back and forth about the merits of the case, rather it will be more about allowing the Commission to talk about potential policy implications and to indicate where some additional information might be needed to inform decisions. For instance, it has been stated by the public that they would like

to see the Eastgate Office Park area well treed and the current park-like setting retained. The Commission should first focus on what the Comprehensive Plan says about how to do that in order to frame the discussion around urban design or environmental policies. He asked for the Commission's indulgence to try the new approach to see if it has merit. Commissioner Hilhorst said she would welcome the approach if it allows the Commission time to ask questions and seek more data up front.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if the need to adhere more closely to the Comprehensive Plan will mean bringing policies to the table as issues are brought before the Commission. She stated that over the last year the Commission has had discussions and made decisions on issues where the Commission was more aligned with the Comprehensive Plan than the staff were. Mr. Cullen allowed that there is much the staff could be doing to help integrate the policy discussion. For example, reports are often shared with the Commission and the issue of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is something that becomes a reactive thing put at the end, instead of forming the basis for how a project is scoped, how the data is collected, how the findings are presented, and how the recommendations are made. It is not only the Commission that must focus on the Comprehensive Plan, it is all players that make up the institution, specifically the staff, the Commission and the Council. The Commission serves as the gatekeeper for the Comprehensive Plan and must act consciously in that role.

Mr. Matz explained that his presentation would unveil what his task is when proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are raised. He allowed that the Comprehensive Plan is not a black and white document, and said that in making decisions it is necessary for the staff and the Commission to make informed judgment calls. He asked the Commissioners to keep the Eastgate Office Park amendment in the back of their minds during the presentation.

Mr. Matz noted that on July 28 the City Council accepted the Planning Commission's threshold review recommendation to refer the Eastgate Office Park site-specific CPA (Comprehensive Plan Amendment) to final review. Thus the privately initiated application joins the Council-initiated Vision Zero CPA in the established work program. The first step is to look at the plan as a single entity, which the Growth Management Act demands, and where changes are proposed, it must be understood what the cumulative impacts will be. The SEPA (State Environmental Protection Act) determinations that are part and parcel of CPAs are primarily used in that regard. When the two applications are before the Commission in November for a public hearing, the focus will need to be on the cumulative impact of the two proposed amendments.

The initial application for the Eastgate Office Park CPA involved a specific 14-acre site on which there are four buildings. The Commission recommended expanding the geographic scope to include two additional office facilities, one of which houses veterinarian practice and the other of which is home to an office of the state patrol, for a total of 21 acres. The proposed amendment seeks a change from Office (O) to Office/Limited Business (OLB).

The Commission's threshold review transmittal included two major findings in support of sending the Eastgate Office Park CPA to final review. First was the fact that the site area had been included in the Eastgate land use/transportation study. He said the argument that the potential for the site to redevelopment had been overlooked as time was spent considering all the other sites that are part of the Eastgate study area will be reviewed. Second, the Commission found that the significantly changed conditions criterion had been met. What the Commission suggested was that the things that have been happening in the area related to the Eastgate land use/transportation project warrant further review because of the potential for creating significantly changed conditions. Mr. Matz said one question that must be answered relative to

significantly changed conditions is whether or not something has happened or will happen and the Comprehensive Plan did not anticipate.

Mr. Matz shared with the Commission a map indicating the Eastgate/I-90 project study area. The map clarified the commercial and residential areas. Eastgate has always been one of the city's employment centers. It has developed with low-rise typical office developments with support commercial and ancillary facilities. The Eastgate/I-90 project study focused on the questions of what should happen next and what the communities are wanting to see happen.

The significantly changed conditions discussion will be threaded around the specific zoning designations, including O, OLB, OLB-2, and EG-TOD. There are also additional policies to consider around urban design, environmental considerations, and the interface between park facilities and the neighborhoods.

The process involves looking at the various goal statements of the subarea plans and then walking all the way down to a site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendment. The focus will need to be kept on what the community is saying it wants to see done with properties. The overarching Eastgate subarea plan goal calls for preserving and promoting the accessibility and appearance of residential neighborhoods, local amenities, and business establishments within the subarea. That statement serves as the starting point in deciding what is to be accomplished.

Mr. Matz said the process of making sure the Comprehensive Plan policies are being adhered to works best if the overall whole is broken down into its various components, beginning with defining the problem. The Comprehensive Plan establishes the citywide vision and policy framework by which land use decisions are analyzed. For Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals, the framework involves four specific components: the land use vision, the transportation vision, the economic development vision and the environment vision.

The specific language of the land use vision focuses balancing growth in specific areas and maintaining the health and vitality of established neighborhoods. Generally speaking, it could be said that the "specific areas" in which growth should be balanced are the downtown and Bel-Red, or specific neighborhoods in Eastgate. The health and vitality of established neighborhoods can refer to everything from Newport Hills to downtown or to 30 houses to the east of Crossroads.

The transportation vision focuses on making moving into, around and through Bellevue reliable and predictable. The reference is not just to residents and not just commuters. The issues of reliability and predictability must be specifically defined for particular areas.

The economic development vision seeks clarity about the role that economics play in integrating land use and transportation. That has not always been the approach. It was a huge thing to take land use and transportation and connect the two and then realize that they influence each other. It is now clearly recognized that economics plays a role in integrating those two components, and in fact the Eastgate/I-90 transportation study talks a great deal about the necessary role of economics in Eastgate as one of the city's employment centers.

The environment vision is specific to embracing stewardship by protecting and retaining natural systems and building for a sustainable future. The specific components are part of the overall vision and they highlight how policy can provide guidance and how proposals can be made that help bring the vision to fruition. Natural systems can be defined as individual trees, tree canopies, and greenbelts. Building for a sustainable future takes in everything from standards for

buildings to impervious surfaces.

Commissioner Morisseau noted that the land use vision incorporates the notion of balancing growth in specific areas, while the Growth Management Act calls for balancing growth in urban areas. She asked how the two are tied together. Mr. Matz said the city of Bellevue is defined as a metropolitan center. Together with Seattle, most of the region's growth will occur in those two cities. When the Growth Management Act talks about urban levels of development, it is talking about densities that are able to accommodate the growth. Associated with that concept is the need to have the ability to support the growth in the areas it is put. As a community, Bellevue has chosen not to spread out the growth but rather to concentrate it in specific areas, and to plan for, regulate and build infrastructure to accommodate it in those specific areas. The two specific buckets of growth are housing and employment. For employment, the city has designated employment centers, including the downtown, Bel-Red and Eastgate, and uses its regulatory authority to allow employment to occur at greater levels in those areas. The same is true for housing in that the city has looked at the number of housing units that must be accommodated under the Growth Management Act and has made decisions regarding where they should be located and what they should look like in terms of density. The decision reached was that the majority of the growth should be in attached housing in specific areas, such as the downtown, Bel-Red, Crossroads and Eastgate, where there is infrastructure to support it.

Commissioner Carlson asked where public safety fit into the mix. He noted that without low crime, the overall vision collapses. Mr. Matz suggested that the notion of public safety fits into each of the four specific visions. The Comprehensive Plan looks at public safety as a capital facility. The Capital Facilities Element talks about infrastructure that must be able to support all of the different things the city is trying to accomplish. The basic infrastructure needs are for water, sewer and transportation facilities, but there are also infrastructure needs for park, police and fire facilities specifically related to where the growth occurs.

Commissioner Hilhorst agreed with Commissioner Carlson that in calling out the four-part citywide vision and policy framework, the issues of public safety and infrastructure are left out. She suggested that the core responsibilities of a municipality are fire, safety and infrastructure. They may be implied in the visions, but that is not clear.

Mr. Cullen said those elements are not typically on the radar screen in the plan amendment process, but allowed that it is on the Commission's radar screen. He said concerns raised regarding policy perspectives will be brought back to be factored in.

Commissioner Hilhorst commented that as growth occurs, there is a clear need for transportation and utilities infrastructure to keep up, but there is also a need for police and fire protection infrastructure to also keep up. She said those issues need to be folded into the conversation. Mr. Cullen said that is a poignant illustration of the need to focus discussions and conversations around the Comprehensive Plan. Comments of that sort of telling with regard to what the weighting factors are. There is a clear need to use the Comprehensive Plan as the city grows and changes to be able to address the issues and have Bellevue remain a world-class city.

Commissioner Barksdale suggested that in some senses the city plans for future growth, but in other senses it must respond to the growth the plan outlines. Transportation and utility infrastructure should be spelled out in the plan, but fire and safety infrastructure must respond.

Mr. Matz commented that when Comprehensive Plan amendment applications are submitted, the applicant often cites specific policies in support of the application. The review process, however,

involves taking the wider view. The Eastgate/I-90 land use and transportation project changed the Comprehensive Plan a great deal, and those changes will have bearing on the proposed amendment as well as on the decisions and recommendations made by the staff for presentation to the Commission. The larger framing issues serve as a platform around which the more detailed conversations take place. At the Eastgate level, there are four specific policy themes that come into play: 1) create a coherent image in the I-90 corridor through design that includes elements of naturalistic landscaping, ecological enhancement and urban design; 2) encourage a greater mix of uses in office and commercial areas to provide goods and services in closer proximity to businesses, workers, and neighborhoods; 3) allow more intense office and commercial development in exchange for additional public amenities; and 4) support all transportation modes to improve connectivity and reduce auto trips. The Eastgate subarea plan specifically states that the Eastgate/I-90 land use and transportation project supports changes intended to capture market demand, improve transportation conditions, address concerns of the employment sector as well as the general public, and position the corridor to grow gracefully over time.

Mr. Matz stressed that while the plan calls for growing gracefully over time, everyone will view that statement differently and it will be interpreted in various ways. However, by relying on the different scales and levels, it will be easier to apply the statement. What the CAC suggested be done in the I-90 Office Park area are built into the policy framework. The land use plan for the Eastgate is a visual representation that underlies all of the decisions being made about what can be expected to see happen on the various sites.

Mr. Matz said the task before the Commission is to determine how the visions and strategies apply to the site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendment; to identify perspectives relative to balancing competing priorities; to determine how tradeoffs should be considered; and what additional information is needed in order to aid the Commission in reaching conclusions.

Chair deVadoss said one elephant in the room is the need for more land and facilities the school district will face as growth continues. Mr. Matz said the city works with the school district on those issues. As a service provider, the city must make sure that the district can accommodate the expected growth.

Mr. Cullen urged the Commissioners to submit to staff questions, comments and policy ideas that will be important to consider in moving forward. He shared as an example a policy analysis workbook sheet based on a structured approach. He stressed that he was not suggesting the Commission should follow the steps exactly as laid out. Policy analysis and determining the implications requires a structured approach; it cannot be done casually. There are three different levels of policies in the plan. First are the macro, big-picture policies that outline the vision. In looking for consistency with the plan, it is necessary to ask if any of the macro policies are applicable to the specific plan amendment. The macro policies address things like land uses, diverse and vibrant communities, housing, outstanding community facilities, transportation, economics, the environment, human services, parks, urban design and the arts. Second are the middle-level policies which constitute the objectives, and the micro-level specific policies constitute the tactics to be used. The plan has a rich mix of things that should be captured in some diverse and vibrant conversations.

Commissioner Barksdale commented that policy analysis involves a line of reasoning from the top down. A proper analysis also requires the right amount of evidence, including information from the community.

Commissioner Morisseau asked if it would be possible to utilize vision boards as part of the

analysis process to keep things at the proper level. Mr. Cullen said anything is possible. He made a note to investigate the suggestion.

BRIEFING
(8:24 p.m.)¹

The Changing Face of Bellevue

Associate Planner Gwen Rousseau, the city's demographer, shared with the Commission the latest demographics from the US Census Bureau's American Community Survey. She noted that in 2016, Bellevue's population reached 139,400, leaving Bellevue to maintain its position as the fifth largest city in the state. Over the next 19 years, the city's population is expected to increase by about 21,000 to reach 160,400 by 2035. Population growth is generally driven by convenient access to jobs, goods and services, multiple transportation options, parks, nature and open space, good schools, and affordable housing. Not all of those factors are true of Bellevue, most notably affordable housing.

Commissioner Barksdale suggested that a sense of community is also a driver in population growth.

Ms. Rousseau commented that job growth is certainly a driver of population growth. Jobs in Bellevue have been increasing over the decades and they continue to outpace population growth. Between 1995 and 2014, the number of jobs in Bellevue grew at a rate of 1.8 percent annually. On average, each house generates about 1.4 jobs. The last time there was a jobs to housing ratio that was in balance was 1980. Where there are more jobs than housing, the demand for housing increases.

The Commissioners were informed that service is the largest job sector in Bellevue. It has experienced fairly steady growth since 2004.

Mr. Cullen explained that from a planning perspective, a jobs to housing ratio is a hot indicator of various things, including problems with housing numbers and affordability, and problems with transportation. The more out of balance the ratio is, the more acute the issues become. The ratio is therefore often a proxy for forthcoming issues on a variety of fronts. Ms. Rousseau added that as the demand for housing increases, the cost of housing increases. Additionally, where people have to travel further to find housing they can afford, there are transportation impacts.

Commissioner Barksdale suggested that while reviewing the data, it would be helpful to think about what the implications are in terms of planning.

Ms. Rousseau pointed out that the percentage of native-born Bellevue residents has not changed dramatically over the last 15 years. In 1990 there were 75,320 native-born Bellevue residents, and by 2015 that number had only increased to 84,895. During the same period, however, the foreign-born population increased from 11,554 to 54,505, marking about 93 percent of the growth in Bellevue's population. Overall, 39 percent of Bellevue's 2015 population was born in another country. About 25 percent were born in Washington state, and less than a third was born in a state other than Washington.

Commissioner Carlson asked what percentage of the foreign-born residents are U.S. citizens. Ms. Rousseau said she would be happy to track down that number and share it with the Commission.

The Commissioners were informed that of Bellevue's foreign-born population, over two-thirds were born in Asia, with the largest numbers coming from India and China. Seventy-five percent of the foreign-born residents, and 27 percent of native-born residents, are a minority race or ethnicity. Eight-six percent of the foreign-born residents speak a language other than English at home; only three percent of native-born residents do. Seventy percent of the foreign-born residents who are 15 years old or older are married, which compares to 49 percent of the native-born residents. The average household size of foreign-born residents is larger, with 2.72 residents, whereas the average native-born household has 2.46 residents. Native-born residents primarily live in single family structures, whereas foreign-born residents primarily live in multifamily structures. Likewise, 64 percent of native-born residents are homeowners, whereas 56 percent of foreign-born residents are renters.

Mr. Cullen pointed out with more apartments in the downtown, there is an increased need for facilities for children in the downtown, particularly so given that foreign-born residents are more likely to rent and have larger families.

Ms. Rousseau pointed out that there is not a significant difference in household income between foreign-born and native-born residents, nor in the percentage of either group living in poverty. There is a difference, however, in terms of educational attainment given that a higher percentage of foreign-born residents have graduate or professional degrees.

Chair deVadoss stressed the need to use the data in ways that will unify the population, regardless of whether they are foreign-born or native-born. Commissioner Morisseau pointed out that Bellevue welcomes the world and the city's diversity is what makes Bellevue great. Ms. Rousseau allowed that there is always a tension given the existence of implicit biases. The data can be used to avoid further stereotyping groups, and it can be used to make sure the city is achieving its goals for equity.

Commissioner Barksdale questioned what the implications of the data are with regard to the work of the Commission. He referred specifically to the median household income comparisons and suggested it might be more helpful to know what the breakdowns are by community or neighborhood rather than by native-born and native-born. Chair deVadoss agreed and added that the work of the Commission is to focus on what is right for the citizens of Bellevue regardless of where they were born. Ms. Rousseau commented that the data goes a long way toward answering questions of equity.

Commissioner Morisseau pointed out that depending on culture and where people come from, the housing needs can differ.

Commissioner Carlson commented that the development in which he lives has only about 25 homes. He said he moved into the house in the late 1990s at a time when there were very few kids and almost all of the residents were Caucasian. Now at least a third of the residents are people of color. The neighborhood is remarkably free of any racial or ethnic tension and the reason is that the residents have all chosen the specific development for the same reason, namely that it is a safe and pleasant place in which to raise families. What is held in common is far more important than the racial diversity. The neighborhood is a mirror of the changing face of Bellevue.

Ms. Rousseau commented that along with the foreign-born population having a larger average household size, when they move to Bellevue they generally replace older adults who are white. That fact points to the need for more schools.

Mr. Cullen commented that while the specific census data may not be particularly relevant to the Commission, it is of particular relevance to sociologists and anthropologists. Income stratification can create more discrimination than racial differences. Income stratification that is almost even could be a better indicator than where there are large gaps in income.

Commissioner Morisseau suggested that the data is in fact relevant in that it keeps the Commission from operating in a vacuum. It is particularly helpful at the 50,000-foot level. It all depends on how the data is viewed. Chair deVadoss agreed but noted that as the data is sliced and diced, it can become divisive. Commissioner Morisseau countered that it is all in how one looks at the data. She said services cannot be provided to those who need it if nothing is known about who has the needs. Chair deVadoss concurred and pointed out the need for information at the neighborhood level and what the expectations are at that level. However, needs are not necessarily tied to specific cultural groups.

Commissioner Hilhorst said what it all comes down to is how the data can be used by the Commission to affect things like income and education. Mr. Cullen clarified that the data was being presented to the Commission for informational purposes. It is interesting to see what has happened to the city over time, and it is helpful for the Commission to know the types of information that are available. Decisions made by the Commission absolutely are relevant in that they move the needle on the compass in a certain way.

Commissioner Hilhorst said the work of the Commission creates economic opportunities and creates increases in density in various parts of the city. Those decisions apply to everyone equally, not just at the cultural and diversity levels. Mr. Cullen said the plan in toto embraces being a diverse community. The work of the Commission is primarily focused on creating a welcoming environment that will bring the elements of the plan to fruition. Were the Commission to take specific drastic actions involving punitive policy measures, people would stop viewing the community as a welcoming place and they would choose to go elsewhere. The decisions made by the Commission are not always visible at the micro level, but they certainly are on the macro level over time. Bellevue has not become what it is by accident. It has come to where it is because of a pro-planning ethic and the fortitude to make the right decisions. The work of the Commission is vitally important.

Commissioner Barksdale said he loves data, particularly data with a purpose. The data presented to the Commission should be specific to influencing the types of recommendations the Commission makes.

Commissioner Morisseau agreed. She suggested that the data as presented acts as an umbrella over the entire city, whereas the work of the Commission is primarily at the neighborhood level. As the Commission moves ahead with focusing on the subarea level, it should keep in mind the data and how it can be applied at the local level. Mr. Cullen said the question of how the data should be applied is one that the Commission will need to answer. The staff will continue to bring the data forward, but it is not staff's job alone to determine what data is important and how it should be used at the local level.

Ms. Rousseau said the data presentation was intended to be about trends and how they may affect the future. The work of the Commission is all about those in the communities and knowing who they are. The data can be used to inform decisions about neighborhood-specific policy.

Ms. Rousseau noted that in 2015, non-Hispanic whites no longer represented the majority of

people in Bellevue. Instead, there was a plurality of ethnicities and races. The most notable comparison Bellevue has with other places is in its high percentage of Asian residents which in 1990 stood at 9.8 percent and which by 2015 had grown to 34.1 percent. In 2010, Bellevue's youth were already a minority majority in stark contrast to Bellevue's older adult population, which was 83.3 percent white.

Commissioner Carlson asked what difference it makes to the Commission that the city is culturally diverse and that a majority of Bellevue is made up of minorities. Ms. Rousseau said there are differences in values that influence their thinking in regard to everything from neighborhood services to elections.

Bellevue ranks fifth out of the state's 11 largest cities when it comes to percentage of minorities. Bellevue's high percentage of Asian residents ranks the city 14th out of 319 large cities in the nation.

Commissioner Hilhorst pointed out that when steps were taken to site a marijuana store in Factoria, Council Chambers was filled to the brim with Asian families who did not want to see the use allowed near where they live. She allowed that the data could be used by the Commission in determining whether specific uses would be welcomed in various areas given the local demographics. Ms. Rousseau said the main thing is to be cognizant of the potential differences of opinion in the community.

Commissioner Barksdale said he would argue against using demographics data to justify allowing certain uses. Using the example of the Asian community asking the Council not to allow a pot store, he questioned whether the Commission should cater to those who do not want such a use as opposed to those who do.

Commissioner Morisseau stressed that ultimately the decisions made by the Commission must be in line with and support of the Comprehensive Plan. The demographic data is not intended to form the basis for making recommendations, but it is helpful to keep it in mind. Mr. Cullen concurred. He said the data is useful in helping to understand Bellevue as a whole.

Commissioner Carlson suggested the three demographic factors that matter the most are age, family structure and income. Commissioner Morisseau disagreed. She said the data is clear that the city's demographics are changing, yet the city's police force has not kept pace. The statistics show that cities with police forces that reflect their diversity have better relationships with those they serve. Commissioner Carlson countered that that would be news to the people of Charlotte, North Carolina. He said the residents of his community all are focused on good policing and less on the gender, age or ethnicity of the officers.

Commissioner Morisseau said she would like to see neighborhood-specific data presented to the Commission.

Ms. Rousseau noted that new census information will be available in December.

DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW – None
(9:18 p.m.)

PUBLIC COMMENT – None
(9:18 p.m.)

ADJOURN
(9:18 p.m.)

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

Chair deVadoss adjourned the meeting at 9:18 p.m.