

CITY OF BELLEVUE
EAST MAIN STATION AREA PLANNING
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

May 3, 2016
4:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-112

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Breiland, Christie Hammond, John King, Scott Lampe, Jim Long, Erin Powell, Danny Rogers, Pamela Unger, Bill Thurston

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Kattermann, Planning and Community Development Department; Phil Harris, John Murphy, Marie Jensen, Transportation Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA, APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Lampe called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Mr. Long. The motion was seconded by Ms. Powell and the motion carried unanimously.

A motion to approve the March 29, 2016, meeting minutes as submitted was made by Ms. Powell. The motion was seconded by Mr. Long and the motion carried unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jack McCullough, 701 5th Avenue, Suite 6600, Seattle, spoke representing the owners of the Red Lion site. He noted that the view corridor issue was stumbled upon last fall and has been bouncing around between the Committee, the Planning Commission and the Council. There is no real legal basis in the code that supports the imposition of the view corridor. The Committee should recognize that fact and in the context of making a report to the Council it should be made clear that the corridor does not currently exist. The current language of the draft plan in item 3 on page 35 calls for reevaluating and reducing the Mt. Rainier view corridor, which implies that the corridor actually exists, but in fact it does not. The sentiment of the Committee to date has largely not been supportive of the view corridor concept. Proposed language for the Committee's report concerning the corridor were provided to the members. It would be good for the Committee to go on record as saying it does not support the view corridor.

Mr. Bill Pollard, 9031 NE 40th Place, Yarrow Point, spoke as owner of the Gateway One office building between SE 6th Street and SE 8th Street on 112th Avenue SE. He asked the Committee to consider an increase in both FAR and height for the site. Currently the site is limited to an FAR of 0.5 and it should be increased to 1.0 in keeping with the graduated FAR concept. The site is only a quarter of a mile from the East Main station and the requested increase in FAR is modest. The height should be increased from the current 75 feet to up to 120 feet to accommodate the additional FAR. There are storm water retention ponds on the site, and the FAR and height increases will allow for not disturbing those areas and locating a project adjacent to 112th Avenue SE.

Mr. Robert Levy, 11915 SE 245th Place, Kent, spoke representing the Hilton Bellevue. The Hilton is supportive of the work of the Committee. Any considerations or variances that might be given to the Red Lion site as well as any surrounding sites should include the Hilton site as well.

Mr. Harold Moniz with CollinsWoerman Architects, 710 2nd Avenue, Suite 1400, Seattle, spoke representing Gateway One. The site is situated just outside the quarter mile walk from the East Main light rail station. He said there are two viable options for redevelopment of the site. One option is to remove the existing office building and building a new structure on the site. Having a little more FAR and height would benefit the development. There is a 20-foot grade difference between the site and 112th Avenue SE, so allowing height to 120 feet would not be seen as a significant increase. The other option for the site involves keeping the existing office and constructing some multifamily up against 112th Avenue SE, with an underground parking structure to support the increase in parking, and a five-story multifamily building.

Ms. Leshya Wig with Wig Properties, 4811 134th Place, said without the view corridor imposed, there would be a shorter building along 112th Avenue SE and there would be more open space overall on the site. Taller buildings would be sited along the freeway. While it has been shown that redevelopment of the site is technically possible with the view corridor in place, the result would not be as good for the Surrey Downs neighborhood because there would be taller buildings closer to their homes, less open space, and less creative designs. The penultimate bullet under item 2 on page 35 of the draft plan calls for limiting building height to 65 feet within 50 feet of 112th Avenue SE, and encourages building design that steps back height above 65 feet in the area between 50 feet and 100 feet of 112th Avenue SE. She proposed adding ahead of the word “encourage” something to the effect of “if the view corridor is not imposed.” If the corridor is not imposed, building design that steps back is exactly the right thing to do. If the corridor is in place, however, buildings will be squished on 112th Avenue SE in a way that does not allow for quickly stepping them up, and the buildings on 114th Avenue SE will also be squished because of the corridor; including open space will be more difficult and may not achieve the goal of creating a place-making event.

Mr. Brian Franklin with PMF Investments, 15015 Main Street, Suite 203, said the family owned and operated company has been in the area for 30 years and recently purchased the Sheraton property off of 112th Avenue SE. The Sheraton site has amazing potential. Its location between the East Main and downtown light rail stations make it appropriate for transit-oriented development. The view corridor, however, debilitates the site. The view corridor does not actually exist. The mention of a view corridor came about from work done on the Metro 112

building in the core design district in a completely different district from where the Sheraton is located. The view corridor discussed for that building does not extend across the boundary. If it existed elsewhere, there would be something in the code that had been voted on by the Council. If the view corridor is imposed, the ability to effect a transit-oriented development will be debilitated on sites that are only a stone's throw from light rail. It should be stated in written form that the majority of the Committee is not in favor of any creation of a view corridor.

Ms. Renay Bennett, 826 108th Avenue SE, said she hoped that all of the neighborhoods would be treated equally by the Committee, and that the Committee would be inclusive rather than exclusive in helping to mitigate the impacts of light rail. She proposed changing the first sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 13 of the draft plan to replace "residential" with "neighborhood." With regard to section 3.1 on page 17, she proposed adding reference to both Bellecrest and Surrey Downs at the end of the last sentence of the first paragraph. With respect to section 3.4 on page 19, she proposed including a reference to Bellecrest in the first sentence of the second paragraph given that both neighborhoods will be impacted by the loss of direct access. The same change should be made to the first paragraph on page 29 where only Surrey Downs is mentioned. She proposed changing "continue to explore new technologies" as used in item 7 on page 30 to read "implement new technologies." With regard to item 8 on the same page, "residential streets" should be revised to read "neighborhood streets." The Committee was asked to add "and evaluate concurrently" to item 10 on page 30.

Senior Planner Mike Kattermann called attention to copies of an email from Mr. Franklin in the desk packet, as well as copies of an email from Rusty Duchene and the accompanying staff reply.

3. REVIEW OPEN HOUSE MATERIALS

Senior Planner Phil Harris reviewed with the Committee the open house materials. He noted that the open house will be live online from May 9 to May 25, and an in-person open house is slated for May 18. The materials included general information about the station area planning process, the study area, the work of the Committee, and the remaining project timeline. The materials included comments received from the Committee and the public that served as the starting point for the discussion of the vision, the strategies and the recommendations on the four main topics of ped/bike access, traffic, character and redevelopment.

Mr. Harris said the online open house will include pages showing the Committee's vision, recommended strategies, maps, and specific questions to be answered. The in-person open house will have the same materials on display boards, and the attendees will be handed comment cards to fill out and submit.

Ms. Powell asked if people will be encouraged to make suggestions on any of the topics. Mr. Harris said the idea behind the "tell us more" button in the online open house is to garner additional information for the Committee to review at its June 15 meeting. Open-ended comments made by those who attend the May 18 in-person open house will also be up for discussion at the June meeting. It will be up to the Committee to determine what to include in the final report.

Chair Lampe asked if the online open house technology will prohibit persons from taking the survey over and over again. Mr. Kattermann said he did not believe so. Transportation Planner John Murphy added, however, that there may be a way to determine if a single person were essentially stuffing the ballot box.

Mr. Kattermann commented that because of space limitations the online materials have been paraphrased. There will, however, be a link included for anyone wanting to see the full list. Copies of the full list will also be available at the in-person open house.

Ms. Unger said “tell us more” could be interpreted as meaning more information is available rather than meaning the viewer is being asked to share more of their thoughts. Mr. Kattermann agreed to work on language that would make that clearer.

With regard to the graphic relative to redevelopment, Ms. Hammond suggested that as drawn it implies the only area that will see redevelopment activity is the Red Lion site. She said those who see the materials should be made to know that what applies to the Red Lion site could also apply to the Sheraton site and other sites. Mr. Kattermann agreed that a map should be included showing all of the areas that are included. He pointed out, however, that the Sheraton site is not part of the Committee’s purview.

Mr. Rogers observed that the graphic shows development with an FAR of 4.0, whereas the Committee has discussed allowing up to 5.0 provided certain conditions are met. Mr. Kattermann said that approach will be described in the strategies.

Mr. Breiland said if the Red Lion site is to be highlighted, some depiction of height up to 300 feet and development up to an FAR of 5.0 should be included to avoid creating confusion.

Mr. Thurston stressed the need to include with the graphics language indicating that the drawings are intended to be representative rather than literal.

Ms. Hammond noted that recent information regarding Sound Transit Phase 3 indicates the possibility of additional ridership coming to the East Main station. She asked if any of that information will be shared at the open house. Mr. Kattermann said he had not intended to include that. Ms. Hammond suggested that it should be given that people will view the materials and make comment based on their understanding of what the impacts will be when in fact the impacts could be much bigger.

Chair Lampe said the big change for the area will be the coming of light rail, which is still seven years out. The Committee is not charged with designing the rail line itself or the station, so the additional information could only serve to confuse. ST-3 is still 25 years out and it has not even reached the ballot yet. He said he would be inclined to stay away from the issue at the open house.

Mr. Breiland agreed. He said Sound Transit has not yet designed anything and cannot even say for sure if their trains will stop at the East Main station. The Committee is tasked with looking at

the surrounding land uses and access issues and the number of tracks or trains on them will not affect that. It is too early to worry about what may or may not happen with ST-3.

Ms. Unger asked staff to clarify the view corridor issue. Mr. Kattermann said it is in the Comprehensive Plan and there are also references in code. Whether or not that means the corridor exists will be left to the attorneys and the policymakers. The issue is before the Council and the Council will have to make the ultimate decision. Ms. Unger asked if the Committee could be provided with some direction from the legal department at the next meeting. Mr. Kattermann said no one knows yet what the Council will do with the issue. The recommendation of the Committee covers both having the corridor and not having the corridor. Any wording changes to the draft recommendations are within the prerogative of the Committee.

Mr. Thurston commented that the Committee's discussion has progressed on the assumption that the view corridor does in fact exist. He said he would support including language in the recommendation to the effect of "...assuming the view corridor exists..." Mr. Kattermann said the Committee is free to include language to that effect.

Mr. Kattermann reminded the Committee members that the online open house would go live on May 9. He said any substantive changes to the draft materials will be incorporated into the documents. Time should not be spent re-debating things that have already been discussed, but if something has been missed entirely, or if an issue has been mischaracterized, the Committee should say so.

Ms. Hammond said she was in favor of including very direct language relative to the view corridor. If the majority of the Committee is not in favor of the view corridor, a statement should be included that the Committee recommends doing away with the view corridor.

Mr. Rogers pointed out that the specific language proposed by Mr. McCullough does that. Mr. Kattermann clarified that the proposed language read "Minimize or eliminate the Mt. Rainier view corridor to prevent undermining redevelopment and transit-oriented development goals, and the CAC desire to locate taller buildings farther from 112th Avenue SE." He said the language would appear in item 3 on page 35 of the draft plan.

Ms. Unger supported including the language as proposed.

Ms. Powell did not agree to include the language. She said the view corridor is an important public asset that needs to be protected. While there are valid points on both sides of the issue, someone should speak up for retaining the view from City Hall.

Mr. Breiland asked Ms. Powell if she could agree to including language calling for the view corridor to be minimized. Ms. Powell said she could not.

Mr. Kattermann proposed adding the proposed language to item 3 on page 35 of the draft plan but acknowledging in the transmittal memo that there was a majority but not unanimity.

Mr. Thurston commented that the fact that the individual Committee members have been willing to express their opinions is what has made the Committee so constructive. He said he personally loves City Hall and the vistas from it, but to tag the entire area of the transit-oriented development district to a view of Mt. Rainier would be tantamount to the tail wagging the dog.

There was agreement to make the change to item 3 as proposed but not to highlight the minority opinion.

Mr. Rogers pointed out that Mr. McCullough had also proposed revising the fourth bullet of item 2 on page 35 of the draft plan to add “if any” following “subject to view corridor height provisions.” Mr. Kattermann pointed out that in the discussion with the Committee the conclusion reached was that the FAR of 5.0 and the 300-foot height limit is not subject to the view corridor. Mr. Rogers said the issue is that if there is a view corridor, the height of the buildings along 114th Avenue SE will be affected, and if the corridor is not there, the height restrictions will not come into play. By adding “if any,” carte blanche is not given to ignore the view corridor. Mr. Kattermann clarified that if the view corridor goes away, the Committee will still want to limit the greater FAR and taller buildings to along Main Street and I-405. That is what the fourth bullet is saying. Adding the “if any” does not really come into play and the recommendation of the Committee will hold whether the corridor is in place or not.

Ms. Hammond suggested moving “subject to view corridor height provisions” to the end of the fourth bullet rather than including it in the middle. Mr. Breiland said the phrase could simply be eliminated. If the view corridor goes away, the height should be pushed back regardless. Mr. Kattermann agreed that when paired with the revised language, it becomes clear where the Committee wants to see the taller buildings.

There was agreement to eliminate the phrase.

Mr. Rogers agreed with the comment made by Ms. Wig concerning the fifth bullet of item 2 on page 35. He said the proposed language is confusing as drafted and when penciled out makes the 200-foot limit extremely narrow. The suggestion was to call for the stair stepped approach if the view corridor is removed; if it is not removed, the ability of the developer to achieve the full FAR will be minimized. Mr. Kattermann said the intent of the Committee was not to squish the development but rather to move it back as much as possible, with or without the view corridor. If language is included about the view corridor going away, however, that would open it up to allowing taller buildings along 112th Avenue SE. Mr. Rogers said if that is the case, the bullet as drafted is too restrictive. The setback should simply be 50 feet.

Mr. Kattermann explained that as drafted, within the first 50 feet of 112th Avenue SE, building height of up to 65 feet is allowed. Then between 50 feet and 100 feet, building height can exceed 65 feet but only in graduations that are not specified. Beyond 100 feet, the full building height is allowed, subject to the view corridor restrictions, which hits at about the mid-point of the southern boundary of the site.

Mr. Breiland said his interpretation was that the edges should be treated much the same way the A and B districts are treated.

Mr. Rogers pointed out that what the Committee wants to see is a development with a courtyard in the middle. As worded, the setback could mean there will be a building situated where the courtyard should be. The restriction will make it difficult to achieve an FAR of 4.0 or 5.0 on the site. Mr. Kattermann said getting to the full density allowed is achievable, but flexibility in how to get there would be impacted by the approach. Mr. Rogers said the proposed language has only triggered confusion about what can be done. What is needed is clear and simple language that will allow a developer to work out with the city a development agreement that will work for all concerned. Mr. Kattermann agreed the language should be reworked to make it clearer.

There was agreement to direct staff to be on hand at the open house to answer questions, and to confirm the language of the paragraph at the June meeting. Mr. Kattermann agreed to include a diagram as well. He clarified that buildings are allowed to begin at the edge of the sidewalk and that is the mark from which to measure the 50 feet in which buildings are allowed up to 65 feet in height. Building height can increase in steps in the area between 50 feet and 100 feet, with full building height allowed beyond 100 feet.

Mr. Breiland commented that the design review process would be used to work out with the developer how to effect the stepping up. Chair Lampe said the challenge would be in accommodating both the steps and the allowed density on the site without filling in the middle section. Mr. Kattermann agreed the approach will to some degree affect the flexibility of what can be done on the site. He said the approach was included based on input from the Committee, but if so directed the approach can be removed.

Mr. Thurston said from the streetscape point of view, the trees and the retail uses will be the most visible. A tall building just beyond that would not be out of place.

Ms. Hammond reminded the Committee that the issues for the adjacent neighborhoods are shadow and privacy. Limiting buildings to 65 feet in the area closest to the sidewalk is an important way of addressing those issues. The group has been very clear about not wanting to see tall buildings right up against 112th Avenue SE. The step-up approach achieves the goal while leaving flexibility for what happens back from the street.

Mr. Rogers said his preference was to temper the verbiage by removing the specificity. As drafted, achieving an FAR of 5.0 may not be possible unless a building is located in the middle of the site. He agreed limiting building height to 65 feet within the first 50 feet makes sense, but the design should be left open after that.

Ms. Unger said she would take a building in the middle over tall buildings on 112th Avenue SE creating shadows and privacy issues for the neighborhoods. She added, however, that she could agree to removing the specificity, provided building height within the first 50 feet is limited to 65 feet.

There was consensus to revise the bullet to read “Limit building height to 65 feet within 50 feet of 112th Avenue SE for buildings outside of the additional FAR/Height (5.0, 300 feet) area; utilize building design that steps back height above 65 feet.”

Referring back to Section 5.2 of the draft plan on page 26, Ms. Unger suggested adding to the discussion that there will be no access to Surrey Downs Park by car, so people will be walking through the neighborhoods to get to the park, which is one of the reasons sidewalks are needed. Ms. Powell pointed out that there will in fact be a few parking spots provided at the park.

Ms. Hammond said the discussion about residential parking zones and permits was in part focused on people parking on neighborhood streets to access the park. Chair Lampe added that the park will be downgraded from being a community park to being a neighborhood park, and the expectation is that fewer people will be using it.

There was agreement to add language to the discussion of Section 5.2 but not to change the associated strategy.

With regard to item 5 on page 35, Mr. Kattermann noted that the Committee had previously agreed to make no changes to the FAR and allowed height for the OLB zone in the area between 112th Avenue SE, SE 6th Street, SE 8th Street and 114th Avenue SE. He said staff recently met with Mr. Moniz to talk about the request to increase FAR to 1.0. The discussion included Development Services staff to determine the feasibility of achieving 1.0 on the site because of the environmental constraints. The conclusion was that there are ways to get there provided height was increased, though the effective FAR would be less than 1.0 because of the environmental constraints. He said staff would support increasing the FAR to 1.0 and height to 120 feet.

Chair Lampe said if the approach is viable, the increases should be allowed, particularly given how close the site is to the East Main station. There was consensus to recommend FAR at 1.0 and height between 100 feet and 120 feet.

Ms. Powell called attention to item 8 on page 27 and suggested that if the corner is redesigned to make it a fully functioning intersection, the call for installation of a crosswalk on Main Street for the east side of the intersection with 110th Avenue NE may be premature. Mr. Kattermann said the recommendation to include a crosswalk would be considered as part of the redesign effort. If the redesign does not come about, the crosswalk may still be needed.

Ms. Powell asked if item 1 on page 29 should include the notion of establishing a residential parking zone area specifically for the Bellevue High School area. Currently, Zone 3 permit high schoolers are coming to the neighborhood, posting their permits, and walking off to high school, triggering a need for enforcement. Mr. Kattermann said that notion is included in items 1 and/or 2.

Chair Lampe pointed out that the high school is in Bellecrest, which is Zone 3. Ms. Powell suggested creating an entirely new zone just for the area around the high school, and reducing the area of the current Zone 3. Mr. Murphy said the phenomenon is an existing issue and is not something that is necessarily tied to the station. Ms. Powell suggested that people will choose to drive and park within their zone and use their parking permits just to get closer to the station. Mr.

Kattermann said the city will not be able to prevent someone with a valid Zone 3 parking permit from parking in Zone 3.

Mr. Breiland agreed that the answer may be to change the boundaries of Zone 3, but also agreed that it is not a light rail issue.

Calling attention to item 7 on page 30, Ms. Powell proposed using the word “implement” in place of “continue to explore.” Ms. Hammond pointed out that it is not possible to be specific about what the new technologies are. She voiced concern over using “implement” given that it may be applied to an as-yet unknown technology that the city may not necessarily want. Mr. Kattermann added that new technologies would not be implemented without first seeking input from the neighborhoods.

Mr. Breiland proposed “Continue to explore and implement as appropriate new technologies....” There was agreement to make that change.

Ms. Powell said she would like to see “residential local streets” change to read “residential neighborhood streets” in item 8 on page 30. Mr. Breiland suggested the better option would be to have it read simply “residential streets.” Mr. Murphy said “residential” would cover it, even though 108th Avenue SE is considered to be a collector/arterial.

Ms. Powell asked to have item 10 on page 30 revised to include the notion of evaluating concurrently with street traffic mitigation. Ms. Hammond asked what the benefit of making that change would be and Ms. Powell said the street would be treated concurrently with other streets, especially 110th Avenue SE, and that people would not disproportionately be encouraged to use 108th Avenue SE because of the left-turn arrow.

Ms. Unger disagreed. She suggested the issue is adequately addressed in item 9 on page 30.

Mr. Kattermann said his understanding of the proposal was that if the configuration of the traffic signal at 108th Avenue SE is changed to include left-turn signals, an evaluation should be done to determine if the change will add traffic to 108th Avenue SE, and if so mitigation should be implemented concurrently. He said evaluations of that sort are always done in conjunction with signal changes.

Ms. Powell said the mitigations discussed by the Committee have included lowering the speed limit in the area of the high school, installing additional speed bumps and using other technologies. Ms. Hammond suggested those options would not be eliminated by leaving item 10 as worded in the draft plan. The fact is 108th Avenue SE is already a through street but 110th Avenue SE is not. The language of item 9 on page 30 regarding 110th Avenue SE very likely will change the character and quality of the neighborhood, particularly if it is made a through street. Any call to consider 108th Avenue SE and 110th Avenue SE concurrently could lead to changing the function of 110th Avenue SE.

Mr. Kattermann clarified that the issue is not concurrency, rather it is looking at mitigation concurrent with evaluating left-turn signals at 108th Avenue SE. As drafted, there is no specific

connection with 110th Avenue SE. Items 9 and 10 are two separate recommendations. While they may be looked at together in how they function, one does not have to happen with the other.

There was agreement to add to the end of item 10 on page 30 a sentence reading “Evaluate concurrently with street traffic mitigation.”

Ms. Hammond called attention to item 5 on page 33 and suggested the word “development” is used too often in the first sentence. There was agreement to eliminate the second one. She also highlighted the need to make sure the item is consistent with what was decided relative to item 2 on page 35 relative to limiting height in the first 50 feet from 112th Avenue SE. Mr. Kattermann said that could be done by revising the fourth bullet from “...above three stories...” to “...above 65 feet...” There was consensus to make that change as well.

Chair Lampe said he was not sure the second bullet would actually buy anything. He pointed out that the proposed front stoops would be facing the busy thoroughfare of 112th Avenue SE. Mr. Thurston agreed that the bullet suggests something that may or may not occur. He said he would prefer to see the developer allowed to decide if the uses there will be retail or residential. He agreed it was somewhat questionable that people would want to live on 112th Avenue SE. Mr. Kattermann said the bullet does not dictate residential, it only indicates that if the use is residential, some additional setback should be provided to yield more of a residential feel. Mr. Thurston proposed adding language to indicate the bullet applies if residential is developed there. Mr. Kattermann agreed to do that.

A motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes was made by Mr. Breiland. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thurston and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kattermann called attention to page 13 and noted that everything in italics is the actual vision statement.

Ms. Powell proposed changing “residential streets” to “neighborhood streets” in the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 13. Mr. Kattermann pointed out that the word “residential” was used in the strategy. Ms. Powell suggested adding the word “neighborhood” ahead of the word “residents” at the end of the first sentence. There was agreement to make that change.

Mr. King called attention to the last sentence of the first paragraph of the vision statement and asked what the genesis is of the notion of a grade-separated crossing of the light rail tracks. Mr. Kattermann said the idea came from the first open house and has been discussed by the Committee as well. Mr. King said he was not aware the Committee had reached a conclusion that such a crossing would be a good idea. Mr. Kattermann said the conclusion reached was that it would be a good idea to study it as a means of providing better access. Mr. King said the crossing seems contrary to the notion of Surrey Downs Park as a neighborhood park.

Mr. Breiland pointed out that the crossing would improve pedestrian access to the park from the new neighborhood to the east of 112th Avenue SE. Chair Lampe commented that it would also provide the neighborhood with better access to the station.

There was agreement to leave in the reference to a grade-separated crossing.

Mr. King referred to the third paragraph of the vision statement and the reference to prohibiting non-residents from using neighborhood streets for parking, pick-up and drop-off for the light rail station from cutting through on the neighborhood streets and asked if the city can by law prohibit people from using public streets. Mr. Kattermann allowed that it cannot. Mr. King proposed substituting “discourage” for “prohibit” in the sentence. Mr. Kattermann pointed out that the word “discourage” was originally used and the Committee elected to change it to “prohibit.” He suggested the intent could be met by using the phrase “effectively prohibit” instead. There was consensus to do that.

Chair Lampe called attention to the third sentence of the first paragraph on page 14 and noted that it is supposed to be only the east side of 112th Avenue SE that is characterized by a wide landscape buffer between the street and the sidewalk. Mr. Kattermann said he could add language to clarify that point. He added that there will be some of the same treatment on the west side of the street.

Following discussion regarding whether or not the second sentence of the second paragraph on page 15 was intended to refer to both residential and commercial towers, there was agreement that the intent was to locate the taller towers closer to the downtown. The consensus of the group was to eliminate the word “residential” from the second sentence.

Ms. Hammond said she was okay with the suggestion made by Ms. Bennett relative to Section 3.1 on page 17 to add to the end of the first paragraph “in Surrey Downs and Bellecrest.” There was agreement to make the change.

With regard to the second paragraph in Section 3.4 on page 19, Ms. Powell proposed revising the first sentence to read “...into the Surrey Downs and Bellecrest neighborhoods...” and the second sentence to read “...walking from Surrey Downs and Bellecrest....”

Ms. Hammond said she was not in agreement with the change because the Bellecrest properties do not open up into Surrey Downs. As previously pointed out by a Bellecrest resident, one should not advocate for cut-through traffic in one neighborhood and then complain about it in another. The proposed language advocates for cut-through traffic through Surrey Downs.

Mr. Kattermann pointed out that in the first sentence the focus is not on Surrey Downs residents but rather it is on direct access into the Surrey Downs neighborhood. Adding Bellecrest there would not make sense.

Ms. Unger said she could agree to change the second sentence as proposed because one point of having light rail is to encourage people to walk to the station. Chair Lampe said Bellevue High School could also be added. Ms. Unger said the other option would be to word the sentence to be more general and not specify any specific groups of people.

A motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes was made by Ms. Hammond. The motion was seconded by Mr. Breiland and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kattermann proposed having the sentence read “People walking from the neighborhoods west of 112th Avenue SE will be able to access the East Main station.” There was consensus to make that change.

With respect to the next steps, Mr. Kattermann said a revised version of the draft plan for review by the public will be pulled together for the online and live open house events. The public feedback will be compiled for the June 15 meeting for the Committee to review and sign off on. He said an appendix will also be added to the document.

Ms. Hammond said if a graphic is developed to share with the public showing a building in the center of the site, another graphic should be displayed that does not show a building in the center. Mr. Kattermann said he would try to do that.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. David Slight, 227 110th Avenue SE, suggested the Committee should clarify for the public what is meant by the view corridor. He also suggested there should be some clarification with regard to how traffic issues for the entire area should be approached, and the role of buses in as a form of transit serving the area.

A motion to extend the meeting by four minutes was made by Ms. Hammond. The motion was seconded by Ms. Unger and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Robert Levy, 11915 SE 245th Place, Kent, thanked the majority of the Committee for approving opposition to the view corridor. He also commented that the notion of stepping up building height will work very well for the Red Lion site but not for the Hilton site, which will not be completely redeveloped. In moving back from the street, development will be impacted.

Ms. Leshya Wig, 4811 134th Place, clarified for the Committee that the drawing she submitted represents an FAR of 4.8 and utilizes only 125-foot buildings on the south corner of the site. It is one potential design that could be used if the view corridor were not imposed.

6. ADJOURN

Chair Lampe adjourned the meeting at 6:51 p.m.