



MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 1, 2015

TO: East Main CAC Members

FROM: Mike Kattermann, Senior Planner, 452-2042
Planning & Community Development Department
Phil Harris, Senior Transportation Planner, 452-7680

SUBJECT: Agenda Packet and Project Update

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an overview of the materials in this meeting packet.

October 27th meeting minutes (Attachment 1)

These minutes are on the agenda for approval.

CAC Draft Vision and Draft Strategies (Attachment 2)

The bulk of the October meeting was devoted to reviewing and confirming the discussion and direction of the CAC on the initial 5 issues/topics presented in July. Similarly, the 4 remaining issues/topics for CAC discussion and direction are anticipated to consume the bulk of the December meeting. The 4 remaining topics are:

- Pedestrian/bicycle connectivity to the station from the wider area: What additional improvements to local and regional facilities should be provided?
- Neighborhood access (motorized and non-motorized): What changes, if any, should be made to remaining neighborhood access points?
- Future land uses for redevelopment area: What mix and scale of uses could best serve and complement the existing and future community?
- Future look and feel of redevelopment area: What design characteristics are important to include in the “new neighborhood?”

Draft Vision Statements in Attachment 2 are intended to generate discussion by the CAC that will provide staff with direction on drafting more specific vision statements and strategies like those confirmed at the October meeting for the previous issues/topics. Non-italicized text in the draft vision statements section is intended to reflect previous discussion and/or direction from the CAC, while the *italicized* text are draft statements offered as a point of discussion by the CAC. In the case of the FAR and height for the redevelopment area (Issue/Topic H), staff is offering a recommendation based on multiple factors including such items as previous discussion by the CAC, relationship to adjoining uses and citywide context. Additional information on all of the topics will be presented at the meeting to facilitate CAC discussion.

Follow-up on Mount Rainier View Corridor

At the October meeting there were many questions about the view corridor of Mount Rainier and its implications for the redevelopment area. There was also a request for the policy basis

for the corridor. The following is intended to provide additional information about the view corridor, its implications for the redevelopment area, and how it could be considered by the CAC in your discussions.

According to the staff report for the Metro 112 project at 112th Avenue NE and NE 4th Street, "Another project element was to provide a view corridor of Mt. Rainier. The applicant revised the plans so a view corridor was maintained from the Major Public Open Space concourse within City Hall." The concourse and balcony were created as public spaces and civic assets in the renovation of this building into City Hall for the enjoyment of the public. The Metro 112 project was modified to shift taller portions of the building west to preserve the view and code variances were applied to allow for the modifications. There are several policies that related to the Metro 112 project; however, the two key policies in the *Comprehensive Plan* relevant to this issue are UD-62 and S-DT-37. The two policies state:

UD-62. Identify and preserve views of water, mountains, skylines or other unique landmarks from public places as valuable civic assets.

S-DT-37. Link building intensity to design guidelines relating to building appearance, amenities, pedestrian orientation and connections, impact on adjacent properties, and ***maintenance of view corridors***. These guidelines will seek to enhance the appearance, image, and design character of the Downtown. ***{Emphasis added}***

These policies were adopted by City Council in a citywide context and it is not within the charge of the CAC to recommend policies to City Council as part of this project. However, because the view corridor could have implications for the CAC's recommendations regarding the overall development potential (i.e. placement of taller buildings), the CAC's report could indicate if existing policies pose a challenge for realizing the CAC's vision and request that City Council review those policies. VIA has done a massing study of the Red Lion site and determined that it can accommodate the staff recommendation of 4.0 FAR considering the view corridor.

Consultants for the Wigs, owners of the Red Lion site, have also done massing studies factoring in the view corridor and determined that the site can also accommodate a higher FAR, including taller buildings on the west portion of the site. This is one more piece of information for your consideration and discussion about redevelopment potential.

The view corridor has not been a consideration for this area previously because the maximum allowed height under the current OLB zoning for these parcels ranges between 30 feet along 112th Avenue SE to 75 feet along 114th Avenue SE. How much to limit building heights along 112th Avenue SE has been a topic of discussion for the CAC that is being revisited in the context of the view corridor information.

Please contact me or Phil if you have any questions about these materials prior to the meeting. Thank you for your time and commitment to this project.



**CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
EAST MAIN STATION AREA PLAN
Tuesday, December 1, 2015
4:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. – Room 1E - 108
Bellevue City Hall – 450 110th Avenue NE**

<u>Time</u>	<u>Item</u>
4:00	1. Call to order, approval of agenda, approval of minutes from October 27 (Attachment 1) – Scott Lampe, Chair
4:05	2. *Public comment
4:10	3. Urban Design Framework – Mike Kattermann, PCD; Dan Bertolet, VIA
4:30	4. Red Lion Redevelopment – Mon Wig, Leshya Wig, Arlan Collins
4:45	5. Continued discussion and approval of draft vision statements (Attachment 2) – Mike Kattermann, PCD; Phil Harris and John Murphy, Transportation <ol style="list-style-type: none">Pedestrian/bicycle connectivity to station from wider areaNeighborhood access – motorized and non-motorizedFuture land uses for redevelopment areaFuture look and feel of redevelopment area
5:50	6. *Public comment
6:00	7. Adjourn

Next meeting: Tuesday, January 26th (room 1E-113)

**To allow sufficient time for all those who want to address the Committee, speakers are asked to limit their comments to 3 minutes per individual. Thank you.*

Wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation available upon request. Please call at least 48 hours in advance. Assistance for the hearing impaired: dial 711 (TR).

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

October 27, 2015
4:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-113

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: John D'Agnone, Christie Hammond, Pamela Unger

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Kattermann, Department of Planning and Community Development; Stacy Cannon, Kevin McDonald, and John Murphy, Transportation Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

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

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. by Chair Lampe who presided.

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Mr. Thurston. The motion was seconded by Mr. Breiland and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. King called attention to the third paragraph on page 3 and noted that "PRZ" should read "RPZ." He also suggested the intent of the fourth paragraph on the same page was unclear; Senior Planner Mike Kattermann agreed to listen to the recording and talk with Ms. Hammond. In the last paragraph on page 4, he noted that "eastbound" should be "westbound."

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Mr. King. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rogers and the motion carried unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Renay Bennett, 826 108th Avenue SE, said she was surprised to learn that the last Committee meeting had been canceled to allow staff time to understand what the proposals are for redevelopment along 112th Avenue SE. Apparently there is some thinking that the new City Hall needs to maintain a view corridor to Mt. Rainier. If that is the case, development on some properties may need to be restricted. She said she was not aware of any law or code stating that City Hall views trumps every other private property owner in the city. If that is the case, there are lots of property owners that will have something to say about their views being obstructed by other development. She also noted that staff have given direction to the Committee about what is in the scope and what is not, yet the meeting minutes indicate staff have been intent about asking

the Committee to approve and encompass documents many of the members have not even seen. It is not right that the Committee should be told to ignore things that will have clear impacts on the area while being asked to approve documents not even seen by the Committee. The members were urged to consider carefully and with a critical eye the motives of what is being addressed and how the Committee should respond.

Mr. Geoff Bidwell, 1600 109th Avenue SE, stated that the major rezone for the downtown area occurred in 1981. At the time the citizens were told that the boundaries of the downtown would be fixed and that there would be no possibility of zoning changes outside the boundary that would affect the neighborhoods. What the Committee has been discussing, however, is the possibility of highrise buildings to accommodate future growth that was supposed to occur in the downtown. Several decades ago a proposal by a developer was made to put up a highrise building on Main Street. The issue went all the way to the state Supreme Court which turned it down. The proposal on the table is a similar situation. The traffic that will be associated with the proposed highrise buildings will impact the neighborhoods, particular given a lack of parking. The same problem has occurred in Vancouver, BC, where transit-oriented development was allowed to go in with no parking facilities; the result was parking in adjoining neighborhoods.

3. PROJECT UPDATE: VIEW CORRIDOR, NEXT STEPS AND NOVEMBER MEETING DATE

Mr. Kattermann explained that the public view corridor policy that is in the Comprehensive Plan has been used in previous developments, including the Metro 112 building at NE 4th Street and 112th Avenue NE. The policy applies to preserving views from public spaces, and City Hall is a public space. Staff initially concluded the policy would not be an issue for the redevelopment area in terms of height, but in conducting a more detailed analysis it was found that the policy will in fact have some significant implications, primarily for the Red Lion site but also for other properties in the redevelopment area.

Asked by Chair Lampe to explain the difference between policy and code, Mr. Kattermann said code language is very specific as to measurements, setbacks and height. In the case of the view corridor policy, it has been applied through the downtown design review process.

Mr. Kattermann referred to the diagram in the Committee packet and noted that the red "A" line runs straight between the compass sculpture on the City Hall balcony and Mt. Rainier. The "B" lines shown in green point to the base of the mountain where it touches the horizon, and the "C" lines, also shown in green, adds the width of the base of the mountain to either side to include some view context. The consultant was tasked with taking measurements from the ground to determine what the building heights could be at various points along the line. The conclusion reached was that on the northern edge of the Red Lion site a building height of 123 feet would not block the view; on the south property line building height could extend to 148 feet without obstructing the view. For the Hilton site, buildings could be as high as 174 feet, and on the Bellevue Club they could be 186 feet on the southeastern corner of the site.

Continuing, Mr. Kattermann said the real issue relates to future development of the Red Lion site. There is a need to take a closer look at what that will mean to the different concepts that have been looked at in the past and how they fit or do not fit.

Mr. Breiland asked if the Metro 112 development was analyzed in the same way. Mr. Kattermann said the Metro 112 site represented the initial application of the policy. Through negotiations with the developer, a portion of the tower along 112th Avenue NE was shifted to the west to be out of the view corridor. Variances were granted to allow the developer to do that.

Mr. Rogers said he assumed the policy would affect Scenario 4, the most intense development scenario, as it relates to the Hilton and Bellevue Club sites. Mr. Kattermann said the policy would likely affect the taller towers that were shown in Scenario 4. The consultant has been tasked with looking at what 4.0 FAR on the sites look like in light of the policy limitations. The initial thinking is that the higher density could still be achieved, though that could mean moving some height to the west.

Mr. Thurston said he was taken aback to hear about the view corridor policy after all the planning work that has already taken place. He said the policy restriction should have been on the table front and center from the start. He asked if the policy is to be treated as law. Mr. Kattermann said the view corridor is not specified in the code but was applied through the design review process for the Metro 112 building.

Ms. Powell said she was pleased to learn about the policy language. A view of Mt. Rainier is a treasure for all people to be able to enjoy. It is clear that the heights thus far proposed are out of sync with the livability of the City Hall site and the neighborhood in general. The heights are also evidence that the downtown zoning is creeping to the south of Main Street into what is basically a neighborhood area.

Mr. Long asked if the policy requires preserving all views within the "C" lines. Mr. Kattermann said the policy is not that specific. Staff had to make some decisions about what context the policy language is trying to preserve for purposes of the analysis. The "C" lines were drawn to give specific context for the mountain when looking at the horizon. Mr. Long asked if the Committee could recommend restricting views only within the "B" lines. Mr. Kattermann said the question is a fair one. He said it is not necessarily the role of the Committee to weigh in on the view corridor itself. However, the Committee could make a statement regarding what the view corridor affects and whether the "B" and "C" lines that make up the view cone should be further evaluated and modified.

Mr. Thurston pointed out that to the degree height is restricted closer to the freeway, allowing for the same level of density will push the height closer to 112th Avenue SE, unless more massing at lower heights is permitted instead. Mr. Kattermann said those are indeed the tradeoffs that will require additional analysis and discussion. He clarified that the FAR currently allowed in the redevelopment area is 0.5.

Mr. Kattermann said the consultant has been asked to come up with a concept for a development scenario somewhere between the existing Scenarios 3 and 4. Scenario 3 had an FAR of 3.8 and

the consultant has been asked to study what could be yielded under an FAR of 4.0 in terms of massing on the site and the height that would be needed. Scenarios 1 and 2 do not bump up against the view corridor issue. The consultant's work will be shared with the Committee in due course along with a scenario being developed by the Red Lion site property owner that involves a greater intensity on the order of a 5.0 FAR.

Mr. Kattermann said there were four topics the Committee did not get to in July that will be presented at the next meeting. Once there is clearer direction as to the intensity of development and the mix of uses, additional traffic modeling will be done. The shadowing issue may need to be revisited by the Committee given the additional analysis triggered by the view corridor policy, and the Committee will need to review design issues in general for the redevelopment area. At another meeting the Committee will be asked to confirm the draft vision and strategies. An environmental review will then need to be done, and the package will be put before the public for review and comment before a final report and recommendation is handed off to the City Council, probably around the end of March 2016.

Mr. Kattermann said the next regular scheduled meeting of the Committee would fall on November 24, the Tuesday before Thanksgiving. Presuming that would not work for most of the Committee members, he proposed moving the meeting to November 17 or to a date in December. There was agreement to schedule the next meeting for December 1.

4. HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT

Mr. Kattermann said he received two photographs of good examples for the station area, both from Chair Lampe.

Chair Lampe said the Pearl District in Portland has a good combination of vegetative sidewalks and fairly low-profile buildings facing the street. He shared his photos with the Committee that also showed sidewalk cafés and a walkable environment.

Mr. Breiland commented that the photos are consistent with the theme for 112th Avenue SE that the Committee talked about in July, particularly for the northern end close to Main Street.

Mr. Thurston said he is a big fan of the Pearl District. He agreed the photos captured the open walkability of the sidewalk. Depending on how things are structured, it is possible to allow for a little more building height that is set back from the sidewalk without negatively impacting the sidewalk experience.

Mr. King commented that light shining on the street is a big part of what makes for walkability. In the case of Bellevue, light will hit the sidewalk only in the summer months regardless of how the street is designed. He agreed, however, that the taller buildings should be set back away from the sidewalk.

Mr. Long said he also has always enjoyed the Pearl District. He noted that in the photo shown the sidewalk was very wide, which is needed to accommodate an alfresco dining experience. The photo does not show that a great deal of urban growth is occurring in the Pearl District that

includes 20-story residential buildings. He added that he often walks around downtown Bellevue during the lunch hour. He said the Manhattan development at Bellevue Way and Main Street has an eight-foot sidewalk in front, allowing for plenty of room to walk, and has cutouts for native vegetation at each end of which there are plantings offering seasonal coloring.

Mr. Thurston said he has seen in both San Francisco and New York street treatments that have included wrought-iron fences and vegetation. The treatment has made the streets very pleasant places.

With regard to wayfinding, Mr. Breiland said Bellevue has some decent examples that are simple and not too attention grabbing. He said the best ones are in the downtown and mark the public midblock crossings, though they are not all that common. Signs of that sort would be appropriate in the neighborhoods as well.

5. REVIEW DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS AND DRAFT STRATEGIES FROM JULY MEETING

Mr. Kattermann highlighted for the Committee how their work is being built on. He noted that the Committee started out by identifying the main issues of concern to the stakeholders in the study area, including fostering new communities to the east of 112th Avenue SE, complementing the existing communities to the west of 112th Avenue SE, and station access. The guiding principles approved by the Committee were built on those three issues. The current focus is on drafting a vision statement that will form the basis for the Committee's recommendations and strategies for the public to comment on, and which will serve as the foundation for the specific strategies and recommendations to be forwarded to the Council.

Mr. Kattermann reminded the Committee that there were six topics on the agenda for the July meeting, only five of which were covered: parking in the neighborhoods; ped/bike improvements; the treatment of Main Street; the treatment of 112th Avenue SE; and the frontage along 112th Avenue SE along the redevelopment area. Not addressed was the issue of what distinction, if any, should be made between the development potential, to the south of NE 6th Street versus to the north of NE 6th Street; that topic will be addressed at the next Committee meeting. He noted that the draft vision and strategies that flowed from that meeting were outlined in the matrix included in the packet.

Under the topic of parking in the neighborhoods, it was noted that the draft vision addresses the concerns about additional traffic and safety by ensuring residential streets serve the access and parking needs of residents, and discourages non-residents from using the streets for parking and for the pick-up and drop-off of light rail riders.

Transportation Planner John Murphy said the four draft strategies included in the packet are intended to drill down to the specific concerns and comments in order to achieve the vision. The first two strategies are tailored to the RPZs specifically and focus on evaluating the notion of expanding the existing RPZs or creating a new one, and evaluating the current time restrictions in place for the RPZs. The third strategy addresses the hammerhead area in the northeast corner of the neighborhood and the need to monitor pick-up and drop-off activities once light rail is

operational, and to implement restrictions as needed. The fourth strategy is predicated on the notion of enforcing the RPZ restrictions to ensure their effectiveness.

With regard to the draft vision, Chair Lampe proposed replacing the word “discouraged” with “prohibited” to make the statement stronger.

Ms. Powell suggested the RPZs should be expanded to the south. Mr. Kattermann said there is a process involved to make sure there is support of the local residents, and that is what is proposed in the first draft strategy.

Turning to the topic of ped/bike improvements within the station area, Mr. Kattermann noted that the general direction regarding the need to improve ped/bike facilities in the station area; construct a pedestrian bridge over the light rail line; implement the recommendations of the Downtown Transportation Plan and Main Street Corridor study; design facilities within the walk area to improve access for all; and to enhance safety. The draft vision emphasized a safe and pleasant experience for all ages and abilities; filling in network gaps; assuring high-quality planning and design; and creating an accessible and attractive grade-separated crossing of the light rail tracks between Surrey Downs Park and 112th Avenue SE near the intersection with SE 6th Street.

Mr. Murphy noted that the draft strategies highlighted specific gaps in the network to be filled, called for installation of a crosswalk on Main Street for the east side of the intersection with 110th Avenue NE, stressed the need to conduct a planning level engineering study and cost estimate for constructing a pedestrian crossing of the light rail line, and developing and implementing a consistent design for the ped/bike network, including wayfinding.

Mr. Kattermann said the principles regarding the issue of the future look and feel of Main Street drew on the notion of being complementary to the downtown by continuing to reflect the distinction between the downtown and adjoining areas. The draft vision statement was crafted after the Committee discussed the issue. The vision statement talks about the Main Street corridor as a safe and inviting connection for pedestrian and bicyclists of all ages and abilities; calls for updating the street by including wider sidewalks and locating landscaping between the sidewalk and the street; continuing the feel of Old Bellevue where appropriate; and treating the north and south sides of the street differently in line with the adjacent neighborhood context.

Mr. Murphy said the draft strategies specifically direct the development and implementation of a design for Main Street that emphasizes safety and incorporates aspects of the look and feel of Old Bellevue along with wider sidewalks and planter strips, and the development and implementation of pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements along the entire corridor from Old Bellevue to 116th Avenue SE.

Mr. King suggested something should be said about Main Street continuing to be a major traffic corridor. The development going on in Old Bellevue, in conjunction with development of the East Main station and the redevelopment area, will only serve to increase traffic on the street and that fact should be made clear.

Senior Planner Kevin McDonald said the Transportation Commission spent several years looking at mobility for all modes in the downtown and for people getting to and from the downtown. Their recommendation was passed on to the Council in October 2013, and the Council subsequently gave direction to begin implementation of the recommendations. He explained that Main Street is intended to perform a number of different functions. It is intended to provide capacity for vehicles; it is intended to serve as a ped/bike route both along the corridor and in light of the larger citywide network of ped/bike facilities; and it is intended to accommodate transit as part of the Frequent Transit Network. There will be difficulties associated with the fact that the roadway cannot be widened because of development on both sides.

The Transportation Commission recommended conducting a Main Street corridor study in addition to all of the work that has already been done. The land use and transportation plan that was developed in the early 2000s included a recommendation to look at the function of Main Street and to look at how it works together with NE 2nd Street. Consideration was given to NE 2nd Street at some future time providing an additional connection with the freeway, leaving Main Street to serve more as a local access street with better ped/bike facilities and improved landscaping.

Early in the 2010s the Downtown Transportation Plan was developed. The Transportation Commission recognized that Main Street was in the same situation it was ten years earlier. A new study was launched that viewed it as an east-west connection. The study specifically looked at the intersections along Main Street that provide effective connections to and from the downtown. The Transportation Commission recommended looking at Main Street as an east-west arterial, looking at 106th Avenue and 108th Avenue as north-south arterials, and paying particular attention to how they function together.

Mr. McDonald said staff worked up a scope of work that would create a Main Street/106th Avenue/108th Avenue corridor study. The study is awaiting the staff capacity needed to carry it out. A number of higher priorities are being addressed first. One such priority is the multimodal level of service approach which ultimately will help inform the study. He explained that currently level of service is interpreted as the capacity of a roadway to move vehicles through intersections. However, roadways also serve pedestrians, bicycles and transit, so the desire is to move to a more comprehensive manner of measuring overall mobility. The multimodal level of service work is about to get under way. Once that project is finished there will be an understanding of what the metrics are for the different modes, and that will ultimately inform decisions about the roadway system by making it possible to evaluate the tradeoffs.

Mr. Kattermann explained that the Committee could recommend that Main Street should serve more of a pedestrian mode without having to say exactly what that would look like. The recommendation would then feed into the multimodal level of service analysis and the corridor studies. The Main Street corridor study that was done in 2008-2009 concluded that Main Street could serve more of a local function if NE 2nd Street were to be designed and built to carry more of the traffic.

Mr. King pointed out that in Old Bellevue there is a lot of parallel parking going on, and the same is happening on Main Street near 110th Avenue. That makes thoroughfare driving more difficult. He said he assumed the transportation study would consider all of that. Mr. Kattermann allowed that the issue will be addressed by the study.

Ms. Powell suggested the Committee could piggyback on what the Transportation Commission is doing by recommending more of an urban multimodal approach. Mr. McDonald said the work about to get under way on both the multimodal level of service approach and the corridor studies is based on recommendations from the Transportation Commission. In preparing the Downtown Transportation Plan, the Transportation Commission looked at the functions Main Street handles ranging from pedestrians to transit. As part of the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan, the Transportation Commission recommended consideration of the multimodal level of service approach that looks at movement along corridors, looks at the intersections along corridors, and possibly changes the level of service for different modes along corridors. In some places it may make the most sense to emphasize moving cars, while in other places it may be more appropriate to emphasize the pedestrian experience.

Chair Lampe said his sense was that the quantitative work will be addressed by the Transportation Commission, whereas the Committee's task is more qualitative in determining context. Mr. Kattermann said that was an accurate statement and said the question is whether or not that was adequately captured by the draft vision statement and strategies.

Mr. King suggested that as drafted the vision statement and strategies do not account for the fact that Main Street is a primary thoroughfare and that the demand for it will only increase over time. While NE 2nd Street may in time take some of the pressure off of Main Street, the vision and strategies should include a reference to being consistent with the function of Main Street relative to moving vehicular traffic. Mr. Kattermann asked if the focus should be on all modes of travel, to which Mr. King allowed that it should.

Mr. Breiland pointed out that when Mr. Pardo presented his vision of what the corridor could look like, which was great from the standpoint of pedestrians and bicyclists, the Committee did not jump at the idea of restricting the roadway to reduce the number of vehicles. The Committee at that time voiced a desire to balance the multimodal needs but deferring the appropriate design of Main Street to the corridor study.

Mr. Long agreed it would make the most sense to reference the multimodal needs of the Main Street corridor. The vision statement should be updated to include that reference. Mr. Kattermann said he would add some multimodal language to the vision and probably add a strategy as well acknowledging the future work to be done.

The group agreed to revise the third paragraph of the draft vision to read "The north and south sides of the street provide continuity of function of the adjoining...."

Ms. Powell said it is clear that something will have to give. It will not be possible to have bike lanes on both sides of the street, wide sidewalks, planter strips and parking and still

accommodate a full contingent of vehicle traffic. Mr. Breiland agreed. He said some things will need to change, but there will need to be a balance found.

With regard to the future look and feel of 112th Avenue SE, Mr. Kattermann noted that the Committee had talked about the roadway being more pedestrian oriented with wider sidewalks, a landscape strip, street trees and lighting. He said the draft vision incorporates that notion and calls for the corridor to retain its green, vegetated feel while making it safe and inviting for pedestrians and bicyclists of all ages and abilities to access the East Main station.

Mr. Murphy commented that there was only one draft strategy focused on bringing the draft vision to life. He noted, however, that redevelopment on the east side of 112th Avenue SE will be largely responsible for bringing about the improvements.

Mr. Kattermann said the Committee previously discussed storefronts, landscape setbacks and building height, all of which will inform the streetscape. The draft vision relative to how the new development fronting the east side of 112th Avenue SE should look calls for street-level activity set at the back of a wide sidewalk to create space for a landscape strip with large shade trees. The vision also entails businesses that cater to pedestrians, including sidewalk cafés. Additionally, new residential development should be designed to be welcoming with landscape strips along the street and front stoops or building entryways facing the sidewalk, with the taller buildings, especially office, sited closer to the freeway and pedestrian-scale buildings fronting 112th Avenue SE.

Mr. Murphy said the draft strategies call for developing and implementing design guidelines for the street frontage along 112th Avenue SE that allow and encourage an active pedestrian environment that includes wide sidewalks, landscape strips between the sidewalk and the traffic, large shade trees, and pedestrian-oriented storefronts and activities. They also call for establishing building setbacks at the back of sidewalks, encouraging front stoops for individual residential units fronting the sidewalk, creating attractive and well-defined entrances serving multiple residential units, additional setbacks for upper floors above three stories, and requiring taller buildings to either be located closer to the freeway or a minimum distance away from 112th Avenue SE.

Ms. Powell asked if having wider sidewalks would preclude having wider bicycle lanes. Mr. Kattermann said it would depend on how the street is ultimately designed and how much dedication is given to the sidewalk and the development that occurs along it. He reminded her that there will be a multipurpose path on the west side of 112th Avenue SE for use by both pedestrians and bicyclists, removing the need for a bike lane on the east side.

Mr. Long asked how many lanes 112th Avenue SE is likely to have. Mr. Kattermann said he was not sure it would be any different from what it is currently. Mr. Long said he would rather see the trees preserved even if that means a somewhat narrower sidewalk on the east side, and added that a lot of storefront retail facing the street is unlikely.

Mr. King said it would be good to investigate whether or not stoops have any implications relative to ADA access. Stoops tend to invite more activity on the street as people come and go.

Ms. Powell asked what is meant by the reference to wide sidewalks. Mr. Kattermann said it depends on the adjacent uses. Where a sidewalk café is involved, the sidewalk will need to be wider, possibly up to 23 feet wide with half of it taken up with seating. He said 12-foot sidewalks will probably be looked at as the minimum for the area. The minimum in the downtown is eight feet, though it goes up to 16 feet for some streets. The light rail station certainly will generate pedestrian activity, and depending on how the redevelopment area develops there will be additional office workers, residents and retail shoppers all using the sidewalk. Mr. Murphy added that the new pedestrian crossing of 112th Avenue SE to connect the east and west sides of the roadway will be created regardless of what happens in the redevelopment area.

Mr. Kattermann informed the Committee that the issues to be addressed at the next meeting will include the broader connectivity issues to the station from the wider area, neighborhood access, the future land uses for the redevelopment area, and the look and feel of the redevelopment area.

6. REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION MEMO

Mr. Kattermann noted that the Committee has made it clear in past discussions that traffic is an important issue. He stressed, however, that it is only one factor to consider when looking at land use. Mr. Murphy reminded the Committee that the modeling process is iterative and does not arbitrarily add in new information.

Mr. Long asked if it would be fair to say there is no model that can take all the available data and spit out exactly how many cars will travel through a particular intersection in 2015. Mr. Murphy allowed that modeling is not an exact science. Mr. McDonald added that a model will say how many vehicles will pass through an intersection based on all of the assumptions that go into the model, and the modeling process is quite good when it comes to comparing the differences between scenarios. The fact is that things change, often rapidly, so it is never possible to be entirely accurate when predicting the future.

Mr. Rogers asked what the margin of error is when it comes to modeling. He also pointed out that the public has claimed the Committee is working in a vacuum by focusing on only the study area. Mr. McDonald explained that the model is based on a much larger geographic area and takes into consideration the land use and transportation network citywide and regionally. The fact is, however, that the more confined a study area, the more specific information there is, and the more accurate the model becomes. The margin of error is reduced as the area of focus is reduced. The model does tend to overestimate.

A motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes was made by Mr. Long. The motion was seconded by Ms. Powell and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Powell commented that the neighborhood will be dramatically impacted by the addition of a lot more traffic, and that is not a good thing. Something will need to give when it comes to protecting the neighborhoods and assuring their livability. There will need to be some effective mitigation put in place.

Mr. Kattermann said the model will be able to tell what closing the two neighborhood entrances will do to the traffic patterns in light of holding everything else constant. It will not predict the actual number of cars that will use 108th Avenue SE, but it will indicate by order of magnitude how the patterns might shift. By the same token, that allows for testing various scenarios, such as adding a turn lane, a traffic signal or changing the timing. The model includes the projected growth citywide as a constant. Traffic related to the high school is also a constant in the model. What the Committee has a say over in terms of future traffic in the area is really related to the redevelopment scenarios.

Mr. Breiland pointed out that current conditions relative to overall growth, particularly in the downtown area, are untenable as far as the Bellecrest neighborhood is concerned. Growth within the redevelopment area will compound the concerns of the neighborhood. The modeling work is needed to understand by what magnitude the redevelopment area will change things.

Ms. Powell said the question is how the station area planning process can serve to mitigate the impacts on the Bellecrest and Surrey Downs neighborhoods. That question still needs to be addressed. Mr. Breiland pointed out that from an environmental perspective mitigation cannot be required for what is fundamentally set in place. Mitigation is tied to new impacts resulting from growth, and that is why it will be so important to identify the incremental change.

Mr. Rogers pointed out that the Committee's recommendations will be focused on a 20-year vision, but the development to come online will be there for a hundred years or more. There will undoubtedly be impacts on the neighborhoods, but the Committee's recommendation will be on behalf of the city as a whole.

Mr. Murphy said the model says that there will be increased traffic both at the city level and the regional level. Specific factors within the station area can alter the amount of change. The talk about ped/bike and neighborhood access improvements is all aimed at making sure people will feel safe and comfortable in light of the increased traffic.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Leshya Wig, 4811 134th Place SE, said her desire relative to redeveloping the Red Lion site is that it will be a high-quality development with lots of open space, gathering space, and landscaping. The view corridor policy caught everyone by surprise. She urged the Committee to carefully consider what would be appropriate in determining how much of either side of the base of Mt. Rainier should be visible. There are very significant implications for the Red Lion site depending on how the cone is drawn. There are a lot of cities between Bellevue and Mt. Rainier and should Newcastle or Renton or any other city decided to put in a very tall building, the views of Mt. Rainier could be obstructed and that would be something the city simply could not control. Depending on what point is used from the City Hall deck to measure the view corridor, the implications on the Red Lion site are drastic. Simply changing the point from one side of the deck to the other side of the deck can have significant implications on the site. The opportunity exists to create something on the Red Lion site that will be iconic and that will be good for the city as well as the neighborhoods, but imposing restrictions that are overly onerous could result in either no redevelopment or redevelopment with far less quality design.

Mr. Mon Wig, 4811 134th Place SE, said he liked the picture of the Pearl District in Portland that was shared with the Committee. He said locating the taller building closer to the freeway and putting storefront buildings facing 112th Avenue SE makes the most sense. The person walking on the street would not even know there are highrise buildings on the eastern portions of the redevelopment sites.

8. ADJOURN

Chair Lampe adjourned the meeting at 6:18 p.m.

DRAFT

EAST MAIN CAC – DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS
December 1, 2015

F. ISSUE/TOPIC: Pedestrian/bicycle connectivity to the station from the wider area.	
What additional connections to local and regional facilities should be provided?	
PRINCIPLES	DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS
<p>Optimize access to the station by people who live and work in the area and apply the principles of universal design to street and sidewalks providing access to the station.</p> <p>Facilitate bicycle access to the station by connecting to the city's network of bicycle routes. Connect the station area to adjacent neighborhoods.</p> <p><i>*Encourage development that is integrated into the station and/or neighborhood.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide weather protection where pedestrians need to wait (e.g. 112th and Main, crosswalk to station). 2. Connect the station area to surrounding neighborhoods outside the immediate station area and to the regional trail system by providing links to the city's pedestrian and bicycle network. 3. Provide signage to destinations beyond the immediate station area for pedestrians and bicyclists.

**From Light Rail Permit CAC Design Advisory Statement*

G. ISSUE/TOPIC: Neighborhood access (motorized and non-motorized).	
What changes, if any, should be made to remaining neighborhood access points?	
PRINCIPLES	DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS
<p>Balance vehicular access needs with traffic issues by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discouraging cut-through traffic. • identifying residential streets that may support traffic calming measures. • recognizing that vehicular access will be reduced by closure of direct access to 112th Avenue SE. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluate potential modifications to neighborhood entrances in order to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continue to discourage cut-through traffic; b. Improve safety for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists; and c. Facilitate vehicular access for residents. 2. <i>Identify and monitor key routes through the neighborhood before and after the closures of SE 4th Street and SE 1st Place to determine where additional traffic calming measures may be needed.</i> 3. <i>Update the city's traffic calming guidelines to incorporate criteria and measures for high-pedestrian traffic areas around light rail stations.</i>

NOTE: Non-italicized draft statements are proposals based on previous discussion and/or direction from the CAC. *Italicized draft statements are a starting point for discussion and consideration by the CAC.*

EAST MAIN CAC – DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS
December 1, 2015

H. ISSUE/TOPIC: Future land uses for redevelopment area.	
What mix and scale of uses could best serve and complement the existing and future community?	
PRINCIPLES	DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS
<p>Be complementary to the community by providing services that are desired by/meet the needs of the community.</p> <p>Be complementary to the Downtown by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continuing to reflect the distinction between Downtown and adjoining areas; • focusing on land use, economic development and urban form on a niche or niches not being met Downtown. <p>Draw people who live and work in the area to the redevelopment by including a mix of uses and activities rather than big-box retail or a single-use corporate campus.</p> <p>Optimize use of the station with land uses that increase potential ridership.</p> <p><i>*Encourage development that is integrated into the station and/or neighborhood and includes housing as well as other uses and higher urban scale densities.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow for flexibility that will provide a variety and mix of uses that predominantly serve the walk area: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Encourage retail and service uses; b. <i>Allow for limited office uses that desire space close to but less expensive than Downtown; and</i> c. <i>Allow multi-family residential uses in a variety of types and levels of affordability.</i> 2. Create an active area during daytime and evening hours, including a community center and recreational uses. 3. Allow redevelopment of OLB north of SE 6th Street at a scale between current zoning and proposed DTN-OLB north of Main St: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Allow building heights of up to 200 feet with taller buildings generally located closer to Main Street or I-405.</i> b. <i>Allow sites to achieve a floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 4.0 using a bonus/incentive system.</i> 4. Allow redevelopment of OLB south of SE 6th Street at a scale greater than current zoning but less than new zoning in OLB between SE 6th and Main St: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Allow building heights of up to 150 feet.</i> b. <i>Allow sites to achieve a FAR of up to 2.0 using a bonus/incentive system.</i> 5. Design mixed-use development that emphasizes walking, bicycling and transit use as ways to maximize investment in light rail and reduce the number of automobile trips. 6. <i>Analyze critical intersections near the redevelopment area for potential traffic impacts and design options to maximize safety and balance mobility of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders and motorists.</i>

**From Light Rail Permit CAC Design Advisory Statement*

NOTE: Non-italicized draft statements are proposals based on previous discussion and/or direction from the CAC. *Italicized draft statements are a starting point for discussion and consideration by the CAC.*

EAST MAIN CAC – DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS
December 1, 2015

I. ISSUE/TOPIC: Future look and feel of redevelopment area. What design characteristics are important to include in the “new neighborhood?”	
PRINCIPLES	DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS
<p>Be complementary to the community by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing noise attenuation to the west from I-405. • incorporating a significant amount of trees and green space into the development. <p>Draw people who live and work in the area to the redevelopment by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating an active, people-oriented environment with trees and green spaces and smaller walkable blocks. • locating parking structures away from the edges of 112th Avenue SE and Main Street. <p>Put “eyes on the station” for better security.</p> <p>Create a network of streets in the redevelopment area with smaller blocks that support pedestrian and bicycle use and are well connected to the non-motorized network.</p> <p><i>*Encourage development that is pedestrian-oriented and places an emphasis on being “a place, not a project.”</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employ site and building design and other techniques to reduce noise from I-405. 2. <i>Create an enhanced pedestrian experience within the redevelopment area using a variety of methods and facilities such as short, walkable blocks; storefronts and sidewalk cafes; landscaping, lighting and street furniture; play areas; water features; and plazas.</i> 3. <i>Place parking predominantly in structures underground or internal to development and behind buildings with storefronts or building lobbies.</i> 4. <i>Evaluate current and TOD parking requirements to determine appropriate ratios for redevelopment.</i> 5. <i>Apply principles of safe environmental design that incorporate high visibility and appropriate lighting of public spaces.</i> 6. <i>Use trees and green space to “soften” the visual dominance of building facades and paved areas.</i>

**From Light Rail Permit CAC Design Advisory Statement*

NOTE: Non-italicized draft statements are proposals based on previous discussion and/or direction from the CAC. *Italicized draft statements are a starting point for discussion and consideration by the CAC.*