



Bellevue Planning Commission

Wednesday, July 8, 2015

6:30 to 9:30 p.m. ■ 1E-113

City Hall ■ 450 110th Avenue NE, Bellevue

Agenda

Regular Meeting

- 6:30 p.m.
1. **Call to Order**
Michelle Hilhorst, Chairperson
 2. **Roll Call**
Michelle Hilhorst, Chairperson
 3. **Public Comment***
Limited to 5 minutes per person or 3 minutes if a public hearing has been held on your topic
 4. **Approval of Agenda**
 5. **Communications from City Council, Community Council, Boards and Commissions**
 6. **Staff Reports**
Paul Inghram, Comprehensive Planning Manager
 7. **Draft Minutes Review**
 - March 25
 8. **Study Session**
- 7:00 p.m.
- A. **Downtown Livability**
Continued review of the CAC recommendations on Downtown Livability Land Use Code Update
Patti Wilma, Community Development Manager; Emil King, Strategic Planning Manager
 9. **Public Comment*** - *Limited to 3 minutes per person*
 10. **Next Planning Commission Meeting**
July 22 – Downtown Livability/Land Use Code; Eastgate/I-90 Land Use Code Amendments
- 8:30 p.m.
11. **Adjourn**

Pg. 1

Agenda times are approximate

Planning Commission members

Michelle Hilhorst, Chair
John deVadoss, Vice Chair
Jeremy Barksdale
John Carlson

Aaron Laing
Anne Morisseau
Stephanie Walter

John Stokes, Council Liaison

Staff contact:

Paul Inghram 452-4070
Michelle Luce 452-6931

** 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).



July 1, 2015

SUBJECT

Downtown Livability Initiative – Land Use Code Update

STAFF CONTACT

Emil King AICP, Strategic Planning Manager 452-7223 eaking@bellevuewa.gov
Patti Wilma, Community Development Manager 452-4114 pwilma@bellevuewa.gov
Planning and Community Development

DIRECTION NEEDED FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

- Action
- Discussion
- Information

Based on Council direction on May 26, 2015, the Planning Commission has commenced their review of the Downtown Livability Citizen Advisory Committee's (CAC) recommendations for Downtown Land Use Code updates. At the June 24th study session the Commission began detailed review of CAC recommendations covering the following topics:

- Public Open Spaces
- Pedestrian Corridor
- Design Guidelines
- Amenity Incentive System

At the July 8th Study Session the Commission is requested to continue review of the CAC recommendations covering the following topics:

- Station Area Planning
- Building Height and Form
- Downtown Parking
- Other Topics (mechanical screening, food trucks, etc.)

Staff will highlight recent direction from Council related to the recommendations, inter-relationships between recommendations, areas identified for additional analysis, and those to be considered in other City efforts. The Planning Commission will be asked to begin to identify items that could proceed toward amendment drafting, those that require additional analysis, and types of information that would aid review of the amendments.

- What topics or items do you see as complicated/controversial vs straightforward?
- What further information or analysis do you need to accomplish this Code Update?

- What topics or items call for additional of targeted public outreach?

Staff anticipates the Commission's work to take a number of months and will involve significant review, analysis and public engagement. The Planning Commission will ultimately form a recommended Code and design guideline package to transmit to Council for final action.

BACKGROUND

Council launched the Downtown Livability Initiative in 2013 to update the Downtown Land Use Code. A Council-appointed CAC was tasked with developing recommendations that built upon the City's successes and furthered the *Great Place Strategy* in the Downtown Subarea Plan. The Downtown Land Use Code has not been significantly updated since its inception in 1981 and does not reflect changes to the Downtown Subarea Plan that occurred in 2004.

Great Place Strategy: To remain competitive in the next generation, Downtown Bellevue must be viable, livable, memorable, and accessible. It must become the symbolic as well as functional heart of the Eastside Region through the continued location of cultural, entertainment, residential, and regional uses located in distinct, mixed-use neighborhoods connected by a variety of unique public places and great public infrastructure.

Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Recommendations

The Final Report of the Downtown Livability CAC details the process, community engagement, and full set of recommendations developed by the group. Public outreach for the Downtown Livability Initiative involved a concerted effort to engage a broad spectrum of stakeholder communities. The CAC's recommendations are those of the group as a whole and, for each topic, include a reference to their relationship to livability.

The CAC set a broad framework for moving forward, and recognized that much additional work was needed to develop the fine-grain details needed for technical Code amendments. The recommendations represent the culmination of the CAC's work, but are a mid-point in the overall process.

Hard copies of the CAC's Final Report and Land Use Code Audits were handed out to the Commission on June 10th. All project materials may be found on the Downtown Livability web page at: www.bellevuewa.gov/downtown-livability.htm

NEXT STEPS

The Commission is currently calendared to continue work on the Downtown Livability Initiative on July 8 and July 22. The Commission is off for the month of August, with work, including a joint workshop with the City Council, continuing in the fall.

A walking tour (open to the public) will also be scheduled for an upcoming date when all Commissioners as well as Council liaison John Stokes are available. This will build upon the April 22, 2015, Downtown walking tour a number of the current Planning Commissioners participated in.



Planning Commission Schedule

July 8, 2015

The Bellevue Planning Commission typically meets on the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month. Meetings begin at 6:30 p.m. and are held in the Council Conference Room (Room 1E-113) at City Hall, unless otherwise noted. Public comment is welcome at each meeting.

The schedule and meeting agendas are subject to change. Please confirm meeting agendas with city staff at 425-452-6931. Agenda and meeting materials are posted the Monday prior to the meeting date on the city's website at:

<http://www.bellevuewa.gov/planning-commission-agendas-2014.htm>

<u>Date</u>	<u>Tentative Agenda Topics</u>
July 22	Downtown Livability/Land Use Code
August	<i>No Commission meetings in August</i>
Sept 9	Eastgate Land Use Code
Sept 16	Potential retreat date
Sept 23	Downtown Livability/Land Use Code
Oct 14	Eastgate Land Use Code
Oct 28	Downtown Livability/Land Use Code
Nov 11	tbd
Nov 25	<i>No meeting</i>
Dec 9	tbd
Dec 23	<i>No meeting</i>

Joint Board and Commission Meeting (August 18, 2015)

Staff is coordinating a Joint Bellevue Board and Commission Meeting in support of Bellevue's commitment to promoting an accessible, well-connected pedestrian and bicycle network that enhances livability, supports economic vitality and serves the mobility needs of our community.

The joint meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 18 from 9 AM to 12 PM at the Seattle Municipal Tower (700 Fifth Avenue; Seattle 98104). Directions to the building are at: <http://www.seattlemunicipaltower.com/directions.axis>.

If you plan on driving to this meeting; be advised that parking is a reimbursable expense. Simply retain your receipt and provide it to Paul Inghram for processing by Bellevue Accounts Payable staff.

Please take a moment to confirm your participation at this joint meeting on the Outlook appointment you received. As soon as we know how many attendees are expected we'll be able to secure an appropriately sized meeting room and email the group.

From: Al and Becky Hopwood <kb7thx@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 8:31 PM
To: PlanningCommission
Subject: Summary of a citizen's concers

July 1, 2015

Dear Planning Commission,

As a three year resident of downtown I have been following, reading, researching, listening, asking questions, and attending meetings and presentations in order to stay current on Bellevue's Downtown Livability study and implementation. In the process I too developed a personal list of desired components and concerns and have shared these via emails with council members over the past year. I now share them with you as well. Following are copies of individual letters expressing my concerns that were sent to Bellevue's City Council Members.

November 14, 2014

Dear Council Members,

I would like to speak to the city's comprehensive plan and specifically The Downtown Livability Study.

The first component of the Comprehensive Plan states that there should be public participation. The downtown segment is called The Livability Study but the public participation has been primarily limited to feedback from builders and land owners who comprise the misnamed Downtown Bellevue Residents Association. The downtown livability study needs to extract feedback from those living in downtown and not limit decision making to the opinions of land owners, developers and architects. The city focus group meetings I have attended have been populated primarily by those with vested interests.

Regarding the proposed building height increase to 600 feet in the 1a core: A very important oversight in the proposed plan is the fact that a building's FAR cap only applies to commercial buildings. As a building's height goes from 450 to 600 feet the individual floor plates must get smaller thus the total square footage of a 600 foot building would be exactly the SAME as a 450 foot building is the way it has been presented. HOWEVER, this only applies to commercial buildings. Residential FAR is UNLIMITED and hotels are considered residential. This is a critical over site that needs to be addressed.

In addition the proposed height increase in 2b increases the FAR from 3 to 6 and 3a is another proposed downtown FAR increase. Increased density creates all the wows that downtown residents are concerned with. Even non downtown residents are becoming reluctant to come downtown due to extreme traffic congestion and lack of parking. Increased density could kill the Bellevue "goose that has laid our golden egg."

Regarding parking: The buildings already approved or under construction will add 12,000 additional downtown parking spaces. However, the projected additional downtown employee population will increase by 34,000. Where will people park?

Before adapting a new Comprehensive Plan please take into account the consequences of each of the proposed changes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Allan B. Hopwood
10070 NE 4th St Unit 2706
Bellevue, WA 98004
Kb7thx@hotmail.com
206.409.6079

December 1, 2014

Dear Council Member,

I am concerned that “the city’s left hand may not know what the right hand is doing” (or so it appears) when it comes to planning for downtown livability.

I live downtown and experience firsthand the community’s frustration with traffic congestion and lack of parking. Both are current serious problems for the city yet the city doesn’t seem to acknowledge that we have a problem. On October 16 Mark Poch, Traffic Engineering Manager, told the Meydenbauer Bay Neighbors Association that the city projects that we will not experience congested traffic until after 2030. Yet we have a road rage level of congestion already.

The just released Washington State Department of Transportation study of I 405 traffic flow through Bellevue confirms our problem is real today. It now takes 39% longer to commute through Bellevue than it did just two years ago.

Increasing the building heights in 1a district of downtown to 600 feet and MU district heights to 300 feet only makes the problem worse.

A city downtown transportation plan states today’s population downtown is 8,000 yet city officials have told me the current population is 10,000+and that does not include the 3,600 apartment units already under construction. Please before approving a Comprehensive Plan that will increase density first develop a plan for transportation and parking.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Allan B. Hopwood
10070 NE 4th St Unit 2706
Bellevue, WA 98004
Kb7thx@hotmail.com
206.409.6079

January 9 2015

Dear Councilman,

In September 2014 KIRO TV reported that our area is one of the fastest growing on the west coast. During the 9/24/2014 Bellevue Planning Commission meeting testimony revealed that Bellevue is the second best city in the entire country to live in based upon various livability criteria. Bellevue's own literature has described Bellevue as "a city in a park."

The goal of the city's Downtown Livability Study and Comprehensive Plan is to extend our enviable quality of life well into the future. A great, no-one-can-find-fault-with, idea; however, a Downtown Livability Study should seek feedback from those that live in downtown and not limit their decision making to input from developers and land owners. As a downtown resident I have concerns regarding the apparent direction of future land use.

Before any of the already approved downtown building projects are completed, downtown is already showing signs of stress with traffic, pedestrian and parking problems. Currently nearly 50,000 commuters work in downtown and I405 is frequently stopped bumper-to-bumper both north and south bound during morning and afternoon rush hours. Office buildings already under construction or approved for construction will add an additional 34,000 commuters to the already jammed roadways. The buildings under development will provide additional parking spaces, but only 13,000 additional spots are provided in the city's approved plans. The current situation with our "wedding cake" and 450 foot height limits is a parking shortfall of 20,000 parking stalls. This does not include parking for the additional 3,600 residential units nor any of the shoppers coming to the approximately one million square feet of commercial space already approved.

If one out of five of the 34,000 additional commuters carpool with a coworker that still leaves 27,200 additional cars coming to downtown Bellevue each day. The average American car is 16 feet long. 27,200 additional cars would be a bumper to bumper, no space in between, string of cars 82 miles long. This does not include ANY of the current traffic or allow any additional traffic for retail shoppers or residents.

The Livability Study and Comprehensive Plan are considering raising the height limit to 600 feet. This will only make our parking, traffic and pedestrian safety problems much worse than they already are. An important point regarding building height that was shared with me by a city employee is the fact that as a building goes from 450 to 600 feet the individual floor plates must get smaller. The FAR would remain the same for a 600 foot building as a 450 foot building. There would be no increase in density is the way it is presented. However, this applies only to commercial buildings. Residential buildings have no FAR cap and hotels are considered residential. This is critical oversight in the proposed Land Use Code that needs to be addressed.

Increased density creates all the woes that I and my neighbors are concerned with. Please consider the impacts of each livability proposal before making a decision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Allan B. Hopwood
10070 NE 4th St Unit 2706
Bellevue, WA 98004
Kb7thx@hotmail.com
206.409.6079

February 9, 2015

Dear Council Member,

I wish to express my concern about the city's proposed Comprehensive Plan and specifically the Downtown Livability component.

The proposed increased density in 1a where residential FAR is currently unlimited, 2b's proposed FAR increase from 3 to 6 and 3a's increase from 3 to 5 will result in added downtown density potentially resulting in delayed response for both police and fire. Has this been taken into account?

Already on a sunny day during the noon hour there are so many pedestrians on the sidewalk some opt to walk in the street. The proposed increased density will exacerbate the situation. Pedestrians waiting for the walk/wait sign are now at risk from drivers making right hand turns. Jay walking is now common place; it too will only get worse with increased traffic density. Has this been taken into account?

The current sidewalk width seems adequate on some streets (by Safeway and at the PSE building on NE 4th for example) but far too narrow and too close to speeding traffic on other streets. Planting curbside trees will add some protection for pedestrians as well as soften the hardscape and help recapture our city's dwindling tree canopy that has been reduced by 40% since 2007. Has this been taken into account?

Inadequate parking for employees, residents, shoppers, guests and the handicapped are already a huge problem. My building, for example, has 1500 residents with zero guest parking and zero handicapped parking. This should not be permitted in the future. Has this been taken into account?

I urge the City Council to reject any Comprehensive Plan that does not address parking, traffic and pedestrian safety; three important components to downtown livability.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,
Allan B. Hopwood
10070 NE 4th St Unit 2706
Bellevue, WA 98004
Kb7thx@hotmail.com
206.409.6079

May 28, 2015

Dear City Council Members,

During the May 18th city council study session I was encouraged by council members comments that echoed my concerns. Specifically "we know traffic projections and if we increase FAR it would be so much worse", "we can't do anything without first addressing parking", "we want to do the right thing", "we need first to address

incentives”, “keep perimeter height lower”, “building locations can be ‘tweaked’ so as not to block views.” Buoyed by the council’s comments I felt your concerns matched my own and I was eagerly looking forward to the next meeting.

Then at the May 26 city council study session they disappointed me. I naively thought my city council would see to it that the planning commission would get a plan for the future that addressed all of our mutual concerns and would continue Bellevue’s place as one of the best cities in America. But then they admitted that council’s hasty decisions in the past had resulted in “building projects that had not turned out as the council had hoped”. That was followed by a rapid vote to pass the CAC proposal onto the planning commission so as not to miss the current building boom without first agreeing to any of the vital components within the plan. I hope that their seemingly premature passage of the CAC will not mean Bellevue will be saddled with open-for-interpretation-consequences for decades to come.

As a resident of Bellevue Towers we bought a unit 270 feet high knowing the wedding cake would protect us by limiting height in the Chipotle block to 250 feet. Now you are proposing to increase that to 300 feet negating my already dwindling view. There was a lot of discussion at the council meeting about the city’s to improve the neighborhood experience and protect views. Bellevue Towers is a “neighborhood” of 1,500 residents please take steps to protect us too.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Allan B. Hopwood
10070 NE 4th St Unit 2706
Bellevue, WA 98004
Kb7thx@hotmail.com
206.409.6079

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

March 25, 2015
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Laing, Commissioners Carlson, Hamlin, Hilhorst, Tebelius, deVadoss, Walter, Councilmember Stokes

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Diane Tebelius

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Inghram, Department of Planning and Community Development; Catherine Drews, Department of Development Services; Lori Rirodan, City Attorney's Office; Kevin McDonald, Department of Transportation

COUNCIL LIAISON: Councilmember Stokes

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:37 p.m. by Chair Laing who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

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

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. James Lowe, 1044 145th Place NE, said he lives very close to one of the houses in which individual rooms are rented out. The proposal to limit the number of people in boarding houses to four, and to require enough off-street parking for all four, is good. However, at the boarding house near where he lives has enough parking for each resident but the residents choose not to use it because it requires parking behind each other. As a result they all end up parking on the street, which is not acceptable to the neighborhood. It would be better to require off-street parking that must be used.

Ms. Agnes, last name not given, a resident of Harrington House, 15980 NE 8th Street, voiced support for affordable housing and transportation. She said Harrington House deals with pregnant women, newborns and toddlers 15 months and younger.

Ms. Alisa, last name not given, also a resident of Harrington House, said she has been a resident for over a year. She said Bellevue is a great place to raise her son, far better than south Seattle where she was raised. There is a great need for affordable housing. Many who are homeless want the chance to have a better life for themselves and their children.

Ms. Karen Tennyson, 12617 NE 87th Place, Kirkland, said she was born in affordable housing and was lucky enough to eventually move into a home in a neighborhood that had great social and economic diversity. That allowed her to see other ways in which to choose to live her life. She urged the Commission to put affordable housing high on the list and said it will bring many gifts to the city.

Mr. Chris Rossman with the Wolf Company, address not given, said the company has an interest in a property in the Eastgate corridor. He said the company is a proponent for a mix of uses and housing types, including affordable and market rate. In studying the plan, the company believes the target for increasing density and adding residential zones will increase the ability to add more affordable housing in the city at various income levels. The Eastgate plan targets density at five or six stories but there needs to be an FAR of 2.0 to 2.5 to support that level of density. The concern is that if the city does not allow for enough density the commercial uses will simply be perpetuated and that will limit adding new residential units. A lower FAR as it relates to a residential community will yield low-rise housing with surface parking, which is the traditional suburban model.

Mr. David Pater, 1614 144th Avenue SE, said he has been working with his neighborhoods on the single room rental issue since May 2013. He said his home is across the street from one of the properties that rents single rooms and there is a regular turnover of residents. The established regulations have been exceeded by the use and there have been cars parked everywhere. Developers are buying up single family properties and converting them into single room rental establishments, and they are doing it because the economics work. The practice clearly is a symptom of Bellevue's lack of affordable housing. It is good the city is working toward a final solution for a use that is not appropriate for single family neighborhoods. Limiting the number of unrelated adults and defining what that means is a good step. There is a need for the city to seriously consider a rental registration program because depending on complaints from neighbors is unreliable.

Ms. Anne Osterburg, 10435 NE 15th Street, said she is retired and lives in a neighborhood with 50s-style ramblers that are being replaced by McMansions valued at \$2.5 million. She said she fears Bellevue will end up as an enclave where only the richest people can afford to live. The Commission should strengthen the draft of the Housing Element before sending it to the City Council. The private market on its own is not able to provide the amount of affordable housing needed. Policy language should be included that calls for planning for and funding the city's regional share of affordable housing at the very low-income, low-income and moderate-income levels. There should also be mandatory requirements for affordable units in residential development, and the staff recommendations for affordable housing in the downtown and near transit should be included as policies in the Housing Element.

Chair Laing noted for the record that a half dozen hands were raised in support of the comments made.

Mr. Tom Fisher, 3338 162nd Place SE, voiced his support for the comments made by Mr. Pater. He said his home is across the street from a single family home that has been turned into a single room rental use. There have at times been more than four people sharing the house. The college kids who have stayed there have been much better neighbors than most. The home gains access via a private street and that has caused many problems. The proposed ordinance is a step in the right direction, but of course enforcement will be key. A rental registration program is needed in

the city with fees that would be used for enforcement.

Ms. Barbara Benson, 14405 SE 17th Street, said the Spiritwood neighborhood is very happy that the permanent regulations on single room rentals are imminent. She noted that the definition of family has been revised to include not more than four unrelated adults living together as a single housekeeping unit, with some exceptions allowed, including minor dependent children regularly residing in the residence. She asked if there are any other exceptions, if the Director will be the decision maker relative to the number of allowable children, if the Director is to be involved any time a lease is signed that involves children in addition to four adults. It is not clear what rules will apply during the amortization period which allows existing single room rentals in single family zones a year to come into compliance. The emergency ordinance currently in effect will be repealed with the permanent ordinance and that could mean reverting to the existing rooming house code for a year, and that would be moving backward. During the interim the number of residents should be limited to four.

Ms. Osha Morningstar, 10022 Meydenbauer Way SE, #315, highlighted the need for more affordable and accessible cultural opportunities in Bellevue, especially if the city is going to give \$2 million to the Tateuchi Center. Additionally, there are many people who would like to be able to live in Bellevue but who cannot afford to do so. There are people commuting all the way from Tacoma just to clean Bellevue buildings in the evenings and they make only about \$11 per hour. There is a living building challenge for affordable housing that will decrease the need of residents to pay utilities through developing net zero structures. Affordable housing can be successful where there is retail or other uses on the ground level. There is a great need to accommodate aging in place, and to address racial equity in housing. There should be policy language calling for the implementation of best practices relative to affordable housing. Additionally, the vision statement should address inclusion, accessibility, equal opportunities, sustainability and co-existence.

Mr. Steven Fricke, 14430 SE 19th Place, implored the Commission to pass the single room rental ordinance. He said everyone was patting themselves on the back, including the Council, the Commission and the neighborhoods, but now more revisions are planned. It will never be possible to draft a perfect ordinance and the Commission should act to approve the draft and move forward.

Ms. Liz Mills with YWCA Seattle/King County/Snohomish County, 1118 5th Avenue, Seattle, said the organization serves about 35,000 people annually and works to eliminate racism and empower women. Part of the vision for the community includes safe and stable housing for everyone. The organization supports measures that make housing accessible for homeless and low-income women and families, prevent homelessness, and that create more affordable housing. The organization owns and operates 813 units of affordable housing, of which 256 are on the Eastside and 64 are in Bellevue. The organization also owns and operates 72 units of time-limited housing, also called emergency shelter or transitional housing, of which 20 are on the Eastside serving homeless families. It is increasingly difficult to find permanent housing in Bellevue and other Eastside communities. It is also very challenging for the organization's staff who want to live in Bellevue. The task of updating the Comprehensive Plan opens the door to taking bold steps, including securing a sustainable revenue source for the ARCH housing trust fund; supporting non-profits in their efforts to site affordable housing and when applying for county, state and federal funding; repurposing surplus properties when it makes sense for the development of affordable housing; expanding development incentives that will result in a diverse range of housing options; and supporting affordable housing in mixed use neighborhoods

near transit and jobs.

Ms. Kayla Schott-Bressler with the Housing Development Consortium, 1402 3rd Avenue, Seattle, said the organization is the primary affordable housing, membership and advocacy group in King County with over 114 members working to make sure everyone in King County can have a safe, healthy and affordable home. Much has been said about the deep need for affordable housing in Bellevue. Bellevue has a long way to go but there are tools that can get the city to where it needs to be.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked what tools are available to the city that are not currently being used. Ms. Schott-Bressler said one tool is the use of surplus land, a tool that has been recommended by city staff and one that is being used in other cities. Another tool is calling out for affordable housing specifically in the downtown, something that is clearly in line with the Downtown Livability Initiative. The Comprehensive Plan should also include strong statements about funding the ARCH housing trust fund, and incentives or requirements to provide affordable housing.

Ms. Leslie Miller, 3545 109th Place NE, voiced support for affordable housing in Bellevue. She said her vision for Bellevue entails a just and environmentally responsible community. The only way to achieve that is by having housing for all people who work in Bellevue regardless of their incomes. There also need to be affordable units for people who cannot work. Concrete and strategic plans are needed to assure housing units that are affordable to the full range of incomes. Both incentives and mandatory requirements are needed.

Chair Laing noted for the record that about eight hands were raised in support of the comments made.

Ms. Loretta Lopez spoke as president of the Bridle Trails Community Club. With regard to Policy HO-16, she suggested the last phrase should be revised to read "...where expressly allowed by neighborhood subarea plans." The clarification is needed to make it clear where detached or attached accessory dwelling units are allowed. Allowing detached accessory dwelling units equates to a rezone of single family areas, and accordingly the city should go through the formal rezone process so everyone will know their properties will be converted to multifamily from single family.

Chair Laing noted that several hands were raised in support of the comments.

Ms. Becky Lewis, 16552 SE 19th Street, stressed the need for Bellevue to be a leader rather than a follower. The fact is, however, Redmond, Kirkland and Issaquah have more affordable housing per capita than Bellevue has, largely because of their requirements.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Councilmember Stokes stressed the importance of having the Planning Commission and the City

Council work together. He said some issues had been raised concerning the single family room rental ordinance and there is a need to get it right. The Council is looking forward to receiving the Commission's final recommendation so it can act to make the ordinance permanent. Clearly implementation will be important and to that end the staff are gearing up to make sure the ordinance will not simply be a document sitting on the shelf.

With regard to affordable housing, Councilmember Stokes said everyone is trying to work through the issues in the best way possible. Bellevue believes its strength lies in its diversity and part of the challenge in that is providing housing for all income levels. The Commission's work on the issue is vitally important in that it sets forth the needed policy guidance.

Councilmember Stokes suggested that the language of Policy HO-16 does not in any way imply a change of zoning. The city is constantly looking at how it can do things better, but it is always with the neighborhoods and the community involved.

6. STAFF REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Manager Paul Inghram noted that the Commission's desk packet included a number of items related to the Comprehensive Plan as well as two items supplied by former Commission Margo Blacker.

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Single Family Room Rentals

Chair Laing explained that subsequent the Commission's recommendation to the Council in the fall of 2014, some additional information was generated through the City Attorney's Office. In light of that information, the Commission was asked by the Council to take another look at the ordinance.

Legal Planner Catherine Drews brought to the table two limited revisions to the proposed ordinance: 1) a specific exemption for unrelated adults who live together as the functional equivalent of a family; and 2) clarification that related people living together in a household are considered a single housekeeping unit. With regard to the first revision, she explained that unrelated persons who live together and share the costs for maintenance, food and utilities in the same way a family would under a single lease agreement should be considered to be the functional equivalent of a family.

Commissioner Walter asked if that definition would apply to a group of single parents and their children who decided collectively to live together under a single roof. Under such a scenario, there could effectively be three or four families living in a single house under a single lease. Ms. Drews said in the event of a complaint the group would have to demonstrate to the Director that they meet the five factors of a functional equivalent of a family.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked what the confidence level is that the city will act to enforce the ordinance once it is adopted. Ms. Drews said the city's code enforcement is complaint based. Complaints can be filed using the city's online system, or they contact code enforcement directly by phone. All complaints filed initiate an investigation.

Commissioner Carlson pointed out that people have complained that the existing code has been

repeatedly violated without consequence. Changing the code but not acting to enforce it will result in nothing. Ms. Drews said the proposed code gives the city the tools it needs to do the enforcement the neighborhoods are looking for. The most important element is the moving of boarding and rooming houses out of single family neighborhoods; that will go a long way toward alleviating complaints.

Commissioner deVadoss asked what data is in hand relative to how many exemptions will need to be made. City Attorney Lori Riordan said there is no firm data available. When the interim regulations were brought to the Council, work was done to create a legislative record that involved looking at cities around the country, particularly college towns, where the phenomenon of single room rentals was known to exist. That information did not, however, include an indication of how many complaints might be generated. The city will track the complaints and will within a few months have some data to rely on. Commissioner deVadoss expressed concern that the exemption could open the door to problems.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if, in those instances where a group must prove to the Director that they live together as the functional equivalent of a family, a public record will be created. Ms. Drews said every decision made by the Director is a public record.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Walter about keeping the interim ordinance in effect until the amortization period ends, and possibly shortening the amortization period to coincide with the end of the current school year, Ms. Riordan said that is something that would need to be studied and discussed with the Council. The proposed ordinance includes changes to the rooming and boarding house regulations and one of the reasons there is an amortization period is to avoid claims of violations of constitutional rights by removing property rights without giving opportunity to change practices. She said it may be possible to separate the single family room rentals from the rooming and boarding house regulations.

Ms. Riordan explained that in looking at private property rights and personal relationships, care must be taken to avoid creating causes of action based on claims of being treated differently from others who are similarly situated. Around the country, the litigation history reveals that where there is a test for functional equivalent of a family, successful litigation can be avoided.

Commissioner Carlson asked what is to keep eight unrelated people from renting a house under a single lease and calling themselves a family. Ms. Riordan said that certainly is possible. Commissioner Carlson said the exemption could create a loophole that will bring things back to where they stand currently. Ms. Riordan said the problem that has been expressed by the public involves people who are transients living in houses that have been chopped up, and who sometimes cook for themselves and have no real relationship to anyone else in the house or anyone in the neighborhood. The definition of functional equivalent of a family includes an arrangement under which the individuals share common areas and payment for all bills, and living arrangements that are not of a transient nature. Month-to-month agreements will not pass the test.

Commissioner Carlson suggested that an enterprising landlord could arrange a single meeting with people who are otherwise strangers in which they become familiar with each other and agree to share the living room and all expenses, thereby meeting the test of the functional equivalent of a family. Enforcement will be key, but some of the elements of the proposed exemption would be very difficult to enforce absent having cameras in the house. Ms. Riordan agreed that there are challenges to any kind of regulation that requires the city for code

enforcement purposes to get inside someone's home. The problem is not unique to the proposed ordinance; it extends to allegations of homes that have two kitchens or remodeling work done without a permit. A large number of cars parked on the street, or always coming and going, is generally an indicator of something other than a single family living situation, although large families could also spill out onto the street. The code enforcement officers are poised to address those issues. The test for functional equivalent of a family is intended to make neighborhoods feel more like a neighborhood. Commissioner Carlson suggested that such requirements would be impossible to enforce.

Answering a question asked by Chair Laing, Ms. Drews said when a code enforcement complaint is received, it is assigned to a code enforcement officer. The officer attempts to make contact with the person or persons responsible for the violation and will look into as many external factors as possible. Where there is a question as to whether or not a group is living as the functional equivalent of a family, the residents would be requested to provide documentation that demonstrates the factors set forth in the test are met. The Director would then review the information and issue a written decision. If the elements of the test are not met, the city can initiate an enforcement action. There is an appeal process in place for code enforcement actions.

Commissioner deVadoss asked if it is possible the city could seek to determine what percent of the renters in the city fall under the scenario addressed by the proposed ordinance, and based on the data subsequently come back and reevaluate the ordinance. Ms. Riordan said that could be done. The Land Use Code is not a static document and in fact it changes quite frequently. The proposed approach has been used successfully by other cities, but if for some reason the city does not get complaints, or gets complaints that are not sustained, or the appellate process does not work out well for the neighborhoods, the ordinance would absolutely be reevaluated. The city does not want to have codes on its books that do not solve any problems.

Commissioner Walter asked if under the scenario raised by Commissioner Carlson it would be the responsibility of the residents or the homeowner to address complaints. Ms. Riordan said the code enforcement officers would make contact with all parties. Ms. Drews added that the definition of responsible party is quite broad.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked what would happen in the instance of a house having a sufficient amount of parking but the residents choosing to park on the street instead for whatever reason. Ms. Riordan said if parking is a condition of being allowed to operate the use, code enforcement can address the issue directly. Parking on a public street, however, is permitted for up to 24 hours at a time.

Chair Laing commented that the big problem has been the model in which a large single family home is chopped up into individual rooms for rent to unrelated individuals who likely do not even know the first names of their housemates. Part of the problem has been a lack of accountability. The community has also testified repeatedly that they have made phone calls to the city in an attempt to initiate enforcement actions to no avail. At the end of the day if the ordinance does not result in a requirement for the Director to make a decision in writing, and the opportunity for an administrative appeal on the part of both the investigated party and the complainant, no one will be held accountable and no one will be satisfied. A Type 5 process would at least create an appeal right on behalf of the affected community members.

Ms. Riordan said the ordinance could be drafted to include the decision of the Director to be in writing. She stressed, however, that it would not be an easy road for a complainant to do

anything other than disagree with the Director's opinion. However, a subsequent complaint can always be made and new evidence gathered, which might result in a different result.

Chair Laing said he did not want to initiate a process under which it is necessary to continue filing complaints until an investigation finally uncovers what is really going on. He said he wanted the ordinance to state that the Director's decision shall be in writing, shall be provided to the complainant, and shall be appealable to Superior Court.

Councilmember Stokes pointed out that the additional review necessary to revise the ordinance as proposed has the potential of delaying adoption of the ordinance and making it final. He added that steps have been taken to deal with the real problem, which is one reason for getting the ordinance in place as soon as possible. Commissioner Carlson's scenario may in fact play out, but it is also true that a house could be occupied by eight persons who are related by blood but who do not in fact comport themselves as the functional equivalent of a family and who are in fact bad neighbors. That's where the rub lies. It would be good to require giving notice, but neighborhoods should not be given too much clout to cause problems for someone they simply do not agree with.

There was consensus to require the Director's opinion to be in writing and not to include an appeal process.

With regard to the amortization period, Chair Laing proposed language along the lines of "...upon the expiration of the last lease or one year, whichever is sooner...." Absent such language, the owner of a house that has been carved up into several rooms would be given a year to continue with the business model, even if the last of the current leases were set to expire in only a few months. Ms. Drews said her concern was with how the city would track and administer the leases. Chair Laing said it would be tracked by following up on complaints registered with the city.

A motion to recommend the adoption of permanent regulations as outlined in Attachment A; to amend Section 20.50.020 to require the Director's decision to be in writing; and amending the last clause of Section 10 to read "...shall be discontinued upon the expiration of the last lease or one year from the effective date of this ordinance, whichever is earlier" was made by Commissioner Hamlin. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Walter and it carried unanimously.

****BREAK****

B. Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Inghram pointed out that the desk packet included memos from the Transportation and Human Services commissions, and a memo regarding tree protection.

With regard to the Utilities Element, Commissioner Hamlin suggested the second sentence of the paragraph proposed to be added following the third paragraph on page 7 should be eliminated.

Chair Laing suggested the last sentence of that same paragraph should be revised to read "Ultimately, this might include ways to underground transmission lines and other ways to avoid or reduce the visual and environmental impacts associated with power lines."

Commissioner Carlson proposed simply deleting the last sentence.

Commissioner deVadoss voiced concern that the language of the paragraph was not strong enough to move the city in the direction of undergrounding facilities.

Chair Laing suggested the paragraph could be better phrases as an aspirational goal. The goal should be to look at ways to move away from overhead wires as it becomes technologically and economically feasible to do so. The paragraph could be broken up into bullet points and inserted into the goals section on page 23 of the Utilities Element.

Commissioner Hamlin agreed it would fit in that section very well. Commissioner deVadoss concurred as well but said the language simply is not strong enough. Chair Laing added that as with all elements in the Comprehensive Plan there is a fine line between being aspirational and prescriptive.

Commissioner Hamlin proposed moving the paragraph to the goal section; while perhaps not as strong as it could be, the wording does convey the intent of the Commission to see all overhead utilities undergrounded.

After additional discussion, there was consensus to pare the paragraph down to its essence by having it read "A future reliable electric grid may include emerging concepts such as non-wire, microgrid, or alternative technology solutions to the existing overhead system that better address the community's interest in mitigating impacts."

With regard to the Transportation Element, Mr. Inghram noted the Commission had previously recommended removal of Policy TR-11. He noted that the Transportation Commission agreed after a full discussion. The Transportation Commission also proposed revising Policy TR-103 to make a clear reference to the CIP and TFP; proposed adding a new policy to the Mobility Management section addressing transportation system resiliency; and proposed adding language to Policy TR-4 to address equity in transportation system investments.

Speaking to Policy TR-4, Commissioner Walter said she was bothered by the latter part of the proposed new language. She suggested putting a period after the word "everyone" in order to be more inclusive.

Mr. Inghram said the intent of including the specific groups identified in the Transportation Commission's proposed language for Policy TR-4 was to highlight the specific groups that tend to be underserved by transportation systems.

Commissioner Hamlin proposed being more abstract by having the sentence read "...needs of everyone, including underserved populations." There was consensus to make the change.

Commissioner Carlson agreed with eliminating Policy TR-11 but suggested replacing it with "Encourage a multitude of transportation modes while not discouraging the use of any particular mode."

Commissioner Walter suggested that concept is covered by the Transportation Element goal. Commissioner Carlson said he would be willing to revise the goal by adding to the end of it "by encouraging a multitude of transportation modes while not discouraging the use of any particular mode." The Commissioners agreed to make the change.

Chair Laing called attention to the Mobility Options paragraph on page 4 of the Transportation Element and suggested the last sentence should be revised to read "while striving to reduce congestion and move more people within a limited right-of-way." He also proposed revising Policy TR-1 to read "Integrate land use and transportation decisions to ensure that the transportation system supports the Comprehensive Plan, reduces congestion, and improves mobility."

Senior Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald pointed out that Policy TR-1 is very specific as to the relationship between land use and transportation. It stresses that the role of the transportation system is to support the land use vision of the Comprehensive Plan. He suggested revising Policy TR-121 rather than the goal statement. Chair Laing commented that managing congestion and increasing mobility is every bit as much a land use issue as it is a transportation issue. The inextricable relationship between land use and transportation planning should be made clear early in the document.

There was consensus to revise the goal rather than Policy TR-121.

Mr. Inghram said his concern centered on the concept of reducing congestion. Level of service is determined by adopted standards. Transportation projects are implemented to help manage transportation flow. The implication of the proposed change to the goal is that somehow by doing planning for transportation and land use the city will be able to reduce the amount of traffic volume on the streets. Chair Laing disagreed to accept the notion that there is nothing that can be done by way of good land use and transportation planning to resolve one bane of the modern urbanite, namely congestion. Mr. Inghram said every transportation project undertaken by the city addresses the issue of congestion and seeks to reduce it in specific locations. The proposed change to the policy, however, would set the bar too high by calling for every project to reduce congestion levels. The fact is the city does undertake projects that result in higher traffic volumes, provided the established level of service is not violated.

Commissioner Walter said in attending neighborhood group meetings she repeatedly hears concerns voiced about traffic and crime. She suggested the citizens would love to see in the Comprehensive Plan language that says the goal is to reduce congestion.

Chair Laing said he could accept revising his suggested language to read "Integrate land use and transportation decisions to ensure that the transportation system supports the Comprehensive Plan, while *striving* to reduce congestion and increase mobility." Congestion can be defined as a number of different things, from too many cars on the road to too many people trying to board the available buses to not being able to cross at a crosswalk given the time provided. Mr. Inghram agreed that as an aspiration reducing congestion is great, but if included as policy it could set a standard requiring all city planning projects to reduce congestion.

Councilmember Stokes said the conundrum is always how to handle growth and congestion at the same time. He agreed with Mr. Inghram and said he would recommend against setting up a challenge.

Mr. McDonald called attention to the first paragraph on page 9 of the Transportation Element and said the Transportation Commission had suggested a revision to make it more forward thinking by having it read something like "Especially for commuter trips and increasingly throughout the day, high-capacity transit will be part of the transportation system...." There was

consensus to revise the wording accordingly.

Chair Laing called attention to the table on page 8 showing the commute modesplit targets and said he would like to see a break down by mode. Mr. McDonald said the data is available, though targets have not been established for pedestrian and bicycle modeshare. There could be another table added showing existing and projected share by mode. There was consensus to do that.

Turning to the Housing Element and the issue of considering areas outside the downtown core for higher density and more diverse uses, Mr. Inghram said typically identifying opportunities is done through a specific planning process. He suggested the established process has proven to be effective and thus there is no need to update the plan in any way. The Commissioners concurred.

It was observed that one public comment called attention to the need for housing for people with mental illness and physical disabilities. Mr. Inghram called attention to Policy HO-37 and noted that it addresses reasonable accommodation for those with special needs. There was agreement the policy satisfactorily addresses the issue.

Mr. Inghram said there are two aspects to the comment made about accommodating seniors and those on fixed incomes. Policy HO-X4 talks about aging in place by utilizing universal design principles, and Policy HO-X10 encourages a range of housing types for seniors affordable at a variety of income levels.

Chair Laing commented that there is a state program under which seniors can apply to have property tax abatement. If the program requires local enabling legislation, Bellevue should certainly act to have the program on its books. At the least the Housing Element should reference the state program.

Commissioner Walter said it certainly is more cost effective to keep seniors in their own homes.

Commissioner Hamlin said he was not aware of any other instances in which a reference to a state program is made in the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Carlson suggested the wording of Policy HO-X4 covers it by referencing support for housing options, programs and services.

Mr. Inghram pointed out that several policies in the plan address the issue of homeless shelter, including policies HO-38, HO-39, HO-X8 and HS-X2. There was agreement the issue is adequately covered.

With regard to housing affordability, Mr. Inghram noted that the public had offered both general and specific observations and suggestions.

Commissioner Hilhorst commented that the general affordability issue is adequately addressed by Policy HO-22. The Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Inghram pointed out that Policy HO-25 encourages housing affordability throughout the city. Commissioner Hamlin allowed that it is the most difficult to achieve affordable housing in the downtown for a variety of reasons. Commissioner Carlson said getting affordable housing in the downtown core is a worthy goal. Councilmember Stokes pointed out that an earlier version of the policy specifically highlighted the downtown but the reference was removed in subsequent

discussions.

Chair Laing said the multifamily tax exemption program usually is attached to certain areas of a city rather than the city as a whole. If the policy language is too specific as to where the city wants to see affordable housing created, it may limit the city's ability to implement the multifamily tax exemption program.

Councilmember Stokes agreed the focus should be on the entire city. He said the discussions held by the Council regarding the multifamily tax exemption have been focused on several non-downtown areas. It would not detract from the policy, however, to have it refer to housing affordability throughout the city, including the downtown and mixed commercial/residential areas.

Commissioner Hamlin suggested that to reference the entire city as well as the downtown is redundant. He said the policy could say something like "with an emphasis on the downtown and the mixed commercial/residential areas."

Chair Laing proposed staying with the broad reference to the entire city and leaving the details to the implementing regulations.

Mr. Inghram said one option would be to word the policy to read "Develop an effective strategy to ensure affordable housing opportunities are available in the downtown and throughout the city...." There was agreement to make that change.

Mr. Inghram observed that a number of public comments were focused on having a housing strategy plan. Policy HO-25 as it has evolved calls for developing an effective strategy.

Commissioner Hamlin said the argument could certainly be made that an effective strategy needs a plan. Chair Laing agreed but pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan itself could be the plan. The policy as drafted calls for the development of an effective strategy without going too far and getting into exactly how that should be carried out.

There was consensus not to revise Policy HO-25.

With regard to using surplus land for affordable housing, Chair Laing reminded the Commissioners that after previous discussions no such policy was included. The community, however, has raised the need to have such a policy.

Commissioner Walter voiced concern over limiting the use of surplus land to affordable housing, thus preventing the city from doing anything else even where there is an obviously better use and even where affordable housing would not be practical. If there is to be a policy, it should emphasize affordable housing without limiting the use of surplus land to affordable housing.

Mr. Inghram said as originally worded, the policy read "Evaluate surplus public land for use for affordable housing." He suggested the language leaves the door open to uses other than affordable housing.

Chair Laing proposed replacing "public" with "city owned."

There was agreement to include the policy as revised by Chair Laing.

Commissioner Hamlin observed that the element as draft includes several policies focused on incentives for affordable housing. The primary policy is HO-23 but policies HO-18, HO-28, HO-32 and HO-33 are also on point.

Chair Laing commented on the need for policy language to be as broad as possible while recognizing that the authority in many cases come from state-enabling legislation.

There was agreement not to make any revisions relative to affordable housing incentives. There also was agreement that the draft policies adequately address public/private coordination relative to affordable housing.

With regard to planning and providing funding for very low- and low-income affordable housing, Mr. Inghram said Policy HO-27 talks about the use of city funding for that purpose. The Countywide Planning Policies call for employing a housing strategy to address the need for housing affordable to very low-, low- and moderate-income households and people with special needs. Policy HO-34 addresses the entire spectrum of housing needs in the city's affordable housing programs, though none of the policies specifically state the need to address each of the income categories.

Chair Laing said in reading policies HO-25, HO-27 and HO-34 together the picture that appears is one of a very comprehensive approach to affordable housing.

With regard to the notion of adding mandatory affordable housing to the Comprehensive Plan along the lines of what Kirkland and Redmond do, Commissioner Carlson suggested it sounded more like a proposal for the City Council to take up rather than a broad goal for the Comprehensive Plan. Chair Laing pointed out that the examples of mandatory affordable housing provisions in other cities are all established at the zoning code level. The broad statement included in the draft is focused on using all of the strategies and tools available. Even as those tools change over time, the broad policy language does not lock the city into any one specific course of action. The Council has the authority to do what other cities have done with relative to mandatory affordable housing requirements.

There was agreement not to add policy language about mandatory affordable housing.

Mr. Inghram reminded the Commissioners that the city already has a practice of reducing impact fees for affordable housing projects. There was agreement no additional policy language was needed.

Chair Laing brought to the table the suggestion made by Ms. Lopez relative to revising the language of Policy HO-16 relative to accessory dwelling units. Mr. Inghram clarified that none of the subarea plans specifically address accessory dwelling units. The current Comprehensive Plan policy allows accessory dwelling units in single family districts subject to specific development, design, location and owner-occupancy standards. The draft adds the notion of "where consistent with neighborhood subarea plans" which gives each subarea the freedom to be able to fine-tune whether and how it should apply in their area. To adopt the proposal as suggested by Ms. Lopez would disallow attached accessory dwelling units in any neighborhood anywhere in the city until every subarea plan is adjusted to specifically allow them. Detached accessory dwelling units are not currently allowed in the city and there is no proposal to allow them, but as the various subarea plans are updated the neighborhoods will be able to discuss

whether or not they would want to allow them.

A motion to extend the meeting until 10:15 p.m. was made by Commissioner Hamlin. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

Councilmember Stokes and Commissioner Carlson left the meeting.

Mr. Inghram reminded the Commissioners that a response was made at the last meeting to a comment about employment for people with disabilities. The suggestion was made to change a policy in the Human Services Element. The Human Services Commission looked at the proposal and suggested no change to policy HS-16 and concluded that if there is to be a policy about employment for persons with disabilities a new, separate policy should be created.

Discussing a potential new Economic Development policy as an alternative to the changes to HS-16, Commissioner deVadoss said he found the phrase "people with barriers to employment" quite jarring and awkward. Commissioner Hilhorst suggested "hire people with differing levels of physical ability" instead, removing the "such as" portion. Chair Laing suggested "hire those with special needs and disabilities."

The language suggested for new policy ED-X by Chair Laing was agreed to.

Turning to the Environment policies, the Commissioners were reminded that several comments from the public supported the notion of protecting or enhancing the city's overall tree canopy. Some of the comments were focused on the loss of trees due to development. The plan includes policies specific to tree preservation, including two new policies in the Environmental Element, EN-X3 and EN-X10. The idea behind revising the language is to move beyond just establishing a target to enacting an action plan with specific steps to address the tree canopy, which could include such things as programmatic tree-planting initiatives, general education efforts, and reviewing the city's current regulations to see how well they are working.

Commissioner Hilhorst said she would like to see the loop closed that allow developers to build and replace very little if any of the tree canopy they remove. While the proposed language does not close the loop, it is on the right path.

Commissioner deVadoss suggested that if a specific target number is to be included, it should read "at least 40 percent."

Mr. Inghram said there are opportunities to adjust the code to realize greater tree protection. The current code talks about retaining 30 percent of the trees on a site, and that percentage could be increased, along with requiring retaining or replanting when development occurs. The code should shy away from giving people the impression that merely trimming their bushes is regulated by the city, but it should address the concern of large sites being completely denuded of trees.

There was agreement to include as Policy EN-X3, "Work toward a citywide tree canopy target of at least 40 percent canopy coverage that reflects our "city in a park" character and maintain an action plan for meeting the targets across multiple land use types, including right-of-way, public lands, and residential and commercial uses."

Turning to the Arts Commission's recommendation for a new policy on public art,

Commissioner Walter said she found it challenging to put high-quality public art in neighborhoods. She suggested not including the proposed policy.

Mr. Inghram pointed out that at the joint boards and commissions meeting there was discussion about the need for art in neighborhoods that is not addressed in the Comprehensive Plan even though the city does have a neighborhood art program in which the city works with neighborhoods to identify art opportunities.

Commissioner Hamlin agreed that the proposed policy directly addresses something that came out of the joint meeting. Additionally, when Chair Jackson of the Arts Commission spoke, there was clearly agreement with what she was calling for.

Commissioner Walter questioned the need to include a new policy when in fact public art in neighborhoods is already being realized. As drafted the policy seems to force art into neighborhoods that may or may not want it. Additionally, "high-quality" is a term that may be difficult to define.

Chair Laing agreed "high-quality" should be deleted. While art is already being realized in the neighborhoods, the policy does not require it.

Commissioner Hamlin suggested the policy should read "Work with the community to develop art that enhances neighborhood character, builds community, and engages residents in the artistic process."

Commissioner deVadoss felt "work with the community" was too directive. He proposed using the word "encourage."

Chair Laing called attention to Policy UD-60 which calls for supporting neighborhood efforts to maintain and enhance their character and appearance. He suggested drafting the new policy, UD-X, to read "Support community efforts to develop art that enhances the neighborhoods, builds community, and engages residents in the artistic process." His suggestion was accepted.

A motion to extend the meeting to 10:20 p.m. was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamlin and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner Walter called attention to the third sentence in the second paragraph on page 14 of the Introduction/Vision and suggested that "young families just getting started" is too prescriptive. There was agreement to leave out the phrase.

Commissioner Walter proposed not changing "homes" to "households" in the first paragraph on page 16 of the Introduction/Vision. There was agreement to use "homes."

Commissioner Walter said she could not see the need to change "institutional uses" to "cultural facilities" in the penultimate line on page 16 of the Introduction/Vision was necessary. Mr. Inghram said the thinking was that "institutional" could be interpreted to mean hospital. There was agreement to use "cultural facilities."

Referring to the third sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 18 of the Introduction/Vision, Commissioner Walter said she did not remember talking about dedicated bus lanes. The other Commissioners agreed the topic had not been discussed.

Commissioner Walter noted her preference for using "abrupt edges" in the first paragraph on page 7 of the Housing Element because it adds visual clarity. There was agreement to use the phrase.

Commissioner Walter suggested that as drafted the first sentence of the first paragraph on page 9 of the Housing Element appears to apply only to the elderly. She proposed retaining the phrase "over their lives."

A motion to extend the meeting to 10:30 was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamlin and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner deVadoss left the meeting.

Commissioner Walter proposed retaining "and public education" in the first sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 4 of the Utilities Element. There was agreement to do so.

Commissioner Walter proposed not making the suggested revisions to the first two sentences of the second paragraph on page 10 of the Utilities Element. The other Commissioners concurred and also agreed to make the other revisions in the draft of the paragraph.

There was agreement to retain "all utilities" in the first bullet on page 23 of the Utilities Element.

Commissioner Walter suggested not making the proposed changes to the first paragraph on the second page of the Transportation Element. The Commissioners agreed with her.

Commissioner Walter referred to the first sentence of the first paragraph on page 3 of the Transportation Element and suggested the statement that traffic volumes have held relatively steady seems out of touch with reality. Mr. Inghram pointed out that in fact the data supports the statement and noted that the addition of the word "relatively" makes the sentence less dogmatic.

The Commissioners agreed with the suggestion made by Commissioner Walter not to change the first sentence of the third paragraph on page 3 of the Transportation Element as outlined in the draft.

There was agreement with Commissioner Walter's suggestion not to make the draft changes to the last sentence of the last paragraph on page 7 of the Transportation Element.

Commissioner Walter suggested the proposed change to page 3 of the Environmental Element significantly changes the message. Commissioner Hamlin said he preferred the change as it makes the statement less technical. There was agreement to retain the revised version.

With regard to the first paragraph on page 6 of the Environmental Element, Commissioner Walter agreed with removing the reference to 2008 but suggested talking about how much of Bellevue is impervious is important. Mr. Inghram agreed to do that.

Chair Laing called attention to the second paragraph on page 6 of the Environmental Element and said he absolutely disagreed with the last sentence. He said the most effective thing would be to regional detention treatment before allowing runoff to be discharged into lakes, rivers and streams. There was agreement to change "the most effective approach" to "an effective

approach" and to retain the other edits to the paragraph.

A motion to extend the meeting to 10:45 p.m. was made by Commissioner Hamlin. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Walter and it carried unanimously.

There was agreement with the suggestion of Commissioner Walter to not include "other native" in the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 11 of the Environmental Element.

Commissioner Walter asked why the proposed deletions to the language on page 15 of the Environmental Element were needed. Mr. Inghram explained that the city does not have clear data about business and multifamily recycling and composting.

A motion to recommend that the City Council adopt the update amendments, as corrected, to the Bellevue Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act. This replaces Volume 1 and the Land Use Map of the existing Comprehensive Plan, and includes limited amendments to Volume 2, including updates to the Downtown Bellevue, Southwest Bellevue, Eastgate, Richards Valley, and Factoria subarea plans, and replacement of the transportation facilities plans, was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamlin and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Inghram thanked the perseverance and hard work of the Commission over the past couple of years. He said a transmittal memo was being prepared and would be forwarded to the Chair and Vice Chair for review.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Osha Morningstar commented that in dealing with the issue of aging in place the city should seek to avoid impacting other demographic groups. As property taxes continue to rise, some have choose to rent out rooms in their homes for extra income. She also noted that while the issue of homelessness is addressed in the Comprehensive Plan, there is no definition of what it means to be homeless. Additionally, she commented that with the new DSM-5 coming out there will be fewer people who can be diagnosed with the disabilities they have already been diagnosed as having and they will therefore qualify for fewer services.

8. OTHER BUSINESS - None

9. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW

- A. February 25, 2015
- B. March 4, 2015
- C. March 11, 2015

No action was taken to approve the draft minutes.

11. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hilhorst and it carried unanimously.

Chair Laing adjourned the meeting at 10:45 p.m.