

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION  
STUDY SESSION MINUTES

December 7, 2016  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Cullen, Carol Helland, Department of Planning and Community Development

COUNCIL LIAISON: Not Present

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

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

The meeting was called to order at 6:39 p.m. by Chair deVadoss who presided.

ROLL CALL  
(6:39 p.m.)

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present.

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

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

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

STAFF REPORTS  
(6:41 p.m.)

Comprehensive Planning Manager Terry Cullen commented that at the meeting on November 9 it was noted that the Commission minutes of February 24 and April 27 clearly reflected the intent of the Commission to allow transient lodging in Eastgate as a conditional use rather than as a permitted use or as an administrative conditional use. In consultation with the City Attorney's office, it was learned the Commission could take one or two approaches, including the formal approach of opening the entire Land Use Code amendment package all over again. Subsequent to the November 9 meeting, it was learned that the City Attorney's office had misunderstood the

issue, thinking that the Commission's intent had been ambiguous and not clearly reflected in the minutes. That is what their recommendation was based on. If the intent was in fact ambiguous and not clearly understood, there would have been a reason to open up the issue and clarify the intent. However, the Commission's intent is in fact very clear in favor of allowing transient lodging through conditional use. Accordingly, the City Attorney's office concluded that the error was made by the staff and that the error should be corrected by the staff by sending a full explanation to the City Council outlining that the Commission's intent had been misrepresented.

Mr. Cullen provided the Commissioners with copies of a letter drafted by Land Use Director Carol Helland and sent to the City Council to reflect the Commission's true intent. Included in the letter was clarification that the Commission intended to allow transient lodging through conditional use in both the EG-TOD and the EG-OLB 2 zones. As a result of the actions taken, there is no need to reopen the issue. There are certain risks associated with reopening the issue. The Commission would first need to formally ask the Council to remand the matter back to the Commission because the Council has already opened its discussions on the topic.

Commissioner Walter noted that during the Commission's deliberations about transient lodging in Eastgate, the discussion focused on EG-TOD and EG-OLB 2 but also included NMU. She noted the use is shown as permitted in NMU and asked if the Commission had failed to indicate a desire to allow the use through conditional use in that zone as well. Mr. Cullen said the conversation on February 24 focused on EG-OLB 2. The Planning Commission meeting on April 27 focused on EG-TOD. He said it was his recollection the NMU district had been discussed the month before, but agreed to verify that and determine what the Commission's intent was for that zone with respect to transient lodging.

Commissioner Hilhorst said she recalled that transient lodging as a use was brought forward as a new designation in the Eastgate study. As such it would have been discussed in regard to each zone.

With regard to the Commission's annual retreat on November 16, Mr. Cullen thanked the Commissioners for their active participation. There was a lot of good dialog and many interesting things will flow from the meeting.

Mr. Cullen said has moved forward in creating an operations manual covering local governance and planning, as well as best practices and guiding principles. The by-laws will probably also be included in the document. The document will be before the Commission for discussion the first meeting in January. Once there is agreement, discussions will start on how to operationalize various approaches.

The Commissioners were informed that the process of digitizing the Commission is moving ahead. Quotes for the equipment are in and it appears the purchases will be made with the current year's budget. Eventually all of the city's boards and commissions will move into the digital realm, but the Planning Commission will be the first. Granicus, the vendor that works with the City Council to host all of their documents, will also be hosting the Commission's documents. The City Clerk's office is currently being trained on how to train staff to work with Granicus. A training session with the Commission will be scheduled as well, and that session will include training in the legal implications involved.

Mr. Cullen said the rollout is expected to be completed by the end of the first quarter of 2017. He explained that the printing costs for the Planning Commission materials between January and October totaled \$18,069. To purchase the iPads and all supporting equipment will cost the city

less than \$5000 and will be recovered in a matter of months. Even with replacing the equipment every three years, the projection is that the city will save over \$60,000 annually.

Mr. Cullen invited the Commissioners to attend a pizza party starting at 5:30 p.m. prior to the regular meeting.

Chair deVadoss asked what steps will be taken to inform the public about the Eastgate transient lodging corrections. Mr. Cullen said the information can be broadcast in a number of different ways. All parties of record can be informed, and it can be tagged to all who are involved in siting the men's shelter in Eastgate.

Chair deVadoss said the Commission's retreat was very good and the conversation was open and honest. He said he appreciated the partnership between the staff, the mayor and the Commissioners. He recommended against calling the document being created a "manual" because of the connotations that word carries with it. He proposed "guidelines" or "practices" instead.

Commissioner Morisseau noted that time did not allow the Commission to discuss the guiding principles during the retreat. Mr. Cullen said he could schedule time at a future meeting to review them to make sure they reflect what is important to the Commission.

With regard to new digital equipment, Chair deVadoss noted that it might be less expensive for the city to purchase Vanilla Android tablets instead of iPads. Mr. Cullen said the issue was raised and the conclusion reached was that it is easier and more cost efficient to support a single type of equipment, and because the Council uses iPads, the conversation moved in that direction. Additionally, the Windows platform operated by Granicus is relatively new and it makes sense to go with something that is more certain.

Commissioner Hilhorst said it was her understanding staff had attended the December 6 East Bellevue Community Council meeting to provide an update with regard to the subarea planning process. She noted that the Commission previously proposed suggesting the order in which the neighborhoods should be addressed, and that the mayor had agreed to that. Mr. Cullen said had attended the East Bellevue Community Council meeting on December 6 and talked about how neighborhood area planning comes from the Neighborhood Element of the Comprehensive Plan. There was a lot of discussion about the framework within the Neighborhood Element and how the original neighborhood plans were developed. The Council has not yet determined how the 2017 program will unfold. Until direction is received from the Council, there will be no action taken to determine a study schedule.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT (7:06 p.m.)

Ms. Betsi Hummer, 14541 SE 26th Street, called attention to page 12 of the packet and the letter she submitted to the Commission that contained a number of questions regarding the permanent men's shelter in Eastgate. She noted that she had asked why the Human Services Commission or Parks had not helped out the neighbors when the shelter was housed at St. Peter's church. The neighbors had appeared before the City Council and the different commissions and ultimately had to form their own committee to get some action in regard to people wandering through their neighborhoods and breaking into their homes. She said she has been to several meetings where the topic was the shelter being taken over by the city or government entities and witnessed the interaction between the neighbors, staff and Congregations for the Homeless. Homeless services

have been addressed by various churches and non-profit organizations on their own. If the city or other governmental organizations are going to step in and take over, the work should be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. There should be a homeless services initiative that is addressed by the subarea plans and housed in the Comprehensive Plan. Homelessness exists throughout the city, not just in Eastgate and not just on 116th Avenue NE. There needs to be a coordinated plan in place detailing the kinds of services will be offered, how they will be offered, and in what zones they will be allowed. There should be an inventory of what is out there, and the role of the government should be defined, and the use should be incorporated into all of the subarea plans. The current approach is very hodgepodge with facilities located here and there around the city.

Mr. Carl Vander Hoek, 9 103rd Avenue NE, said over the past week he and his father had been reviewing the draft Land Use Code. He noted that the material is very difficult to review yet very important. He offered to make himself available to the Commission as a resource in reviewing the materials. He asked the Commission to direct staff to provide a red line copy of the draft Land Use Code to make the review work easier and to allow for a level of transparency. He also encouraged the Commission to establish a realistic and responsible timeline for the remaining process. It has for a long time felt like the process has been both hurried and delayed, and the clock needs to be reset. Realistically, there are issues that could take another six months to fully discuss. It has been 35 years since the code was last updated, and once adopted the new code could be in place for another 35 years, so there is a clear need to get it right. The code that has been in place for so long has clearly worked and it should not be broken. The Commission should be allowed ample time to do the work right. With regard to the height limit in the A2 district, he said the current limit is 55 feet and the recommendation of the CAC and the Commission has been to increase that to 70 feet, yet the packet continues to show the limit at 55 feet. Including 15 feet for mechanical equipment, the height limit should be 85 feet. Additionally, the proposal to require a ten percent floor plate reduction above the current height, and giving ten percent of the site over to public amenities, has not been fully analyzed to determine if it is feasible.

Mr. David Hoffman with Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties noted that earlier in the day his organization forwarded a letter to staff and said he hoped it had made its way to the Commissioners. He said the Association's own program, which is a homegrown Bellevue-based green building program, is not included in the FAR bonus language. The program is at least as aggressive as the living building challenge program. He said the Association supports the green factor score as written and appreciates the fact that the Built Green program does count towards the score. He said he has tentatively reviewed the draft amendments as a whole and found that several of them are shown as to be determined, which would seem to imply they have not received full review yet. No recommendations should be made by the Commission to the Council until those items are fully studied.

Mr. Jim Hill with Kemper Development Company, 575 Bellevue Square, said he a member of the Bellevue Downtown Association land use and livability committee, and is the Chair-elect of the Bellevue Chamber of Commerce. He stressed, however, that his comments were his own and not reflective of either the Bellevue Downtown Association or the Chamber of Commerce. He said while he greatly appreciates the efforts of the staff and the Commission, he said the efforts appear to be taking on a live of their own. What was originally characterized as some minor tweaks to the code has expanded significantly. The document no longer even closely mirrors the recommendations of the CAC or the original direction from the City Council. It was very disappointing to learn recently that the ULI and BERK reviews of the downtown amenity bonus system are not yet available for discussion. There is yet a lot of work to be done before the



Commission can forward a recommendation to the City Council. There are many uncertainties that if acted on too soon could create unintended consequences. Bellevue is a great city with a healthy and robust development community. Nothing should be done to unintentionally increase the already high costs of development without having information in hand about how the economic model will ultimately work for the downtown livability update.

Chair deVadoss asked Mr. Hill what advice he would offer relative to the livability study taking on a life of its own. Mr. Hill allowed that both the Commission and the staff have been very deliberate. What seems to have expanded is the scope of what is covered by the downtown livability program. The current code is working very well, and whatever can be done should be done to bring the study to a conclusion.

Mr. Jack McCullough, 701 5th Avenue, Suite 6600, Seattle, referenced the newly named project Élan at Bellevue Way and NE 8th Street. He commented that NE 8th Street is a critical east-west street serving the downtown. Densification has been occurring along the street for several years. The Grand Connection, that will be addressed as part of the Wilburton plan, and the grand shopping street creates an intersection at Bellevue Way and NE 8th Street that will serve as the epicenter of the downtown. Three of the four quadrants of the intersection are fully developed, leaving only the one where the Élan project is envisioned. In July the recommendation was made to move ahead with a development agreement as the vehicle for bringing the project online. The Commission appeared to favor the approach as an acceptable way to proceed. He said he has been working with staff on language to that effect and will continue to work with staff to refine the language which in time will be presented to the Commission. He shared with the Commissioners updated renderings of the project.

Commissioner Carlson asked if the Élan project fronts Bellevue Way. Mr. McCullough allowed that it does. The site to the southeast of the corner of Bellevue Way and NE 8th Street is owned by another party and is under ground lease by yet another party. There have been conversations with them but there are no current plans to do anything there. He stressed that a development agreement is not the same as a green light, it is just another process. The team is working to put together a project that is substantial, offers public benefits and is iconic, and the hope is that the Council will be persuaded that the project should be allowed additional height as a result. He said the development agreement process has been proposed but has not been approved.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if the Commission has the authority to review and recommend approval of development agreements. Commissioner Laing said it is not within the purview of the Commission to review a development agreement for a specific project. To do so would represent a site-specific project review. The question before the Commission with regard to the Fortin group was whether or not a development agreement should be required in the zoning code. No specific details for such a development agreement for that project were before the Commission. The Commission could make a recommendation that there be a footnote or provision in the code to allow certain departures through a development agreement process, but the Commission could not review an actual development agreement.

Ms. McCullough said claims were previously made that he was seeking relation of the parking requirements and additional FAR. He clarified that those claims are not true. All the project is seeking is additional height, which will allow for creating more open space at the ground level and a more iconic project.

Commissioner Morisseau noted for the record that she works as a broker for Realogics Sotheby's International Realty, which is in communication with the Fortris Group about the Élan project.

She said she has not personally been privy to any of the communications and will not be.

Mr. Cullen called attention to written correspondence received subsequent to the packets being mailed out, specifically a letter from Master Builders, an email from Regina Wagner, and a letter from VIA Architecture.

## STUDY SESSION

### Downtown Livability – Review of Draft Downtown Land Use Code Amendment

Land Use Director Carol Helland acknowledged that a certain level of anxiety exists in regard to the downtown livability amendment. She agreed that the current code has achieved a fabulous downtown in which everyone can take pride. She stressed that there was no intention to see the focus change. She also explained that a red line version of the code has not been created because the work will include transitioning to a new organizational construct, the same one used for the Bel-Red and the Shoreline Master Program. The draft does include roadmaps indicating a tie to the current code. There is still work to be done before the Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to the Council, including the testing of sample projects to see if they can work; where it can be shown the new code will not work, it will be revised.

Ms. Helland explained the organization of the document that was included in the Commission packet. She allowed that there remain some issues still to be determined. The ULI, which thought it would be doing its economic analysis in December, will instead be doing their work in January. They need the proposed code in order to do their analysis, because the changes will need to be valued.

Ms. Helland explained that Part 20.25A will ultimately be removed and replaced with whatever the Commission recommends to the Council. The intent is to create better ease of use, to reduce the number of references outside the Land Use Code, and to incorporate as many applicable parts of the Land Use Code as possible into the draft, which is the approach that was used in Bel-Red and the Shoreline Master Program. She called attention to 20.25A.B and noted the organization section was new. The section talks about land use classifications and is intended to serve as a roadmap. It would be a good place to include an illustration once the words are finalized.

Section 20.25A.020 includes the definitions specific to the downtown. The downtown section of the current code does not have definitions in it. As proposed, the section includes definitions that are really only applicable in the downtown, and clarifies that there are some definitions housed in the Land Use Code that are applicable across the entire code that do not apply in the downtown.

Section 20.25A.030 is a new section and states that review is required. The section is very similar to the approach used in Bel-Red and includes most of the same information that currently is in the general section of the Land Use Code. Currently, projects in the downtown are required to do master development planning, but people do not do them very often because the provision is hidden in the design guidelines. Bringing it forward makes more sense. Design review is already required for all projects in the downtown.

Paragraph D addresses departures, which is something that has been commented on by many stakeholders in terms of making clear the flexibility in the code. The departures include administrative departures, which are the kinds of things that can be done as a part of the design review process, and which generally have fog line limits that cannot be exceeded administratively. The paragraph also describes legislative departures, which are allowed through

the development agreement process. The Planning Commission has the authority to describe when it is appropriate to use a development agreement in making its recommendations relative to code process. The Commission does not, however, have any role in approving actual development agreements. Development agreements go to the Council and are subject to a public hearing. While similar to planned unit developments, development agreements can be beauty contests in which public benefits the city may never have thought of are packaged in exchange for a building the city may never have thought of.

Ms. Helland said the use provisions begin with Section 20.25A.040. The nonconforming use provisions come first in paragraph A, which has not been modified much from the current approach, other than to move it from another section. It has been drafted to mirror the modifications made as part of the Shoreline Master Program to protect existing nonconforming uses and allowing them to continue to exist.

The actual use charts are in Section 20.25A.050. Ms. Helland noted that the Commission reviewed the use charts exhaustively as part of its focus on achieving early wins.

Commissioner Morisseau pointed out that the draft use charts do not indicate what is existing and what is new. Ms. Helland allowed that clarification could be made. Commissioner Morisseau called attention to Land Use Code Reference 61 and noted that reference is made to Footnote 10. Footnote 10, however, has no clear connection to the finance, insurance and real estate services use. Ms. Helland explained that the footnote indicates that banks, which is one use in the land use classification, are allowed to have drive-up windows under certain circumstances. Commissioner Morisseau said what threw her off is that real estate is a use also allowed under the classification, making it appear that that use can also have a drive-up window.

Commissioner Walter pointed out that Land Use Code reference 13 and 15 relative to the Eastgate districts is not the same as the same references relative to the downtown districts. In Eastgate the category includes transient lodging, whereas in the downtown it does not. She asked if the land use tables should be consistent across all districts of the city. Ms. Helland explained that they are not consistent in that way. Commissioner Walter suggested the downtown chart should include transient lodging just as the Eastgate chart does. Ms. Helland said she would flag the issue and bring it back for additional discussion.

Chair deVadoss proposed continuing the overview and flagging items to be brought back for review.

Commissioner Barksdale said it would be helpful to have the maps as an index to everything the Commission talks about. In going through the zones, it would be good to compare the surrounding areas to understand the relevant amenities and the dimensional requirements.

Commissioner Carlson said he was chairing the Commission at the time the Downtown Livability Initiative CAC was assembled. He said former Commissioner Ferris and current Commissioner Laing were tapped to serve on the CAC. The thinking at the time was that no massive overhaul was needed, rather just some adjustments and tweaks. He asked how the process became such a huge undertaking.

Commissioner Laing said the update has indeed become far more than was originally intended. At the first meeting of the CAC, then Mayor Lee launched the work in May 2013. He said at the time it was anticipated the CAC would be done with its work by June or July 2013. The Downtown Livability Initiative report bears the date of October 13, 2014. At the end of the



report the next steps are outlined, including a call for city staff to begin in the near term working with the Planning Commission to address the proposed amendment recommendations. The process was never envisioned to a grand rewrite of the code. The draft, however, represents a great deal of work. Much of the draft includes exactly what is in the existing code, but there are also some significant changes, including changes that do not track the recommendations of the CAC or recommendations the Commission has made since taking up the endeavor. A lot of good and thoughtful work has been done by the staff, and the recommendation of the CAC for additional analysis is being undertaken, so the pieces are coming together. However, the question of what is broken and what needs fixing remains largely unanswered. The process has been viewed by a lot of different interests as an opportunity to make big changes, and that is part of why the work has expanded.

Commissioner Morisseau commented that she could see from her experience on the Commission how the process has moved to where it is currently. The area is growing and there is a real need for the city to addressing growth responsibly. Downtown livability offers the opportunity to do that. The Commission is not a group that will simply check the boxes. The CAC offered a vision, but the Commission has the responsibility to the community to do what is right and what will work for the city for the next 25 years or more. If that means the Commission needs to look at every line, that is what the Commission should do, because there is a lot at stake.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if there is a way to get to the end quickly without leaving anything out, or if the Commission will be on the same path for months to come.

Commissioner Carlson suggested dealing exclusively with new language and clear changes, and language that is proposed to be dropped. The assumption at the time the CAC was formed was that the existing downtown plan has served the downtown very well. Bellevue has in fact done very well as it has grown as a cultural and economic center. The existing plan is three decades old and needs some revisions, but it does not need a complete rewrite.

Commissioner Laing said Commissioner Morisseau's point was well taken. He also agreed with Commissioner Carlson that the proposal includes new things and removal of some things, and leaves much of the existing code unchanged. The elephant in the room for the CAC was the amenity incentive system. At the end of the day, that is what mattered most to the stakeholders along with some massive changes to the way in which height and FAR are calculated, namely removing the parking bonus and the residential bonus. The early wins process has already addressed many of the issues. It is the TBD items that will cost the Commission a lot of time and effort. It should take the Commission only a meeting or two to work through the procedural issues because they are not controversial. Dealing with the amenity system and the base FAR and height issues will take several meetings.

Chair deVadoss suggested that regardless of the reason why the issue has grown, the Commission owes it to the community to conduct all due diligence in addressing the individual issues.

Commissioner Barksdale commented that the procedural issues fall outside of what is allowed or not allowed by zone. The work of focusing on the specific zones should be tied back to and align with the CAC report. Ms. Helland suggested the dimensional standards will be the only thing that lends itself to such an analysis. That is because things like mechanical equipment has already been addressed in the early wins process. She said staff is genuinely interested in hearing suggestions about what the Commission needs to do its work, but added that she would be honest in saying what will take staff a long time to put together. Hopefully there can be a meeting in the



middle. To organize the issues by geographies would be somewhat redundant in that some of the same sections of the code would be addressed over and over again.

Ms. Helland also stressed that while it appears on the surface that much is being changed, the fact is that a lot is not being changed at all. She agreed staff should do some work to describe what is different and what is the same. The downtown code has evolved over the past 35 years. That means all of the stakeholders got together and did something really comprehensive in the beginning. In the intervening years stakeholders came forward seeking small changes and tweaks, the result of which was hundreds of amendments. The code in its current format just no longer holds together as a result of all those relatively small changes. For instance, there are now 43 footnotes that have added because issues could not easily be fit into the code language. The draft has taken most of the footnotes and incorporated them back into the code language. Fewer footnotes means fewer exceptions and more clarity, and a code that hangs together.

Commissioner Hilhorst asked if some of the footnotes were developed after the CAC concluded its work. Ms. Helland said the CAC was not specifically focused on the code itself, rather it focused on principles. One of the principles the Council always challenges staff and the public with is making codes easy for everyone to understand. Recently someone indicated they did not understand the difference between a stepback and a setback. The fact is that is in the current code, but it requires visiting four different sections to figure it out. Staff are seeking ways to make things like that hang together, and that has to some degree come across as making big changes.

Commissioner Walter suggested that the stepback/setback issues could quickly, easily and with more clarity through the use of visuals rather than words. Ms. Helland said both need to be done. The law relies on words not pictures, but a picture can certainly be used to clarify the meaning of words.

Ms. Helland allowed that clarifying the changes could be done. She called attention to Section 20.25A.100, the downtown pedestrian bridges section, and noted that in parentheses is it noted that the section has been moved from 20.25A.130 and amended. She said it would be easy to include in a text box or comment bubble what the amendments are.

Commissioner Walter suggested the Commission should focus its energies on substance rather than format in reviewing the draft. Ms. Helland agreed and said that is essentially why a red line draft had not been produced; such a draft would have been exceedingly noisy just because so many things have been moved from one section to another.

Commissioner Laing commented that the code is divided into clear sections. As the Commission works through them, many of the sections will see some wordsmithing of a noncontroversial nature. A couple of the sections will require a lot of work, however. The CAC took a similar approach of chunking the issues into sections, which worked very well. Where things fell apart was when the focus turned to the incentive system and the dimensional requirements, both of which are inextricably linked. He recommended delving into the noncontroversial issues first, and then turning to and discussing together the incentive system and dimensional requirements.

Commissioner Barksdale suggested the stakeholders will experience the issues by zones. A cross analysis in the way things have already been analyzed by the CAC would tell a better story, because it would be clear what the character is supposed to be for each of the zones. Commissioner Laing agreed but stressed giving specific regard to the incentives and dimensions. Much of the discussion on the part of the CAC was by district, and much of the city's planning

efforts over time have taken the same approach. Amenities identified as very desirable in one district may not be so desirable in another district. However, other sections of the draft are of general applicability and to discuss them by zone would mean the same things would be discussed multiple times without potentially changing anything.

Ms. Helland said she has heard a call to slow things down and at the same time has been getting pressure to speed things up. She said the packet for the December 14 meeting has been assembled so there is no time to do new work and include it in the packet. She said her intent was to work through the document and orient the Commission to where things have changed and where they have not. The process issues offer a good place to start because they are unrelated to what the ULI is undertaking and is largely already in the code. She agreed to draft a cover letter to sent out listing off the sections to be covered at that meeting, allowing both the staff and the Commissioners to know where to focus their attentions in the intervening time.

MINUTES  
(8:40 p.m.)

A. September 14, 2016

Mr. Cullen noted that the minutes were approved by the Commission on November 9, but Commissioner Laing had noted several small non-substantive revisions.

B. October 12, 2016

Mr. Cullen called attention to the revisions made on pages 6 and 7 of the minutes in response to a request by Commissioner Barksdale to review the audio recording.

Commissioner Barksdale clarified with respect to his comment under Communications From City Council, Boards and Commissions that the community meeting he referenced was the Mike McCormick meeting with neighborhood leaders.

Commissioner Walter called attention to paragraphs 5 and 6 on page 10 of the minutes and noted that while Ms. Byers had agreed to redraft the proposal relative to parking and bring it back to the Commission for additional review, the Commission has not to date seen that redraft. Mr. Cullen said he would bring that back.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Walter and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioner Laing abstained from voting.

C. October 26, 2016

Commissioner Hilhorst called attention to the penultimate paragraph on page 9 of the minutes and clarified that not all of the panelists should live in large cities outside of the Northwest, but some of them should. She asked to have the first sentence revised to read "...for some of the panelists to live in large cities outside of the Northwest...."

Commissioner Walter referred to the third paragraph on page 41 and asked if the Council has already been updated, if they will be updated, or if they will need to be updated about the designation for Eastgate shelters being allowed through a conditional use permit. Mr. Cullen said the Council has been updated both by memo and orally.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Barksdale and the motion carried unanimously.

D. November 9, 2016

Commissioner Laing called attention to the sixth paragraph on page 5 of the minutes and asked to have the first sentence revised to read "Commissioner Laing suggested that the policy should not say "regardless of demographics and geography" but rather should give.... He also referred to the first paragraph on page 7 and suggested the phrase "feasible, reasonable and appropriate" should also be in quotes.


A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Commissioner Hilhorst. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laing and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioner Walter abstained from voting.

PUBLIC COMMENT – None  
(8:50 p.m.)


ADJOURN  
(8:50 p.m.)


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

Chair deVadoss adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Cullen  
Staff to the Planning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John deVadoss  
Chair of the Planning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

