

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

January 26, 2016
4:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-113

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Breiland

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Kattermann, Terry Cullen, Planning and Community
Development Department; Phil Harris, John Murphy,
Transportation Department; Dan Bertolet, VIA Architects

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

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

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m. by Chair Lampe who presided.

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

A motion to approve the December 1, 2015, meeting minutes was made by Mr. Long. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thurston and the motion carried unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Mon Wig, 4811 134th Place SE, reminded the Committee that about a year ago an open house was held at which the community was invited to indicate their preferences, including what should happen on the Red Lion site. The information was taken to heart in crafting a place-making environment for the site, with tall buildings set back on the site, and a two-story structure having ground-floor retail and a stepped back second story. The site plan includes the option of creating future connections with the Hilton site to create an overall district. On the 112th Avenue SE side, the design is left open to welcome light rail traffic into the development. If and when Main Street gets extended, some retail fronting on that street could be created. The heights of the buildings contemplated in the plan are 120, 250 and 300 feet. If the view corridor were not an issue, the tall building would be shifted to the east, and the average height would be about 200 feet.

Ms. Leshya Wig, 4811 134th Place SE, called attention to the Committee's draft strategies and highlighted three concerns. With regard to maximum square footage for building footprints, floorplates and retail space, she said the Committee has indicated an interest in seeing certain types of tenants in the development, including a grocery store or a medical use. Those types of tenants typically require larger floorplates. It would be better to establish an open space requirement rather than a maximum square footage. There is no intent to put in big box retail, which could have been the reason for the language limiting maximum square footage. The second issue was with regard to retail and service uses scaled to primarily serve the immediate community. The concern is that if the retail only serves the immediate community, it may not be able to survive in the long run. It will need to be of a scale large enough to be able to draw some from outside the immediate community. The third concern was in regard to the proposed 4.0 FAR and 200-foot building height. FAR is a measure of density and without density development of the site cannot be justified. The more square footage permitted, the more money that can be spent on amenities for the development. A base FAR, with an opportunity to increase it by 1.0 through the use of bonuses and incentives, should be established. Height controls form, so a high FAR but a low height limits open space. An average building height of about 200 feet should be allowed.

Ms. Renay Bennett, 826 108th Avenue SE, called attention to paragraph (c) on page 10 of Attachment 3 in the Committee packet and the idea of coordinating additional traffic calming measures for 108th Avenue SE with measures for 109th Avenue SE to discourage cut-through traffic and maintain safety on local streets. Rather than using the word "local," it would be better to use "neighborhood" or "on these streets" in order to make it clear traffic calming is needed on both streets. With regard to paragraph (e), which calls for adding a protected left-turn signal phase for westbound Main Street to southbound 108th Avenue SE to facilitate residential neighborhood access, she said such an action would facilitate access for everyone, not just local residents. If the language is to be retained, it should be revised to call for the action to be concurrent with traffic restrictions into the neighborhood to restrict cut-through traffic.

3. PROJECT UPDATE AND NEXT STEPS

Senior Planner Mike Kattermann explained that the focus of the meeting would be on completing the discussion and give direction on the draft vision statements and strategies. The vision statements are intended to capture what the Committee wants to accomplish, and the strategies are the actions needed to get there. He noted that items (A) through (F) had previously been addressed. An open house to gain public comment on the draft vision statements and strategies will be scheduled, probably for early March. In the meantime, work will be done on the Committee's report. The Committee meeting on March 29 will serve as the opportunity for wrapping everything up, including the transmittal report and recommendation to be presented to the City Council in May.

Mr. Kattermann explained that Attachments 4 and 5 in the packet were designed to reflect the type of material for the public to comment on at the open house. He said Attachment 4 consolidated all of the draft vision statements, and Attachment 5 contained a consolidation of the draft strategies, each organized into the categories of traffic, ped/bike access, character, land use and redevelopment.

Ms. Unger said she would not be able to attend any meetings in March. Mr. Kattermann said any comments she wanted to make before then would be relayed to the rest of the Committee. Ms. Unger asked if the Committee would be kept informed as to presentation to the Council and any actions the Council takes subsequently. Mr. Kattermann said he would send out to the Committee members a report regarding the conclusions reached. Ms. Unger asked how recommendations will make their way into the city budget. Mr. Kattermann said the process to create a budget for 2017-2018 will be adopted in December. Recommendations from the Committee's report may or may not make their way into the current budget cycle, though some items may be included in a work program and funded in that way.

4. CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF DRAFT VISION STATEMENTS AND STRATEGIES FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

Senior Planner Phil Harris reminded the Committee members that in May 2015 they were informed with regard to some of the transportation changes that will be happening. There will be closures on 112th Avenue SE that will prevent 50 vehicles in the evening peak from going into the residential areas by using SE 1st Place and SE 4th Street. Over the next 20 years traffic will increase as population and employment increases, and that growth will need to be mitigated. Redevelopment will occur to the east of 112th Avenue SE with land uses that will redistribute some growth from other parts of the city, and the growth will trigger increases in traffic along 112th Avenue SE and 114th Avenue SE.

Mr. Harris said the draft vision relative to neighborhood access, as outlined in item (G), talks about balancing things like vehicular access as well as pedestrian safety in the neighborhoods, and about addressing cut-through traffic.

Transportation Planner John Murphy called attention to strategy (a) and noted that it sets the context that would allow more traffic calming measures to be installed in residential areas. The idea is that there will be a lot of people walking in the neighborhood areas around the light rail station. The city's traffic calming guidelines are such that the speed thresholds are too high. In the interest of safety and lack of sidewalks in the neighborhood areas, adjusting the guidelines to allow for traffic calming measures will decrease vehicle speeds and improve pedestrian safety.

Chair Lampe commented that the primary emphasis is on pedestrian safety as opposed to a disincentive for more people to take a particular route, such as 108th Avenue SE, by putting more speed bumps in. Mr. Murphy said the two go hand-in-hand. The idea is to allow for traffic calming measures to improve pedestrian safety, while also setting up to discourage cut-through traffic on 108th Avenue SE and 109th Avenue SE.

Ms. Powell noted that currently there are speed bumps on 108th Avenue SE, a speed limit of 25 miles per hour, and a nice sidewalk. She asked if the proposal is to utilize other methods, such as signage at 108th Avenue SE and Main Street and 108th Avenue SE and Bellevue Way. Mr. Murphy said strategy (c) talks more specifically about traffic calming and outlines some potential strategies without talking about a specific strategy at a specific location.

Ms. Powell asked if steps will also be taken to improve safety for bicyclists? Mr. Murphy said that has not been discussed in the context of the Committee, but there are other city programs that address bicycle safety. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative that is currently under way among other things is actively looking at continuing with 108th Avenue SE as a priority bike corridor and considering additional enhancements to make it easier to use and more inviting as well as safer. The street will be overlaid in the near future at which time there may be opportunities to make it more conducive to bicycles.

Mr. Murphy explained that the guidelines for traffic calming measures say the speed threshold needs to be 35 miles per hour before considering something like speed humps. In areas where there is more pedestrian activity, like around schools and parks, there is a lower threshold. There are currently no light rail stations in the city and the opportunity exists to recognize that, similar to parks and schools, light rail stations will generate pedestrian activity and as such the guidelines may need to be adjusted accordingly.

Ms. Hammond asked if items like traffic circles are a possibility. Mr. Murphy allowed that they are included in the traffic calming toolkit.

Ms. Powell pointed out that there is a difference between elementary schools and high schools in that the speed limit for the former is 20 miles per hour and for the latter it is 25 miles per hour and higher. There have been discussions over the years about reducing the speed limit on 108th Avenue SE to 20 miles per hour from the current 25 miles per hour. She asked if that is something that could be done, even though a high school is involved rather than an elementary school. Mr. Murphy said that approach is not embedded in strategy (a). The issue is complicated and is something staff is looking into. Ms. Powell said she would like to see the option on the table.

Ms. Hammond added that there is a sidewalk only on one side of 108th Avenue SE and when the high school lets out there are herds of students walking to metro bus stops and the like. The sidewalk is not big enough to accommodate them all, so some students walk in the street. Reducing the speed limit or having sidewalks on both sides of the street would improve safety. Special consideration needs to be given to the roadway.

Mr. Thurston asked if, in the event of a tragic occurrence, the city could determine the area needs additional help and work on mitigations even if the guidelines are not revised. Mr. Murphy said there are always extenuating circumstances that allow the city to make adjustments.

Mr. Rogers pointed out that the vision statement calls for effectively eliminating non-residential traffic from cutting through the neighborhood. He suggested there should be a correlating strategy that specifically addresses the vision statement. Mr. Kattermann called attention to the second page of Attachment 3 and noted that it lays out some fairly specific items the Committee has identified and which have been included in the strategies. There undoubtedly are things that have not yet been thought of, so item (b) calls for continued evaluation.

With regard to strategy (b), Mr. Murphy said there was strong consensus on the part of the Committee members to continue enforcing access restrictions from the downtown to 108th

Avenue SE. It has been observed that between eight and ten percent of vehicles are violating the through movement restriction, which highlights the need for continued monitoring and enforcement. Between March and December of 2015, the police department issued 115 citations to people going through.

Chair Lampe asked about the potential for including a left-turn movement at 108th Avenue SE as proposed during the public comment period. As phrased, the vision statement seeks to facilitate neighborhood traffic without encouraging additional traffic. He asked how the one can be done without the other. Mr. Murphy said he did not know what that mechanism would be. He allowed that there are some items that somewhat contradict each other, which is a reflection of the diverse opinions of the Committee members. Access into the neighborhood will be more challenging with SE 1st Place and SE 4th Street closed, and the potential increase in traffic that will result needs to be balanced with additional traffic calming measures on key corridors aimed at discouraging cut-through traffic. Restricting and permitting at the same time will be difficult to achieve.

Ms. Hammond said when it comes to cut-through traffic, the issue neither the Committee or the city has been able to get beyond is the fact that 108th Avenue SE is a collector arterial, making the definition of what constitutes cut-through traffic somewhat gray. The designation of the street should be reviewed. Mr. Murphy said there have been conversations with the Committee about the classification and the determination made was that no attempt would be made to reclassify the street.

Ms. Hammond asked if there are specific times of day the police department is watching the intersection and enforcing the prohibition against through movements. Mr. Murphy said he did not have those specifics. However, it can be said that the police focus energy on when violations are committed the most, which in the case of the intersection in question is the evening peak period.

Mr. Murphy noted that strategy (c) calls for coordinating additional traffic calming measures for 108th Avenue SE with measures for 109th Avenue SE to discourage cut-through traffic and maintain safety on local streets. The idea is that there is a relationship between the two streets and what happens on one could impact the other.

Chair Lampe brought up the issue raised by the public regarding the use of a word other than "local." Mr. Murphy said either "neighborhood" or "residential" could be used in conjunction with the classification of the street.

Ms. Powell said the issue that 108th Avenue SE may be a collector arterial, but it is also a neighborhood street. Mr. Murphy said changing to "neighborhood" or "residential" would reflect that fact.

Mr. Harris commented that strategy (d) calls for maintaining the existing access restrictions at Main Street and 110th Avenue SE. If the current restriction were to be removed, more traffic would use 110th Avenue SE.

Ms. Unger said she would buy off on (d) if (e) is retained. Ms. Hammond agreed that (e) should be retained. Adding a protected left-turn signal phase for westbound Main Street to southbound 108th Avenue SE will facilitate access to the neighborhood. She added that the intersection in its current configuration is dangerous to pedestrians.

Ms. Powell disagreed. She said she would like to see (e) deleted. It would be good for Surrey Downs to have more access on 110th Avenue SE because of the coming closures at SE 1st Place and SE 4th Street. There is also a hill on 110th Avenue SE that somewhat obstructs the view. Mr. King agreed that the hill is an important factor. Exiting Surrey Downs onto Main Street and then going into the downtown on 110th Avenue SE, drivers must cross two lanes of traffic and get into a third lane in a distance of about two car lengths. The Committee should recommend putting in a traffic light with a short signal time.

Ms. Hammond said she recognized that there will be more traffic and that access to the neighborhood is going to be difficult, but even so favored retaining strategy (d). Before the restriction was put in place, people were always trying to turn left, causing traffic to back up into the neighborhood. Mr. King said retaining the right-turn action makes sense, but a signal for eastbound traffic half a block up from where it is on Main Street would help. Things should not be left as they are.

Ms. Hammond said allowing traffic to go from the downtown directly into the neighborhood would change the character and quality of the neighborhood. Mr. Kattermann said the group has been very clear about that, which is why the idea of constructing a full signalized intersection there is not on the list.

Chair Lampe commented that traffic on Main Street will increase over time as development continues. Both strategies (d) and (e) make sense from the standpoint of accommodating the additional flow while protecting the neighborhood.

Ms. Hammond said it is equally dangerous to turn from southbound 108th Avenue SE to eastbound Main Street without a turn arrow. It makes sense to at least look at putting in left-turn arrows all around. Bicycles are allowed to go straight through the intersection and safety would be improved by having the arrows.

Mr. King suggested the problems facing 108th Avenue SE and 110th Avenue SE are not the same. The concerns regarding 108th Avenue SE could be addressed without foregoing correcting the distinct problems associated with 110th Avenue SE.

Ms. Powell said if the access restrictions at Main Street and 110th Avenue SE were to be removed, and if right- and left-turn lanes were created for traffic to get into and out of Surrey Downs at 110th Avenue SE, the focus could be on local access only. Everything that can be done to discourage cut-through traffic should be done, but the fact is it will continue to occur even with signage, lights and all manner of traffic calming measures in place. Removing the barrier at 110th Avenue SE to allow for getting in and out of Surrey Downs, it could be treated the same as 108th Avenue SE relative to local access only.

Mr. Harris commented that strategy (h) references incorporating the recommendations of the East Main Station Area Plan into subsequent studies and programs. The recommendations call for a full corridor study of Main Street. Strategies (d) and (e) both relate to intersections on Main Street. The strategies will help to inform the overall vision for Main Street, but Main Street will continue to be viewed as a corridor.

Mr. Kattermann said taking a look at the safety and function of turning movements at 110th Avenue SE and Main Street could be included as a separate strategy. To do something similar for 108th Avenue SE and Main Street, including looking at protected left-turn movements in all directions, could be another strategy. Additionally, the suggestion made by Ms. Bennett to add language if there is a protected left-turn lane to concurrently look at additional traffic restrictions, could also be added. The Committee members agreed.

Ms. Powell reiterated that the closure of SE 1st Place and SE 4th Street will create access issues for the Surrey Downs neighborhood. One solution would be to remove the current restriction into the neighborhood from the intersection at Main Street and 110th Avenue SE.

Ms. Unger agreed that the neighborhood will be somewhat hampered by losing two access points. However, the neighborhood has been clear about wanting to improve safety and reduce cut-through traffic. The current restriction should be retained, but there should also be a call to continue researching ways to restrict access to local residents only.

Mr. Thurston commented that Surrey Downs should be given what it wants in terms of improving safety and reducing cut-through traffic. While there is no perfect solution, the fact that access to the neighborhood will be limited will make the neighborhood less palatable as a cut-through route.

Mr. Murphy noted that strategy (f) calls for evaluating the potential for marked crosswalks or other treatments to better highlight pedestrian crossings at SE 2nd Street and SE 11th Street to access the sidewalk on the west side of 108th Avenue SE. The strategy is in recognition of the Bellevue High foot traffic and the need to create a more cohesive pedestrian network. Additionally, strategy (g) calls for a sidewalk on at least one side of SE 16th Street between Bellevue Way and 108th Avenue SE in order to fill in the gaps for the points that lead into the neighborhood areas.

Mr. Harris reiterated what he had said earlier about strategy (h), and stressed that the Committee's recommendations will inform the future studies.

Ms. Powell proposed specifically mentioning the Downtown Transportation Plan in the strategy.

Mr. Kattermann stated that there is quite a bit of overlap between issues H and I. He reminded the Committee that no changes are being considered for the residential areas and the Office/Light Industrial area to the south. The main focus of the discussion in the vision statement and the strategies is on the overall mix of uses, the scale of development, building placement, and floor/area ratio (FAR) on the Red Lion and Hilton properties. Quality and the things that go into the look and feel of development are primarily covered in issue I. The mix of uses refers both to

in the buildings and in the redevelopment area. Retail goods and services cannot be limited exclusively to the local community but will be focused primarily on serving those living and working with the redevelopment area and the immediately surrounding areas, including the residential areas to the west, the office areas to the south, and the southeast quadrant of the downtown. That is not to say there will be none who come in from other parts of the city or the region. The Committee has been clear about not wanting to see big box retail, which will help to focus the draw area. Limitations are anticipated to be put on office uses to keep them from becoming the dominant use for the area. Similarly, with residential the focus is on low-rise, possibly townhouse, along with mid- to high-rise to provide for a range of housing types in terms of unit size and affordability. The hotel uses would continue as the exception to serving only the local community.

The primary transit-oriented development area is between Main Street and SE 6th Street. Mr. Kattermann said the area is unique in that it is not in the downtown, it is not part of the residential area, and it is not exactly part of the Bellefield office development to the south. It is however, next to the downtown, next to the residential, next to the office development to the south, next to the freeway, next to the light rail station, and next to the Wilburton area, all of which have different characters and development potential. Until the BelRed plan was adopted, no FAR above 0.5 was allowed outside of the downtown, except for Factoria which was developed under King County rules. In the downtown, the FAR for non-residential uses range from 0.5 to 8.0; for residential uses in the downtown, the FAR is unlimited in certain zones. Non-residential heights range from 45 feet to 450 feet, and residential heights range from 55 feet to 450 feet. Bel-Red has a maximum FAR of 4.0 and a maximum height limit of 150 feet, both of which can only be achieved through bonuses and incentives.

Currently, the maximum FAR in the Office/Limited Business zone north of Main Street is 3.0, and the allowed height is 75 feet for non-residential uses and 90 feet for residential uses. The Downtown Livability Initiative Citizen Advisory Committee has recommended a 200-foot height limit and an FAR of 5.0 for the area. On the north side of Main Street and west of 112th Avenue NE, the height limit is 45 feet for non-residential and the FAR is 1.0, and 55 feet for residential with an FAR of 3.5. For the areas south of Main Street in the redevelopment area, the FAR is 0.5 and the height ranges between 30 feet and 75 feet, and there are transition zones that come into play that serve to limit height. The proposal is to eliminate the transition zones and to write their restrictions into the new zone.

Mr. Kattermann commented that even with the view corridor restrictions, an FAR of up to 5.0 can be fit on the site. With that in mind, he suggested the larger issue for the Committee to address is building height and where buildings should be located. He shared with the group an outline of the site with actual buildings both inside and outside the downtown situated on it. The buildings included Skyline Tower, 300 feet tall; Washington Square, 200 feet tall; Hilton Hotel, 110 feet tall; and August Wilson Place, 70 feet tall.

Mr. Thurston said the question in his mind is what creates a successful transit-oriented development. The TOD Institute tracks such developments nationally and lists the elements for what is successful. Their website makes it apparent that the elements of success are open space, cafés, retail uses, pedestrian friendliness, and overall livability. Regardless of building height and

FAR, those issues must be embraced. The Bellevue Club property is not likely to have redevelopment on any large scale. The Red Lion property is the only one that can create what is identified as a place-making opportunity, meaning a place that is an asset for the community, for those living nearby, and for Sound Transit. The trade-off to open space is building height; reducing building height spreads out the density and leaves little room for open space. The viability of retail uses is tied to density. The Red Lion site is the linchpin to the success of the district.

Mr. Kattermann pointed out that transit-oriented development comes in a variety of scales. The Spring District in Bel-Red has an FAR of 4.0 but will be building to something less while including all of the customary transit-oriented development elements. With regard to the view corridor issue, he noted that it was taken to the Council for discussion and they concluded additional study is needed. That does not preclude the Committee from making recommendations as it sees fit. The Committee should recognize the view corridor currently exists, and any recommendation for a building placement that does not fit the confines of the view corridor should be added as a caveat.

Mr. Thurston said the view corridor emanating from City Hall should not be allowed to preclude what would otherwise be a successful district. Ms. Hammond and Ms. Unger concurred.

Mr. Kattermann said strategies (a) and (b) included language the Committee had previously seen related to other topics. Strategy (c) is about the primary transit-oriented development area and outlines a maximum height of 200 feet and an FAR of 4.0, which is in line with the previously discussed Scenario 3. Bonuses would need to be earned through the incentive system in order to achieve the maximums. It will be at the discretion of the City Council to decide what to do with the Committee's recommendation, and the Planning Commission will be directed to weigh in as well, though both groups will give deference to the work of the Committee. In going through the details of how to achieve the FAR, some additional adjustments may be identified.

A motion to extend the meeting to 6:30 p.m. was made by Ms. Unger. The motion was seconded by Mr. King.

Ms. Hammond suggested the topic is too important to squish into a half hour discussion. Mr. Kattermann pointed out that the discussion could be continued at the next meeting, but Ms. Hammond said that could result in a loss of momentum for the conversation.

The motion carried with Ms. Powell and Ms. Hammond voting no.

Ms. Hammond suggested strategy (a) as drafted is vague. Mr. Kattermann said new development is already required to analyze and mitigate for project-related traffic impacts, and by including the strategy the public will know the approach will continue.

Mr. Rogers asked if it would be appropriate include verbiage that would apply to both the Red Lion and Hilton properties. Mr. Kattermann explained that the strategies will apply to the entire redevelopment area. No property owner would be required to take advantage of the new approach, and it is possible that the development that would be allowed on one site could be

transferred to another. Should one of the three property owners decide not to use only half of their allowed FAR of 4.0, they could possibly sell the balance to one of the other sites. A maximum limit on FAR could also be imposed. The strategy would require a willing seller and a willing buyer.

Ms. Hammond asked how that would play out. Mr. Kattermann said transfer of development rights is a program already in place in the downtown. Essentially sites can sell their unused bonus incentives to another site. The selling site would then be precluded from ever using the FAR it sells.

Ms. Hammond said it would be helpful for the Committee to be given a quick tutorial on the bonus incentive system and how it works. Mr. Kattermann said he could provide that at a future meeting.

Chair Lampe commented that a bolder vision from what otherwise might be established for the redevelopment area is needed to optimize the transit-oriented development potential and to assure high quality. He said he would be amenable to allowing a higher height limit on the northwest corner of the Red Lion property across from the park. Even going to 250 feet would not trigger shadowing implications for nearby residential uses. He agreed the view corridor restrictions should not impinge inappropriately on the ability to create a strong transit-oriented development area, one that will be a good neighbor to the adjacent neighborhoods.

Ms. Unger suggested the Committee should make one recommendation that assumes the view corridor restrictions will be in play, and another assuming the restrictions will not be in play. The Committee should also be clear about how it feels about the view corridor requirements. Mr. Kattermann said it would be entirely appropriate to state a preference for the redevelopment area with or without a view corridor. The view corridor issue itself is a policy matter the Council will decide.

Mr. Thurston reiterated that the linchpin required to make the district successful is the Red Lion property. If that property gets what it needs, everything else will fall into place. Mr. Kattermann said from a planning perspective, a higher FAR yields greater potential, but other elements need to be put in place in order to assure the outcome. The charge of the Committee is to set the vision; the details of how to accomplish the vision will be in the code, which is the responsibility of the Planning Commission and the City Council. The Committee's vision statements and strategies will inform their work.

The Committee members took the time to read through the consolidated draft vision statement that was included as Attachment 4 to the desk packet. Chair Lampe said he saw nothing in it that was inconsistent with the tenor of the Committee's discussion, but suggested the open space issue could be given more attention.

Mr. Thurston said the TOD Institute has a nice summary of the elements necessary for the success of a transit-oriented development. He suggested they could be added to the document as bullet points. Additionally, the public should be shown drawings of how the development potential will play out relative to pedestrian scale.

Ms. Unger pointed out that the vision statement talks about taller buildings being strategically located, but it says nothing about where they might be located on the site. There is also a reference to maintaining compatibility with nearby single family residences, but what is meant by compatibility is not specified. Also, the statement talks about siting mid- and high-rise office buildings closer to I-405 to provide a visual and noise buffer, but as drafted it could be interpreted to mean a single building can be located right on 112th Avenue SE.

Ms. Hammond suggested the fastest way to guarantee that the neighborhood and community will see the worst possible impacts will be to handicap a transit-oriented development from being successful. Mr. Thurston concurred.

Ms. Unger asked if the vision statement is the place to comment on the view corridor and the degree to which it could hamper the success of the transit-oriented development. Mr. Thurston suggested it would be the right place to do that. Mr. Kattermann said he would work with the suggestions and include something to that effect in the vision statement.

Ms. Powell said she wanted to see a successful transit-oriented development brought about while at the same time honoring the policy direction to preserve the view corridor.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Mon Wig, 4811 134th Place SE, pointed out that the Red Lion property is not in the central business district and as such it will require enough density to make it successful, especially if the adjoining properties do not get redeveloped for 20 years.

Ms. Renay Bennett, 826 108th Avenue SE, thanked the Committee members for their great and supportive comments. She pointed out that state law does not spell out that elementary schools are the only ones with speed limits of 20 miles per hour; state law refers to schools period and is not prescriptive.

6. ADJOURN

Chair Lampe adjourned the meeting at 6:25 p.m.