

Memory Book

The following matrix represents a compilation of the topics raised or questions asked by the City Council during its review of the Planning Commission Recommendation on the Downtown Land Use Code (LUC) Update. Each of the topics and questions is identified by the date that it was raised, the origin of the comment, by the date that the topic question was discussed and the date that it was resolved.

TOPICS AND FOLLOW-UP	REQUESTOR	TARGET DATE FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION
June 26, 2017 – Code Topics for Follow-Up		
Downtown Office Limited Business District <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density/design parameters (height, floor plates) Incentives Relationship to East Main Station Area Planning 	Chelminiak Robinson	Originally targeted for July 17, but discussion postponed until September 5
Floorplate reduction with added height; 10 percent open space with added height	Chelminiak Wallace	Discussed on July 17 and discussion to be continued on September 5
Tower separation (w/visuals)	Chelminiak Robinson Wallace	July 10 and discussion to be continued on September 5
Transportation analysis briefing	Lee Wallace	July 10
Downtown parking flexibility	Lee Chelminiak Wallace	July 10
Small site exceptions and deviations	Wallace	July 10
Details of affordable housing exemption	Reserved in Code for Council Discussion	July 17 and continued until September 5 for affordable housing language and departures
20-foot Downtown boundary buffer/landscaping strip	Chelminiak	September 5
Fee in lieu incentive zoning for parks	Robinson	September 5
Accessibility and use of alleys	Robinson	September 5

TOPICS AND FOLLOW-UP	REQUESTOR	TARGET DATE FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION
June 26, 2017 – Other Follow-Up		
<p>How can we explore Park Impact Fees?</p> <p><i>The Planning Commission recommended that park impact fees be further explored by Council as a follow-up item to the Code update, and outside the scope of the Planning Commission. Staff would need clear direction from Council to explore park impact fees with necessary analysis and stakeholder outreach. The 2016 Bellevue Parks & Open Space System Plan lists park impact fees as one of a number of potential funding sources. As noted in the Plan, park impact fees are one-time fees on new development projects that could support additional park and open space infrastructure to offset the impact of that development's new residents or workers on existing City infrastructure systems. Currently, Bellevue collects transportation impact fees, and school impact fees for Bellevue development located in the Issaquah and Renton School Districts. Eastside jurisdictions with park impact fees include Redmond, Issaquah, Bothell, Sammamish, Kirkland, and Woodinville.</i></p>	Robinson	Exploration of Park Impact Fee to occur, separate from Code update, based on Council direction.
July 10, 2017		
<p>Tower separation and setbacks – Councilmembers directed staff to include 60-foot tower separation in the next draft. Councilmembers will reflect on topic and were encouraged to contact staff with any questions.</p>	All	Council leaves proposed code “as is.”

TOPICS AND FOLLOW-UP	REQUESTOR	TARGET DATE FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION
Parking flexibility – Council directed staff to bring back language that provides Director with flexibility to increase or decrease parking ratios similar to BelRed provision in Part 20.25D LUC.	Lee Chelminiak Wallace	Language will be provided on September 5.
Small site exceptions and deviations	Wallace	Council leaves proposed code “as is.”
July 17, 2017		
Floorplate reduction with added height 10 percent open space with added height	Chelminiak Wallace	Discussed on July 17 and discussion to be continued on September 5
30,000 sq. ft. floor plates – Council directed staff to confer with Economic Development Department to determine market demand and whether the proposed floor plates in the OLB will accommodate the influx of technology based businesses, or is greater flexibility necessary in DT-O-1 and DT-O-2.	Robinson	September 5
Affordable housing	Chelminiak (1) Robinson (2) Robinson (3)	Topics delayed until the consideration of the Affordable Housing Strategy include (1) Potential of subsidizing unites to remain at 60 percent AMI beyond 12 year MFTE Term, (2) Discussion of MFTE and layering incentives, and (3) Discussion of units below 80 percent AMI
September 5, 2017		
Tower setbacks between projects.	All	Council Direction: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nonresidential buildings – 20-foot setback above 80 feet for buildings exceeding 100 feet in height. 2. Residential buildings – 30-foot setback above 80 feet for buildings exceeding 100 feet in height.

TOPICS AND FOLLOW-UP	REQUESTOR	TARGET DATE FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION
Floor plate reduction when building exceeds trigger height	Chelminiak Wallace	<p>Council Direction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10 percent reduction in floor plates above 80 feet for residential buildings that exceed the trigger height. 2. 15 percent reduction in floor plates above 80 feet for nonresidential buildings that exceed the trigger height in DT-O-1 and DT-O-2. <p>To be discussed on September 18:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage reduction in floor plates above 80 feet for nonresidential buildings that exceed the trigger height in DT-MU, DT-MU Civic Center, DT-OLB Central and DT-OLB South. 2. Should there be a point below which floor plates should not be reduced, e.g. 20,000 square feet?

TOPICS AND FOLLOW-UP	REQUESTOR	TARGET DATE FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION
DT-OLB density and design	Chelminiak Robinson	<p>Council Direction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow 25 percent increase in floor plates in the DT-OLB Central District between 80 and 150 feet of building height with required continuous east-west building separation above 40 feet and no negative impact on access to light and air, or privacy. This was provided only to DT-OLB South in the Planning Commission recommendation. 2. Use a 10 percent floor plate reduction above the trigger height. (See Floor Plate Reduction Topic above). This would apply to the nonresidential trigger height of 115 feet and residential trigger height of 230 feet in the DT-OLB Central and DT-OLB South Districts. 3. Discussion of potential additional density bonuses in the DT-OLB Central District should await the planned 2018 code updates to implement the Grand Connection Framework Plan currently being developed.

TOPICS AND FOLLOW-UP	REQUESTOR	TARGET DATE FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION
<p>30,000 sq. ft. floor plates – Council directed staff to confer with Economic Development Department to determine market demand and whether the proposed floor plates in the DT-OLB districts will accommodate the influx of technology based businesses, or is greater flexibility necessary in DT-O-1 and DT-O-2.</p>	Robertson	<p>Staff reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger office floor plates for larger companies are important because separate floors mean less collaboration. Small and medium sized tech companies are generally priced out of Downtown. • There are a number of large software research and development companies in Downtown Bellevue that have been happy with the office space options with less than 24,000 square foot floor plates. • A floor (18,000 square feet) and a ceiling (30,000 square feet) is desirable for office floor plate sizes, but emphasis is placed on design, amenities, and accessibility as priorities as well.
<p>Carry-over topics from September 5 Study Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing code flexibility • Accessibility and use of alleys • Downtown boundary linear buffer • In-lieu fees for parks • Wrap-up of minor topics 		<p>Topics were scheduled for discussion on September 5, but postponed until September 18 due to time constraints.</p>
<p>New Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small site exceptions and deviations • Floor plate reduction when nonresidential buildings exceed trigger height; possibility of floor plate reduction stopping at 20,000 square feet in DT-MU • Update on Wilburton Commercial Area Study 		<p>To be discussed on September 18.</p>

TOPICS AND FOLLOW-UP	REQUESTOR	TARGET DATE FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION
September 18, 2017		
Nonresidential towers exceeding the trigger height in the DT-MU and DT-OLB districts	Chelminiak, Robertson, Robinson	Provide three code language options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 percent reduction in floor plate – consistent with Planning Commission Recommendation • Safe harbor option – Floor plate shall not go below 20,000 square feet. • No requirement for floor plate reduction over the trigger height if “exemplary design” is provided.
Affordable housing flexibility		Direction to include flexibility regarding reduced parking, increased lot coverage, and ability to reduce upper level setbacks as recommended by staff.
Accessibility and use of alleys		No changes to current version of the draft code were requested by Council.
Downtown boundary linear buffer		No changes to current version of the draft code were requested by Council.
In-lieu fees for parks		Direction to include language that in-lieu fees may be expended on parks located adjacent to or connected to Downtown as well as in Downtown. Direction to allow in-lieu fees for public open space, not just parks.
Small site exceptions		No changes to current version of the draft code were requested by Council.
Vesting and sustainability certification		No changes to current version of the draft code were requested by Council.

TOPICS AND FOLLOW-UP	REQUESTOR	TARGET DATE FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION
Tower setbacks from interior property lines		Direction to include 20-foot setbacks from interior property lines for both residential and nonresidential towers in the draft code. Alternative draft code language was requested for Council discussion on October 2 to include a 30-foot setback from interior property lines for residential towers with flexibility to reduce the setback to 20 feet.
Increase in nonresidential trigger heights in DT-OLB Central and DT-OLB South districts		Direction to bring back this topic for Council discussion on October 2.
October 2, 2017		
Nonresidential towers exceeding the trigger height in the DT-MU and DT-OLB districts		<p>Council reviewed three code options as shown below on October 2.</p> <p>Council direction to bring back these three options for final deliberation on October 16 prior to overall code adoption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 percent floor plate reduction – consistent with Planning Commission Recommendation • Safe harbor option – No required floor plate reduction below 20,000 square feet. • No requirement for floor plate reduction over trigger height if “exemplary design” is provided.
Increase in nonresidential trigger heights in DT-OLB Central and DT-OLB South districts		No change to current version of the draft code – retain nonresidential trigger height of 115 feet in DT-OLB Central and DT-OLB South districts.
Downtown boundary linear buffer		Direction to incorporate staff’s modest changes to avoid unintended consequences while achieving Commission’s recommended intent.
Residential tower setbacks between projects		No change to current version of the draft code – retain 20-foot residential tower setback above 80 feet.

