

## Policy Changes from Planning Commission Review

### Background

Proposed policy changes to the BelRed Subarea Plan were released for public review on January 15, 2024. The public was invited to submit comments on the future land use map, and to provide input on policy moves through a series of three questionnaires between January 15 and February 16.

In February and March, several boards and commissions reviewed proposed policies along with community feedback, made changes and recommended policy amendments to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission reviewed policies at their meetings between February 28 and April 24 and provided direction on changes to the policies.

The following list identifies feedback given by the Planning Commission followed by staff considerations and recommendation.

### General

1. PC Feedback: S-BR-2. A commissioner suggested adding language to recognize both opportunities provided by both public and private redevelopment.
  - i. Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-2. <del>Reduce and mitigate environmental and transportation spillover impacts of new development and employment growth and leverage opportunities provided by redevelopment to improve ecological function and resilience, and work to continually enhance environmental conditions in the area, through a combination of development regulations and incentives, public investments, and other public and private strategies.</del></p>	<p>S-BR-2. Minimize the environmental impacts of population and employment growth and leverage opportunities provided by <u>public and private</u> redevelopment to improve ecological function and resilience.</p>

### Land Use

2. PC Feedback: S-BR-8: Commissioners felt the terminology about building and expanding upon BelRed’s “existing” economic clusters was limiting and should be expanded to include new economic clusters.
  - Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-8. <u>Provide for a range of distinct economic centers that build and expand upon BelRed's existing economic clusters by tailoring dimensional standards and permitted uses to different center needs.</u>	S-BR-8. Provide for a range of distinct economic centers that build and expand upon BelRed's existing <u>and emerging</u> economic clusters by tailoring dimensional standards and permitted uses to different center needs.

3. PC Feedback: S-BR-9: A commissioner believed that artist live/work and work/live uses often do not work and wanted to see examples of successful applications.
  - Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
    - i. Staff recognize challenges with this building typology exist yet believe successful solutions have been implemented elsewhere and the policy intent to provide for them is warranted. Below are examples of projects and codes designed to facilitate living and working within the same structure.
    - ii. Note, some of these take a different approach to live/work and work/live than what has been done in the past.
    - iii. Projects:
      1. [Mosaica Alabama Street Housing - Mithun](#)
      2. [Union Flats | David Baker Architects \(dbarchitect.com\)](#)
      3. [18th & Arkansas/g2 Lofts | David Baker Architects \(dbarchitect.com\)](#)
      4. [Potrero 1010 | David Baker Architects \(dbarchitect.com\)](#)
      5. [Everett Artists Lofts](#)
    - iv. Presentations, articles, reports, and code:
      1. [Microsoft PowerPoint - Presentation to the Planning Commission - 6-12-14 gc.pptx \(sfplanning.org\)](#)
      2. [PDR 101 \(Production, Repair, Distribution\) - Arts for a Better Bay Area](#)
      3. [CW DPR Chapter5\\_3-Report \(sfplanning.org\)](#)
      4. [Projects | Live-Work](#)
      5. [Welcome to Live/Work in Plain English \(live-work.com\)](#)
      6. Tacoma examples:
        - a. [Live/Work and Work/Live - City of Tacoma](#)
        - b. [L-104 Live-Work and Work-Live Uses.pdf \(cityoftacoma.org\)](#)
        - c. [Tacoma Work/Live Code for Historic Redevelopment\\* - Building Innovations](#)
        - d. [2009 Code Update: Live / Work Units - EVstudio](#)

- e. [blrbreport.pdf \(cityoftacoma.org\)](#)
- f. [Live/Work Townhome | Sixth Ave \(Tacoma, WA\)](#)
- g. [Tacoma For Rent - McKinley Artist Lofts — Surge Residential](#)
- h. [Townhouse Style Live/Work Unit in Historic Theater District - South Sound Property Group](#)

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-9. <u>Provide for small artisanal manufacturing and artist live/work and work/live uses.</u>	No change.

Neighborhood Districts (a subsection of the Land Use section with close ties to the Future Land Use Map)

- 4. PC Feedback: S-BR-14: A Commissioner felt the wording of this policy was awkward though appreciated the examples given.
  - Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-14. <u>Prohibit large low job and population density land uses such as storage buildings and standalone parking garages from locating within high density light rail station area nodes.</u>	S-BR-14. <del>Prohibit</del> <u>Limit large commercial land uses with very low job and/or population density densities such as large standalone storage buildings facilities and standalone parking garages from locating within high density light rail station area nodes.</u>

- 5. PC Feedback: S-BR-15: A Commissioner felt the wording was “fluffy.”
  - Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-15. <del>To s</del> <u>Support the development transformation of new Bel-Red into new neighborhoods that achieves distinctive and high quality character distinguished by unique, community driven characteristics and high quality urban design.</u>	S-BR-15. Support the transformation of BelRed into new neighborhoods distinguished by their unique <del>community driven characteristics and high quality urban design</del> <u>natural and built environments and concentrations of uses.</u>

- 6. PC Feedback: S-BR-16: A commissioner suggested adding “office” uses to the list of uses provided for.
  - Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

- i. Office uses could support medical office uses and would be compatible with medical office.
- ii. However, allowing unlimited office uses in this area could have the unintended consequence of office uses outcompeting medical office uses and thereby displacing medical office uses due to higher cost lease rates.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-16. Provide for <u>medical office and life science</u> uses in this area, with an emphasis on medical office, and with an FAR up to 4.0 along 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE <u>allowing for high intensity development within the half-mile walkshed of light rail stations transitioning to lower intensity development to the north.</u></p>	<p>S-BR-16. Provide for medical office, <del>and</del> life science, <u>and limited office</u> uses along 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE allowing for high intensity development within the half-mile walkshed of light rail stations transitioning to lower intensity development to the north.</p>

7. PC Feedback: Policy S-BR-16/FLUM: Several commissioners questioned the size of the area designated for Medical Office Mixed Use, especially when much of the area appears to be underdeveloped. Commissioners also felt that allowing residential uses would make the area more walkable. Commissioners asked why a medical office designation was recommended over a broader mixed use designation.

- Recommendation: No change to the area designated for Medical Office Mixed Use is recommended. (See policy above).
  - i. Property owners in this area requested a medical office land use designation with higher development allowances.
  - ii. The existing Medical Office zoning district allows only one FAR of development, which may not be high enough to incentivize investment and redevelopment. Providing for increased development potential under the new Medical Office Mixed Use designation with 4 and 6 FARs will likely generate greater interest in redevelopment.
  - iii. The Medical Office Mixed Use future land use designation would allow for multiple zoning districts within it, one of which would allow for broad residential uses mixed with medical, office, and other commercial uses.
    - 1. During the environmental review, two medical office/residential mixed use land use designations (MOR-1 and MOR-2) were analyzed in both Alternative 3 and in the Preferred Alternative with a capacity of over 600 housing units.
    - 2. New policy S-BR-17 calls specifically for providing for some residential mixed use development within the Medical Office

Mixed Use designated area along the eastside of 116<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. This would include housing for all households, not just older adults.

- iv. The purpose of designating an area for medical office mixed use versus a nondescript mixed use designation is to emphasize the provision for medical office while still allowing other uses to coexist in the area. This emphasis directs the city to tailor its land use code regulations in such a way as to allow for the greatest flexibility for medical and life science uses while allowing, yet with some limitations, other uses.
  - v. Medical office uses are allowed currently in nearly all of Bellevue's commercial zoning districts across the city, with few use limitations.
    1. However, other districts seek to achieve multiple objectives many of which are tied to the desired form and function of these areas with which large medical and life science uses would be incompatible. Dimensional standards in these districts are more restrictive to achieve the vision of a walkable district.
    2. Office uses often out compete medical office uses and therefore, they are currently limited to 0.5 FAR within the MO zoning district.
  - vi. The area designated for Medical Office Mixed Use would provide space for the continued growth and expansion of Bellevue's medical office sector along with Bellevue's emerging life science sector supporting the city's goal of economic diversification to support economic stability/sustainability.
  - vii. As noted in Attachment D to the Commission's April 3 Agenda Memo, demand for medical office space is projected to increase with population growth in Bellevue and across the Eastside, as well as with changing demographics where a higher proportion of the population is projected to be comprised of older adults. Demand for space for life sciences is also anticipated to grow on the Eastside due to the area's highly skilled workforce and the strength of the region's existing health and life science institutions.
8. PC Feedback: S-BR-34: A commissioner asked why the entire area between 136<sup>th</sup> Place and NE 140<sup>th</sup> Ave was not all designated for Highrise Residential Mixed Use.
- Recommendation: No change to the area designated for Midrise Mixed Use is recommended. Staff recommend maintaining the Midrise Mixed Use designation for the area between 136<sup>th</sup> Place NE and NE 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

- i. The area currently designated for Midrise Mixed Use falls outside of the ½ mile walkshed to a light rail station and therefore is located outside of a station area node.
- ii. A key strategy for meeting the housing needs of all household types, sizes, and incomes is to encourage a diversity of housing types as articulated in policy S-BR-63, which as amended would read:
  - 1. Encourage a diversity of housing types, including:
    - a. highrise housing in transit nodes,
    - b. midrise housing outside nodes,
    - c. lowrise housing in transition areas, and
    - d. other innovative housing forms, such as live/work and work/live units.
- iii. Construction of midrise buildings is more efficient than highrise buildings allowing greater opportunity for provision of affordable housing.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-34. <u>Provide for a mix of midrise housing and retail uses in this area lower in scale than that provided for within the Station Area Nodes.</u>	No change.

- 9. PC Feedback: Old S-BR-86, S-BR-88, and S-BR-89: A commissioner questioned whether key concepts were lost with the repeal of the discussion sections in these policies.
  - Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
    - i. Policy S-BR-86 refers to the area south of NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street that is recommended to become part of the Wilburton/ NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street Subarea Plan. The entire policy is recommended for repeal in the BelRed Subarea Plan, as it would no longer be part of the BelRed subarea.
    - ii. Policy S-BR-88 was split into two policies – S-BR-24 and S-BR-25 to focus on one topic per policy. Topics in the discussion are covered within several policies – policies S-BR-24 and S-BR-25 in the land use section, policy S-BR-63 in the housing section, and policy S-BR-57 in the parks and open space section. No concepts have been lost in terms of policy direction. The discussion will be incorporated into the narrative preceding this section to provide context.
    - iii. The discussion within policy S-BR-89 describes where the neighborhood district is located. This description will be incorporated into the narrative preceding this policy section.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-86. Discussion: This is an area directly adjacent to Overlake Hospital Medical Center and the Group Health Ambulatory Care Center, by far the largest medical complex on the Eastside, and just south of the planned Seattle Children’s Hospital facility. In addition to these institutional uses, the area is characterized by a wide range of medical office uses that complement the medical campus. At the time of the adoption of this Subarea Plan in 2009, multiple locations were being considered for a light rail station to serve the Medical Institution District, including on the northwest side of Overlake Hospital and immediately east of Whole Foods. When a final station location decision is made by Sound Transit, expected in 2010, the City may consider the need for additional land use planning in that area, which may warrant amendments to the Subarea Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>S-BR-88. Discussion: <del>This area is envisioned as a predominantly residential neighborhood with an active retail street at its core. With its focus on residential uses, this area represents a key opportunity to develop a range of housing types and densities. An urban plaza located near 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE will serve as a “town square”.</del></p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Topics in discussion are covered within the following subarea plan policies, which as amended would read:</p> <p>S-BR-24. Provide for a mix of housing, retail, and services in this area, with an emphasis on housing.</p> <p>S-BR-25. Provide for a pedestrian-oriented retail area along 130th Avenue NE.</p> <p>S-BR-63. Encourage a diversity of housing types, including highrise housing in transit nodes, midrise housing outside nodes, lowrise housing in transition areas, and other innovative housing forms, such as live/work and work/live units.</p> <p>S-BR-57. Centrally locate a park near the 130<sup>th</sup> Light Rail Station with dedicated facilities for outdoor performance and community events to serve the needs of the community and the BelRed Arts District.</p>
<p>S-BR-89. Discussion: <del>This mixed use node is on the edge of Redmond’s designated Overlake neighborhood, and is within the walkable area of the planned Overlake transit station at 152nd Avenue NE.</del></p>	<p>No change.</p>

10. PC Feedback: S-BR-28: Commissioners questioned why the area adjacent to SR 520 within the Overlake Village Station Area Node was recommended for a Highrise Office Mixed Use designation and not a Highrise Residential Mixed Use Designation.

- Recommendation: No change to the area designated for Highrise Office Mixed Use is recommended. Staff recommend maintaining the Highrise Office Mixed Use designation for this area.
  - i. This location is more suitable for office and commercial uses than for residential uses, which may be more sensitive to noise and air pollution impacts.
  - ii. The Highrise Office Mixed Use Designation by itself would allow for a mix of uses including residential uses under that designation.



However, policy S-BR-28 specifically calls for providing for a mix of highrise office and retail uses adjacent to SR 520. This policy was recommended for the following reasons:

1. Today, the Oakhurst Center, an office complex built in 1985 occupies a large portion of the area designated for High Rise Office Mixed Use. Infosys Limited is one of their largest tenants.
2. Parcels adjacent to freeways and high frequency transit are optimal locations for highrise office uses since
  - a. these locations minimize traffic impacts associated with high density employment, and
  - b. these uses are much better equipped and more effective at filtering air and noise pollution from freeways due to their centralized HVAC systems whose large motors can handle high rated filters and can be serviced routinely.

11. PC Feedback: A Commissioner requested staff come back and present an overview of how different spatial information informed staff's recommendation for the FLUM.

- Response:
  - i. In BelRed, key inputs informing the staff FLUM recommendation included:
    1. Existing BelRed Vision, goals, policies, and FLUM
    2. Transportation infrastructure – light rail station walksheds, freeways, Eastrail
    3. Property lines, property owner requests, ownership aggregations
    4. Publicly owned land: Parks, Utilities, Sound Transit, BSD
    5. Environmental layers: critical areas – hydrology, geology, canopy/habitat
    6. Redevelopment potential
    7. Existing use concentrations

### Urban Design

12. PC Feedback: S-BR-38: Commissioners suggested staff consider adding language to provide administrative flexibility to deviate from building standards to achieve these goals, which was recommended in a comment letter.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-38. Encourage diversity in the built environment through a variety of building heights and forms, building articulation and modulation. Encourage building rooflines and floorplates that break down the scale of buildings, help to differentiate Bel-Red from Downtown, and enhance the architectural variety of the area.</p>	<p>S-BR-38. Encourage diversity in the built environment through a variety of building heights and forms, building articulation and modulation. Encourage building rooflines and floorplates that break down the scale of buildings, help to differentiate Bel-Red from Downtown, and enhance the architectural variety of the area. <u>Provide for administrative flexibility to deviate from building standards to achieve these goals.</u></p>

13. PC Feedback: S-BR-39: Commissioners questioned whether “encouraging innovative” building and site design, etc. was in conflict with reflecting local “historic” context.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
  - i. The intent of the policy is to support the development of a sense of place within BelRed, which is often best achieved by first understanding the history of an area. Encouraging innovative design, techniques, and materials need not be in conflict with reflecting the local historic context.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-39. Reinforce the area’s sense of place and Northwest provenance by encouraging innovative building and site design, construction techniques and materials that reflect the <del>industrial roots</del> <u>local historic context</u> of the area while emphasizing <del>its</del> <u>the emerging urban character of Bel-Red.</u></p>	<p>No change.</p>

14. PC Feedback: Old S-BR-22: Commissioners questioned whether policy sections b and c which refer to encouraging structure parking as opposed to surface parking and prohibiting surface parking between buildings and sidewalks were covered by policy in Volume 1.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
  - i. Sections b and c have been implemented in code and are no longer needed in policy.
  - ii. The Land Use Code currently requires buildings to be built to the back of the sidewalk along key arterials and requires pedestrian oriented

development where building frontages have direct entries from the sidewalk and/or building frontages have a high degree of transparency and activating land use on several other local streets. Design guidelines further promote designs with a pedestrian emphasis along streets. Requirements for screening of vehicle parking are also required.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>Old S-BR-22. <del>Promote parking design and management that supports local uses in a manner compatible with the area's urban design, transit and pedestrian orientation, including:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a. Encourage shared parking;</del></li> <li><del>b. Encourage structured parking as opposed to surface parking, particularly in identified development nodes;</del></li> <li><del>c. Prohibit surface parking between buildings and sidewalks where appropriate, and provide visual screening and/or landscaping relief of surface parking where it occurs; and</del></li> <li><del>d. Allow reduction of parking supply in transit development nodes.</del></li> </ul>	<p>No change.</p>

15. PC Feedback: S-BR-41: Commissioners questioned whether the use of vibrant color should be limited to being an accent and not be a feature. Questions were also raised as to how this policy would be implemented.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-41. <u>Use vibrant color as an accent in the Arts District Intensive Area, such as in murals, furnishings, architectural details, lighting and other features, to highlight and distinguish the area as a creative and artistic hub.</u></p>	<p>S-BR-41. Use vibrant color as an <del>accent</del> <u>feature</u> in the Arts District Intensive Area, such as in murals, furnishings, architectural details, lighting and other features, to highlight and distinguish the area as a creative and artistic hub.</p>

16. PC Feedback: S-BR-42: Commissioners recommended encouraging water features, public plazas, an ecological orientation, and other sensorial features into the pedestrian experience.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following broad policy modification and adding more specific examples when developing the code.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-42. Design and develop an <del>outstanding</del> street environment -that promotes streets as key urban places, <u>designed to be sensitive to their context</u> and <del>to providing</del> <u>provide</u> an interesting and aesthetically rich <u>pedestrian</u> experience. <del>Apply a street hierarchy with design guidelines and street standards that provides an appropriate combination of the following elements:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a. Strong consideration of character and aesthetics in the design and implementation of all street projects;</del></li> <li><del>b. Integration of open space and landscaping, including street trees;</del></li> <li><del>c. Environmentally sensitive practices, including natural drainage systems where appropriate;</del></li> <li><del>d. Sidewalk development standards that promote pedestrian functionality and interest, and avoid obstructions;</del></li> <li><del>e. Ground floor differentiation, including preferred uses, visual and physical access;</del></li> <li><del>f. Mid-block pedestrian crossings; and</del></li> <li><del>g. On-street parking, where it contributes to pedestrian convenience and safety.</del></li> </ul>	<p>S-BR-42. Design and develop a street environment that promotes streets as key urban places designed to be sensitive to their context and to provide an interesting and <del>aesthetically</del> <u>sensorially</u> rich pedestrian experience <u>for people of all ages and abilities</u>.</p>

17. PC Feedback: S-BR-43 and S-BR-44: Commissioners recommended adding the term active transportation to both of these policies.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification to policy S=BR-43. However, no change to policy is recommended for policy S-BR-44.
  - i. Integrating safe and convenient access for both pedestrians and bicyclists to the Eastrail within adjacent development is key since the Eastrail will become a regional bicycle corridor.
  - ii. The intent of policy S-BR-44, however, is to focus more narrowly on the pedestrian and call out key attributes of their experience to promote.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-43. <u>Integrate safe and convenient access to the Eastrail within adjacent development.</u>	S-BR-43. Integrate safe and convenient <u>active transportation</u> access to the Eastrail within adjacent development.
S-BR-44. <u>Promote a safe, comfortable, integrated, and vibrant pedestrian experience.</u>	No change.

Environment

18. PC Feedback: S-BR-46. A commissioner noted the importance of streamlining permitting for projects that include stream rehabilitation.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
  - i. Policy S-BR-45 calls broadly for development incentives to promote the rehabilitation of streams, which could include faster permitting along with other incentives such as increases in FAR and height. However, staff noted that achieving expedited permitting for projects that involve critical areas is often not possible as the city does not have control over the amount of time reviewers outside of the city will take.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR- 45. Promote the rehabilitation of streams and their adjacent riparian corridors, through a combination of public investments and private development incentives, as a means to improve the natural environment and provide multiple public benefits.	No change.

19. PC Feedback: S-BR-49. Commissioners requested more specificity regarding how density transfers would occur to achieve stream corridor objectives.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
  - i. Details of the process enabling density transfers will be determined through the Land Use Code Amendment process.
  - ii. The intent of the policy – to allow for density transfers within BelRed to achieve stream corridor objectives – is clear. As the policy reads, density transfers could occur anywhere within BelRed. However, per the dimensional standards within the City’s Land Use Code, certain districts would be eligible for greater density transfers than others.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-49. <u>Provide for density transfers within the Bel-Red Subarea as a means to help achieve stream corridor and open space objectives.</u>	No change.

Parks and Open Space

20. PC Feedback: S-BR-60. A commissioner recommended adding the word “preserve” to this policy.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-60. <u>Rehabilitate and manage riparian and upland park areas to protect habitat and restore natural functions.</u>	S-BR-60. Rehabilitate, <u>and manage, and preserve</u> riparian and upland park areas to protect habitat and restore natural functions.

21. PC Feedback: S-BR-61. A commissioner recommended adding language to ensure trails are connected to the active transportation network as well as the regional trail system.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-61. <u>Provide an interconnected system of non-motorized trails for recreation and transportation within the study area BelRed, connected to the larger, regional trail system, including Marymoor Park and Bridle Trails State Park the Eastrail and the SR 520 trail. The system will emphasize recreational use and provide transportation benefits as well;</u>	S-BR-61. Provide an interconnected system of trails for recreation and transportation within BelRed, connected to the larger, regional trail system, including the Eastrail <u>and the SR 520 trail, and other active transportation facilities.</u>

22. PC Feedback: S-BR-62. Commissioners recommended adding “active transportation.”

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-62. <u>Incorporate park, recreation, and green infrastructure into streets.</u>	S-BR-62. Incorporate park, recreation, and green infrastructure into <u>streets public rights-of-way and active transportation facilities.</u>

Housing

23. PC Feedback: General: Commissioners recommended including policy language that recognized the need for a multi-pronged approach toward achieving housing affordability within BelRed.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-64. Promote owner and rental affordability in <del>every Bel-Red's new housing stock, with a policy target that 50% of new units be affordable for households earning 120% of median income or less. This overall target should include 10 to 20% of new units affordable to low income households (those earning up to 50% of area median income), another 10 to 20% of new units affordable to moderate income households (those earning up to 80% area median income), and another 10 to 20% affordable as an additional segment of "workforce housing" (for households earning up to 120% of median income). These targets will be addressed</del> <u>neighborhood district</u> through a combination of development regulations and incentives, <del>public investments, and other public and private strategies, such as employer-assisted housing and short-term property tax exemptions for multi-family housing.</del></p> <p><del>Discussion: The policy targets are not expected to be met by each Bel-Red housing development. Rather, they are intended to be met over time, across the subarea as a whole, through a combination of public and private strategies. The overall supply of affordable housing will be monitored and if policy targets are not being achieved, affordable housing tools and incentives should be adjusted, or new more effective strategies adopted.</del></p>	<p>S-BR-64. Promote owner and rental affordability in every BelRed neighborhood district through a combination of development regulations, <u>and incentives, and public investment.</u></p>

24. PC Feedback: S-BR-65: Commissioners recommended adding language to support a diversity of housing unit sizes to meet a variety of family needs.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-65. <del>Integrate the strategy</del> <u>Align strategies</u> for promoting housing affordability in <del>the Bel-Red area</del> with the citywide approach <u>and ensure each neighborhood district offers housing affordable at a range of income levels.</u> <del>of which Bel-Red is a part.</del>	S-BR-65. Align strategies for promoting housing affordability in BelRed with the citywide approach and ensure each neighborhood district offers housing affordable at a range of income levels <u>and household needs.</u>

### Arts and Culture

25. PC Feedback: S-BR-67: Commissioners recommended striking “cutting-edge” from the policy.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-67. Provide funding for <u>a wide range of public art projects and events that explore the intersection of art and technology, draw attention to the Arts District, spark creative placemaking, and reinforce the identity of BelRed as a cutting-edge creative destination.</u> <del>public art and cultural activities in the Bel-Red area.</del>	S-BR-67. Provide funding for a wide range of public art projects and events that explore the intersection of art and technology, draw attention to the Arts District, spark creative placemaking, and reinforce the identity of BelRed as a <u>cutting-edge</u> creative destination.

26. PC Feedback: S-BR-73: Commissioners questioned whether specifying the provision of affordable housing for artists was allowed under fair housing laws.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
  - Providers of affordable artist housing must adhere to fair housing practices and allow anyone to apply for housing in their developments. They may however, give a preference for occupancy to those applicants who participate in and are committed to the arts so long as their practices do not result in any disparate discriminatory impacts to any protected classes.
  - As explained in an [ArtSpace FAQ sheet](#), applicants do not need to derive their income from their art, nor is the content or quality of an applicant’s artistic work judged. Artist Interview Committees can only



make judgements regarding an applicant’s energy and passion for their art form.

- iii. Artists often have special needs in their housing that warrant provision of housing tailored to their needs, whereas people in other occupations can be accommodated in general affordable housing units.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-73. <u>Stimulate the development of affordable artist housing through public-private partnerships within the BelRed Arts District Intensive Area.</u>	No change.

27. PC Feedback: General: Commissioners recommended adding language to encourage live music performance, indoor and outdoor space for performance arts in general and space for the creator economy.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
  - i. Staff recommend adding descriptive examples of performance arts to the narrative preceding this section and maintaining the broad policy language found in policies S-BR-74 through S-BR-77, which aim to create the needed support for a wide variety of performance arts including live music and dance, etc. This is reflected in the attached draft included as Attachment D.

### Transportation

28. PC Feedback: Old S-BR-54. Commissioners asked to revisit this policy.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended. Staff maintain their recommendation to repeal this policy for the following reasons:
  - i. The intended outcome of this policy is to ensure residents, workers and visitors have the option of traveling along arterials to destinations within and outside of the subarea even as job and population growth occurs.
  - ii. Policy S-BR-80, in contrast, provides direction for the development of local streets calling for their development to occur through development review. Since the development of a local street grid is unique to BelRed, policy direction is needed within the BelRed subarea plan.
  - iii. Policy S-BR-51 calls generally for the city to *support the BelRed Land Use Plan with a multimodal transportation network that provides enhanced*

*multimodal travel connections within the BelRed subarea and to other parts of the city and region.*

- iv. Old S-BR-54 specifically highlights the need for improving arterials to serve travel demand. It calls upon the city to design and develop improvements along arterials for all modes of travel including improvements for vehicles, transit, and active transportation modes as travel demand increases. This is a policy that applies citywide. When improvements are needed to serve Bellevue's growing population, it is city policy to design and development improvements along arterials for all modes of travel to ensure everyone has the ability to move from place to place. Areas that are expected to experience the most growth, namely countywide centers, are called out particularly in policy as needing transportation investments. The following policies in Volume 1 provide direction for providing arterials to support land use plans:
  1. TR-44. Provide an arterial system, and encourage the state to provide a freeways system, that together support local and regional mobility and land use plans.
  2. TR-17. Scope, plan, design, implement, operate, and maintain a complete and multimodal transportation network in accordance with the Performance Metrics, Performance Targets and Performance Management Areas as established in the Mobility Implementation Plan.
  3. TR-2. Direct transportation investments and services to support the designated Urban Center and the Countywide Centers identified in the Countywide Planning Policies.
  4. TR-23 Increase connectivity and system completeness for all transportation modes to create a Complete Streets arterial network.
  5. TR-18. Ensure that the transportation network infrastructure in Bellevue provides mobility options for all modes, and accommodates the mobility needs of everyone, including underserved populations.
- v. Note, specific functional plans including the Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan, the Transit Master Plan and the Mobility Implementation Plan all provide for implementation strategies to accommodate growth with a multimodal transportation network in BelRed and citywide.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>Old S-BR-54. <del>Design and develop arterial improvements, including added vehicular capacity, transit facilities, and non-motorized components, to serve travel demand generated by the Bel-Red Land Use Plan in addition to citywide and regional travel demand.</del></p>	<p>No change.</p>

29. PC Feedback: S-BR-79. A commissioner asked staff to look for a term that would be clearer than “environmentally sensitive.”

- Recommendation: Staff recommend adding a definition of environmentally sensitive design to the glossary.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-79. <del>Extend and expand NE 16th StreetSpring Boulevard as a multi-modal corridor that includes vehicular, high capacity transit, and non-motorized active travel transportation modes to serve east-west trip demand across the Bel-Red area, while incorporating significant urban open spaces, and environmentally sensitive design features.</del></p>	<p>Add the following definition for environmentally sensitive design to the glossary: Environmentally sensitive design helps to balance community needs, budgetary limitations, and natural ecosystems functions. Solutions seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the environment, while simultaneously enhancing the quality of human life.</p>

30. PC Feedback: S-BR-80. A commissioner suggested replacing the word “character” with the terms “aesthetics and functionality.”

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-80. <del>Develop</del> <u>Provide</u> for local streets through development review to establish a new grid system with smaller block sizes, particularly in development nodes; emphasizing continuity, connectivity and community character.</p>	<p>S-BR-80. Provide for local streets through development review to establish a new grid system with smaller block sizes, particularly in development nodes; emphasizing continuity, connectivity, and <u>pedestrian oriented design</u> community character.</p>

31. PC Feedback: S-BR-81. A commissioner asked about the use of both “limited flexibility” and “where site constraints exist.”

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
  - i. One of key objectives of the BelRed Look Forward is to improve clarity of policy direction. Development review staff indicated that the

second phrase, “where site constraints exist” is needed to clarify when and where flexibility should be applied.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-81. <u>Allow for limited flexibility to implement the intended alignment and function of local streets where site constraints exist.</u>	No change.

32. PC Feedback: S-BR-57. Commissioners noted it was not clear how TR-53 in Volume 1 was redundant with this policy.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended. Staff recommend maintaining the repeal of this policy.
  - i. TR-53 contains the outcomes desired, namely, *to improve the pedestrian and bicycle environment and to reduce the potential for collisions*. It also identifies the problem specifically – *the number of driveways along arterials*. The word, “driveways” in TR-53 includes garage and service vehicle access to buildings.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-57. <del>Encourage garage and service vehicle access via local and secondary streets and alleys. Limit access points along arterial streets.</del>	No change.

33. PC Feedback: S-BR-84. A commissioner suggested replacing the word “character” with the terms “aesthetics and functionality.”

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-84. Include on-street parking where it contributes to the pedestrian environment and other elements of the desired neighborhood character.	S-BR-84. Include on-street parking where it contributes to the pedestrian environment and other elements of <del>the desired</del> neighborhood <u>aesthetics and functionality</u> character.

34. PC Feedback: S-BR-85. A commissioner suggested adding “reducing the heat island effect” to the list items of benefits provided by green streets.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-85. Promote the development of “green streets” <del>throughout the corridor,</del> with an abundance of street trees and areas of landscaping to improve <u>the quality</u> and reduce the amount of stormwater runoff, <del>and to be aesthetically pleasing, and</del> provide an attractive <u>and comfortable</u> pedestrian experience.	S-BR-85. Promote the development of “green streets” with an abundance of street trees and areas of landscaping to improve the quality and reduce the amount of stormwater runoff, <u>to reduce the heat island effect,</u> and to provide an attractive and comfortable pedestrian experience.

35. PC Feedback: S-BR-86. A commissioner asked for language stronger than “improve.”

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-86. Improve pedestrian connectivity and the quality of the pedestrian environment with a <del>comprehensive</del> <u>complete and connected</u> sidewalk and trail system, including through- block pedestrian connections, <del>and</del> mid-block crossings, <u>and pedestrian amenities.</u> <del>Include pedestrian amenities such as pedestrian scaled lighting, seating, transit shelters, and weather protection.</del>	S-BR-86. <del>Improve</del> <u>Provide for</u> pedestrian connectivity and <del>the a high quality of the</del> pedestrian environment with a complete and connected sidewalk and trail system, including through- block pedestrian connections, mid-block crossings, and pedestrian amenities.

36. PC Feedback: S-BR-88. A commissioner suggested adding in “active transportation” to this policy and providing more direction describing the criteria for placing access points.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend adding “active transportation” to the policy. However, no change to policy is recommended regarding adding a description of criteria for placing access points due to the following:
  - Currently two access points exist - the new access point at Northrup and 116<sup>th</sup> just north of BelRed and the access point along the north side of Sound Transit’s Operations Maintenance Facility. Soon a new access point will be constructed from NE 12<sup>th</sup> at Spring Boulevard. Few opportunities exist for developing additional connections in the near future, yet more may arise over time, especially from the west.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-88. Develop multiple access points to the <del>planned BNSF corridor multi-use trail</del> <u>Eastrail.</u>	S-BR-88. Develop multiple <u>active transportation</u> access points to the Eastrail.

37. PC Feedback: S-BR-90. Commissioners suggested replacing the word “support” with the word “encourage.”

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-90. Support the development of a Transportation Management Association in the Bel-Red Subarea to assist employers in providing commute options for employees.	S-BR-90. <del>Support</del> <u>Encourage</u> the development of a Transportation Management Association in BelRed to assist employers in providing commute options for employees.

Implementation

38. PC Feedback: S-BR-94. A commissioner suggested using stronger language such as incentivize.

- Recommendation: No change to policy is recommended.
  - i. Staff recommend maintaining the existing policy language as the City may want to encourage this in some cases, but not in all cases. Also, it would likely be challenging to provide adequate incentives to motivate construction of infrastructure improvements.

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
S-BR-94. Allow for private development to voluntarily advance the building of public infrastructure improvements, in order to enable land use to proceed in sync with the availability of needed infrastructure; <del>consistent with the phasing approach set forth in Policy S-BR-4.</del> Such investment may be repaid in part by latecomers agreement or similar device.	No change.

39. PC Feedback: S-BR-98. A commissioner believed the term, “partnerships” was unnecessary and possibly limiting.

- Recommendation: Staff recommend the following policy modification:

PC Reviewed Language	Recommendation
<p>S-BR-99. <u>Develop rehabilitation and restoration plans for the West Tributary, Goff Creek, Unnamed Creek, and Valley/Sears Creek riparian corridors to facilitate partnerships and coordinated strategies for improving water quality, flow control and wildlife habitat as well as for providing increased access/exposure to nature, aesthetic enhancements, and noise attenuation.</u></p>	<p>S-BR-99. Develop rehabilitation and restoration plans for the West Tributary, Goff Creek, Unnamed Creek, and Valley/Sears Creek riparian corridors to facilitate <del>partnerships and</del> coordinated strategies for improving water quality, flow control and wildlife habitat as well as for providing increased access/exposure to nature, aesthetic enhancements, and noise attenuation.</p>