

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION MINUTES

June 14, 2017
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Morisseau

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Cullen, Nicholas Matz, 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 with the exception of Commissioner Morisseau who was excused.

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

There was agreement to amend the agenda by adding reports from staff.

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

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

STAFF REPORTS
(6:40 p.m.)

Comprehensive Planning Manager Terry Cullen said the last meeting in June is when the election of Commission officers normally takes place. However, given that the June 28 meeting agenda is full, he recommended moving the election of officers to the first meeting in July.

Commissioner Carlson said his concern was whether or not there would be a full complement of Commissioners at the ~~July 12~~~~July 13~~ meeting. He said he was not sure he would be there.

Commissioner Barksdale said he would be out of town on that date. Commissioner Laing reported that he would be traveling on that date as well.

There was consensus to hold the Commission elections at the ~~June~~~~July~~ 28 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT (6:47 p.m.)

Ms. Sake Letove, 3831 145th Avenue SE, read into the record an email from Linda ~~Nohavec~~~~Novahack~~ on behalf of the Eastgate Residents Council regarding the operations and maintenance facility (OMFE) Sound Transit will be constructing in the Bel-Red area. The email noted that the OMFE master development plan was presented by Sound Transit to the Council on June 12. As proposed, the plan places the majority of the Sound Transit facility on the northern portion of the site, landlocked between the railroad tracks to the west and 120th Avenue NE to the east. The most southerly portion of the site borders NE 12th Street and allows an opportunity to develop a campus that perfectly suites an area for supportive housing and a men's low-barrier shelter adjacent to the planned transit-oriented development site. The other attractive aspect of the OMFE surplus property is the reduced land cost offered to developers to build affordable housing. By statute, 80 percent of the entire Sound Transit surplus inventory must be utilized for affordable housing based on the 80-80 rule. The opportunity exists to continue to develop the surplus property as a light industrial campus, the most successful location to incorporate the shelter use as research suggests. It is best for the community, and mitigations can be substantially less located near the downtown area where services are so closely located. The community has a unique opportunity to finally embrace the men's low-barrier shelter by siting it at an appropriate location where the success rates can be measured.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS BY STAFF (6:47 p.m.)

Mr. Cullen said the public hearing on the Bellevue Technology Center was the sole item on the agenda. The Commission will conduct a study session on the topic on June 28 and will at that meeting make a recommendation to be forwarded to the City Council. The expectation is that the Commission will conclude its review by June 28 in order to allow the Council to hear the issue in July.

Mr. Cullen said Senior Planner Nicholas Matz would first present a report and a recommendation, and would outline the overall plan amendment and the process that is involved. He said the Commission would be allowed to ask clarifying questions about the information presented before taking formal action to open the public hearing. The applicant or applicant representatives will be allowed to speak first for up to 15 minutes, following ~~with~~~~which~~ three neighborhood spokespersons representing a collection of neighborhoods will be allowed up to 15 minutes total to speak. It is expected that the comments made by those representing the neighborhoods will preclude some individual testimony and help to expedite the public hearing without compromising effectiveness. The balance of the public hearing will then be given over to testimony from individuals for up to three minutes each.

The public was respectfully asked to maintain the decorum of the meeting and to refrain from shouting out remarks during the meeting. Mr. Cullen said the chair is charged with maintaining a

meeting environment in which everyone can feel comfortable in sharing their views regardless of whether or not others agree with them.

Mr. Matz said a single site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendment was before the Commission for ~~2017 threshold review~~ Threshold Review. He explained that the city uses an annual process to accept applications to amend the Comprehensive Plan. The Growth Management Act limits the process to one time annually. All of the various applications made are brought together for a cumulative and consistent review. The threshold action, which some have referred to as a docketing function, sets applications for consideration in the annual work program, which is established when the City Council acts on the recommendations of the Commission to establish it. The Council is scheduled to take action on the work program on July 24.

Mr. Matz said there are two site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendments for consideration. The Bellevue Technology Center in the Crossroads subarea in an area bounded by Northup Way, 156th Avenue NE, NE 24th Street, Interlake high school and some residential neighborhoods. The other application involves the Eastgate Office Park which passed the ~~threshold review~~ Threshold Review in 2016 but was deferred for action to 2017. It will be in the ~~final review~~ Final Review package the Commission will take up in ~~final review in~~ the fall.

Also in the mix are two applications that have been initiated by the City Council, namely the Complete Streets and Downtown Implementation Plan policy updates. The East Main Comprehensive Plan amendment is a third application under consideration.

Mr. Matz said the Bellevue Technology Center is a 46-acre site. The privately initiated application proposes new policies in the general land use, economic and transportation sections of the Crossroads subarea plan, and amendments to existing policies as well as Figure S-TR-1 in order to enable redevelopment of the Bellevue Technology Center site. There are residential neighborhoods to the east, north and south of the site. The whole of the Crossroads subarea lies generally to the south of the site. The Bel-Red district is situated to the west of the site, and to the northwest and further to the north are the city of Redmond's Overlake area and the former Group Health site.

During the Commission's study session on April 26, the issue of expanding the geographic scope of the application was considered. The ~~conclusion reached~~ Commission agreed with a staff recommendation ~~was~~ that the geographic scope should not be expanded based on the criterion of similarly situated properties. It was determined that the size of the Bellevue Technology Center makes it uniquely situated to take advantage of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and that surrounding properties, due to their size, could not do that.

Mr. Matz said the recommendation of the staff was that the application does not meet ~~threshold review~~ Threshold Review and to not include it in the work program. Specifically, two of the application criteria that must be met in order to advance the application fall short. ~~The First, the~~ application does not address significantly changed conditions (LUC 20.30I.140.E.) The citywide Comprehensive Plan update was adopted by the City Council in 2015, laying out the city's overall growth strategy, specifically in the Land Use, Economic Development and Neighborhood elements. ~~P, which is that~~ placing more growth on the Bellevue Technology Center site is not part of the overarching strategy of managing growth and development while working to protect and enhance neighborhoods. While the specific text of the Crossroads subarea plan was not included in the updates to the general elements of the plan, there has been no significant change since the 2015 plan adoption with regard to the overall growth strategy. The passage of time is also not a significantly changed condition. The Crossroads subarea plan remains effective in part

because the policies apply to the site that was sensitive to its owner and the surrounding community in 1972, and its continued impact on the community is sensitive still. The sensitivity of the site for the adjacent neighborhood and special conditions on the office use continue to be appropriate despite the passage of time. ~~The Staff also asserts that the~~ growth strategy policies that are suggested by the applicant to apply to the site are also included the significantly changed criteria review.

The second criterion not met by the application is consistency with current general policies in the Comprehensive Plan for site-specific amendment proposals (LUC20.30I.140.G) for accommodating the city's projected growth and targeted areas, with clear dividing lines in the subarea and appropriate transitions along those lines. The proposal for increased commercial density on the Bellevue Technology Center site is not aligned with the Comprehensive Plan's identified target areas for major mixed use and commercial growth as shown on map LU-4, which indicate the target mixed use areas that are anticipated to accommodate a significant portion of the city's projected growth. While the eastern edge of the Bel-Red district includes a portion of a high-density node along 156th Avenue NE across from the subject site, a clear dividing line is established along the center of the arterial. The Bellevue Technology Center lies on the east side of the dividing line and is outside any area envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan to accommodate denser urban development. The subject site along with other office and commercially designated properties on the east side of 156th Avenue NE and Bel-Red Road NE provides for commercial development at an appropriate transition scale to the residential neighborhoods to the east and the south.

Mr. Matz said it is not that the extension of higher density implementing the growth strategy to the Bellevue Technology Center site is a reasonable suggestion, rather it is that the city plans for growth in certain defined areas and then plans the infrastructure needed to support the growth in those areas. Conversely, areas not planned or targeted for growth have tools to protect them. The subarea policies and discussions reflect that.

~~-Proximity is not a standard for long-range planning, and the significant work for the city with significantly changed conditions is unanticipated. A finding of significantly changed conditions is needed to warrant further review.~~ None of the things argued for the Bellevue Technology Center site that are in proximity to the site, thus warranting an extension of the city's growth strategy policy framework, were unanticipated by the city in planning for growth in Crossroads.

Mr. Matz said to date there has been a great deal of public comment received. Several different platforms were used to convey access to the comments, including online searchable access to a Flippingbook document, and printed materials. He said comments had been received from 124 persons and included 91 parties of record. An online petition was circulated; the language of the petition and the names of the persons who signed it were made part of the public record. A number of persons who signed the petition also included comments that will be included in the record for review ahead of the June 28 study session.

~~-The Commission received a comment letter in which the application was analyzed, the letter was signed by representatives of ten different neighborhood associations in which the application was analyzed. Everyone, including the applicant, have been participating in a civil and engaged manner. The applicant has also submitted comments on a public hearing meeting they held, on a transportation analysis they performed, and on the staff recommendation. With the exception of the applicant's comments and one comment supporting changes that are required to enable height and density redevelopment of the area, all of the public comments and inquiries have been opposed to advancing the proposal out of threshold review. Everyone, including the applicant, All~~

parties to the review process have been participating in a civil and engaged manner.

With the exception of the applicant's comments and one comment supporting changes that are required to enable height and density redevelopment of the area, all of the public comments and inquiries have been opposed to advancing the proposal out of Threshold Review.

Comments opposed to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment fall into various themes. The proposal risks the unique and sensitive relationship the site holds for the community, specifically the meadows, trees and low-impact visual access that is protected by the PUD. The PUD established an agreement between the community, the city and the property owners that the Comprehensive Plan and the Crossroads subarea plan continue to reflect. The focus of the proposal on urban growth, density and infrastructure factors is discounted by those opposed to the proposal. The idea that 156th Avenue NE is a boundary is supported, as is the notion that the neighbors adjacent to targeted high-density growth areas continue to deserve protection as the policies specify. The public comments included specific and repeated mention of how growth in Bellevue and the area has severely affected people's quality of life as well as their choices about travel and access, and how the communities are having to weather the impacts of and are being overwhelmed by what they feel is never-ending change.

Chair deVadoss thanked everyone in the audience for their participation in the process.

Commissioner Carlson asked if a quick spot poll could be taken amongst Commissioners present about the staff recommendation. None was taken, and Chair deVadoss began to review the sign-up sheets.

PUBLIC HEARING

(7:09 p.m.)

Chair deVadoss said he would limit comments to three minutes during the public hearing. The audience was urged to raise their hands in support of comments made rather than commenting verbally.

A motion to open the public hearing was made by Commissioner Walter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laing and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jeff Rader, senior vice president with KBS, spoke representing the property owner. He said KBS acquired the Bellevue Technology Center site in 2012 and targeted the property for purchase for many of the reasons highlighted by the neighbors, including the meadow, the trees and the park-like setting. KBS wants to preserve and enhance the park-like setting while re-energizing the center with technology and headquarter tenants. The center has been a success because high-quality tenants want to be there. Since KBS acquired the property, occupancy has been increased by 30 percent to where the center is now fully occupied. The center is home to the headquarter of MOD Pizza, the second fastest growing company in the state; and is home to the headquarters of a number of tech companies. Sixty percent of the current tenants are tech companies that provide high-quality living wage jobs that are contributing to Bellevue's economy. A conversation with the city about opportunities to support economic growth began in 2014. The focus was on preserving the elements of the center that are cherished by KBS, the tenants and the community. For the past four years, KBS has conducted outreach to the city and the community. Five public open houses were held to explore opportunities to meet the city's land use, housing, economic and transportation goals by providing for moderate transit-oriented development opportunities for new jobs and housing next to a rapid transit station on NE 24th

Street and within 15 minutes walking distance of a future light rail station. It has been communicated that KBS wants to build on the meadow, but that is not the case. KBS is committed to permanently preserving the meadow and the tree buffers. For that reason, KBS reached out to ~~Forterra~~^{4Terra}, a leading conservation organization. KBS is committed to mitigating traffic impacts and to that end has hired two leading transportation engineers to study and identify mitigation measures that go well beyond the traffic that may be generated by the infill development. KBS is committed to the transit-oriented development concept and would be willing to phase development in accord with the Overlake light rail station that will be built in the future. It is the right time for the conversation. There have been significant changed conditions.

Mr. Jack McCullough, 701 5th Avenue, Suite 6600, Seattle, praised the Commissioners for taking their jobs seriously and maintaining open minds. He suggested that after hearing the applicant's position, the Commission will conclude that the application does in fact meet the threshold criteria and should be moved forward. The proposal that was on the table three years ago ended on a 2-2 vote, after which the applicant elected ~~to~~^{with} withdraw the application. At that time, the proposed amendment was not substantive, rather it sought the establishment of a process to create a visioning concept for how to move forward with possible redevelopment of the Bellevue Technology Center campus. The message then was clear that the proposed path was not the appropriate path to pursue, and that what should be pursued was a rezone application. Beginning in 2014, a rezone application was pursued for two years at extraordinary expense. No stone was left unturned. During the winter of 2016, much to the surprise and chagrin of the property owner, ~~that~~ the rezone process was not in fact the appropriate process to pursue and that the way to go would be a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Dutifully in response to direction from the city, the focus was shifted toward filing a substantive Comprehensive Plan amendment with nine amendments to the text and the maps.

Continuing, Mr. McCullough pointed out that the staff report indicates that of the seven criteria set forth in LUC 20.30.L.140, five are without question met by the application. The only two issues, therefore, are whether or not the significantly changed conditions criterion is met, and whether or not the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Planning Policies criterion is met. With regard to changed conditions, the staff report does not cite or apply the appropriate standard, which the Commission must do. The staff report finds that the proposal does not address significantly changed conditions on the subject property or the surrounding area where such change has implications of a magnitude that needs to be addressed for the Comprehensive Plan to function as a whole. That is not what the code says. Rather, the code says the criterion to be applied is that the proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions since the last time the pertinent Comprehensive Plan map or text was amended. The pertinent Comprehensive Plan map or text was last amended 30 years ago. Accordingly, changed conditions should be measured from 2015 should in fact be measured from 1988, which is the last time the Crossroads policy at issue was amended. The application as submitted identifies five ways in which conditions have changed significantly since 1988, including the emergence of Microsoft and business services clusters within a quarter mile of the site; a new bus rapid transit line running adjacent to the Bellevue Technology Center site; the 2014 adoption of the transit-oriented development policies; the passage of ST-3; and the 1990 adoption of the Growth Management Act. The staff report does not address single one of those changed conditions; it includes nothing that says the application does not satisfy that criteria.

Mr. McCullough shared with the Commissioners aerial photographs of the subject area, beginning with shots taken in 1965 and continuing with photos taken in 1977, 1996 and 2009, as well as maps showing where the bus rapid transit will run. The evidence is clear that the changed

conditions criterion is met by the application. With regard to consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Planning Policies, it was noted that the staff report indicates growth is intended to be located only in certain areas of the downtown. The staff report goes on to say the target areas are for major mixed use commercial growth and are intended to accommodate a significant portion, but not all, of the city's projected growth. The growth strategy acknowledges that some job and housing growth will occur outside of the mixed use centers. The Bellevue Technology Center site is identified as a major employment center on map ED-1 of the city's Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan also states that housing and employment growth will not only occur outside the mixed use centers, it can occur inside a major employment center.

The staff review is erroneous and mischaracterizing the Comprehensive Plan view of where growth can occur. Growth can occur in areas other than the downtown, Bel-Red and Eastgate, including on the Bellevue Technology Center site. The criterion of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Planning Policies is met by the application.

Mr. McCullough mentioned the B Line, the Growing Transit Communities Act and the involvement of both Futurewise and Forterra in their application process.

Mr. McCullough reiterated that the goal of the property owner is to provide long-term legal non code-based protections for the meadow and the trees. The protections would be based in private contracts. A map of the city's major employment centers was shown to the Commissioners, and Mr. McCullough pointed out that Bellevue Technology Center is identified as one of the city's major employment centers.

Mr. McCullough proposed the Commission should condition approval of the docketing of the application with four specific conditions. For three years the property owner has been trying to get the information together that is applicable to the site and put it in front of a decision-making body so that someone can make a reasoned decision about what should happen on the site. Making a decision not to docket the application for full review means the property will once again be locked out, leaving out the opportunity to put all the information in front of the city's decision makers. The application should be docketed, leaving to the property owner the burden of showing public benefit, to provide additional transportation studies to match up with what the city is doing, to conduct additional public outreach, and to come up with a phasing plan so that implementation aligns with the funding and construction of the Overlake light rail station.

Mr. Edward McDonald, 15936 NE 27th Place, spoke on behalf of a coalition of 13 neighborhoods. He noted that the coalition had prepared a detailed rebuttal of the Bellevue Technology Center Comprehensive Plan amendment request. He noted that the neighborhoods in the coalition collectively have over 2000 homes, and that each of the neighborhoods had signed support for the rebuttal document. The property owner KBS is asked to amend the Comprehensive Plan, but their real objective is to vacate the PUD, rezone the site and build to the maximum possible and then flip the property. The proposed amendment is the third submitted for the site in the last three and a half years. The proposal on the table in 2014 was voted down 5-1, with one abstaining. The subsequent rezone attempt was unproductive, and the current request is basically a repackaged version of the 2014 Comprehensive Plan amendment with a new spin focused on significantly changed circumstances.

Ms. Els ~~Bloome~~^{Blomma}, 1010 185th Avenue NE, said the proponent states their Comprehensive Plan amendment request is warranted because it will allow for achieving 14 Comprehensive Plan policies and that it is needed to enhance consistency with another 28 policies. The proposal,

however, is based on three key assumptions, the first of which is that the Bellevue Technology Center site is located within the watershed of the Overlake Village light rail station. Transit-oriented development is a hip concept, but its definition ~~carries~~ varies depending on the source. Most sources agreed that a watershed for light rail is defined as a ten-minute or half-mile walk. Online maps put the Bellevue Technology Center property at 0.7 miles from the proposed light rail station, which takes about 20 minutes to walk from the northwest corner of the site, which happens to be the meadow that the applicant says will be preserved, which means any building on the site will be even further from the light rail station. The conclusion is that the Bellevue Technology Center site is not eligible for transit-oriented development treatment.

Ms. ~~Bloome~~Blomma said the second assumption is that the Bellevue Technology Center site is located in a mixed use or commercial area. The fact is it is located in a residential neighborhood and is designed to serve as a buffer to the residential neighborhoods to the east, north and south, and the higher density mixed use areas to the west. The clear dividing line is 156th Avenue NE. As part of the neighborhood area planning initiative, the Bellevue Technology Center site will become part of the Northeast Bellevue neighborhood and will no longer part of the Crossroads neighborhood, and Northeast Bellevue is residential. Bellevue is not opposed to growth, but the Comprehensive Plan clearly targets areas in which mixed use and commercial growth should occur. Those are the areas in which infrastructure investments are being made.

Ms. ~~Bloome~~Blomme shared with the Commissioners a map showing office developments that are projected to have about 300,000 square feet. She noted that the projections, which were for 2027, still show the Bellevue Technology Center site at its current density, and she pointed out that office developments of that size occur primarily adjacent to residential uses. If approved, the amendment would allow the Bellevue Technology Center property to almost triple its density, which would be in keeping with densities that occur along I-90, in the downtown and in the new Spring District.

The third assumption is that the site can be further developed while protecting the meadow and the trees. However, unless the property owner intends to build vertically, it will not be possible to increase the footprint and still protect the meadow and the trees. In 2015, an administrative amendment was granted that allowed for cutting down 11 mature trees to create more parking on the site. The trees were replaced with much smaller trees, about half of which appear to have died. Removing mature trees jeopardizes the health and safety of the remaining trees in a given stand during high wind storms.

Mr. John Emel, 15849 Northup Way, said nothing has really changed since 2014. With regard to the 2014 Bellevue Technology Center Comprehensive Plan amendment request, Commissioner Diane Tebelius remarked that at the time the Bel-Red planning was taking place, the city made sure not to include the area east of 156th Avenue NE. At that time, Commissioner Tebelius said nothing had changed to suggest reconsideration of that position. Commissioner Michelle Hilhorst made the point that owners of property in the Bellevue Technology Center vicinity bought with the understanding that an agreement was in place to bar further development and maintain the natural barriers of the site. She went on to say there is no turning back the clock if development is allowed, and that the PUD must be preserved at all cost.

Continuing, Mr. Emel said the Bellevue Technology Center property owner has introduced the concept of transit-oriented development. The fact is the site is too far from the light rail station to qualify. It is a walk of seven-tenths of a mile, which on a good day takes 14 to 15 minutes to walk, and on a bad day 20 minutes.

KBS highlighted five areas of change. Mr. Emel agreed that the IT and business services sectors have grown as stated, but the growth was planned for in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. The rapid ride B-line, mentioned as a new development, was instituted in 2011 and was incorporated into the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. Prior to 2011, there were four routes serving the area, and there are currently four routes serving the area. The claim has been made that approval of ST-3 changes things, but the Overlake station will not be any closer, and light rail was already ~~part~~^{part} of the planning in the Comprehensive Plan. The planned new station in Redmond will be four miles from the Bellevue Technology Center site. The claim that the transit-oriented development zone is applicable is not true. Bellevue embraces transit-oriented development in certain areas, but the Bellevue Technology Center site is not in a transit-oriented development zone. Transit-oriented development was incorporated into the 2015 Comprehensive Plan and is nothing new. Bellevue adopted the Growth Management Act in 1990, and reaffirmed the Bellevue Technology Center PUD in January 1992. The Growth Management Act is incorporated in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan.

The only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn with regard to the five areas of change highlighted by the applicant is that there has been no significant change since the 2014 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. ~~Blomme~~^{Blomme} pointed out that the rebuttal letter was written by the staff recommendation was released. She said there are 14 policies that need to be carefully considered, and commented that 30 policies would be jeopardized by approval of the Comprehensive Plan amendment. The issues center around four criteria: maintaining the character of the residential neighborhoods; protecting the open space and the tree canopy; reducing traffic congestion; preserving the safety and livability of the residential streets.

The letter submitted to the city from KBS in reaction to the opposition comments offered several concessions to their application. Their offer includes a substantial voluntary public benefit package, which is not needed because all of the benefits already exist under the PUD. Their offer includes additional transportation studies at their expense, but they have had years to provide additional traffic improvement proposals but the public has seen none. They are offering to undertake additional outreach regarding transportation challenges and potential mitigation, but the public would like to see the existing gridlock addressed before any additional development is allowed in the area. They are offering to phase over time implementation of future development, but if they are willing to wait that long there is no need to give them a blank check up front. The city should uphold the PUD and continue to protect the site.

Mr. McDonald said the coalition of neighborhoods believes there are no significantly changed conditions. Nothing has changed since the Commission said no to the property owner in 2014. The applicant has failed to justify amending the Comprehensive Plan, and 156th Avenue NE must remain as a clear dividing line separating the residential neighborhood from the high-growth areas to the west. The PUD was negotiated between the property owner, the city and the community, and concessions were made by each party. The community believes the agreement was intended to be permanent. The coalition wants the Commission to say no to the KBS Comprehensive Plan amendment, and to do what the City Council did in 1992 relative to the John Hancock property, now the Bellevue Technology Center property, in which the proponent was denied the opportunity to move forward with a development. They appealed and were told no a second time. The Council then reaffirmed the terms and conditions of the 1972 PUD. The Commission was asked to do the same.

Mr. Neil Nelson, 871 171st Place NE, said he has been involved in each recurring discussion of

what is now the Bellevue Technology Center site. He said in 1972 a very civil process was undertaken which resulted in an agreement between the community, the city and John Hancock as to what development could take place on the site. Two phases of development were identified, and when John Hancock came back for the second phase of development they expressed a desire to step outside of the agreement but were denied. The current request to amend the Comprehensive Plan would replace some of the concomitant agreement. The applicant's proposal is based on the general goals of the city with regard to transit, employment, attractiveness, pedestrian corridors and the like. The proposal, however, ignores the fact that in 1972 the residents gave up existing single family zoning and allowed commercial development to come in on the basis of a full understanding of what that development would be. Any change to the existing agreement must specify the exact uses to be allowed and the exact distribution of the uses throughout the property.

Ms. Carol Walker, 1908 160th Avenue NE, said her family moved to northeast Bellevue in 1969 and has been there ever since. At the time, the property in question was a horse farm and there were gravel paths where there are now sidewalks. She said she now walks her dog where she used to walk with her children around the wonderfully wooded property. If development is allowed and the trees are removed, they will never come back. She said she has always understood that the property has always been a desirable and valuable site. Local residents believe the decisions made in 1972 and subsequently were made to protect the neighborhood, but every few years the property owner seeks to change the agreement. She said she would be thrilled to see the open areas of the site turned into a public park and preserved forever. Instead, local residents feel betrayed because the expectations set down in 1972 are being eliminated without a clear understanding of what the final outcome will be.

Ms. Ann Kauflin, 16856 NE 14th Place, said she moved to Bellevue 22 years ago. Reading from the Commission meeting minutes of July 30, 2014, she noted that Commissioner Walter voiced support for the recommendation of staff, having read over all the materials and finding no compelling argument for moving the proposal forward. Commissioner Carlson commented that anytime actions are taken to deviate from the Comprehensive Plan, there should be a compelling and justifiable reason for doing so, and that in the case of the Bellevue Technology Center there were no changed circumstances warranting revising the Comprehensive Plan. He went on to say that the argument made by Mr. McDonald that a deal is a deal and that there are many commercial properties both in Bellevue and in the area where the Bellevue Technology Center is located were right on point, and that no argument can be made that commercial development should be allowed in an area where it is clearly not wanted. Commissioner Hilhorst agreed with Commissioners Walter and Carlson and went on to say that the owners of the residential properties surrounding the Bellevue Technology Center site purchased their homes with an understanding of the agreement that is in place, and the new owner of the Bellevue Technology Center clearly understands the limitations that are in place. She added that if approved and the property is allowed to redevelopment, there would be no opportunity to turn the clock back; a natural barrier has been retained because of the agreement and it should be preserved at all costs. Commissioner deVadoss noted that he lives near the Bellevue Technology Center property and said he could see no compelling reason to change the deal that is in place. Commissioner Tebelius agreed with the statement made by staff at the May 14 meeting that development activity occurring on the old Angelo's site was contemplated at the time of the Bel-Red planning effort, and that the decision of the city at the time was to make sure not to include the area east of 156th Avenue NE, and that nothing had changed to suggest reconsideration of that position.

Mr. Pat Tierney, 1406 177th Avenue NE, said he graduated with a civil engineering degree and spent ten years in the aerospace industry and 31 years with the Department of Veterans Affairs,

with the last 15 years spent working on planned unit developments. He said he was one of 12 in the United States that could ~~approve~~approved an association's planned unit development. He said he moved to the Sherwood Forest neighborhood in 1971 as the discussions regarding the Unigard site were ongoing, which were finalized in 1972 in an agreement to retain open space, the trees and to have buffered streets along NE 24th Street and Northup Way. He said he is now retired and it takes ten minutes to travel down Northup Way from 140th Avenue NE to 148th Avenue NE during non-peak hours. There are now 460 units on the old Angelo's Nursery site, and 640 units being planned right across the street, and there is no open space. There are already problems with traffic that will only get worse. People living in the Sherwood Forest area wanting to get to the downtown must use Northup Way or NE 24th Street. Coming from Seattle traffic gets off at 148th Avenue NE and uses NE 24th Street to get to the neighborhood. Over the past 45 years there have been few improvements with regard to traffic flow. He said when he was working with developers on planned unit developments, there were always compromises made in which the developer got more density and the city got more open space. Three parties would have to agree to change the PUD that is in place: the city, the neighborhood and the property owner.

Ms. Diane Kerry, 16223 NE 26th Street, said she has lived at that address since 1979. She said she cares about her city and her neighborhood and was present to voice her concerns. She said she could remember Bellevue before Bellevue Square; Evergreen East before Microsoft; Eastside Group Health before Avalon; Angelo's Nursery before LIV; and Evergreen Village before the Hyde Square Apartments. Those good memories have been replaced by the frustration of traffic and sterile architecture with little or no landscape. With regard to the Bellevue Technology Center application, she said she remembers meeting neighbors and walking her dogs on the site and creating long-time friends; kids sledding on the hill at the first sign of snow; the tall fir tree adorned with lights at Christmas; walking the upper meadow to see fireworks in the distance on the 4th of July; the friendly security guards; and voles hiding in holes and birds nesting in the meadow. She said she did not want to see the abundant trees and open space become a meadow. The city is already overwhelmed with traffic. Passthrough traffic has increased, and drivers ignore speed limits and stop signs. No progress has been made between the cities of Redmond and Bellevue to address the traffic issues. The city has continued to permit more development, which has only added to the problem. She urged the Commission to reject the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment for all of those very personal reasons.

Ms. Janet Henry, 1812 161st Avenue NE, said she has been at that address for just over 24 years. She said her property faces the Bellevue Technology Center property on the other side of 160th Avenue NE. She said the experience of the neighbors has been that since 2012 when KBS purchased the Bellevue Technology Center property, the focus has constantly been on trying to get out of the PUD. The organization knew full well what the PUD limits were when they bought the property. In 2014 they filed a Comprehensive Plan amendment request, and in 2015 they filed a request for an administrative amendment to the parking. In 2016 they sought a rezone request, and in 2017 they filed another Comprehensive Plan amendment. The neighbors wonder if the property owner can be trusted when they make promises of the sort they are currently making. A request was made in 2015 to remove 11 significant trees to make room for 27 parking spaces on the strength of the argument by the property owner that the office buildings were projected to be fully tenanted by the fall of that year. The request was granted, the trees were cut down, and the parking spaces were created. The parking spaces are now empty, the replacement trees that were planted were allowed to die, and signs have gone up around the property indicating that monthly parking is available to anyone in the city for \$150 per month. It is clear they did not need the extra parking spaces. It was also surprising to hear from the KBS representative that the site is 100 percent leased given that the KBS website shows there is much

space for lease, including an entire QVE building available for sublease with about 68,000 square feet. KBS is on record saying it cares about the environment, and that they chose the site because of the park-like environment, but on the KBS website it says clearly that when properties are identified for acquisition, KBS develops a business plan for each asset, including a well-defined distribution strategy, and target cash returns. The approach seems contrary to saving the environment.

Mr. Bruce Whittaker, 1924 160th Avenue NE, said he and his wife live in Park Place, a residential development at the southeast corner of the Bellevue Technology Center site, just to the south of the baseball diamond at the high school. He said his house looks out to the west, adjoins the Bellevue Technology Center property, and has views of the trees that provide an excellent buffer between the commercial development on 156th Avenue NE and the residential areas to the east. He said in looking to purchase the home in which he now lives he conducted due diligence by meeting with the Bellevue Technology Center property owner and by visiting City Hall to look at all of the documents and was satisfied that the restrictions were substantial and that they would remain in place. The 156th Avenue NE corridor between NE 40th Street and Crossroads is a good example of the traffic problems facing the area. The corridor can actually be walked faster than it can be driven, especially during the evening peak period. The original PUD got things right. It was set up properly and it should be left in place as recommended by the staff.

Ms. Toren ~~Elsey~~Elsde, 2064 West Lake Sammamish Parkway, said she has been a resident of the area for more than 31 years. She said she remembers as a child walking through the Bellevue Technology Center site to stores, walking the back way to Crossroads, and going to Angelo's Nursery after school with her mom. She said she also enjoyed seeing the horses on the horse farm. The amount of development already happening around the area is disconcerting. Light rail is coming to Overlake; LIV Bel-Red is where Angelo's used to be; and Hyde Square is coming with 618 apartments. All of that development is occurring very close to the Bellevue Technology Center area. Development is happening in Redmond as well, including on the old Group Health site. Even the Microsoft main campus is within a mile of the Bellevue Technology Center site. She said she works in sustainability at the University of Washington and is every day reminded how important it is to have green space, especially in urban areas, that creates habitat for wildlife, improves air quality, and improves the well-being of everyone. The city should consider preserving the small amount of green space left in the ever-developing Overlake area.

Ms. Gail Toney, 1910 160th Avenue NE, said her property is adjacent to the Bellevue Technology Center on the east quarter. She said the Council's vision statement talks about embracing the future while respecting the past. The Bellevue Technology Center site clearly falls into that category. The property has been treasured by the citizens for decades and is an important part of the neighborhoods' past as well as the future. The Commissioners were asked to respect the past and uphold the decisions and agreements that were made to protect the neighborhoods. The Council's vision statement goes on to talk about neighborhoods being defined by the people, as being safe and friendly places to live, and repeatedly talks about Bellevue as a city in a park. The livability of the neighborhoods would be severely impacted by development of the site. The concept of a city in a park is diminished daily by the loss of more and more of the tree canopy and natural spaces. The Bellevue Technology Center site has one of the last remaining significant stands of trees in the city. Keeping the trust of the city is also a big part of the Council's vision statement. Keeping the trust of the residents by continuing to be a community that cares for all people is another vision. Citizens in the city are expressing with more frequency frustration with the way in which city government is letting them down. The Commission can help keep trust in the city by putting the citizens first and not capitulating to all

the developers who come to Bellevue. The vision for regional roads that limit the impacts on neighborhoods is lovely in concept, but in reality there is no place for more roads in the area. Cut-through traffic in the neighborhoods is already substantial and will only increase. If the vision for Bellevue is to be a city inspired by nature with an abundance of open space, every effort should be put into trying to stop destroying the natural and open spaces of which there are very few left. They should be protected. The success of Bellevue as a city and the strength of the neighborhoods is not a fluke, rather it stems from decades of community work, foresight and planning. Past city officials recognized the need to protect the Bellevue Technology Center site and the current city officials should do the same. Many in the area purchased their homes knowing they were protected by the PUD, the natural barrier and the wooded nature of the site. KBS has presented conceptual plans at its open house events that show large buildings being built within 50 feet of some backyards. One of the things Mr. McCullough did not note is that while growth is expected in areas other than Bel-Red and the downtown, the infill that is allowed under the current zoning does not include the Bellevue Technology Center site. The amendment is not wanted, is not necessary, and should be rejected.

Ms. Gracie Toney, 1910 160th Avenue NE, said her home is next to the Bellevue Technology Center. She said she loves to ride her bike there and ~~take~~~~talk~~ walks with her dog there. The site is one of the only big places in Bellevue left with trees. If they cut down all the trees and put up big buildings, she said she would no longer be able to see them, and the homes of animals would be destroyed. In the morning when her mother drives her and her sister to school, sometimes 40 or more cars go by before getting out of the neighborhood. If lots of buildings are put up on the Bellevue Technology Center site, it will not be possible to get out of the neighborhood.

Ms. Gabby Toney, 1910 160th Avenue NE, said she hoped the city would not let all the trees on the Bellevue Technology Center site be taken down and the meadow removed because lots of birds and animals live there. She said she likes to walk her dog there and to be out in nature with all of the trees. She said not long ago she was with her mom driving down the street in front of the Bellevue Technology Center. The mountains could be seen along with the sunset, and it was beautiful. Now there are just tall ugly apartments and the beautiful sunset can no longer be seen. In the movie The Lorax, all the trees got cut down and the people has to use fake air and fake trees. She said she was worried that in the future Bellevue's world might be like that. As the Lorax said, unless someone like you cares a whole awful lot, nothing is going to get better, it's not.

****BREAK****

Ms. Karen Campbell, 2447 160th Avenue NE, said she is a Sherwood Forest resident just north of the Bellevue Technology Center site. She shared with the Commission a photographic tour of the neighborhood. She said residents of Northeast Bellevue are well aware of the traffic problems given the rating of LOS E-. Development of the area has increased, including the Spring District, the old Redmond Group Health site and the massive apartments on the west side of 156th Avenue NE. The views and the trees are disappearing, and sunlight during the day is being diminished.

Mr. Ruby Coache, 15869 Northup Way, said she is 11 years old and lives in a neighborhood across from the Bellevue Technology Center. She said she is a fifth grader and a Girl Scout. She pointed out that some signs were placed outside of the Bellevue Technology Center to inform everyone about the public hearing, but they were stolen by some adults, which is a really bad thing. She said lots of people are thinking about cutting down the trees and ~~replacing~~~~replace~~ them with parking lots and buildings. She said she did not agree with doing that. Trees and plants

~~give~~given oxygen, and cutting down the trees will mean the oxygen level will immediately become lower in the area. It takes a day to cut down a tree, but it takes many years to grow one. Traffic is bad and she has even been late for school because her mom could not get out of the neighborhood. The animal habitat in and around the Bellevue Technology Center will be destroyed if the trees are cut down. The animals should be allowed to rest in peace. Every year she goes up to the meadow and sleds down the hill during the winter when there is snow. Building buildings and parking lots will mean kids cannot do that anymore.

Ms. Jennifer Wong, 4505 152nd Lane SE, said she and her twin sister Julie, both 15 years old, used to live in Shanghai, China's biggest city and a global financial hub. She said every day she struggled with tall skyscrapers, cars, subways and other things, and played in parks with manmade lakes. The city largely lacked green space and pollution continues to be a huge problem caused by daily traffic flows, the burning of fossil fuels, and the huge population. Most importantly, Shanghai lacks trees to offset the daily emissions.

Ms. Julie Wong, 4505 152nd Lane SE, said she and her sister moved to Bellevue when they were 11 and they were surprised by the diversity of the area, where the air is fresh and the water is drinkable and the sky is blue. Pollution is not only a problem in Shanghai, however. During the recent spring break, her class traveled to New York and upon landing it seemed like being back in Shanghai with the familiar smells of pollution. New York, like Shanghai, has tall skyscrapers, subways, cars and pretty much everything besides green space. Even though New York and Shanghai are miles apart, they face similar problems. The skyscrapers are so close to each other than there is no buffer between residential and commercial areas. Bellevue should not be allowed to become another Shanghai or another New York. Bellevue should flourish and become an economic center while preserving nature.

Ms. Amy Lee, 3068 169th Avenue NE, spoke as vice president of the Ardmere Community Club and opposed to the Bellevue Technology Center Comprehensive Plan amendment. The Community Club represents some 300 households and is a social group rather than a political group. She ~~said~~ by talking to people in the Northeast Bellevue communities she has learned that people care about the issues, but they have a deep emotional pain at the thought of losing the environmental habitat of the trees and the meadow. It is important to their quality of life and what they value about Bellevue as a city in a park. Members of the Community Club were encouraged to sign the petition and did so. She presented the Commission with eight pages of signatures from the Silver Glen active retirement community that is located at the intersection of NE 20th Street and Bel-Red Road.

Mr. John Latino, 16516 NE 27th Place, stated his opposition to further development on the Bellevue Technology Center site. He said he opposed amending the Comprehensive Plan so as to enable such development. He said he purchased his home in large part because of the residential feel and the abundance of trees and open space, much of which is contributed by the Bellevue Technology Center property. Bellevue is known as a city in a park and it should work to keep it that way. Development of the Bellevue Technology Center site will ruin the character of the area and would have a negative impact on home values in ~~addition to~~additional overall quality of life.

Mr. Kurt Howler, 16243 NE 30th Street, said he moved to Bellevue in 1966 when what is now the Bellevue Technology Center was the Hungerford dairy farm. The farm had been there for a long time and the residential developments had moved in beside them, and the residences were protected by the trees on the south, the east and the north sides. Whether designed that way or not, the trees provided a buffer. In the late 1960s the property was sold and the developer wanted to do things that were incompatible with the nearby residential areas. The Sherwood Forest

neighborhood engaged a well-known land use lawyer who suggested taking a long-range view of the property. With his guidance, the neighborhood worked with the city and the landowner to come up with something that would work for the long term. The plan that was crafted allowed the owner to put in a commercial development that could not be seen from three sides. Over time, the site has developed exactly as envisioned. Nothing has changed from the original vision, and no changes should be allowed on the property.

Ms. Marilyn McGuire, 16223 NE 25th Street, said she moved into the Sherwood Forest community in 1961, and as an adult returned in 1995 to live in the same property. She said her dad used to say it is not possible to put two pounds of anything in a one-pound bag. Much has been said about attempts to do that with all of the building and all of the traffic, and the result is a risk to quality of life. The approach of KBS has been to do whatever needs to be done to get things changed. Their efforts have been disingenuous. There will be no benefit for the neighbors if the site is allowed to redevelop. The result will be more traffic, less green, and a triple-sized footprint. The neighborhood property values are important, the PUD is important, and quality of life is important. Just as school children need adults to get involved in preventing bullying, the neighborhoods need the city to preserve quality of life, homes, streets and neighborhoods. The Commission was asked to deny the Comprehensive Plan amendment by just saying no.

Ms. Pamela Johnson, 3741 122nd Avenue NE, said she attended the Sound Transit meeting at the Highland Community Center on June 13 where it was evident that there is fear in the community that the city will be overrun with development. Many who attended voiced fears that their neighborhoods would be taken over next. KBS is not an ordinary developer and the Bellevue Technology Center is not an ordinary property. The fact is there is a PUD in place that was agreed to years ago. Everyone fears a land grab, and the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment is just a different kind of land grab. A deal is a deal and the facts are the facts. Throughout the city where the new light rail route will run there are neighborhoods that will need to be preserved. Proximity to a station is not a good argument for simply taking over a neighborhood with transit-oriented development. The property owner is allowed under the law to continually seek to change the land use on their site, but their continual coming back with a new idea is not wearing down the community. The property owner has conducted public outreach, but that has not necessarily included listening to the public; if they had listened, they would know that the community does not support their proposal. The transportation level of service in the area is rated E-, which is the lowest grade there is. There is a Comprehensive Plan policy on the books calling for 40 percent tree canopy, and it would be good to know what percentage tree canopy there is in the area of the Bellevue Technology Center site. The city needs to have a way of dialing back growth until the infrastructure is ready.

Mr. Grant Gilkinson, 16008 NE 26th Street, said he is a second generation Sherwood Forest resident. He said his mother, a past member of the Planning Commission, moved to Bellevue in 1962. The PUD that is in place is the direct result of work by long-term residents who wanted to preserve open space for kids, many of whom had enjoyed the original farm on the Bellevue Technology Center site. The PUD allowed change to happen on the site while also allowing for the future to be controlled. An agreement is an agreement and it should be left in place.

Mr. Reggie John, 15803 NE 27th Place, spoke as the current president of the Sherwood Forest Community Club. He said the vision outlined in Bellevue Comprehensive Plan includes growing in a manner ~~that~~ enhances the livability of the community while maintaining ~~those~~ those elements that residents cherish. Growth in Bellevue is focused in denser mixed use centers like downtown, Bel-Red and Eastgate, while maintaining the city's outstanding natural environment and the health and vitality of established residential neighborhoods. To the residents, the vision is

compelling, but it is at risk. The residents of Sherwood Forest and the neighboring communities urge the Commission to uphold the recommendation of the planning staff to not approve the policy changes proposed by KBS.

Ms. Sheila Dupree, 1700 159th Place NE, said she came to the Eastside for the first time in her dad's 1947 Pontiac via ferry across the lake. She suggested that all of the residents opposed to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment should simply band together and buy the property and turn it into a park. Or the city should buy the land and turn it into a park.

Ms. Janet Castaniela, 2447 161st Avenue NE, noted that the online petition had been signed by more than a thousand people, and the petition taken door to door has been signed by more than 400 people. People willingly opened their doors and invited the petitioners in to talk about the issue and to ask what they can do. There have been community meetings as well. Traffic congestion has been a top topic, as has preserving the PUD.

Mr. Bryce Eden, 816 2nd Avenue, Seattle, spoke as the state policy director at FutureWise. He said for over 25 years the organization had worked to prevent sprawl in order to protect Washington's resources and make the urban areas livable for and available to all. The organization focuses on preventing the conversion of natural resource areas, such as working farms and forests, to subdivisions while directing growth and ensuring an equitable approach to affordable housing, effective transportation, and environmental quality in urbanized areas. He said he was present in support of updating the Comprehensive Plan and the proposed amendment. Bellevue is required to abide by Vision 2040 as well as the Countywide Planning Policies in addition to its own policies. Bellevue is also a signatory of the growing transit community strategy, which is supported by goals and strategies in the Comprehensive Plan. In its analysis moving forward, Sound Transit is using a walkshed minimum of half a mile. Within the Sound Transit system plan they have added dollars for transit-oriented development as well as access funds. The access funds are for anywhere between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile, and FutureWise is working closely with them to identify a policy that will push them to a mile. Through current studies across the nation, it is known what high-capacity frequent transit results in the opportunity to walk further than previously anticipated under regular metro. In addition, Sound Transit runs a three- to six-mile bike shed. The Bellevue Technology Center site is part of the significant change due to the recent developments within Sound Transit's policies included in the ST-3 system plan. He suggested the Commission should continue to look at how Vision 2040 impacts the growth and development within Bellevue and on the Bellevue Technology Center site specifically.

Commissioner Carlson commented that one of the issues with mass transit, whether it be by bus or light rail, is the availability of parking for commuters. He asked where FutureWise sees that happening. Mr. Eden said the current Sound Transit plan relies on park and ride lots in urbanized areas, to which ST-3 adds some 15,000 spots. The fact is, the area will grow by more than a million people whether anyone wants the growth to occur or not. To accommodate that growth, the city is going to need to allow for gentle infill development that will use the infrastructure being put in place. Sound Transit will continue to relieve the pressure on the roadways, in part by relying on transit-oriented development opportunities.

Commissioner Carlson pointed out that in fact parking is going away at the same time bus and light rail services are expanding. He said many drive first in order to access the bus and light rail and he asked where that parking will occur. Mr. Eden said the point of the site is that people will not be driving there. It should be understood that there will be a wide range of uses across all of it. It will not be possible to make transit accessible for everyone, so there will need to be multiple

options. The only way to do that is by providing transit-oriented development options such as on the Bellevue Technology Center site to allow people who do not need to use their cars to access the site in alternative modes. Part of the vision will be less parking overall. In Seattle, the transit commute rate for new people arriving in the region is well over 70 percent. Alternative modes of transportation will be needed to alleviate some of the traffic congestion on the current roadways, which cannot be expanded any more. Commissioner Carlson said the Seattle vision of increasing density in single family neighborhoods is not the Bellevue approach. Mr. Eden allowed that FutureWise is fully supportive of increased density across the central Puget Sound region, which also happens to be a requirement under the Growth Management Act and under the Bellevue Comprehensive Plan and under Vision 2040. Commissioner Carlson said Bellevue's focus has been on directing growth in the downtown, the Spring District and Eastgate specifically to preserve the character of the single family neighborhoods.

Commissioner Barksdale said the FutureWise website says the organization focuses on preventing the conversion of wildlife habitat, open space, farmland and working forests to subdivisions and development. He suggested that statement seems contrary to supporting development on the Bellevue Technology Center site that will in fact remove habitat and open space. Mr. Eden said within the Growth Management Act there is something called the Urban Growth Boundary which is intended to prevent sprawl. Density needs to be increased inside the Urban Growth Boundary through the use of gentle infill that protects open spaces. If that is not done, the result will be sprawl beyond North Bend up toward Snoqualmie Pass, destroying natural forests and making traffic even worse.

Mr. Emmanuel Solis, 2447 161st Avenue NE, apologized that the Commission has had to hear the same arguments over and over again for the last four years. He said the residents of northeast Bellevue are also very tired of having to defend the community from the interests of out of state companies that are focused only on profit. The Bellevue Technology Center site is what it is because of the PUD that is in place; without the PUD, the trees and the open space would all be gone. The PUD preserves the meadow and all of the trees, not just the trees around the perimeter. The PUD is doing the work it was designed to do. The meadow and the trees have been preserved, and development has been allowed on the site. By following the recommendation of staff, nothing will be taken away from KBS. KBS is asking for something they have never had, and they are asking that something be taken away from the community and be entrusted to them. One good thing about all the years of meetings and hearings and documentation is that the northeast Bellevue communities have banded together with a common cause.

Commissioner Carlson informed the chair that he would need to leave the meeting soon, and he noted that because Commissioner Laing had already left, his leaving would mean the Commission would not have a quorum. Mr. Cullen confirmed that absent a quorum, the meeting would need to stop.

Chair deVadoss noted that comments can be submitted online at any time.

A member of the audience suggested the Commission had heard enough to be able to say no to the Comprehensive Plan amendment and to not move it to the next phase. Mr. Cullen explained that the intent of a public hearing is to allow anyone who wants to share their viewpoint to do so in a caring and respectful environment.

Ms. Michelle Niethammer, 15897 Northup Way, thanked the Commissioners for their time. She said the PUD has been valuable in preserving green space through solid planning. In areas where there is no PUD in place, such as in Redmond, the result has been clearcutting ahead of

development. Taking away the restrictions from the Bellevue Technology Center property will give KBS a blank check. The property owner has not submitted any development plans for the site in order to keep secret their real intent. The trees will come down and it will take many years for them to grow back. KBS says is has engaged Forterra4Terra to create permanent conservation for the site. That is something that is already in place with the PUD. All Forterra4Terra would do is protect what does not get destroyed. The property owner claims the city has not given consideration to the Bellevue Technology Center site in the Comprehensive Plan, but in fact the site has been more planned than any square inch of land in the entire city. The site has been documented up, down, right and left. To say the site has been overlooked in the planning process is utterly ridiculous. KBS talks about transportation studies, but they have had three years to do them, though they have not shared the results of a single one. Traffic in the area during the peak hours is bad and is getting worse, and the peak period is expanding. People are having to plan their lives around when they can get into and out of their communities. Much has been said about transit-oriented development, which in short involves building around train stations. The concept does not extend to buying a piece of property and hoping the bus drives by. The Bellevue Technology Center has 300,000 square feet of office space, which makes it a major employment center. It does not, however, make it unique as the same exists in other areas around the city. The Commission was urged to avoid overdeveloping the city. There is huge development coming, and the last thing the city wants is vacant buildings and developers going bankrupt and trying to sell properties. The Spring District is planned and should be allowed to fully develop before figuring out what more is needed. She guaranteed that in six years, everyone will still be happy to have the Bellevue Technology Center green space.

Mr. Cullen said Commission could decide to either end the public hearing or continue it to another date. Either approach would require a formal action. He strongly recommended against letting a lack of quorum cause the meeting to end abruptly.

A motion to continue the public hearing until 9:45 p.m. was made by Commissioner Carlson. The motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Walter suggested limiting testimony to two minutes each. The suggestion was not discussed further.

Chair deVadoss said if possible, he would like to continue the public hearing even without a quorum. Mr. Cullen explained that absent a quorum, there would be no public record. The Commission cannot conduct business without a quorum.

A member of audience expressed frustration at the notion of ending the public hearing without everyone being allowed to speak. He said he had skipped his son's last Boy Scout meeting in order to be present, and said he was sure others in the room were waiting to speak.

Chair deVadoss said if the meeting must end, the public hearing should be carried over to the next Commission meeting. He said he would entertain a motion to continue the public hearing to June 28.

Commissioner Barksdale suggested limiting the public hearing time on June 28 to no more than one hour. Chair deVadoss pointed out that there were 30 people on the sign-up sheet who had not yet spoken. At three minutes each, that would be a minimum of an hour and a half. He said to be conservative, at least two hours should be allowed.

Commissioner Barksdale asked if testimony at the next meeting could be limited to just those

persons who are on the list. Mr. Cullen said public hearings are open to the public and to anyone who wants to speak. The Commission can, however, put a time limit on the length of the hearing, and the continued public hearing could begin with those already on the list.

A motion to carry over the public hearing to June 28 and to limit it to an hour and a half was made by Commissioner Barksdale. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Walter and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Shawn Sheridan, 17419 NE 12th Street, said he raised four children at that address. He said his eldest is currently enrolled in college in New York City and reports having nightmares of coming home and finding the trees cut down. When home, she walks past the grove of trees on the Bellevue Technology Center twice daily, and she is distraught when she thinks about what might happen to the site. New York City without Central Park would be a nightmare. More than a hundred years ago someone had the foresight to save land in the middle of a very dense city. He said in coming home every day, he purposefully drives through the Bellevue Technology Center site in order to relieve his stress. He said he was amused by the arguments of KBS that appear to be legal maneuvering rather than an attempt to do what is right. To say they want to go from 0.16 usage to 0.5 usage and to call it a small increase is laughable. They would not be laughing if someone were proposing to cut their salaries by the same percentage on the claim that it is only a small change.

Mr. Hayden Hoppert, 1905 160th Avenue NE, said he was opposed to the Comprehensive Plan amendment. The applicant says the map and Comprehensive Plan has not been amended since 1988, but in fact the entire Comprehensive Plan was updated and readopted very recently. It is clear the property has been looked at since 1988. The property owner says that development on the site is not excluded, that there are other concentration areas. While that is true, that is not the intent of where the growth is focused; other growth is considered to be organic and will occur without requiring huge public hearings and tripling the amount of development on a given site. The neighborhood property owners feel that in general KBS has been disingenuous in many of their dealings, making it hard to believe them when they say they have no specific plans for the site and when they say they will save the trees.

Mr. Robert Pomeroy, 16055 NE 28th Street, said he has been a resident of Sherwood Forest for 20 years. He noted his support for keeping the PUD in place permanently. If the arguments of the applicant sways the Commission, the timing is not right for redeveloping the site given all the construction in the areas targeted for high density on the west side of 156th Avenue NE and the impact of those changes cannot yet be measured. He said he regularly is a pedestrian on 156th Avenue NE and often passes cars.

Mr. Mark Thorpe, 2604 169th Avenue NE, said there are two major issues with the proposal. Traffic is one. In the presentation made by KBS a couple of years ago they talked about a thousand additional parking slots. Now they are talking about people coming to the site by bus and light rail, which is not what their intent was two years ago. Anything that will add to traffic in the area will not be welcomed. The applicant says they will preserve the meadow and the trees, but in fact the PUD that is in place already does that; no additional protections are needed. The photos submitted by the applicant showing changes in the area are all focused on the area to the west and the south. If photos were to be taken to the east and the north, they would show that nothing has really changed for a very long time. He pointed out that more than a hundred persons were in attendance at the public hearing, and added that the last time there was a public hearing regarding the site a similar number of persons attended. People clearly care about the site. The recommendation of the staff should be approved.

Ms. Deb Wexler, 15811 Northup Way, said she has lived in the area for only three years but chose the area in large part due to the greenbelt on the Bellevue Technology Center property. She said her thought at the time was that Bellevue did things right. She said when she asked about the greenbelt, she was told that it was to be permanent. The PUD does more than preserve memories, it also preserves property values and lifestyles. The applicant has asked to be allowed to move the proposal forward, in part to allow for more community outreach. The neighborhoods would like to know how many more times they will need to say the same things before being heard.

Mr. John ~~Haro~~~~Harrow~~, 2431 161st Avenue NE, said he has lived in Sherwood Forest for 30 years. He noted that page 3 of the Commission packet included a statement from planning staff regarding traffic impacts from the Overlake Village developments in Redmond. Included in the statement was the notion that Bellevue is not planning for infrastructure outside of currently planned areas. That was affirmed in the 2015 major Comprehensive Plan update and the growth projections in the Northeast Bellevue Mobility Management Areas. Based on public information, the formerly Group Health site will have 1400 residential units, 1.4 million square feet of commercial, and at least 675 parking stalls, possibly twice that many when they are done. Overlake Village South will have 1805 parking stalls. The LIV apartments have 476 parking stalls. Sherwood Center apartments have 800 parking stalls. The Microsoft OBAT (Overlake Business & Advanced Technology zone) height limit approval means they can take the original campus buildings ~~rebuild~~~~can be rebuilt~~ up to nine stories and have an unknown number of parking stalls. That is a total of 3756 known parking stalls. The KBS documents call for 2785 parking stalls on the Bellevue Technology Center site, which would bring the total to 5500 parking stalls coming into the Overlake area. If the cities of Redmond and Bellevue are interested in traffic improvements to accommodate all the traffic from new developments in the area, and if they are interested in promoting high-density live/work solutions to reduce traffic congestion, it is questionable as to why they are approving so many new developments with attached large parking facilities. The Commission was urged to agree with the recommendation of the staff.

Mr. Lee Sergeant, 16246 NE 24th Street, said he has lived at his current address for 38 years. He said he worked at Unigard for 32 years and walked to and from work. He said originally there was gravel on the side of the road to walk on but the city has since put in paved sidewalks on both sides of the street, which has reduced the number of accidents at 164th Avenue NE and NE 24th Street. The city has done a good job, but there is still room for improvement. Until additional improvements are made, the obvious choice is to wait until some future time to even consider changes to the Bellevue Technology Center site.

Ms. Kathy Benetary, 16255 NE 26th Street, said she has been a Bellevue resident since 1983 and purchased her home in Sherwood Forest in 2001. She pointed out that the schools are at capacity and parents face a race to register their students on a first come-first served basis. There is no room for additional students. She said her daily commute is very stressful because it is not easy to get into and out of the neighborhood. There is new development happening all around the area, all of which will make traffic worse. Local residents are feeling betrayed by the city and no longer brag about how nice a place ~~to live~~ Bellevue is to live. The Commission was urged to reject the proposal.

Commissioner Carlson pointed out that a lot of the development people are concerned about is occurring in Redmond.

Mr. Dan Krevinson, 2555 162nd Avenue NE, said he moved into his present residence in 1988 and has seen a lot of changes in development. He suggested the city should be celebrating the success of the PUD that is in place, and those who worked to see it instituted should be acknowledged. The Commission was urged not to pass the Comprehensive Plan amendment on to ~~final review~~Final Review.

Mr. Reed Miller, 15929 NE 27th Place, said the applicant has claimed to have performed outreach to the community, but has said nothing about the response received. The fact is they have consistently ignored it. They should probably have checked with the community before purchasing the site. They have chosen to talk about the amount of time they have invested, which has really been time spent trying to subvert the PUD in direct opposition to the community. The time they have spent is irrelevant, and so ~~is~~isn't their expense. There are plenty of locations in Bellevue being allowed to grow and develop. KBS knowingly chose to purchase the site knowing the PUD was in place, also knowing that the previous owner tried and failed to remove it. The PUD was put in place specifically to prevent further development on the site and its purpose has not changed, nor has the community's support for the PUD. The community has been fighting the fight longer than the current applicant and will continue to fight long after they have given up and sold the site to the next guy who thinks the PUD and the community can be steamrolled. The Commission was asked to consider the cumulative time put in by all the unpaid people opposing the proposal each time the issue has come around.

Mr. Bill Kapadano, 1904 161st Avenue NE, said his home is just around the corner from the Bellevue Technology Center site. He said he grew up on the East Coast but moved to the Seattle area in 1999 to work for Amazon and Microsoft. He said he believes in moving forward but also in protecting the past. He said he moved to Bellevue because of the city's diversity. He said as a business person and as a marketer, KBS has done a terrible job of researching and understanding their audience. They have done a poor job of trying to solve problems by talking to their target audience, and especially of trying to understand the needs of the target audience. Sometimes businesses make investments that fail, and when they do they must move on to the next thing. The Bellevue Technology Center site is a battle the community is willing to stay in for the long haul. KBS has really done nothing to engage with the community and the Commission should vote down the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Mr. Shawn Donohue, 1617 185th Avenue NE, said his home is in the Tam O'Shanter community. He said there are probably 2000 homes between his and the Bellevue Technology Center, the owners of which must rely on only two roads, both of which skirt the Bellevue Technology Center site. If the site is redeveloped and the expected traffic evolves, adding to the traffic from all the current development, there will be far more pain. Traffic is already at LOS E- and there are no options. He said his wife is from Madrid where there is a light rail system, but no one walks to access the train, they all drive or gets someone to drop them off. There are no places to build additional roads, so there is no way to mitigate all the extra traffic. He said he owns two homes in the Tam O'Shanter community and is afraid that his property values will drop because of the traffic issues.

Ms. Heidi Wrestler, 917 168th Avenue NE, said she had the pleasure of growing up in the 1970s at 1903 143rd Place SE. She said she watched the widening of 148th Avenue. Houses were lifted up and rolled out in the middle of the night to accommodate the work. The businesses that developed along 148th Avenue were interspersed with residences and kids had places to go get jobs. She said her concern is that ten years down the road 164th Avenue NE, the only escape route from her neighborhood, will also be widened, with houses lifted up and rolled away. Once that street becomes a boulevard, the beautiful trees in the affected neighborhoods will be lost.

When the new extension for I-405 to SR-520 was done, trees had to come down, pushing the road closer to the neighborhoods, and increasing the overall noise. Taking trees out will mean noise levels will increase and water quality will be reduced. The sidewalks around Crossroads Mall should be repaired.

Ms. Pam Toelle, 14845 NE 13th Street, said she lives in the Chevy Chase community which has been involved in community issues since its inception. She said she has been involved with land use and transportation issues along with the Sherwood Forest community over the years. She said her personal goal is to preserve and protect neighborhoods from more intense uses, which is a Comprehensive Plan policy. Times have changed: 148th Avenue, which used to be a two-lane country road, is now a major boulevard and is often referred to as alternate I-405. In the 1970s there were two PUDs established: the Bamco property across from Highland school, and the Unigard property. Both were planned and designated PUDs to protect neighborhoods from more intense uses and different kinds of uses. The Bamco PUD limits the kinds of uses in businesses near the school to those that will not attract children. The Unigard PUD was established to protect the neighborhoods from different kinds of uses and intensity of uses. Under King County, the Hungerford farm was zoned OU, and then later OU-R, which means designated for residential. In both cases, the reasons for establishing the PUDs have not changed. She said she was proud to be part of a community that worked with the city in pioneering a process that keeps property owners from annually seeking amendments for the same properties.

Ms. Carolyn Stanley, 1915 177th Avenue NE, said her property is at the dividing line between Redmond and Bellevue. She noted that the current electric grid is operating at capacity, yet development continues without adequate infrastructure. Redmond recently came to her neighborhood to talk about the water pipeline that will be coming down NE 24th Street in the next two years. That project will trigger huge traffic impacts. She said her son is a senior at Interlake high school where the motto is Honesty, Integrity and Scholarship. That motto is how the children are asked to live. City employees should have the same motto. She said in her professional life she works as an advocate for families and children, those facing domestic violence situations and those without a voice. She said there is family disintegration and a loss of connection going on in the community. More traffic means less time together. There are learning and cognitive developmental issues that have come as a result of people living in large cities that have been documented by the World Health Organization, the Centers for Disease Control, the Department of Health and Human Services. Overdevelopment has negative impacts on children and their families, impairing the ability of children to learn how to read, affecting executive functions, creating behavioral issues, and triggering hyperactivity and sleep deprivation. Cancers have been identified as being triggered by high traffic and pollution in cities across the nation and around the world. There is an increased impact on physical health, resting heart rates and blood pressure, increased cortisol levels, increased lipids and heart disease in children. In January 2016 there was a car accident on 160th Avenue NE and Northup Way that she witnessed. She said she helped direct traffic because the police could not get there for half an hour because of the traffic. The safety of Bellevue's children must be considered.

Chair deVadoss thanked Commissioner Carlson for staying so the Commission could retain a quorum for the public hearing and make it all the way through the list of persons signed up to speak.

A motion to close the public hearing and to rescind the motion to continue the public hearing to June 28 was made by Commissioner Barksdale. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Walter and the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT
(10:21 p.m.)

Mr. Guy McGrauby, 2428 159th Avenue NE, noted that in the neighborhoods around the Bellevue Technology Center there are some 2000 homes. The Hyde Park development alone has more than 1100 units. The infrastructure in place was meant to serve 2000 households, but now it will need to serve 3000 households. Every year the traffic problems have become worse as more development has occurred. It can take up to ten minutes during peak times to get out of the neighborhood.

ADJOURN
(10:23 p.m.)

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Barksdale. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Walter and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair deVadoss adjourned the meeting at 10:23 p.m.