

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION  
STUDY SESSION MINUTES

February 24, 2020  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Virtual Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Moolgavkar, Vice Chair Malakoutian,  
Commissioners Bhargava, Brown, deVadoss, Ferris,  
Morisseau

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Thara Johnson, Matt McFarland, Department of  
Community Development; Kristina Gallant, Trisna Tanus,  
Department of Development Services

COUNCIL LIAISON: Councilmember Barksdale

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER  
(6:30 p.m.)

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Moolgavkar who presided.

Chair Moolgavkar stated that the meeting was being held remotely via zoom in order to comply with the Governor's emergency order concerning the Open Public Meetings Act, which prohibits in-person meetings.

2. ROLL CALL  
(6:31 p.m.)

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Bhargava, who joined at 7:26 p.m.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA  
(6:33 p.m.)

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Vice Chair Malakoutian. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and the motion carried unanimously.

4. REPORTS OF CITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS  
(6:34 p.m.)

Councilmember Barksdale reported that the City Council had adopted the ADU and Unit Lot Subdivision Land Use Code amendments as recommended by the Commission. He thanked the Commissioners and the staff for their thoughtful work.

5. STAFF REPORTS  
(6:35 p.m.)

A. Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Comprehensive Planning Manager Thara Johnson briefly reviewed the Commission's upcoming meeting dates and agenda items.

Ms. Johnson commented that the Commission has recently had a number of Land Use Code amendments that go through the legislative process, as well as Comprehensive Plan amendments, which follow a similar process. She said a question was recently raised about whether the Commission needs to make a recommendation at the same meeting where a public hearing is held for a particular issue. She clarified that there is no requirement that that be the case. In 2020 the Commission's schedule was fairly tight and so the public hearing and Commission recommendations were programmed to occur on the same night. However, the Commission always has the leeway to make a recommendation at a following meeting.

6. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS  
(6:39 p.m.)

Ms. Betsi Hummer, 14541 SE 26th Street, said she has followed the city's Affordable Housing Strategy since its inception. She said there are near her home in East Bellevue a number of King County Housing Authority subsidized housing developments, as well as a number of moderately priced market-rate apartment buildings along with other subsidized housing units. There appears to be a direct correlation between affordable housing and the concentration of low-income populations in various neighborhoods such as Newport Hills, Lake Hills and Crossroads. A review of the minutes of the Affordable Housing Strategy meetings shows that those involved had a good grasp on how development occurs and what affordable housing strategies do to neighborhoods. The major concern was the permit fees and the process of getting permits, and having affordable housing dispersed throughout the city rather than concentrated in just a few neighborhoods. The Commission has been seeing elements from the Affordable Housing Strategy one at a time, but to see them as a whole will be very important. The Commissioners should take the time to read through the Affordable Housing Strategy documents and the minutes of the technical advisory group.

Ms. Dianna Thompson said she could see no reason for dispersing affordable housing throughout the city. She said people buy their homes in the neighborhoods they expect to live in and there is no reason why they should suddenly see their neighborhoods change just because the city decides to have a lot of businesses move in.

Ms. Johnson pointed out that staff had included in the packet the written communications received prior to the packet publication date, and had forwarded the emails received prior to 3:30 p.m.

7. PUBLIC HEARING  
(6:49 p.m.)

A. Public Hearing on a Land Use Code Amendment (LUCA) to establish lower minimum parking requirements in the Land Use Code (LUC) for certain residential developments with frequent transit service and consistency with RCW 36.70A.620 and the City's Affordable Housing Strategy

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

Consulting attorney Trisna Tanus reminded the Commissioners that the six topic areas in the proposed Land Use Code amendment (LUCA) were presented to the Commission on January 13 and January 27. On January 27 the Commission directed the staff to schedule a public hearing on the reduced minimum residential parking issue. She said the Commission would be asked following the public hearing to recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed LUCA.

Ms. Tanus highlighted the baseline objectives for the LUCA, beginning with the need to conform the Land Use Code with the state requirements of RCW 36.70A.620 and 36.70A.698. She said the former became effective on June 11, 2020, and the city adopted an Interim Official Control to achieve conformance and meet the required deadline. The bill capped the minimum parking requirements that cities and counties in the state can impose for housing units served by frequent transit service. The latter RCW provision also became effective in 2020 and allowed cities to adopt conform regulations by July 1, 2021. The proposed LUCA includes permanent amendments that will conform the city's Land Use Code with the two state statutes. The second objective for the proposal is to support the city's Affordable Housing Strategy and Transit Master Plan by reducing the parking requirements for apartments near transit stations, which is Action B-1 of the Affordable Housing Strategy, and by lowering the cost of building affordable housing, which is Action C-5.

Ms. Tanus pointed out that Comprehensive Plan policy LU-1 directs most of the city's growth to the Downtown regional growth center and other areas designated for compact mixed use development served by a full range of transportation options. Additionally, Strategy 7 of the Transit Master Plan recommends supporting transit use through design regulations.

At the time the Council adopted the Interim Official Control, direction was also given to work on permanent regulations to continue to be in conformance with state regulations. Additionally, the Council asked the staff to analyze four parking-related topics beyond the state mandates, namely the appropriate radius, one quarter mile or one half mile, for eligibility for frequent transit service; revisiting the Downtown residential visitor parking requirements; improving certainty within the parking departure process; and additional parking-specific incentives to encourage affordable housing.

Senior planner Kristina Gallant addressed the six topics addressed during the two Commission study sessions and included in the proposed LUCA, beginning with frequent transit service criteria. She noted that the proposal includes two tiers for classifying transit stops, the first tier for stops with service between two and four times per hour for at least 12 hours per day, in which only affordable housing would be eligible for a parking reduction within a quarter mile radius; and the second tier for stops with service at least four times per hour, in which a half mile radius applies and where market-rate multifamily would also be eligible for a reduced minimum parking ratio. Included in the second tier are future light rail or bus rapid transit stops opening within two years. The city's definition of affordable housing is up to 80 percent of area median income instead of the state's up to 50 percent of area median income; the 80 percent level is more in line with incentives established in the code. Under state law, it is only optional to require affordable housing to be permanent, and the proposed LUCA specifies that it only applies to permanent affordable housing units. The proposal expands the radius for higher frequency stops to a half mile in consideration of the definition of transit-oriented development in the Comprehensive Plan. The amendment takes advantage of the flexibility the law offers in terms of

review and incorporates a standard for the director to determine if a physical impediment blocks transit access.

Ms. Gallant said Topic 2, parking ratios, and Topic 5, incentives for affordable housing, are tied together. She said the proposal does not change a developer's ability to provide more parking than is required, including affordable housing and senior housing developers. For the lower frequency transit stop tier, the proposal is for 0.75 spaces per unit for affordable housing units, and in the higher frequency tier 0.5 spaces per unit. For small units affordable to households up to 60% AMI, including studios and one bedrooms, the proposal is for 0.25 spaces per unit. Market-rate multifamily is only eligible for lower parking ratios in the higher frequency tier, and the proposal is for 0.75 spaces per unit. For senior housing, and consistent with state law, the minimum parking for residents only is removed; she stressed that senior housing providers are permitted to provide more than the minimum parking as they deem necessary. Under state law, the minimum parking ratio for market-rate multifamily and affordable housing is 0.75 spaces per studio and 1.0 space per bedroom. The minimum does not apply in the case of housing for seniors and people with disabilities, or to accessory dwelling units given that they are addressed separately in the legislation.

With regard to Topic 3, the parking departures process, and Topic 4, the Downtown visitor parking requirements, Ms. Gallant said the proposal does not include any changes. Neither topic is required under state law. In the case of the parking departures process, there are opportunities for improvement; the topic would benefit from a more comprehensive approach and more time for analysis. Downtown visitor parking is a requirement that was implemented in late 2017 and there has not been sufficient time to fully evaluate the outcomes. The LUCA does include a "not to exceed" provision in order to conform with the intent of the reduced parking minimums.

Turning to Topic 6, ADU parking, Ms. Gallant said the proposal is consistent with the state legislation and removes the off-street parking requirement for ADUs located within a quarter mile radius of the higher frequency tiers. The provision includes future light rail stations and bus rapid transit stops coming online within two years.

The Commissioners were reminded that questions arose during the second study session relative to the mitigation of future changes with regard to transit. Ms. Gallant said the proposal focuses on setting up a process under which decisions can be made on information that is as up to date as possible. Under the proposal, whether or not a project meets the criteria for frequent transit availability would be determined based on service at the time the building permit application or land use approval is complete. If any previously identified qualifying stops no longer have frequent service, a future project near that stop would not be eligible. Under state law there is additional discretion allowed during the project review process if the city determines that a unit is in an area with a lack of access to street parking capacity, physical space impediments, or other reasons supported by evidence that would make on-street parking infeasible.

Ms. Gallant said three primary modes of outreach had been utilized in regard to the proposed LUCA, including the standard process IV requirements for noticing and public hearings. There has also been direct engagement and feedback with the Master Builders Association, developers, affordable housing providers and other stakeholders, and the project webpage includes public information regarding key dates and contact information for public comment. She noted the receipt of 62 emails on the Interim Official Control and the proposed draft LUCA. Most comments were in support of the reduced parking requirements for eligible developments in frequent transit service areas. There were, however, specific concerns expressed regarding future transit service changes, transit ridership impacts due to COVID, transit service not frequent

enough to justify reductions, overflow parking impacts, variation in transportation needs among seniors and people with disabilities, general opposition to increased affordable housing, and the reductions not going far enough.

Ms. Tanus briefly reviewed the LUCA process to date and noted that the Commission's recommendation is tentatively scheduled to be presented to the Council on April 5 and to the East Bellevue Community Council for a courtesy public hearing the following day. Council action is tentatively slated for April 26, and the East Bellevue Community Council's public hearing and approval or disapproval is set for May 4. The current Interim Official Control expires on May 18.

Chair Moolgavkar opened the floor to testimony from the public.

Mr. Dick Thompson, 3115 103rd Avenue NE, spoke against the recommendation to approve the Land Use Code amendment establishing lower minimum parking requirements for certain residential developments. He said his opposition was based on the finding that lower minimum parking requirements will not enhance the public health, safety and welfare. Bellevue is a car-dependent city. It measures a walkability score of 40 on a scale of 100 according to walkscore.com. He said in his general neighborhood north of NE 24th Street there is only one street that has a sidewalk, namely Bellevue Way NE. All of the neighborhoods to the east and west of Bellevue Way have undulating curvy roads with visibility challenges. A car on those roads has limited visibility of oncoming cars on the other side of the rise, and many curves are blind because of residential shrubbery. Lighting is minimal. Safety rules dictate pedestrians should walk facing traffic, but that often puts the pedestrian on the wrong side of the road from the standpoint of an oncoming driver's visibility. When a car is approaching where one is walking, best practices require the walker to leave the roadway, which often means encroaching on someone's property. Parking more cars on the streets will add more obstructions for walkers. Two cars traveling in opposite directions will take up the whole roadway, and pedestrians are forced to move off the road. A single car traveling where cars are parked, the walker will be forced to find a way around the parked cars. If the LUCA is approved, it should be conditional on locations where sidewalks are available to pedestrians.

Mr. Emmanuel Solis said he was glad to see the city taking the initiative to address affordable housing in combination with transportation. The two issues are clearly related. He voiced his support for reducing the minimum parking requirements for multifamily construction in areas that are served by frequent transit service. He indicated, however, that he is also very concerned that some of the data used to make decisions is outdated and out of context, and in some areas the LUCA appears to overreach. From past study sessions it is clear the Commission is considering expanding the scope of the LUCA. There are real-life implications that must be remembered. Not all distances are created equal. Not all of the assumptions apply to every location. Walkability should be in the curve as part of the equation. There are many older neighborhoods in northeast Bellevue that do not have sidewalks which makes walking in the dark or on rainy days challenging and even potentially dangerous. The city has used out-of-state studies for reducing the parking requirements, but those studies largely focus on already transit-reached areas, and they do not consider ADUs in residential neighborhoods. The proposed LUCA is not consistent with the state regulations and there are several reasons why an ADU should require an off-street parking spot. The LUCA requirements should apply to targeted growth areas where multifamily dwelling is already planned and where transportation investments are already in place. Accountability must be ensured; developers that take advantage of the lower parking requirements should deliver the expected affordable units. The maps showing frequent transit service areas should match the designated land uses. Developers should

not be allowed to use the maps to extend the growth areas beyond the clearly designated and transit-reached areas.

Mr. Ryan Donohue, advocacy and policy director for Habitat for Humanity, Seattle/King County, spoke in support of the efforts to reduce the parking requirements for residential developments near areas with frequent transit service. Parking remains a significant cost barrier which affordable housing developers must navigate. The reality is that parking spots take up a lot of project site space, ultimately reducing the buildable area. By reducing the parking requirements, the total development costs of affordable homes across the entire spectrum will be reduced, something the city desperately needs. The proposal will help further the city's sustainability goals. The city's Environmental Stewardship Plan identifies 76 percent of transportation emissions come from passenger vehicles. By reducing the parking requirements within a reasonable walkshed of a quarter mile or even a half mile from frequent transit will encourage residents to rely more consistently on the growing transit network Bellevue enjoys. With the future investment in transit in the future it only makes sense to encourage the use of transit by implementing the reductions in parking requirements. He highly encouraged the Commission to support the LUCA.

Ms. Pearl Leung, senior manager of external affairs for Amazon, affirmed the support of Amazon for the proposed LUCA. She said Amazon believes all people should have access to housing they can afford. Building parking is a significant cost driver in residential development, a cost that negatively impacts the affordability of housing. Reducing the parking requirements in transit-oriented development areas is the right thing to do for both housing affordability and protecting the natural environment. It is good that the amendment defines frequent transit service as being within a half mile of future light rail or a bus rapid transit station rather than a quarter mile; the best practice will encourage transit usage and leverage the investments made in the transit system.

Ms. Diana Thompson said the proposed regulations concern her because of their impact on parking for residents of senior housing. Many seniors are disabled and thus walking a quarter or a half mile to a bus stop is overly exerting or impossible. In addition, the walk from one's residence to the bus stop is not the only distance seniors will need to walk if on-site parking is not provided. A senior who retains a car will need to walk unknown distances from a street parking place to his or her residence. In addition, whenever a senior takes the bus, the senior may need to walk a considerable distance after getting off the bus, and then need to walk a long distance to catch a bus home. There are other ways the city can conform to the state regulations. The city can request the legislature not to have the parking restrictions apply to senior housing. The LUCA proposal does not appear to include the language of the RCW which states that a city may establish a requirement for the provision of one or more parking space per bedroom if a jurisdiction has determined a particular housing unit to be in an area with lack of access to street parking, physical space impediments, or other reasons supported by evidence that would make on-street parking infeasible. That language should be incorporated. RCW 36.70A.620 may overlook laws that protect the disabled. The construction of senior or disabled housing funded in part with federal dollars may not meet the requirements of the Americans With Disabilities Act and/or the Fair Housing Act if parking is not provided. She asked the Commission to reconsider the changes that will impact seniors and those who are disabled and allow seniors living in senior facilities to be able to leave their residence to go shopping or visiting.

Ms. Nancy Whittaker, 1924 160 Avenue NE, said the recommendation before the Commission is primarily based on a Denver parking study. There are some good points made in the Denver study, such as the parking needs should be correlated with the type of multifamily housing

provided, so the more affordable a unit is, the less the need for parking. It makes sense to allow lower parking requirements for affordable housing. It also reflects that distance from a transit station matters, so it makes sense to define a distance from frequent transit stops. There is also a section about bundled versus unbundled parking that has an impact on the use of parking, which should be at the discretion of the developers. But there are concerns, starting with whether or not it is adequate to take data from a Denver study and apply it to Bellevue; it does not appear that there has been any data gathered that is specific to Bellevue. The Denver study recommends situating affordable housing in station areas and to that end Denver has amended its zoning code to allow for reducing the minimum parking requirement by 25 percent for properties within a quarter mile of a bus, rapid transit and train station. The proposed LUCA appears to include all transit service. She proposed the approach for Bellevue should be focused on transit-oriented development and transit-rich areas, and should not allow for lowering parking requirements near non-bus rapid transit stops or throughout the city.

Ms. Marilyn McGuire concurred with the comments of Ms. Whittaker and said not all neighborhoods are equal and they should not all see reductions to the parking requirements. Context makes a difference. Data from Bellevue is important so it can be known what is happening locally before taking the proposed actions. She said she was happy to see the LUCA includes language from the RCW about lack of access to street parking, physical space limitations and so forth that may result in the need to ameliorate situations in specific areas. She said she lives across from two schools, one of which is a high school, and the neighborhood is impacted by cars to the degree that the city was asked to issue parking permits allowing local residents to park their own cars. There are no sidewalks so pedestrians must walk in the street and if cars are parking on both sides of the street, pedestrians have to walk in the middle of the street. Seattle has parking on both sides of streets making it difficult to navigate those streets safely, and emergency vehicles have problems operating there as well. The assumption that the residents of ADUs will not need or use cars because of the availability of other transportation options may not be entirely reasonable; there is not enough data to support that assumption. People who live in ADUs may do shift work that is not easily accommodated by public transportation schedules. Others may have jobs that require them to be in many different places around the city, making it difficult or impossible to use rapid transit. ADUs are proposed as an option for allowing seniors to age in place, or to house people with disabilities, but there are times when seniors and those with physical difficulties prefer to use their cars due to mobility issues involved in walking to and using public transportation. There are many factors that may require cars to be used that should be considered and planned for. Some additional work should be done with current and relevant data, including from homeowners and neighborhood people who could collaborate and work with the city. The final approach will affect both affordable housing and the neighborhoods that will be part of the effort.

Ms. Betsi Hummer, 14541 SE 26th Street, noted that she had sent a letter to the Commission regarding her input. She said she was heartened to hear from so many citizens reflecting the same issues she raised. She said her neighborhood includes developments with subsidized housing units in addition to market-rate apartment units. The parking lots for those developments are always full during the night and empty during the day, even though the area is served by four distinct bus lines and is located only three-quarters of a mile from the Eastgate park and ride lot. It is discriminatory to say someone who is poor does not need a car just because they live near a bus stop. Bellevue was built as a car-oriented city and the city should take the initiative of listening to its citizens and should limit the parking reductions to the transit nodes of BelRed, Downtown, East Main and South Bellevue near the park and ride lot. The Commission should make some amendments to the finely detailed staff proposal.

Ms. Heidi Dean, 11661 SE 56th Street, concurred with most of the previous speakers. She said the notion that just because someone is low income they do not have or require a car is false. She said she lives in a neighborhood that has quite a lot of low-income housing and all the residents have cars. It is also a false assumption that seniors do not drive.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Commissioner Morisseau. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ferris and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Morisseau commented that while the concept behind the LUCA is good, the execution of it will be what needs to be considered to avoid unintended consequences. She said when reading through the language the issues that rose up were seniors and safety. She stated that while she believed the LUCA should be recommended for approval, there should be something similar to the BelRed look back a few years out to determine if the approach is working and what improvements can be made. Ms. Tanus said staff appreciates the concerns about senior housing and to have essential zero parking requirements per unit or per bed. The language used, however, was drawn directly state law and the city does not have the authority to make modifications that would require more than the minimum imposed by the state regulations. With regard to something akin to the BelRed look-back, she said the question in her mind was how that would be done. The BelRed look-back was written into the code itself, and similar language is not built into the proposed LUCA.

Commissioner Brown said she fully understood the need for low-income residents of affordable housing, including the disabled and single mothers, to have a car. She pointed out, however, that the LUCA as drafted would not prevent those people from having a car, it would only provide fewer parking spaces. The most compassionate and empathetic thing the city can do is to make sure disabled individuals and seniors can actually afford to live in Bellevue in the first place. The LUCA will bring down the cost of building affordable housing. To not adopt it will be a step toward making sure those individuals are priced out of the market. She suggested that if at some point parking becomes a huge consideration in a particular neighborhood or development, a way to make adjustments should be clarified. Ms. Tanus indicated that it would be difficult to go back after a development has been approved and built. Commissioner Brown agreed little could be done once something is built, but suggested that if in a particular area, after many developments have taken advantage of the lower parking ratios, should there be parking issues raised by the neighborhood, there should be a way for the city to require additional parking for any new development proposed for the area. Ms. Tanus said she did not see that as a possibility. If after a number of years of the approach being in place there are complaints by citizens and the specified outcomes are not achieved, the city could take the opportunity to revisit the issue.

Commissioner Ferris voiced her support for the proposed LUCA. She noted her appreciation for the comments made by the public. She said she shared the concern voiced about neighborhoods that lack sidewalks. That should be taken into consideration and where there is a node of high transit, top priority should be given to putting in sidewalks.

Commissioner deVadoss noted his appreciation for the staff presentation of the proposal. He questioned judging and deciding that someone who lives in affordable housing does not or should not have a car. As proposed, the LUCA will take choices away from those who live in affordable housing. The issue is primarily about shifting people away from automobiles and toward using transit, and about creating high-density housing in Bellevue. To market the units as affordable housing is ethically wrong.

Commissioner Bhargava commented that balancing land use considerations with the city's



requirements to provide equity and ensure that development occurs within a framework that is consistent with the direction the city wants to go involves making tradeoffs. Many of the concerns about the assumptions made are valid, but the proposal does not disqualify anyone from having a car, though it might make it more difficult under certain circumstances. The parking issue must be balanced with the ability to create higher density developments around transportation nodes, and a creative land use pattern that is more consistent with regional transportation networks. He said he would support the LUCA.

Vice Chair Malakoutian thanked staff for the presentation and the public for their feedback. He agreed with the concern over the lack of Bellevue-specific data, much of which the Commission requested but is not available. He agreed with Commissioner deVadoss that the effort will not bring about affordable housing, though it might contribute to attainable housing. The proposal will, however, reduce the cost of developing housing. In the same way the city cannot dictate that poor people should not drive, the city cannot dictate that everyone needs to have a parking spot. There are many who choose not to own a car and forcing developers to provide parking for them anyway does not make sense. Overall, the negative consequences of the proposed LUCA are not overly negative, particularly given that the developers will not be required to limit parking to the minimum. He said he would support the LUCA.

Chair Moolgavkar agreed with Commissioner Bhargava that there are tradeoffs involved, but she said the proposal represents the right tradeoff. The demands for affordable housing and equity outweigh the concerns around safety and senior parking, issues around which there are ways to provide mitigation. Lowering the parking requirements will result in lower development costs and thus will benefit housing affordability, especially in combination with other programs the city has in place. The city should do everything it can to bring about affordable housing, even if it means taking some risks.

Commissioner Morisseau said the language of the LUCA relative to light rail and bus rapid transit coming online within two years does not clarify which tier they would fall into. She said she assumed the stations would have service at least four times per hour for 12 hours or more per day. Ms. Gallant said the language assumed that future light rail and bus rapid transit stops would have the higher level of frequency based on the type of service typically provided by those systems regionally. Commissioner Morisseau suggested that should be made clear. Ms. Tanus said staff could take another look at the language to see if clarity could be provided, and suggested that would not change the intent of the LUCA to be voted on.

Chair Moolgavkar moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that it adopt the Land Use Code amendment to establish lower minimum parking requirements for certain residential developments with frequent transit service, consistent with RCW 36.70A.620 and the city's Affordable Housing Strategy as drafted in Attachment A, and consistent with the decision criteria required for adoption of amendments in the text of the Land Use Code, pursuant to Part 20.30J. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bhargava and the motion carried 6-1, with Commissioner deVadoss voting nay.

Commissioner Morisseau recommended requesting the staff to consider something similar to the BelRed lookback a few years out to determine how effective the approach is and if improvements should be made. Ms. Johnson said the BelRed lookback was codified. If that approach were to be taken with regard to the reducing parking LUCA, it would have to be part of the language adopted by the Council.

Assistant City Attorney Matt McFarland said in general development services staff are mindful

of what is working and what is not working in the Land Use Code based on things like public comment and other input. Sometimes it is ambiguous code language that causes problems going forward. An informal review is built into the work of development services staff with the Land Use Code. He suggested staff should talk internally about the best way to monitor the parking reduction LUCA to determine if it is working or not as it is implemented with future developments. Rather than including the issue in the recommendation to the Council, the Chair should mention to the Council in making the presentation of the Commission's recommendation that the item was raised by the Commission.

Commissioner deVadoss said it did not seem right to him that the staff would both implement the requirements and conduct the review as to whether or not they are working.

There was consensus in favor of having Chair Moolgavkar inform the Council that the lookback issue had the support of the full Commission.

8. STUDY SESSION – None  
(8:14 p.m.)

9. OTHER BUSINESS  
(8:14 p.m.)

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
(8:14 p.m.)

A motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Morisseau. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ferris and the motion carried unanimously.

11. CONTINUED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None  
(8:15 p.m.)

Ms. Betsi Hummer, 14541 SE 26th Street, said she had found the meeting to be very interested and said she was impressed with the amount of input received from the public. She said she was, however, sorry to see the Commission simply rubber stamp the staff proposal, and did not even seek to add an amendment to include the suggestion to focus the reduced parking requirement on the transit nodes. Reducing the half mile to a quarter mile radius would have been a no brainer. The visitor parking requirements in the Downtown were carefully crafted. If there had been an amendment to apply the parking requirements only to the transit nodes of BelRed, Downtown, Eastgate, East Main and the South Bellevue area, the neighborhoods that are served with a bus a few times each day would be protected. Enforcement will be an issue and will largely fall on the neighbors. The Commission had the opportunity to change things but did not do so. She said she would be making her recommendations directly to the City Council.

12. EXECUTIVE SESSION – None  
(8:19 p.m.)

13. ADJOURNMENT  
(8:19 p.m.)

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Morisseau. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Moolgavkar adjourned the meeting at 8:19 p.m.



3/29/2021

---

Thara Johnson  
Staff to the Planning Commission

---

Date



3/29/2021

---

Radhika Moolgavkar  
Chair of the Planning Commission

---

Date