

Public Comments Park in Bellevue CPA 19-104143 AC

March 29 – February 27, 2019

Matz, Nicholas

From: Mary Ellen <sailmeaway00@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:41
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: Party of Interest - 1515 Bellevue Way

Dear Nick,

Thank you for the conversation. As discussed, we're moving to the Enatai neighborhood of Bellevue in a couple of weeks and I noticed this sign.

My concern is how to encapsulate the density growth with clearly defined boundaries and to gauge the potential for a spread into the existing residential neighborhoods. Obviously our property value is dependent on its setting in a family-oriented neighborhood (like the one next to subject address) - so a substantial density change of this proposed nature could have a significant adverse affect. I just want to understand the boundaries and rules.

Please include me in future notices/information on this process.

All the best,
Mary Barnard

Matz, Nicholas

From: PHIL BLOCH <bloch1@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2019 12:42
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: The Park in Bellevue - File 19-104143-AC; 19-104144-LQ

I'm writing to request inclusion in any future public notices regarding this proposed action, and if its not too late, to provide the following comments.

1) I was a resident at The Park in Bellevue for approximately 6 months in 2015. This form of residential unit is extremely scarce in Bellevue and is very helpful for transitional families and families of more modest means. My family was resident there as a result of a move back into the area. We were moving back to a property in Bellevue we've owned since 2015, however due to characteristics of our move we were unable to immediately move back into our owned residence. This particular residential unit was essential as it was the only one that we were able to identify that was willing to offer a short term lease. This provided us the opportunity to enroll our children in the same school district as our house (where they continue to be enrolled to this date) and to avoid having to attend an interim Bellevue Public School during our move which would have been extremely disruptive to their learning. Living at The Park I observed that a large fraction of the families living there have children enrolled at Bellevue schools. Whatever redevelopment is considered here, this parcel represents a very rare type of housing in the Clyde Hill Elementary catchment area and that attribute should be recognized and protected.

I would note that the existing 184 units housed enough elementary school children to fill approximately 2/3 of a school bus when I lived here. Assuming future redevelopment provides similar family and child friendly characteristics, it is safe to assume that more than a full school bus of children (and possibly as many as 4 or 5 if the applicants proposal is fully realized) will travel from this site to Clyde Hill Elementary daily. Consideration of redevelopment at this site should carefully incorporate the school and school district, and preserve opportunities for this site to provide housing for families, including those that cannot afford the so-called "high-quality residential product" the developer characterized in their application materials.

2) This proposal has implications throughout Bellevue and should require a full public vetting. There are many areas that border or provide transitions between the more urban developments and the residential areas in Bellevue that continue to transition and change as a result of ongoing development interest in Bellevue. I disagree with allowing this single developer to identify the proposed density and character of these transitional developments. In this case the developer is proposing an approximately quintupling (from 20 to 110) of the unit density and a dramatic increase in building heights (from current 2-3 story buildings to 75 feet). These characteristics represent relatively high urban densities and may be appropriate in some areas, however that action should be initiated and driven by City Council and the Planning Commission, not external developers who are responding to their individualized profit motives rather than the best interests of the City, its residents

and taxpayers. If this proposal is successful, I anticipate that multiple, other multifamily zoned areas and properties in transitional areas will be coming to the City for similar changes. I believe this application should be denied and that the city should respond by investigating the issues identified in this proposal and create a future opportunity for the applicant to reapply after these issues have been considered on a more comprehensive basis and with a more complete opportunity for public engagement.

3) If a project is ultimately identified, the increase in units from 184 to an estimated 1034 (based on maximized R-110) would require substantial upgrades and modifications to existing transportation infrastructure and utilities. While the site is currently served by these services, this infrastructure may not be suitable for this level of intensification and use. In recognition of the tremendous economic value that would be realized by the developer associated with such an increase in allowable use, it should be incumbent on the developer to fund independent studies and evaluations of public investments needed to meet the envisioned use, and to fund their share of the demand for these public investments.

4) I note that the site is currently a moderate density urban development that has some natural functions while supporting multi-family needs. I fear that an upzone and change in development pattern here will eliminate substantially all natural functions (infiltration, on-site stormwater treatment through natural systems designs, tree canopy cover, etc.). These 'green' functions should not be ignored and completely lost in the transition to more urban uses.

5) The application incorrectly identifies that adjacent properties as all designated as Multifamily (medium, high or low). This context ignores the SINGLE FAMILY residences abutting the property that are on 102nd Ave NE. There are trails that link the subject property and these adjacent single family residences. I believe that context should not be lost and that the applicant should be thoroughly rebuked for attempting to suggest this is a multi-family project that only abuts other multi-family parcels. That presentation is false and should be corrected.

Thank you for consideration of these comments and feedback. As noted, please keep me apprised of future/further updates on this action and if any mailing list exists, please add my information to it so I can track this project in a timely manner.

Best regards,

- Phil Bloch

Mailing address:

3708 96th Ave, Kirkland, WA 98033

Matz, Nicholas

From: Bonnie Schiller <signarf@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2019 11:40
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: Re: request

Hi Nicholas!

Please add my thoughts below to the ongoing public comments section.

Hello, my name is Bonnie Schiller and I live at 1290 Bellevue Way NE #1.

According to a December 25th article in The Registry, Continental Properties paid UBS \$90,750,000 or \$493, 478. per unit for the Park's 184 units. IF the application is granted the number of units can go as high as 1034 which represents the existing 9.4 acres x up to 110 units per acre.

While I am not against suburban renewal of the Park complex – possibly including 12 Central Square, I strongly believe any requested re-zones need to adhere to both the spirit and the specifics of our City of Bellevue's Comprehensive Plan. As well, I believe the applicant has other remedies.

According to The Plan it is the BelRed that *“will become another dynamic vertical neighborhood...while protecting established neighborhoods from needing to absorb this growth.”*

Also: *“Ninety percent of the city's future housing capacity is in Bellevue's multifamily mixed used districts.”* I submit, BelRed but **not** the N. Bellevue subarea.

A look at the North Bellevue Land Use Plan map clearly shows the Park does not sit in an H (high density) area. Why is that? It is because repeatedly, as we shall see, the Comprehensive Plan protects low rise, lower density neighborhoods and, again, because the City has already designated the BelRed to absorb vertical growth.

The Plan p 69: *“District neighborhood character enhances the quality of life for the entire city. Because neighborhoods have unique values, amenities, natural environments and local priorities, the (City of Bellevue's) Neighborhood Plan provides policies that encourage neighborhoods to reserve and develop distinct neighborhood character.”*

Granting the requested height and density changes clearly mitigates against the spirit of existing code and, as well, against protection afforded existing neighborhood “quality of life” and “character.”

The Park parcel sits within the designated North Bellevue subarea whose goal under its Land Use section (p.223) reads: *“To protect the predominantly single family character of N Bellevue from encroachment by other uses.* How does the Plan stipulate accomplishing this? S-NB-3 reads in part: *“Scale down multifamily ...development as it approaches single family areas so as to create an appropriate transition.”*

S-NB-6 reads: *“Retain and Enhance Natural Vegetation”* while S-NB-11 states: *“Minimize land coverage by impervious surfaces in environmentally sensitive areas.”* While we can argue the vague term “environmentally

sensitive,” what is inarguable is that clearly the luxuriant, beautiful, air freshening, arboretum like vegetation and abundant bird/small critter habitat that currently exists will be severely diminished due to the extent both of clear cutting and by the greater impervious surface area needed to achieve the requested 110 units per acre.

Additionally, in my opinion, granting this privately initiated application also now violates the city's Environmental Stewardship Initiative which acknowledges the benefits trees provide and which seeks to increase current canopy by at least 3%.

S-NB-15 “*Protect established residential neighborhoods by **retaining** residential zoning **that reflects the density of the developed residential use.**” As in **already** developed.*

S-NB-21 “*Extend McCormick Park west to the end of the proposed extension of N.E. 12th to provide a visual buffer from the **more intensive land use to the south.**” Again and again both the Comprehensive and subarea plans assure Bellevue N. residents and Continental Properties as well that other city areas are available and designated for both vertical and density growth.*

S-NB-39 “*Provide for conditions on any rezone in the vicinity of Bellevue Way N.E. and N.E. 12th to minimize the impact of any development of adjoining single family residential areas. Conditions to be included are: Development should appear residential in character by **reducing** the density and though scale and design features. This would include designing **smaller**, more highly detailed buildings rather than massive, bulky buildings of an institutional character.*”

S-NB-29 “*Limit access to Bellevue Way, ...and N.E. 12th St in order to facilitate traffic movement along these major arterials.*” How can granting increased density possibly be in sync with S-NB-29? What traffic headaches/ revisions will ensue?

Please consider in your deliberations that the border of N Bellevue subarea does not exist in a vacuum and rezoning requests must be looked at within the greater picture. This commission's Major Project's List for the downtown core has in land use and building review some 26 projects, which include at least 2000 new residential units where it is already legal to build high and to build dense. This indeed is the already referred to (above) “more intense land use to the south.”

Also, at some point, our “downtown” ends. Where that occurs it needs to abut (as per The Comprehensive Plan) differently zoned and plan protected subareas.

If I buy a lottery ticket, I am buying a chance, not a guarantee. In purchasing the Park complex and hoping for rezones to be granted, so too did Continental Properties take a chance. But neither the residents of N Bellevue subarea nor the existing Comprehensive Plan ought to be held hostage to guaranteeing it.

I believe granting the application sets a very bad precedent; it becomes the thin edge of the wedge in the hands of others seeking major zoning changes down the road - a domino effect.

To wit and with apologies to Shel Silverstein – in the following re-write, the snake represents those who, motivated by profit would seek to change existing, reasonable and protective zoning while the speaking voice represents the N Bellevue subarea:

I'm being swallowed by a boa constrictor,
I'm being swallowed by a boa constrictor,
I'm being swallowed by a boa constrictor,

And I don't like it very much.

Oh no - he swallowed my toe
Oh me - he swallowed my knee
Oh fiddle - he's up to my middle
Oh heck - he swallowed my neck

Oh dread, as a Multifamily-Medium subarea, I'm totally dead!

Respectfully, I urge the City Council to vote against the requested changes and send Continental Properties back to the drawing board. Let us not erode our neighborhoods block by block. To do so begs the question: Is the City of Bellevue's Comprehensive Plan a serious commitment or is the plan a sham?

Matz, Nicholas

From: Dave Wrenn <wrenndave@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2019 16:35
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: The Park Apartments - Bellevue, WA

Dear Mr. Matz,

Email: nmatz@bellevuewa.gov

Subject: The Park Apartments

My name is ___Dave Wrenn_____. Please include me as a Party of Interest - Park in Bellevue.

I live at the Carlyle Condominium's across the street from the Park and I am vehemently opposed to this requested action. Traffic is already terrible during evenings and Holidays on Bellevue Way now. Another high density group of Apartments/Condo's would only add to an already unpleasant situation.

Should this request be granted, other rental properties South (1 property) and North of the Park would then want to go in the same direction and our community will be ruined for the sake of a few more dollars for already wealthy Land Owners.

Please add my name to your list of interested parties.

Regards,

Dave Wrenn | Email: wrenndave@comcast.net | Home Phone: 425.450.0912 | Cell: 425.614.7221

Matz, Nicholas

From: keith swenson <keithgs25@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2019 13:47
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: The Park in Bellevue

Nicholas

My wife and I reside in the 12 Central Square Apartment complex, south of and adjacent to The Park Apartment complex. I received the Feb 2-2119 Weekly Permit Bulletin and became aware of the owner's proposal to amend the Comprehensive Plan. Will you please place me on a list of individuals that wish to be notified of Planning Commission (and any other Citizen Advisory Commissions if appropriate) and City Council meeting when public testimony may be offered.

It is probably fair to inform you that I, as a retired urban planner and Charter Member of AICP (formerly AIP) I find the proposal patently absurd.

Thank you.

Keith

My email address is keithgs25@gmail.com and I may also be reached by text or phone at 425495-2009.

Matz, Nicholas

From: Laura Tuck <eggplantana@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2019 11:52
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: The Park Apartments

Dear Mr. Matz,

I received your name and email address from Debra Hughes.

My name is Laura Tuck and I am an owner/resident/board member of the Carlyle Condominiums in Bellevue. Please include me as a Party of Interest regarding the Park Apartments on Bellevue Way NE.

Thank you!

Laura Tuck
eggplantana@hotmail.com

Matz, Nicholas

From: Bonnie Schiller <signarf@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 11:35
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: request

Hi Nicholas,

My name is Bonnie Schiller. Please include me as a party of interest with re The Park on Bellevue Way.

Meanwhile, my thanks for giving me some phone time today.

Best wishes,

Bonnie

Matz, Nicholas

From: DEBORAH WILSON <dawilson3@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2019 18:11
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: The Park Land Use Code Change

Dear Mr. Nicholas

Please include me as a party of interest in regards to The Park's proposed Land Use Change. I am concerned about how a change like this will impact zoning in the area as well as traffic on Bellevue Way.

Regards,

Deborah Wilson

1392 Bellevue Way NE #3

Bellevue, WA. 98004

Matz, Nicholas

From: Debra Hughes <debrahugheshomes@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 16:18
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: The Park Apartments Potential Re Zoning

Hi Nicholas. Please Include me as a party of interest in the Park Apartments potential rezoning.

Thank you-

Kind Regards,



Debra Hughes REALTOR ®, CNE, ASP 425.891.0073

CERTIFIED NEGOTIATION EXPERT
ACCREDITED STAGING PROFESSIONAL

International Presidents Circle Award - Top 7%
Best in Client Satisfaction Award - Seattle Magazine

COLDWELL BANKER
BAIN

Matz, Nicholas

From: russ@sunsetglass.com
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 11:41
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: Park Apartments

Hello,

My name is Russell Cowdin. Please include me as a Party of Interest - Park in Bellevue.

I own a rental unit at the Carlyle across the street. I am totally upset that the city of Bellevue would allow and apartment building to be higher than 2 to 3 stories.

425-652-9534 cell
425-455-3617 home
russ@sunsetglass.com or
russecowdin@gmail.com

Thank you!

Russ Cowdin



Matz, Nicholas

From: lisa@sunsetglass.com
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 11:33
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: Park Apartments

Hello,

My name is Lisa Cowdin. Please include me as a Party of Interest - Park in Bellevue.

I own a unit at the Carlyle across the street. I am totally upset that the city of Bellevue would allow an apartment building to be higher than 2 to 3 stories.

425-652-9534 cell
425-455-3617 home
lisa@sunsetglass.com or
lisaannesc@comcast.net

Thank you!

Lisa Cowdin



Matz, Nicholas

From: Plummer David F. <pdf3@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 21:28
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: File Numbers 19-104143-AC, 19-104144-LQ

Hello Mr. Matz!

If only the Planning Commission, City Council, or Development Services Director can initiate amendments to the text of the Land Use Code (LUC 20.30J). and the following text does not provide for a Process IV Notice of Application for this request, does that mean that the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan will not be considered as part of the subject proposals?

RSVP,

David Plummer

Matz, Nicholas

From: Plummer David F. <pdf3@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 18:40
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan

Hello Mr. Matz!

What is the name of the applicant for file numbers 19-104143-AC, 19-104144-LQ?

RSVP,

David Plummer

Matz, Nicholas

From: cathy <cagiles100@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:41
To: Matz, Nicholas
Subject: Park Apt land use

Please include me as an interested party on this land use issue.

Thank you

Catherine Giles

cagiles100@gmail.com