

From: [Els Blomme](#)
To: [Rousseau, Gwen](#)
Cc: [Michelle Niethammer](#)
Subject: Re: NE Bellevue Neighborhood Plan
Date: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 10:07:21 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Hi Gwen,

Thanks for the update. We appreciate your following up on this!

1. We find this whole concept confusing. If no land use changes are being made in Great Neighborhoods, then no land use changes are being made now for the NE Bellevue plan and no land use changes should be made for the Crossroads plan. What are we missing? It would make sense to re-evaluate this when the Comprehensive Plan is updated, if needed.
2. BTC's land use is very different (and is meant to remain very different through the PUD and related documents) from District A. So yes, a new District 1 and District 2 (with only BTC) in NE Bellevue would make sense.

Sincerely,

Els and Michelle

On Tue, Jun 8, 2021 at 8:20 PM Rousseau, Gwen <GRousseau@bellevuewa.gov> wrote:

Els and Michelle,

Two follow-up items:

- 1) In discussing your questions with staff further today, I learned that my earlier statement that changes to Northeast Bellevue policies being considered during the update to the Crossroads Neighborhood Area plan **being unlikely**, was incorrect. It is not out of the realm of possibilities that when the Crossroads Neighborhood Area Plan gets updated that the policies that were previously part of the Crossroads Subarea plan and moved into the Northeast Bellevue plan get reevaluated.

Since policies limiting multifamily uses in specific areas are predominantly in the Crossroads Subarea Plan, and since changes to the land use map were out of the scope of the Northeast Bellevue Neighborhood Area planning process, changes to these policies were not considered during this most recent process. However, when the Crossroads Subarea Plan is updated, it is possible that these policies would be reevaluated. Another possible time these policies could be reevaluated would be during the update to the Comprehensive Plan. In either case, any process evaluating changes to these policies

would include full community outreach and engagement, and residents who engaged in the Northeast Bellevue Neighborhood Area planning process would be notified and invited to participate in the process.

2) Would creating two districts named District 1 and District 2 address your concerns regarding the lumping of the two areas together under one district? There is concern that creating another District "B," even if it is in the new Northeast Bellevue Plan, could be confusing when referencing the District B that remains in the Crossroads Subarea Plan. This edit could be made easily in the next week prior to publishing the draft policies for the public hearing.

Apologies for not having gotten more clarity before sending my initial email to you yesterday. Again, I would be glad to discuss further if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Gwen

From: Rousseau, Gwen
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 9:24 PM
To: Els Blomme <ebomme@gmail.com>
Cc: Michelle Niethammer <michni@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: NE Bellevue Neighborhood Plan

Hello Els and Michelle,

Thank you for your questions. Els, I apologize for not getting back to you regarding your previous email. I will aim to respond to that tonight as well. Below is an explanation regarding the multifamily and retail use policies that I hope makes sense, but if not, I would be glad to jump on a call to discuss.

The Crossroads Subarea Plan currently has about 6 to 7 policies that limit multi-family development, two of which speak directly about the portions of Crossroads that are moving into Northeast Bellevue. Because the scope of our Neighborhood Area Planning process did not include making any changes to the Land Use map, keeping the policies about limiting

multifamily and retail uses with the areas moving over made sense.

Policies S-CR-60 and S-CR-63, shown below, were combined into one policy and incorporated into the Draft Northeast Bellevue Plan as S-NE-6, and Policy S-CR-61 was incorporated in as S-NE-7. If the Northeast Bellevue Plan is adopted, those policies would then also be stricken from the Crossroads Subarea Plan, and the boundaries of the Crossroads and Southeast Bellevue Subarea Plans would also be amended to exclude areas newly added the Northeast Bellevue Neighborhood Area.

To answer your question, yes, the policies would be moving now, and the Crossroads Plan would be updated now as well by striking those three policies from the plan and amending the boundary of the Crossroads Subarea land use map.

POLICY S-CR-60. Multifamily development is not allowed within District A. Existing multifamily uses within District A can be converted to senior citizen housing, senior congregate care housing, assisted living and nursing homes.

POLICY S-CR-63. Multifamily use is not allowed within District B. Existing multifamily uses within District B can be converted to senior citizen housing, senior congregate care housing, assisted living and nursing homes.

- **S-NE-6.** Multifamily development is not allowed within Northeast Bellevue District A. Existing multifamily uses within District A can be converted to senior citizen housing, senior congregate care housing, assisted living and nursing homes

POLICY S-CR-61. Retail uses are not allowed in District A.

- **S-NE-7.** Retail uses are not allowed north of NE 24th St within Northeast Bellevue District A.

The intent of the agenda memo was to explain one, why these policies were being carried forward without any change – since it was not part of the Great Neighborhoods scope to make changes to the land use map – and two, to let Commissioners know when, if ever, a change to any Land Use Map might occur. I realize the way the agenda memo was written, it makes it sound like Northeast Bellevue policies could be changed during the update to the Crossroads Neighborhood Area plan, though, that is not likely. However, changes to land

use maps could occur during the Comprehensive Plan update when housing needs are examined on a citywide basis.

The reason District A and B were combined was for simplicity sake as it would be the only area having unique policies associated with it. These policies will be removed from the Crossroads Plan.

I hope the above makes sense, but if not, please let me know when would be a good time to reach you tomorrow. I would be glad to chat.

Thanks,

Gwen

From: Els Blomme <eblomme@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 6, 2021 9:32 PM
To: Rousseau, Gwen <GRousseau@bellevuewa.gov>
Cc: Michelle Niethammer <michni@comcast.net>
Subject: NE Bellevue Neighborhood Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Hi Gwen,

It is good to see the recommended changes to the neighborhood plan. Thank you for incorporating our feedback.

Can you clarify what item 3 on page 3 of the Agenda Memo "Policies limiting multifamily and/or retail land uses within the larger Crossroads area" means? How will this work? Are these policies moving now, or when the Crossroads plan gets updated? What does all this mean and how will it all work? If anything, these particular areas are closer to BelRed and Redmond's Overlake than to Crossroads... If these areas are moving out of Crossroads, why do they continue to be linked to Crossroads or become part of citywide discussions? What are the implications of this paragraph?

BTC is a unique property, with different characteristics and use than District A. It doesn't seem right to lump it into the new District A. Including it in District A will create confusion when the City wants to make policy changes to the existing Crossroads District A that would not be appropriate for BTC. Why does BTC have to be included in District A?

Any chance you can reply before the Planning Commission study session on Wednesday?

Sincerely,

Els and Michelle

From: [Rousseau, Gwen](#)
To: [Els Blomme](#)
Cc: [de Regt, Elizabeth](#); [Marilyn McGuire](#); [Michelle Niethammer](#); [Anne Coughlin](#); [Janet Castaneda](#); [Emmanuel Solis Nepote](#)
Subject: RE: Draft NE Plan Feedback
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 9:01:00 AM

Hello Els, Janet, Anne, Marilyn, Michelle, and Emmanuel,

Thank you all for your dedicated engagement and thoughtful comments on the draft Northeast Bellevue plan. I apologize for the late reply to your email. Please see responses below in **purple**.

I am looking forward the [Planning Commission Study Session](#) tonight. I hope you are able to make it.

Thank you,
Gwen

Gwen Rousseau, AICP

Senior Planner, Community Development, City of Bellevue
grousseau@bellevuewa.gov | 425-452-2743 | BellevueWA.gov

From: Els Blomme <eblomme@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 23, 2021 10:11 PM
To: Rousseau, Gwen <GRousseau@bellevuewa.gov>
Cc: de Regt, Elizabeth <EdeRegt@bellevuewa.gov>; Marilyn McGuire <m2mmcguire@comcast.net>; Michelle Niethammer <michni@comcast.net>; Anne Coughlin <Doctorannecoughlin@gmail.com>; Janet Castaneda <castaneda.janet@gmail.com>; Emmanuel Solis Nepote <emsolis@live.com>
Subject: Draft NE Plan Feedback

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Hi Gwen,

We have read through the materials posted for Wednesday's study session by the Planning Commission and have the following comments:

Agenda Memo

- Part of the existing Crossroads Subarea is moving to the new NE Bellevue.
 - What does "staff recommend holding a conversation about these policies as part of the larger Crossroads Neighborhood planning efforts in the future" mean? Will the discussions in the Crossroads neighborhood affect these properties?
[The policies moving from the Crossroads Subarea Plan to the Northeast Bellevue Neighborhood Area Plan are policies that require a broader community discussion](#)

than we were able to have as part of the Great Neighborhoods process for the Northeast Bellevue Neighborhood Area. Since these policies are part of a larger group of policies found in the Crossroads Plan all of them should be addressed at the same time and within the broader context of housing needs citywide. Because evaluating these policies was not part of the Northeast Bellevue plan scope, we did not propose changing them, but instead propose deferring evaluation until a broader community discussion can be held on all similar policies in the Crossroads Subarea plan. These discussions could occur during the update to the Crossroads Neighborhood Area Plan or during another citywide planning process on growth and housing affordability.

- Why do we need to keep this District A designation and why does it continue to be tied to Crossroads?

The District A designation was carried over from the Crossroads plan to designate the area where the policies applied. It will no longer be associated with the Crossroads Subarea plan, but instead will move to the Northeast Bellevue Plan. As I mentioned in my former email however, we would be glad to rename the district, District 1 to avoid any confusion with the existing Crossroads Subarea plan. We could also add a District 2 (formerly part of District B) to keep policies for the two areas distinct, but this would not change the resulting policies and impact.

- States "The relevant policies from the Crossroads subarea plan have been stricken if no longer relevant or transitioned over to the new plan"

- Why were the policies regarding District B not copied to the new NE Bellevue plan? Some of the language for District A is moving over to the new NE Bellevue plan; why are the District B policies not transferred?

Many of the policies under District B state what the land use designations are in the Land Use map and are therefore redundant. Policies that added an additional restriction over and above the land use designation were kept and moved over. In addition, many policies under District B were in reference to areas within Crossroads and therefore were not pertinent to Northeast Bellevue.

After discussing Policy S-CR-66 further, we will add that policy into the Northeast Bellevue plan. Although the policy is redundant with the map, we understand the importance the community places on maintaining clarity about the intended use of the BTC property.

Community Engagement Report (attachment A)

- Captures the conversations well.
- The interpretation of some survey results (particularly re DADUs and tree preservation) is somewhat stretched - e.g. on page 10 the first chart shows clearly that more people strongly disagree than strongly agree; on page 12 the comment on the chart re tree removal could highlight that the vast majority of residents feel too many large trees are unnecessarily being removed.

When looking at the percentage of people who felt strongly about DADUs, it is true that a higher percentage of people strongly disagreed with the statement (35 percent) than

strongly agreed (23 percent), and overall 46 percent of people disagreed versus 44 percent who agreed.

NE Bellevue Comments (attachment C)

- Interesting to read everyone's comments. It would have been nice to share these regularly during the meetings and have a discussion. Perhaps something to consider for the subsequent neighborhoods?

All comments related to the topic at hand were shared prior to brainstorming events. These comments are how the brainstorming topics were determined as well.

- Was any of the data gathered in Terri Cullen's days taken into account? We had two well-attended in-person meetings, including brainstorming sessions, and an online platform with comments and suggestions.

Yes, conversations with community members held during the Teri Cullen days helped in the development of the initial values and themes and were reviewed by staff to inform continued work.

Existing Crossroads Subarea Plan Highlighted (attachment F)

- The only highlighting we see is on the map on page 14. Is that correct or should there be highlighting in the actual policies as well?

Good point. Highlighting the policies would also be helpful.

Draft Neighborhood Plan (attachment G)

- We suggest including a map of the new neighborhood, ideally the entire city with our neighborhood highlighted, on the cover page - perhaps remove one of the pictures on the top and replace it with a map?

There is a map of the neighborhood on the community profile page as well as in the Neighborhoods element to show where the boundaries are, but considering putting one up front in each Neighborhood Area Plan is a good idea that staff will consider as the graphics are filled in.

- Let us know what kind of pictures you are looking for and how to share them. As you know, we have quite a collection!

Thank you! Yes, any pictures you have that illustrate the goals and policies would be greatly appreciated.

- In reading the plan, it is not always clear whether a particular section pertains to the present or the future. Can this be made clearer in the title and perhaps also in the intro to a section? It is confusing for the reader as the document changes between the future and the present and back.

We will work on making that distinction clearer. Thanks for pointing it out.

- Page 2: change "great access to schools" to "access to great schools", or do you mean convenient access to schools as community places, in the future?

It was intended to focus on great access, though of course great schools is also something families value about living in Bellevue. Will reword to capture both sentiments.

- Page 9:
 - The current policy S-CR-66 belongs here, possibly right after S-NE-5. Our understanding is that one of the key reasons the BTC (formerly Unigard) property is moving to NE Bellevue from Crossroads is to better align the property's (intended) use with its surroundings: the PUD was designed to make this property work with the surrounding residential neighborhoods; it is intended to serve as a buffer between these neighborhoods and the higher-density uses across 156th Ave NE. S-CR-66 needs to be transferred to the new NE Bellevue plan.
 - Understood. We will move this policy into the new plan with one improvement policy wise – the phrase “as a conditional use” will be removed as stipulating how land uses are permitted is the purview of zoning regulations not a policy document.
 - S-NE-8: yes, let's enter the 21st century and not cut trees back to prevent power outages! This should not only be the case with new development but also be coordinated with Utilities and Transportation (e.g. underground power/cable when the roads are ripped up for resurfacing and/or sewer replacement, as is currently the case to "our" stretch of West Lake Sammamish Parkway).
- Page 10:
 - S-NE-11: can the document specify what this refers to?
 - S-NE-13: can the document specify what this refers to?
 - S-NE-15: can you give us examples of such programs?
 - I will work to incorporate examples back in to these policies to provide clearer context.
- Page 11: S-NE-18: how/when will this "exploration" happen? What will it constitute? Wasn't this supposed to be part of this Great Neighborhoods planning process?
 - Exploration of opportunities to restore, preserve and/or enhance gathering places could happen during other system planning processes such as the update to the City's Parks and Open Space System Plan or as part of the Neighborhood Enhancement Program or a streetscape or transportation project.
- Page 12:
 - Mobility and Access Goals and Policies: add policy language to coordinate with Redmond, as our area is heavily impacted by the redevelopment of the Overlake Urban Center and the Microsoft campus.
 - Coordination with Redmond is covered by a policy in the “Sense of Place” section but staff will evaluate if an additional policy is needed in the Mobility section to ensure the coordination around transportation needs is clearly covered.

S-NE-26: "maintain and improve" rather than "maintain" the transportation system.

- Great suggestion.

- Page 13: S-NE-32: add "and for pedestrians" after "for people with disabilities": blocked sidewalks (trash cans, overgrown plants, Lime bikes) are not only a barrier to people with disabilities but to ALL pedestrians. Think of people pushing strollers or walking dogs (or kids biking or riding their scooters on the sidewalk).

- Yes.

- Page 15:

- S-NE-43: how do "impervious" surfaces help achieve this goal?

- Excellent catch. Should state pervious.

- the 1985 NE Bellevue plan has policies protecting the steep slope between the lake and the plateau - why have none of these policies been carried forward?

- Previous policies on protection of steep slopes were removed since the city's new critical area regulations have implemented those protections.

General Questions

- did we understand correctly from Thara on Thursday's Zoom that the City will not notify us (i.e. residents who have participated in the GN process) of actions on this topic - Planning Commission, City Council, etc.? Do we need to track all the agendas posted weekly to the City website? If so, can you reconsider this and notify engaged residents when Great Neighborhoods come before the Planning Commission or City Council? (essentially the same mechanics (if not the same legal standing) as being a part of record)
 - The City will notify residents who have participated in the GN process of actions being taken on the Northeast Bellevue Neighborhood Area Plan.
- Residents put a lot of effort and energy into this process; great ideas were shared. We would like to be able to act on some of these ideas. Will there be a published resource to empower us to realize some of these wishes (e.g. how to organize a block party, where to look up tree preservation rules, how to request a street light)?
 - That is an excellent idea Els and one that would benefit residents in moving projects forward in their neighborhood. The Neighborhood Proposals list includes these ideas that came out during our outreach efforts in order to ensure they are recorded and can be evaluated for future work-planning efforts.
- We understand implementing policy will take time, however, some items are time sensitive - e.g. we need urgent action on the tree preservation goals, before more mature trees are cut down unnecessarily. How can residents work with the City to prioritize policies?
 - Updating the city's tree codes is part of the City's [Environmental Stewardship Plan's](#) list

of near-term actions and tentatively planned for 2022. Continuing to advocate for this to be included in the 2022 work plan will help it remain a priority.

We look forward to your response, ideally prior to the Planning Commission meeting on Wednesday.

Best regards,

Els Blomme
and
Janet Castaneda
Anne Coughlin
Marilyn McGuire
Michelle Niethammer
Emmanuel Solis

From: [Sally](#)
To: [PlanningCommission](#)
Subject: Written communication for June 9th Commission Meeting
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 5:45:47 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

To the Planning Commission:

Thank you for providing an opportunity for written communication regarding the Draft NE Bellevue Land Use Plan (Figure S-NE.1) and the Draft Crossroads Land Use Plan (Figure S-CR.1).

These two draft maps were not discussed in any of the Great Neighborhoods meetings that I attended over the past year. There is an important change, which is the designation of the property called Planning District A. My review of the two maps indicates that Planning District A is being transferred from NE Bellevue area to the Crossroads area.

This change affects NE Bellevue in two ways:

1. NE Bellevue has been assessed as having less public park area than other parts of Bellevue (see Bellevue Parks Plan). District A contains the Bellevue Technology Center property which is private. However, because of an agreement with the surrounding neighborhoods 50 years ago, the open space and forest at the Bellevue Technology Center has been accessible to the public for walking and enjoyment of nature. If this property is transferred to Crossroads area, then NE Bellevue loses its largest quasi-public park space.
2. The transfer of Planning District A has not been accompanied by the 50-year-old neighborhood agreement. What is happening to this agreement? Once District A is transferred to the Crossroads Planning Area, this 3-party agreement will make no sense and will by stroke of the pen, become void. This seems to be an underhanded approach to making a change that is unacceptable to the surrounding neighborhoods, without proper public consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Lawrence and David Lai

28-year residents of northeast Bellevue (initially in Tam O'Shanter and now in Lochmoor)

104 174th Place NE, Bellevue 98008

425-351-6881

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Sally Lawrence](#)
To: [Rousseau, Gwen](#)
Cc: [Brod, Brooke](#); [Johnson, Terryjo](#)
Subject: District A in NE Bellevue draft plan?
Date: Monday, June 14, 2021 3:47:49 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Hi Gwen,

I feel like I missed a session of Great Neighborhoods. In the draft plan I've reviewed I don't see an explanation of the rationale surrounding District A as seen in the draft maps. I am beginning to understand that District A formerly was part of the Crossroads subarea but is proposed to be attached to NE Bellevue? Is that what is happening?

Can you point me in the right direction for an explanation of what is proposed and why, for District A?

Thanks
Sally Lawrence
Resident, NE Bellevue
425-351-6881

From: [Sally Lawrence](#)
To: [Johnson, Terryjo](#)
Cc: [Rousseau, Gwen](#)
Subject: Apology
Date: Monday, June 14, 2021 9:16:50 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Hi Thara,

I sent a panicky and negative email about the draft NE Bellevue neighborhoods plan last Wednesday just prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

I apologize to you and the Commission for the negative tone of the email.

That said, the draft maps that were the subject of my concern had not been reviewed during the Great Neighborhoods process. I find this very strange, to say the least.

Planner Gwen Rousseau just spent an hour on the phone with me explaining what the maps and their associated policies were. She did an excellent job, and I really appreciate her effort.

Best regards,
Sally Lawrence
104 174th Pl NE, Bellevue, WA 98008
425-351-6881

From: [Rousseau, Gwen](#)
To: [Lee Sargent](#); [Brod, Brooke](#); [PlanningCommission](#)
Subject: RE: Great Neighborhood data collection comment
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 1:38:00 PM

Thank you, Lee, for your thoughtful comments. Below are responses to the excellent points you made. However first, I would like to highlight the concerns you raised about invalidating our city goals and plans in the short term and your hope that long term planning does not justify business separation from family housing. Could you please elaborate on your specific concerns so that we better understand them?

Yes, more representative data collection and participation across the community spectrum can always be improved. Building a robust culture of community engagement is an ongoing process, and we will certainly glean lessons from this last year of engagement.

As you know this past year has presented many challenges for engagement. While Zoom provided an important platform for engagement, it does have its limitations. One thing we found is that the length of time people are willing to spend in a virtual meeting is shorter than an in-person meeting. That meant we had to cover more content in less time, which impacted the agenda for each meeting. Another challenge you noted is the need to create agendas that are appropriate to people across a range of knowledge and experience with engaging. We found that at each neighborhood planning meeting we gained new participants, which meant that we had to cover some material that was a repeat for other participants. We continue to think about how to address these challenges, and appreciate your perspective

We greatly appreciate your efforts in encouraging people to get involved and to let their voices be heard; your positive comments on Next Door were great as word of mouth from a resident carries a lot of weight.

Your ideas for improving meetings via Zoom are all very relevant. We will work to further incorporate them into future planning processes. We are looking forward to having more flexibility again soon in how we can hold public meetings. It will be interesting though to see how we might continue to include Zoom options once things begin opening up. As you point out, the format has its pros and cons. It is great that people can participate during their lunch hour without having to spend time traveling from one place to another. Yet, in person meetings can allow for greater sharing of ideas amongst participants.

Thankfully, many ideas have been brought out and surfaced by the community.

Again, it would be great to hear more about the concerns you raised. Please let us know if you would like to jump on a quick call to provide more explanation.

Thank you,
Gwen and Brooke

From: Lee Sargent <LeeSgt@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 2:02 PM

To: Brod, Brooke <BBrod@bellevuewa.gov>; Rousseau, Gwen <GRousseau@bellevuewa.gov>;
PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@bellevuewa.gov>

Subject: Great Neighborhood data collection comment

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

I shared some of Anne Morisseau thoughts about the data collection process while I was involved in the GN process. I wasn't able to focus the misgivings as well as she did.

Having a local general meeting to assess ideas, usually, needs to be focused since it can go far afield from the specifics quickly needed. Without providing focus the meeting is not able to get the interest of people quick enough, thus losing participants. Focusing on dislikes gets quick reaction but potentially fails to generate cooperation to accomplish fleshing out what can be done. General meetings can connect people with city personnel and reduce anonymity. Having experts in city processes at these meetings allows for connection and opens the understanding of the city. (Having commissioner participation might generate some understanding of the participants and make some of the ideas more understandable.)

Gathering participation/input from different generations is a difficult process for those that are in the community. I have invited people to participate by telling them what is available, what can be worked on and ways to work on problems especially with the Great Neighborhoods-when and where they let me. I, like so many others, have definite ideas about some of the issues but I try to listen to others including those that have different ideas. This may lead to difficulty in getting some to be involved. I always try to share that if they have different ideas then bring them up at the meetings since it is their opportunity as well. In general, getting people to present their ideas is not easy whether in an actual meeting, Zoom meeting, survey and/or in-person. I think a lot of the people feel that no one will listen especially government. I point out that if they do not share their ideas then why would the government know what they want or how much they want it.

I think the problems Zoom has for a general meeting:

1. It requires education for new people to the meetings to use the tools. Which may distract or cause some to not participate as well as they could have. Some of those that already know the features of Zoom will find this a waste of their time. This might cause the knowledgeable to not attend.
 1. (I suggested the training time be specified a certain time before the start the meeting starts and allow practicing in the learner environment. I

- shared this previously and training was decreased in time so that the flow would start and stop for everyone at the same time.)
2. (Maybe providing YouTube video links of the new options before the meeting might help cut the time in the meeting and reduce the need for city resource people and keep the Zoom literate connected to the gist of the presentation.)
 3. Time is precious when on lunch breaks or at dinner time.
-
2. The explanation-bringing people up to speed-part of the meeting takes a good deal of time. This causes people to not knowing how long before they can share their thoughts.
 3. The breakout rooms discussions, people and updates to viewed documents were not discussed in the body of the whole which limits the sense of what was discussed. Leading to little direct communication when rejoining the body as a whole.
 4. Break out room being randomly assigned may have hindered discussion amplified discussion that similar generations might have had

I think the problems Zoom has for the commission meeting are:

1. We know who presented visually and numerically because of the video feed.
2. We also know who the city representatives in various categories were because we saw them for the most part
3. We did not know the total number of attendees so when we are presenting we might feel a little intimidated since we know the city is so well represented visually. (If we were in a conference room, we would get a sense of community that is missing in this environment.)
4. (I was quite impressed by the variety of people that attended the meeting especially the younger ones. I also know that the time I get from this group normally is exceedingly limited when talking to them And I liked the comments made.)
5. (I was also very impressed by the double extension of time on the meeting because of the unknown number of attendees that remained present.)

These are my thoughts regarding the meetings, Zoom and what seemed to work and what needed some review. Overall, given the length of time and the efforts given under mostly Covid conditions, I think a lot has been brought out and a lot has been surfaced from the community. My concern remains on what is being done as we speak/write that invalidates our city goals and plans in the short term. (I hope that the long term planning put in place does not justify the skeptics regarding business separation from family housing.)

Respectfully,
Lee Sargent
425-641-7568
16246 NE 24th ST
Bellevue, WA 98008-2414

Sherwood Forest Community Club

President

Websiter: <https://sherwoodforestbellevue.org/>

From: [Rousseau, Gwen](#)
To: [Lee Sargent](#)
Cc: [PlanningCommission](#); [Brod, Brooke](#); [de Regt, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: RE: Great Neighborhood data collection comment
Date: Thursday, June 24, 2021 12:45:00 PM

Thank you, Lee, for taking the time to share more of your thinking on these issues. I appreciate how much you've put into fostering good community dialogue throughout this past year. Your suggestions helped us improve the virtual experience for everyone, and we'll continue to glean more lessons learned. We hope to utilize some of what we've learned, including your suggestions, into upcoming engagement efforts even as we reopen to in-person engagement. Also, your passion for preserving trees and for building community is inspiring. I am hopeful that the policies in the plan for Northeast Bellevue reflect those values and will support effective implementation measures in the future.

You mention however a feeling of disconnection, which I believe may stem from the limited geographic scope of the neighborhood area planning process. The limited geographic scope in turn limits the depth with which the process can tackle issues that are larger in context and citywide in scope. Issues important to the neighborhood area such tree preservation, housing affordability, and mobility and access can be supported by neighborhood area plan policies, but often require larger citywide discussions to direct some of the more action oriented measures you desire i.e. adoption of stronger tree preservation regulations or adoption of revised standards for housing development. Within a larger framework that looks at needs citywide, a comprehensive set of policies can be developed to ensure multiple objectives are met. At the neighborhood level in contrast, plans and policies indicate neighborhood priorities and focus in on specific challenges and opportunities to address those challenges.

Fortunately, the city's Comprehensive Plan is due to be updated over the next few years. Getting robust engagement during that process will be key to ensuring the Plan addresses the breadth of issues the city is grappling with at a depth that directs effective action. We look forward to your continued engagement during that and other planning processes.

Thank you,
Gwen

From: Lee Sargent <LeeSgt@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 4:04 PM
To: Rousseau, Gwen <GRousseau@bellevuewa.gov>; Brod, Brooke <BBrod@bellevuewa.gov>; PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@bellevuewa.gov>
Subject: RE: Great Neighborhood data collection comment

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Thanks for your response. I know it does impact other things that need to be done. I appreciate the

time and effort.

First off, I am willing to discuss any of the specifics I mentioned with anyone that has time with a little heads up time for coordination. I know that my abilities are only from the outside looking in and limited exposure but I am sure that I can help in small ways.

There are always drawbacks on what can be done whether in Zoom or direct contact. We share a knowledge of some of the limitations we are struggling with because of COVID forced changes. Some limitations will exist forever for some people like the “fact” that the city bows down to those with money due to the lack of involvement by some of the people. However, there are those that are willing to talk, email, share verbally and do research. With this last group, I think there is opportunity and that is why I am working for that process to succeed on my limited basis. I do share the “why’s” in order to get the ball rolling and show the reasons. The people that seem to be listening have shown up at meetings we have had. They may have encouraged others to do so as well.

Another thing that might be helpful in the future is to provide more granular neighborhood representation as I understand New York City instigated where they got Neighborhoods to set up websites within the city structure with certain clout for the city that the neighbors can see. When we are talking about single family residences as being in Northeast Bellevue and Northwest Bellevue that covers territory but probably hosts many different neighborhood ideas of what should/should not be in their neighborhood. Some of those neighborhoods have identities.

Just my normal wordy concerns so you can bypass them if you like. Planning for future goals is always difficult since it is predicated on the idea that we know what the future holds. (I agree with what was mentioned at the last meeting that the plans should allow for leeway with change in mind.) City goals should be intimate with the plans.

- If **tree canopy** is truly important then requirement for tree preservation is important and yet with a limit of 5 trees removed without concern for even the mature nature of the trees for each residential area how is that affecting the plan? Many of the people have expressed their concern over this due to what they see happening now. The talk has been expanding the canopy within the city parks,-how long does it take to achieve that and how many trees will be disappearing at the same time? It seems that the goals are lofty but the results not.
- **Affordability** seems to be a remote thought which decreases as more people pay more for houses and raise taxes on surrounding homes. I am not sure it really is much of a goal. As presented in the phone connection we had from the Silicon Valley woman, she showed a very big interest in restricting who and what can be done. I think that the more people that pay a huge sum for homes will want to keep the riff raff out and they can commute from someplace else. Single family homes of 4000 sq. ft. or more are being built with no restraint and the price tag gives the owners a feeling that they can do what they want with the property.
- **“City in a Park”** vision that depends on the other goals and related plans or not.
- **Diversity as a population**-is a very good goal. We do have a good deal of diversity in age, race, genders, ethnicity but I am guessing we have a growing move to displace the aging. As costs rise the tendency will be to use ADUs whether new or already happening but since a lot of younger family members will have found more suitable circumstances elsewhere and invite

parents/grandparents to move this will change.

- **Traffic (except for the COVID timing.....**
- **Etc.**
- **I could go on but I want you to see what I see.** Normally if I listen to a person say something very good and do something that is not meeting those statements, I call them ... The result of the differences is that I begin to realize that the city I am living in is not what I thought it was and I get overwhelmed. I see that as the problem I am constantly facing from the residents of our neighborhood. When this exists, the people do not see that they are accomplishing anything. This disconnects us from each other and, therefore, the organizations that are frustrating them.

Sorry about the rants. I really don't think that what is being done is bad for the planning. I just worry that while we are talking about very helpful improvements to our living environment there are things that are slipping through that may be more critical in the long term.

Thanks for your time and effort. I know that writing the concerns has allowed me to a cathartic moment.

Vaya con Dios,

Lee Sargent
425-641-7568
16246 NE 24th ST
Bellevue, WA 98008-2414

From: Rousseau, Gwen [<mailto:GRousseau@bellevuewa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 1:39 PM
To: Lee Sargent; Brod, Brooke; PlanningCommission
Subject: RE: Great Neighborhood data collection comment

Thank you, Lee, for your thoughtful comments. Below are responses to the excellent points you made. However first, I would like to highlight the concerns you raised about invalidating our city goals and plans in the short term and your hope that long term planning does not justify business separation from family housing. Could you please elaborate on your specific concerns so that we better understand them?

Yes, more representative data collection and participation across the community spectrum can always be improved. Building a robust culture of community engagement is an ongoing process, and we will certainly glean lessons from this last year of engagement.

As you know this past year has presented many challenges for engagement. While Zoom provided an important platform for engagement, it does have its limitations. One thing we found is that the length of time people are willing to spend in a virtual meeting is shorter than an in-person meeting.

That meant we had to cover more content in less time, which impacted the agenda for each meeting. Another challenge you noted is the need to create agendas that are appropriate to people across a range of knowledge and experience with engaging. We found that at each neighborhood planning meeting we gained new participants, which meant that we had to cover some material that was a repeat for other participants. We continue to think about how to address these challenges, and appreciate your perspective

We greatly appreciate your efforts in encouraging people to get involved and to let their voices be heard; your positive comments on Next Door were great as word of mouth from a resident carries a lot of weight.

Your ideas for improving meetings via Zoom are all very relevant. We will work to further incorporate them into future planning processes. We are looking forward to having more flexibility again soon in how we can hold public meetings. It will be interesting though to see how we might continue to include Zoom options once things begin opening up. As you point out, the format has its pros and cons. It is great that people can participate during their lunch hour without having to spend time traveling from one place to another. Yet, in person meetings can allow for greater sharing of ideas amongst participants.

Thankfully, many ideas have been brought out and surfaced by the community.

Again, it would be great to hear more about the concerns you raised. Please let us know if you would like to jump on a quick call to provide more explanation.

Thank you,
Gwen and Brooke

From: Lee Sargent <LeeSgt@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 2:02 PM

To: Brod, Brooke <BBrod@bellevuewa.gov>; Rousseau, Gwen <GRousseau@bellevuewa.gov>;
PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@bellevuewa.gov>

Subject: Great Neighborhood data collection comment

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

I shared some of Anne Morisseau thoughts about the data collection process while I was involved in the GN process. I wasn't able to focus the misgivings as well as she did.

Having a local general meeting to assess ideas, usually, needs to be focused since it can go far afield from the specifics quickly needed. Without providing focus the meeting is not able to get the interest of people quick enough, thus losing

participants. Focusing on dislikes gets quick reaction but potentially fails to generate cooperation to accomplish fleshing out what can be done. General meetings can connect people with city personnel and reduce anonymity. Having experts in city processes at these meetings allows for connection and opens the understanding of the city. (Having commissioner participation might generate some understanding of the participants and make some of the ideas more understandable.)

Gathering participation/input from different generations is a difficult process for those that are in the community. I have invited people to participate by telling them what is available, what can be worked on and ways to work on problems especially with the Great Neighborhoods-when and where they let me. I, like so many others, have definite ideas about some of the issues but I try to listen to others including those that have different ideas. This may lead to difficulty in getting some to be involved. I always try to share that if they have different ideas then bring them up at the meetings since it is their opportunity as well. In general, getting people to present their ideas is not easy whether in an actual meeting, Zoom meeting, survey and/or in-person. I think a lot of the people feel that no one will listen especially government. I point out that if they do not share their ideas then why would the government know what they want or how much they want it.

I think the problems Zoom has for a general meeting:

1. It requires education for new people to the meetings to use the tools. Which may distract or cause some to not participate as well as they could have. Some of those that already know the features of Zoom will find this a waste of their time. This might cause the knowledgeable to not attend.
 1. (I suggested the training time be specified a certain time before the start the meeting starts and allow practicing in the learner environment. I shared this previously and training was decreased in time so that the flow would start and stop for everyone at the same time.)
 2. (Maybe providing YouTube video links of the new options before the meeting might help cut the time in the meeting and reduce the need for city resource people and keep the Zoom literate connected to the gist of the presentation.)
 3. Time is precious when on lunch breaks or at dinner time.
2. The explanation-bringing people up to speed-part of the meeting takes a good deal of time. This causes people to not knowing how long before they can share their thoughts.
3. The breakout rooms discussions, people and updates to viewed documents were not discussed in the body of the whole which limits the sense of what was discussed. Leading to little direct communication when rejoining the body as a whole.
4. Break out room being randomly assigned may have hindered discussion amplified discussion that similar generations might have had

I think the problems Zoom has for the commission meeting are:

1. We know who presented visually and numerically because of the video feed.
2. We also know who the city representatives in various categories were because we saw them for the most part
3. We did not know the total number of attendees so when we are presenting we might feel a little intimidated since we know the city is so well represented visually. (If we were in a conference room, we would get a sense of community that is missing in this environment.)
4. (I was quite impressed by the variety of people that attended the meeting especially the younger ones. I also know that the time I get from this group normally is exceedingly limited when talking to them And I liked the comments made.)
5. (I was also very impressed by the double extension of time on the meeting because of the unknown number of attendees that remained present.)

These are my thoughts regarding the meetings, Zoom and what seemed to work and what needed some review. Overall, given the length of time and the efforts given under mostly Covid conditions, I think a lot has been brought out and a lot has been surfaced from the community. My concern remains on what is being done as we speak/write that invalidates our city goals and plans in the short term. (I hope that the long term planning put in place does not justify the skeptics regarding business separation from family housing.)

Respectfully,
Lee Sargent
425-641-7568
16246 NE 24th ST
Bellevue, WA 98008-2414

Sherwood Forest Community Club
President
Websiter: <https://sherwoodforestbellevue.org/>

Engaging Bellevue Draft Plan Comments (May 27 - June 29, 2021)		
Post Date	Post	Login Name
May 25 21 01:30:45 pm	The description of the Draft Neighborhood Plan for NE Bellevue says it includes a map of this area. The map is missing! this is critical, because how these policies are implemented, street by street and sub-neighborhood by sub-neighborhood, is critical. For example, how will S-NE-18 be implemented? Will "new typologies" of housing including detached ADUs, duplexes and triplexes be allowed everywhere within the NE Bellevue neighborhoods? And how will "adequate separation" (between new housing typologies and adjacent properties) be enforced, when developers can make more money by building the largest possible house on a lot, taking away existing trees and shrubbery that provide privacy and environmental benefit.	Sally Lawrence
Jun 01 21 05:43:44 pm	Although the "plan" seems to be well written, it is a disappointment. It is not a plan at all. After participating for several years in workshops, surveys, zoom meetings, etc. I had anticipated the "plan" to contain plans. While the statement suggests some revisions to codes regarding ADUs etc., there are no specifics. I was expecting to see let's widen X street, let's put bike lanes on Y street, you know.....a plan!! Plenty of specifics were presented in the meetings with ample support, but there's just nothing here!!	Jerry T

Johnson, Thara

From: Anne Drebin <adrebin346@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 11:44 AM
To: PlanningCommission
Subject: ADUs

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Dear Planning Commission – This email is to let you know that I strongly object to allowing ADUs within single family areas in the City. I’m also not in favor of approving higher intensity districts.

I understand the City is looking at affordability, but this is not the answer. Apartment owners should be encouraged to lower rents to make housing more affordable. Don’t cram hundreds of people into small spaces, or turn our neighborhoods into something resembling migrant farm worker camps.

I’ve lived in Bellevue all of my life. As much as I love my nice quiet neighborhood, it’s certainly changed with all the growth. Traffic is a nightmare, crime is up and the general character of these established neighborhoods is changing (and not for the better).

It’s obvious big businesses (i.e. Amazon) are behind this push. Please listen to your residents and not the dollar signs. Think of the people and not always just the tax base.

Thank you!
-Anne

DATE:

July 7, 2021

TO:

Chair, Redmond Planning Commission
Chair, Bellevue Planning Commission

FROM:

Tom Hinman, Redmond Resident

SUBJECT:

Joint Letter to Planning Commissioners

The evening of July 7th both Planning Commissions will be having simultaneous study sessions with converging agenda items – to wit, updated planning for the future of Overlake and Northeast Bellevue neighborhoods respectively. Why not schedule a joint session of both Commissions, which could perhaps (but not necessarily) set up a joint City Council meeting? The last meeting of the two Councils was September, 30, 2014. Both jurisdictions are in the process of updating their Comprehensive Plans and the shared information should be of value going forward. Some Redmond Council members have publically expressed interest in such a meeting with their Bellevue peers in the context of Redmond 2050 efforts.

Although a resident of Overlake in Redmond, I was a participant in Northeast Bellevue's Greater Neighborhood conversations. It is notable that the draft plan resulting from that process speaks to desirable consultations with Redmond. These will be essential since Overlake's Metro Growth Center development planning per PSRC guidelines will have resounding impacts on Northeast Bellevue – both positive and negative.

For a time in 2012-13, I was pleased to co-chair the PSRC's East Corridor Task Force to with current Bellevue Assistant Planning Director Emil King. The Task Force worked to develop strategies for optimizing growth in the vicinity of future light rail stations, with some focus on Transit Oriented Development (TOD). This very night, the Redmond Planning Commission is getting a presentation on Overlake TOD with additional attention to making these developments accessible and equitable to all. (Some of these concepts are guided by the Building Vibrant Neighborhoods recommendations of the Growing Transit Communities Report.¹) They are also considering priorities and processes for Redmond's updated Transportation Management Plan and how to best serve light rail stations.²

¹Below is the full GTC report:

<https://www.psrc.org/growing-transit-communities-%E2%80%93-east-corridor-implementation-support-project>

Chapters of specific note for Planning Commissioners in this report are:

[Vibrant Urban Neighborhoods](#)

[Benefits of Green Transit-Oriented Development](#)

[Transit Integration and Parking Management](#)

[Bicycle and Pedestrian Connectivity](#)

²For the benefit of Bellevue Planning Commissioners, see Agenda items 5 and 6 at [07072021-793 \(redmond.gov\)](#) Redmond 2050: Transportation Study Session. Staff will provide an update on the status of the TMP update (quarterly briefing). This Study Session will focus on the updates to the Transportation Element and discussion of transportation related policy options and alternatives.

I could testify to my hopes that the Bellevue Technology Center become a district park jointly funded by the two cities. I could speak to my concern about building heights being considered in early Redmond 2050 up-zoning analysis for Overlake. I could add my voice to the many concerned about traffic congestion in the Northeast Bellevue/Overlake area. And I could speak to promoting community conversations and a focus on place-making strategies for this exciting new neighborhood. These are all important planning elements that could be shaped positively by a public dialogue between the leadership of our two Cities.

Please let me know if I can assist in any way in uniting the public engagement of, and planning for, the future of Overlake and Northeast Bellevue as we determine the opportunities light rail can provide.

Redmond 2050: Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Briefing. Staff will introduce the TOD issues that will be explored during the Redmond 2050 update. Attachment A – Growing Transit Communities Summary, Attachment B – Overlake Center Boundary Revision & TOD map, Presentation

For the benefit of Redmond Planning Commissioners, this is the relevant item on Northeast Bellevue [City of Bellevue - File #: 21-509 \(legistar.com\)](#)