































































Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>Keep in mind that the reason why cities don't have the budget to replace the plumbing is due to the bad sprawling land use patterns that create high infrastructure costs for a very small amount of homes. Introducing duplexes and other types of housing that are more space-efficient than detached single family homes will substantially raise the tax base of your neighborhood. Hopefully to the point where the city can actually afford to maintain the infrastructure.</p>	sandervalstar
<p>We should never destroy what made us great in the first place, which is family oriented community. A safe -place to raise families. Right now most families cannot afford to live in Bellevue. So if your point is that besides affordable apartments we also need more affordable housing types that are suitable for raising a family (e.g. duplexes, row homes with gardens and garage-linked homes), then I agree. The free housing market is a myth, it acts freely only within the constraints placed upon it by the local government. For example, if Bellevue made it easier to repurpose lots for duplexes, you'd likely see fewer new villas go up than now. Fortunately the state recently passed a bill to address this issue.</p>	sandervalstar
<p>How would we for instance finance public transportation or walking-distance stores in every street in the city?</p> <p>We could start by creating more housing above and around the existing stores. Currently most of our stores have zero housing above and around it and instead are surrounded by swathes of parking.</p> <p>Additionally, the city could make it possible for neighborhoods to have corner stores that provide basic necessities to the locals.</p> <p>While car-less life is possible at the urban core, transport hubs, and neighborhood centers, residential neighborhoods will remain more distant from transit and stores</p> <p>In my ~10K pop home town I can walk to the stores in 15 minutes, walk to a train station in 15 minutes (or cycle in &lt;5 min), cycle to like 5 super markets in 15 minutes. There is no reason this cannot be done in Bellevue too. In fact I can technically already cycle to 5+ super markets in 15 minutes, it's just not safe to do so.</p>	sandervalstar

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>The people of bridle trails have enjoyed their oversized lots near their 500 acre park, trail network and public golf course long enough. Please increase density on 140th. It is a perfect place to add density. Specifically the large vacant parcels across the street from the golf course. You can fit a lot of housing on acres of vacant land. And with more people maybe the bus line can come back along 140th.</p>	gigio
<p>The infrastructure is not built friendly to walking or cycling, hence more incidents with pedestrians and the cyclists in recent years when the activities picked up. Should we encourage activities which are unsafe and not going to work even after modification with lots of wasted resources?</p>	wkuo3
<p>Not everyone could afford Medina, Clyde Hill and all those water front area. Should we rezone those area to allow more density housing development? No. Bellevue is not going to be affordable for a start up family. As well as all the other places in the world which are desirable. Building more apartment or high density within the City limit is not viable and should not be. Families dwellings should be concentrated on the edge or outside of the city core as it is always the case. What moved the housing cost up is the market price is still deemed a great value comparing to all the other major cities, including the nearest one, Seattle. When the price move to certain point, the cost will stabilize. As it always will be. Not going to be a place where everyone could afford. What should we do? Artificially suppress the cost of live. Have the waiting to take a number to stay in line for their turn? As we have seen in the last 2 decades, the rapid growth ( both in volume and cost ) had slowed down. I predict in the next few decades the adjustment will come when the investors and the pension funds get out of the real estate investment. The families are not just competing with other families in the Bellevue housing market, their biggest competitors are those REIF and the recent flippers. Bellevue will never be a place affordable for the start up family as it has always been.</p>	wkuo
<p>I support the option that adds the most new units that are not rentals. We want to be a community of owners, not renters.</p>	rhee.j

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>The problem is that various schemes of zoning have been put in place that are car centric. Left alone we wouldn't have these car centric suburbs. But we have these zoning requirements that create problems. We should recognize the errors and make future zoning pedestrian and bike more efficient. Unaffordable housing is also a creature of bad zoning decisions. We have zoning now. We need to recognize walkable areas make for more affordable housing, then creating "affordable " housing in car centric places. Affordable walkable. Cars have a 7000 annual hit to poor people. They need commercial and job close to where they live and can walk or ride a bike too. Don't force poor people to buy cars</p>	<p>steven.D</p>
<p>I don't understand how you can claim to hold this view: We should never destroy what made us great in the first place, which is family oriented community. A safe -place to raise families. When at the same time you express this view: Bellevue will never be a place affordable for the start up family as it has always been. Being pro too-expensive-for-young-families is at odds with your goal of being a family oriented community. Sure, a 4 million dollar mansion will never be affordable for young families, but we should have more affordable offerings for young families in Bellevue such as town homes, duplexes, row homes with gardens, garage-linked homes, etc. These will be smaller than the 4 million dollar mansion and the average detached home, but will still be family friendly. Building more apartment or high density within the City limit is not viable and should not be. There are plenty of opportunities for infill development in Bellevue. For example by adding apartments above existing commercial areas that generally have single-story buildings. What moved the housing cost up is the market price is still deemed a great value comparing to all the other major cities, including the nearest one, Seattle. No, what moved up the housing cost is the population increase in the area combined with not enough new housing getting built to keep up with that growth. Prices are simply high due to the scarcity of available housing. As we have seen in the last 2 decades, the rapid growth ( both in volume and cost ) had slowed down. The Puget Sound region is expected to grow from 4.3 million residents today to ~5 million by 2040 and ~6 million by 2050, so I don't know what you're talking about here.</p>	<p>sandervalstar</p>
<p>It is the cars that cause the safety problem. We should make our streets safer so that drivers are less likely to injure or kill other road users. I encourage you to watch some videos about Vision Zero: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5aNtsWvNYKE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5aNtsWvNYKE</a></p>	<p>sandervalstar</p>

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>You don't understand? maybe because you are either very young or you are not in this area long enough to see the progress. When a city grows to be desirable for more to move into the area, it will become inaccessible to most because demand will promote hike in cost. When we move in, there were nothing east of the East Gate area but trees and the roadways. Carnation was a real farming neighborhood and Issaquah was mostly undeveloped. Bellevue back then was about the same level as Seattle. You probably don't know there were single family dwellings in Bellevue fits in the budget of a middle income family. No one could see the rapid growth in the last 25-30 years, so was the planning not suited for the expansion. All I can say is, learn from what happen to all the other major cities and avoid/delay the route we don't want to be in. We're about 30 years behind the development of central and southern California. Do we want to be just like those cities?</p>	<p>wkuo3@</p>
<p>The cars are not the issue, the cyclist are the issue. They are not stopping at the stop sign and often running the red lights. The infrastructure was not built to accept cyclists, no matter if we narrowing the roadway to make these so called bicycle lanes. Narrowing the roadway will increase the possibility for accidents as it yields less margin for error. Not what it was designed to do. What we're looking at is trying to fit something which was not designed to accept. Unless you'll propose to stop all motor vehicles on the roadways, there will not be a safe street for the jaywalker and those riding shoulder to shoulder on the narrow bicycle lanes which were built as an after thought. Look at Seattle, spending millions to change their streets with bicycle lanes and special signal lights for the bicycles. Just how many cyclists use the expensive feature after the initial couple of years? I have not seen "one" in recent months. Why should the budget be spent on the features not being utilized? Inconvenience caused by the remodeling /construction of the special lane made for "bicycle friendly" ? Don't believe every thing you read, common sense and experience will make better decision.</p>	<p>wkuo3</p>
<p>While it's great to have a discussion, the reality is that, no matter how much we talk about this, all we see is more new huge houses replacing older houses in Bellevue. Meanwhile, the current zoning limits the ability of homeowners to split their lot and build more housing.</p>	<p>leowbb2011</p>
<p>Increase homeownership opportunities for low to moderate income individuals &amp; households with gap financing, e.g., purchase assistance.</p>	<p>curlygirl246</p>



Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>Bellevue is planning for at least 70,000 new jobs and 35,000 new housing units by 2044. People are becoming concerned that these numbers are unrealistically high, and that the planning process will lead to over-building, leaving us with an excess of unoccupied housing and office buildings. This is especially a concern for downtown Bellevue, where new high-rise projects are breaking ground all the time. Who is going to occupy all these high-rises? We are already seeing some companies scale back on their occupancy plans, such as Amazon is doing with the nearly-completed East of Main project.</p>	pudgy-brig.0
<p>I think having more 1-, 2-bedroom, 3-bedroom condos would be nice to have in the downtown area. A lot of the older commercial buildings with the sprawling lots could be repurposed for condos. I think there should be some more affordable housing, but not to the point where it's pervasive. Bellevue doesn't need to be affordable for everyone, but it would be nice for those who make ~\$60k to have some sort of option for renting if they work in the city (duplexes, triplexes, etc.). These buildings can be built outside of the downtown core - maybe a 10 or 15-min drive away.</p> <p>I think we also shouldn't go too crazy with building so many residences that we take up space from building interesting, quirky, fun places to hang out at. Having a city full of residential buildings and corporate offices isn't that exciting and makes us boring.</p>	brenf
<p>I moved to downtown Bellevue 4 years ago and have overall been very happy with my new home. Living in a walkable area has been such a great experience, and I'm particularly excited about the upcoming light rail opening. That being said, it feels as if more than 50% of downtown's construction is dedicated to office space at a time when more and more companies are releasing their physical spaces in favor of hybrid or remote work. I would love to see downtown Bellevue deprioritize office space developments in favor of more housing, retail, and public space that support diverse and walkable communities. I am particularly concerned about the development of Main Street Market Place, including H Mart, which is a necessary and popular grocery destination for many residents of my neighborhood. I hope that the Bellevue City Council will consider future developments in downtown Bellevue based on how they contribute to the wellbeing of their constituents and not the wallets of businesses.</p>	Bianca.c

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>These tax incentives that you giving to the builders for MFTE it is not working for the law and middle class income the city needs to look into it again it's best on 80k for 1 room the majority of the people that this tax was intended for still cannot afford it. My question to the city what happens to those Builders after they get tax incentives and they can find people that can afford their rooms what happens to that money?</p>	e_butera
<p>My family has lived here since 1970. I understand growth is every where but most of us are being priced out. My dad lives on a fixed income and cannot live here even though he wants to and my wife and I are living paycheck to paycheck as all our money goes to rent. The surrounding areas of the core of Bellevue ie most of the apartments are being torn down and replaced with housing we cannot afford. The city should really understand the needs of the lower income people that work here also. We are already getting notice to vacate in May because the city wants to expand Meydenbauer Park. You are talking about 100 or so tenants that live here. At a bad time with inflation and rents already going up and not down. Where does this stop!!!</p>	psergeeff
<p>Too many apartments! Not everyone wants to rent for the rest of their lives. Why is the City of Bellevue allowing land hoarding? Home developers like DGR, MN Homes, etc buy a huge parcel of land only to build 1 gigantic single family home selling for \$3-4M? That parcel is better utilized for 2-4 townhomes that are more affordable and can house multiple couples/families that earn a decent living. We make good money, but we cannot buy property on the Eastside... sounds dysfunctional to me.</p>	conniec
<p>I'm excited to see the state legislature take action to increase options for homeowners throughout the state. Once signed by the governor, I'd like to see Bellevue quickly enable ADUs, duplexes, quadplexes under the new rules. Sounds like the law will require doing so by 12/2024 in Bellevue's case, but sooner would be better. Would love to be able to start considering options for our property. Beyond that, I agree with many of the statements looking for continued investments to enable more walkability, bikability, transit options throughout the city.</p>	robr
<p>Lake Hills/Phantom Lake for mixed use: Crossroads neighborhoods...</p>	sida114

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>Because of the turnover in ownership of single house/dwellings, the developers are razing the houses, building large million \$ homes besides the ramblers &amp; split levels. Every neighborhood deserves to keep its "scale" of building. Please make city requirements of size w/ car parking re: replacement houses. Who does inspections?</p>	
<p>With the expense of housing in Bellevue, many of the houses are being turned into shared rentals, which have 3-6 renters with car ownership. The neighborhood streets are becoming lined with cars, even on 165th Ave. S.E. &amp; N.E. which is designated for the bike path. Is there any ticketing process for cars?</p>	
<p>Build as much housing as possible ideally in mixed uses. Make building as easy as possible, removing as much red tape as possible. No long mandatory design sessions and reviews that take years. Remove any 'mandatory car parking' limits. Improve non-car alternatives like biking, walking, transit.</p> <p>Do not let perfect be the enemy of good. Market rate housing being built is GOOD. Adding affordability requirements that stiffen development is bad. The housing crisis is a supply problem, as such we need to do things to increase supply. A robust housing supply is good for the economy and for the city of Bellevue and for everyone in the long term. Let the market take care of the housing problem by lessening all restrictions on housing. Including affordability requirements.</p>	eggnog_0_volute
<p>Build as much as you can. Build large houses, build medium sized houses, abolish single-family zone, promote mixed-usage zoning, be sure that downtown has enough residential building for each office building. Don't limit construction. It is insane that Bellevue downtown is so tiny. It is insane that there are ranches near Bellevue. Please reconsider your zoning policy in favor of mixed-usage.</p>	reldan0

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>The City should support Housing Approach 2: Mixed Use Hubs, and Housing Approach 3: Walkable Centers, with an additional amendment to each. Specifically, multifamily and townhomes without integrated retail should be added as allowed uses in the City’s Neighborhood Business zones. Allowing multifamily and townhome uses, while eliminating the need to integrate retail in the buildings is a market-based approach that supports the policy goal of attaining new housing in neighborhood shopping centers like Lake Hills. The current approach of constraining residential development in Neighborhood Business zones to only allow a level or two of apartments over retail is not a feasible housing product type and, therefore, is not resulting in new housing or retail construction in these areas. The City should add multifamily and townhomes without integrated retail as an allowed use in the Neighborhood Business zone to fill the greatest area of need, especially at Lake Hills.</p>	<p>Bryon.Z</p>
<p>I support Approach 3. Maybe also Approach 2.</p>	<p>santiagosoz27</p>
<p>Our family has lived in Bellevue (Crossroads/Lake Hills area) for 6 years now, renting a house and have always thought that we would want to buy something here or nearby one day. My husband and I both work for state government and make close to \$100K/year each (though one of us has been underemployed until last year). With how expensive real estate, property taxes and utilities are, we have come to realize that we will never be able to afford what we want unless it's a fixer upper in dire condition. We previously owned property in another state, and will most likely be moving soon because we would like to own our home, but there is just no way we can do that here.</p> <p>I see a variety of suggestions for low-middle income residents (it's crazy to think that we are barely considered middle income in this area whereas in many other areas, we would be in the upper income bracket), but nothing that would work for people like us. We would like to live in a single-family home with a backyard, and those options are just not available for</p> <p>I don't know what the solution is? It seems like unless you bought pre-2018 or inherited your property or work one of the high-paying tech jobs, you are out of luck. Perhaps some subsidy programs can be initiated that honor the service of state workers, or public employees who are contributing to the community, but don't make enough to afford a house in the area where they live?</p>	<p>carabiniero8</p>

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>It's also been painful to watch the knock down of perfectly decent mid-century ramblers and in their place the erection of pop-up mansions that sell for 3-4 times the amount all over our neighborhood! There should be some sort of rule against purchasing a house for a fraction of what it is put back on the market for. At the very least, perhaps allow only a certain number of these developers into a specific neighborhood per year. Most recent egregious example nearby is a house that was bought by a developer for \$875K, remodeled, and flipped for \$3.75M. With practices like these, only the super rich will be left living in these neighborhoods in the not too distant future and the character of Bellevue will change completely.</p>	
<p>One key item for home ownership would be to lower property taxes. How can young people buy a home when many are being taxed out? Property taxes in our state/county/city have jumped a lot in the past years. Also, water and power bills, city monopolies yet sales tax on them. The city water bill is split into 3 parts and a tax is on each part.</p>	g-d-hoff
<p>I agree</p>	g-d-hoffm

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>There should be a study on the number of vacant homes and rentals in our city and the reasons for them. The near 18 month rent moratorium put many renters out of the market. The rising property taxes and rental risks causes increasing prices. For families, it is very difficult to live without a car. Parents think about safety issues with kids walking alone, in the dark, to and from transit. The mornings are cold, sometimes wet, and dark. Similarly, in the late afternoons after band and sports practices. For a young mother, picking kids up from preschool, grocery shopping, children after school activities, driving a car is almost a necessity. A mother's time is juggled in between daily chores, children's activities including doctor and dentist visits. For the elderly, it's difficult to walk or catch the transit everywhere. Riding a bike is the most physically challenging for many of us. Aside from housing, the costs of living are also high in Bellevue. I can't find a haircut below \$85, for example. There are also the costs of select sports, music tutoring, and other miscellaneous costs to contend with. Every neighborhood is different, and in some neighborhoods, there are differing types of housing. To mandate that there should be only build, build, and more building growth without thinking about it affecting the aesthetics and character of the neighborhood is a mistake. To also assume that architects and developers will only build aesthetically pleasing housing as one Councilmember stated, is mistaken. Housing, in this market, is increasing because more people are able to afford buying them at the higher prices. Some people have more than 2 homes and are renting all but the home they are living in. Some larger type homes have multifamily and multi-generational families living with them. Bellevue is open to foreign investors buying homes and leaving them vacant. I feel we should prioritize essential workers for affordable housing. Many of them are the 80% AMI, and some will need subsidized housing. There are many below 80% AMI who want a yard and single-family residential. They don't mind driving to Bellevue. To mandate that everybody, of all ages, in every job skill, must be able to buy a housing unit and live where they work, may not be workable. They may be able to able to buy a home in a nearby city, or places that are more affordable.</p>	<p>phyllisjw</p>

Question: When you think about the issue of housing what values and goals are most important to you?	Screen Name
<p>My concern is the switching of the Crossroads, Eastgate, Factoria to a mixed use approach. Why? The area of Eastgate has recently been expanded to encompass our quiet wooded neighborhood on Cougar Mountain. We use to be part of the Lakemont/Cougar Mtn area, but Bellevue decide to make Eastgate bigger, including our area into this new neighborhood. If the new plan is to make all of Crossroads, Eastgate, Factoria into a mixed use area with tall mid-rise apartments and a mix of smaller apartments and townhomes, it will drastically change the neighbor, and the heat index/noise/traffic in our neighborhood. Is this the plan? Will the entire area of Eastgate become mixed use with mid-rise apartments and a mix of smaller apartments and townhomes?</p>	eanthonise
<p>And wouldn't we all be better serviced if we concentrated on better, cleaner transportation between neighborhoods so people can live where they want, at a price they can afford.</p>	eanthonise
<p>People who live in single family resident neighborhoods have bought their homes in part because of the neighborhood. Many will feel that something important has been taken away if multi-house building is allowed. Single family residence areas should continue to be allowed in Bellevue if allowed by state law unless the majority of the persons in a single resident neighborhood vote to allow a zoning change in their neighborhood.</p> <p>In Bellevue when new homes are built, many trees are often cut down. Bellevue tree ordinances need to be changed so we can protect our trees. If the state requires duplexes, Fourplexes, and six-plexes in lots of a set size, the areas with trees and where it would be difficult to build in should be subtracted from what otherwise would be the size of the lot. (e.g. lots that are hilly, lots that are filled with trees)</p> <p>If multi-house housing is required, it is important to require sufficient parking spots on the property. Many single resident neighborhoods have narrow streets. If parking on one’s property is not required in Bellevue, it will be unsafe backing out of your driveway. Moreover, if people must park in the street due to lack of parking on their lot, fire trucks will not fit on many streets. Also, with many cars parking on the street,</p> <p>one will no longer be able to safely walk down one's street. AND many many streets in Bellevue lack sidewalks</p>	dianaft21

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 1? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>If the majority of housing is 1-bed and studios then it will be of little help to families priced out of the Bellevue market. Regardless of income level, this type of housing is only of interest to the young and childless, and the very old. Families want to move to Bellevue, and young people moving up from all those small apartments will want to stay here; we must have greater diversity to meet their needs.</p>	anthony.c
<p>I too, would like to see condo homes of all sizes offered in downtown. There's plenty of good parks, schools, restaurants in urban core that some urban families, even those with kids, would like to live next to. 2 bedrooms are also useful for couples to each have their own space, or simply a separate home office from the bedroom as hybrid work increases.</p>	bobyangyf
<p>There are too many people in this city, it is congested and takes so long to get anywhere! Stop adding new people.</p>	cada4
<p>I have been thinking about all the new development and future planning. Maybe it is a time to pause and think heavily about what the future demand will be for housing. The pandemic has changed our behaviors in transportation, where we work, where we shop, where we want to live, how we live and how we view our compensation. Do we really know who is going to occupy all this space, what is important to them and if they really want it? Developers will build to the greatest profit margin possible weighted against perceived risk of consumer acceptance. They often miss the market and the housing remains empty or does not perform to expectation. We have seen first hand what happens to boarded up empty spaces. Perhaps code changes need to be placed in order to force mix and size of housing.</p>	waterdog_fk



Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 1? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>I support the creation of mixed-use developments. That said, I'm afraid that this plan will lead to some mixed-use islands that are not well connected to the city and their environment. I'm afraid these developments will still force people to drive from and to them. Say for example I live in the new Eastgate Mixed-Use development and I want to attend a sports class in the South Bellevue Community Center less than a mile away. Would there be any safe and convenient way for me to not drive there? And if I live north of I-90, will there be a safe way for me to cross I-90 to go to Safeway without driving? By addressing these types of problems the benefit of creating mixed-use developments will compound and many Bellevue residents will benefit. Without addressing these problems we'll just end up creating some islands where the residents can buy toothpaste without driving, which is great. However, if they are still dependent on their car for most other trips within the city, that is a massive missed opportunity. Equally, if residents from surrounding neighborhoods cannot safely get to the mixed use areas without driving, that is a massive missed opportunity too. Please use Lake Hills Village at Lake Hills Library as a case study of how not to design a mixed-use development. Instead of a pedestrianized plaza with greenery and places to enjoy a coffee it has a massive parking lot at the center. The space could have easily had double the number of businesses and double the amount of housing and still have had room for a pedestrian plaza if the surface parking lot was moved underground (there actually already is underground parking right?). Moreover, the store fronts are cold and uninviting and restaurants do not have outside seating. A large portion of businesses do not appear to have any apartments above them. I was told the space below the library has never been rented out due to how expensive it is. It is not safely and conveniently reachable by bike or on foot from the surrounding neighborhoods. The city is going to make it even less reachable on bike and foot by converting the 4-way stop into traffic lights, increasing traffic speeds on surrounding streets. The amount of missed opportunities make me sad whenever I go there.</p>	<p>sandervalstar</p>

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 1? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>Based on the information I have, I prefer Approach 1 over 2 and 3. Approaches 2 and 3 seem to use a lot more land which means there will be a lot more miles of utilities and roads to deal with down the line. Approach 1 prioritizes density and mixed use, so it is less land intensive and has lower maintenance costs than the Approaches 2 and 3. I don't want to end up in a situation where Approaches 2 and 3 use up most of the land with mid/low density housing and we have to sacrifice what little green spaces we have left.</p> <p>Rather than the capacity numbers associated with each approach, I would like to see how fast each approach will allow us to build housing. Since all approaches already exceed the 35000 target, we should be focusing on speed, not capacity. Like others have mentioned already, there are people who want to raise families in high density neighborhoods. I want to see more high density developments that are built with the family and extended family in mind. Smaller unit sizes are generally more profitable for the developer; how about we have them build more larger unit sizes for a change.</p>	evnl.business
<p>Honestly, I don't really have any preference, besides maybe not liking the very last proposal which is no change. As long as protected bike lanes are added and expanded, and sidewalks and park access are improved, congestion will go down naturally, and development will follow.</p>	hengyu
<p>The conventional wisdom is that concrete and steel construction isn't financially feasible for buildings between 5-10 stories tall (that could change if mass timber ever becomes more cost effective. So, to gain a realistic notion of how much housing is likely to occur under new zoning, I would plan on 5 over one construction in the Bel-Red and Wilburton areas and 15-20 story buildings in the CBD.</p>	rwallace
<p>I agree with many of the comments below that this plan needs to go beyond adding studio/1 bedroom apartments. This does nothing to create more affordable housing for families when it doesn't have to be that way. Families as well as single people could benefit from living in urban cores. Just take a look a New York, Chicago, Boston, etc. Why limit Bellevue to this?</p>	miep23

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 2? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
There are too many people in this city already. It takes forever to get from Point A to B. Congested. Stop building here.	cada4
The Newport Hills Mixed Use Core where the shopping center is needs to be redeveloped to include the same mix of services already in place. All the apartments and condominiums currently provide for parking. If more residential is added it will need to go up in height. Extra vehicles are already spilling out into the streets. Any new construction would need to have parking off street. The SE 60th corridor and the 119th Ave SE corridor is already to tight for the use these streets are getting. SE 60th also is being used as a way to cut through the neighborhood to get to I-405 when Coal Creek Parkway slows to a crawl twice a day. It is frightening to be crossing SE 60th and seeing a car approaching you at 50 miles per hour in order to get to or from I-405. A few developers have attempted redeveloping the core business area of Newport Hills. The neighborhood has never been supportive so far. Change is inevitable and perhaps community representatives should work with the property owners as a first step?	waterdog_fk
I support the addition of new transit oriented developments. That said, if the city is creating transit oriented developments, the bus service should be fast, frequent, reliable and convenient or the residents will still end up driving. Besides increasing the frequency of bus service, what does the city plan on doing in terms of increasing the speed of bus service? If the busses get stuck in the same traffic as cars, then there is not much benefit to taking the bus instead of driving. Same point for the reliability. Over the winter I sometimes prefer to take the bus instead of riding my bike. Unfortunately I've been left standing in the cold (literally) on several occasions for an unacceptable amount of time. Sudden service cuts, stop closures or finding out that my next bus comes in two hours were things forcing me to Uber back home. I prefer not to drive my car to downtown, but the unreliability of the bus service made me drive. If the bus service was fast, frequent, reliable and convenient and the bike infrastructure was safe and pleasant, then people that commute from Bellevue to Bellevue would have no good reason to commute by car unless they have other errands to run during the day. Finally, people still want to be able to get around on evenings and in weekends. Bus frequency is cut so drastically at these times that it won't convince anyone who owns a car to take the bus instead.	sandervalstar
I appreciate your feeling, however the reality is that our region is growing. We can't stop it. The best thing to do is to thoughtfully plan for the future, which is what the city is trying to do.	roseb
I like the idea of increasing density in places like Lake Hills and Yarrowood. Right now small ramblers are being torn down & replaced with massive single-family homes. All this while average family size is shrinking. The space would be much better used with duplexes and triplexes that are designed to fit-in to the neighborhood's current aesthetic. Perhaps a duplex with an ADU over a shared garage? Especially in blocks are areas that are within 1/4 - 1/2 mile of retail and commercial cores.	roseb

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 2? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>Unintended inequities appear to be that *the size of proposed individual housing units favors single persons or couples, not families and *without requirements about affordability, units are likely to be unaffordable due to market economics.*Bellevue's past emphasis on parks, or even retention of trees for the alleged goal of a broader green canopy, seems totally absent. *Aesthetics affect outcomes.</p>	camaxim
<p>I like that this option is strengthening mixed use areas; however, the transit portion of the option seems to be skipping a step. "Adding new development around areas that have frequent bus services" does not mean that people the people there will take the bus. It would make more sense to me if new development was added around areas where people are already largely walking and biking. Bus service can be always be reorganized later.</p>	evnl.business
<p>This was my second favorite proposal. It seems to maintain areas that are single-family neighborhoods (which many folks seems to prefer and value), while creating density in planned areas and continues to support the development of mixed use areas. I like the idea that you could move easily between hubs on mass transit and having a mix of retail and housing in the same place. I think it also provides the second most housing, which I hope will make Bellevue more affordable for more people. Affordability it important for the health of the community— we want nurses, teachers, and firefighters as well as retail workers to be able to live where they work. That value shouldn't just be for folks who move here years ago or for the rich.</p>	koan_maurer

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 3? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>This has the most amount of housing and greatest types of housing. We have to stop catering to the ultra rich who want to keep their neighborhoods lily white and free of affordable housing. If they want that then their property taxes should triple. If a neighborhood allows affordable housing and multi zoning then they should have the most favorable property tax. Bellevue is a major city now and growing. City of Bellevue has continued to allow businesses to come in and build office space without creating enough housing and parking for all of those new people. City of Bellevue should be trying to keep those office workers near their offices but continuing to not allow the multi housing zones they have allowed the property values and rents to increase to such an extent that only the rich can afford to live in the city of Bellevue. We need all incomes to have a chance to live in the city which means we need to increase housing in anyway we can.</p>	umxw10
<p>My family lives in and near Bellevue. I do not. I cannot afford to live there but under this option, number 3, I have a much greater chance of finding a place I can live. Bellevue is far too expensive, so much so that our inclusion and diversity suffer from it. This is far and away the best housing plan for the forward thinking and optimistic city Bellevue is.</p>	erikster46
<p>There are too many people here, it is nightmarishly congested and you want more people? No thanks. It takes so long just to drive 3 miles in Bellevue. STOP building here!</p>	cada4
<p>I support this option because it adds the most new units. We need as much supply as possible.</p>	rhee.j
<p>I have seen this being done in other communities. It works better when blended in with new housing development because the streets can be wider, sidewalks can be included up front, street lighting is built by the developer and covenants, regulations and expectations are established prior to the point of sale. When land zoning is changed to increase occupancy after construction of a community, none of the benefits mentioned in the beginning of the paragraph exist. You end up with more people using less of the things that make living in a neighborhood enjoyable. There is a lack of uniformity in retrofitting, design limitation, coloring, scaling and rarely adequate parking. It is a mess like Seattle which has already spilled into portions of Kirkland. Nothing is being said in all this planning about affordability which is a huge issue for our City. When you allow land to be divided or you allow more density to existing residential lots, the land value is going to go up. It will go way up. This does nothing for affordability. Over many years of watching this process I have grown favorable to some form of taxing to move income from our highest producing companies with excess profit to increased income for employees. I am not in favor of basic income for all, but I am in favor of rebuilding the middle class as opposed to personal excessive wealth which serves no purpose in building a better America.</p>	waterdog_fk

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 3? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>I support this, it adds the most housing, the most variety of housing and on top of that it adds interesting walkable spaces that everyone in the city will benefit from. Let’s switch the way people talk about Bellevue from a collection of arterials and shopping malls to a collection of interesting walkable centers. I would like to add that there are many more types of housing than apartments, town homes, and n-plexes. For example, row homes with gardens and garage linked homes are still much more space efficient than detached homes, but they do provide features attractive to families such as a garden and/or a garage. Why are these two types of housing impossible to find here?</p>	sandervalstar
<p>Small, single family homes on large lots (worse yet - massive homes on large lots) within walking distance of a commercial center is a waste of space and a missed opportunity. Attractively designed duplexes and triplexes will make Bellevue more affordable and will encourage a broader range of residents.</p>	roseb
<p>I strongly favor this option, not only does it create the most housing, which I see a desperate need for among the 20 &amp; 30 year olds who are essential to Bellevue's future, but also for these reasons:* My husband and I would really love to be able to walk to a destination and build walking as a mode of transportation, not just avocation, into our daily lives. It will make us and our community healthier!* Our single family neighborhood has become so boring -- mostly older people, few children and almost all of us from the same income group. I would like to live in a more interesting and income diverse place! * My household currently contains 2 20-year olds with Master's degrees and good jobs who cannot afford to live in Bellevue. They would like to move to their own homes.</p>	sallybfo
<p>I liked this option the best. It reminded me of what I like best about other cities I have visited —to have areas that support both housing and necessary shops that easily accessible.</p> <p>I also liked that is provided the most number of housing units. We need to improve the affordability in Bellevue for the health of the community — the school district is shrinking in large part due to affordability. It doesn’t matter that schools are top-notch if families cannot afford to live here. It is important to me that people who work in Bellevue like teachers, police, firefighters, city administrators, retail workers can afford to live in the community.</p> <p>I liked the comment of changing walking from an avocation to a mode of transportation.</p>	koan_maurer

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 3? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>Love this option! I think it's the best for many reasons. 1. The most housing built, we have a huge supply problem.2. Being able to walk + take transit easily is great3. Creates lot of variety.4. This is the best for the environment.5. This is the best for city as it makes maintaining infrastructure and creating infrastructure for housing easier.</p>	chirag.k.k
<p>I like this option. We need build more. We need to avoid having strict zoning like single-family zoning. Instead let's rezone everything to mixed-usage zone. Bellevue adds offices at much faster pace than adds new residential units.</p>	reldan0
<p>I support this option the most. Walkability is so important and we simply need more AFFORDABLE housing to be built</p>	santiagosoz27
<p>I think supporting safe walking (and cycling) around our neighborhoods is so important for a number of reasons, so a plan that values this is fantastic.</p>	nicolejba

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 0? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>I support this approach. I am not a supporter of increasing subsidized or mix use in residential areas. If I wanted that approach I would have purchased my house in Seattle.</p>	ttrotta4
<p>This city is already too congested. There are too many people here. For God's sake stop building. It takes 25 minutes to drive 3 crummy miles in Bellevue. STOP!</p>	cada4
<p>I rarely go into town anymore and avoid it at every opportunity. It feels, looks and moves in congested ways. Pedestrians, cars, bikes, scooters, roller skates, long boards, motorcycles and segways are not a good mix for safety.Frank</p>	waterdog_fk
<p>Not adding more housing in Bellevue will only increase traffic from people who have to drive over from far away. The city needs to create viable alternatives to driving so that people don't have to rely on their cars for every single errand. Then we can add housing that is not car-dependent (e.g. Transit Oriented Developments).</p>	sandervalstar

Question: What do you like about Housing Approach 0? What concerns do you have?	Screen Name
<p>I don't think this approach alone is sufficient as it will only serve specific groups of people. Don't get me wrong, adding small studio apartments, one-bedrooms and two-bedrooms is great and necessary. However, I suspect it will primarily serve students, young professionals and retirees. It won't add any housing suitable for young families for example. There is a wide range of housing types between two-bedroom apartments, and detached single family homes that young families could benefit from. For example: duplexes, town homes, row homes with gardens, garage-linked homes, etc. These are all wildly more efficiently with land use than detached single family homes. However, they are extremely rare in Bellevue and if they exist at all they are often still unreasonably expensive.</p>	sandervalstar
<p>If you're meaning to say that the city needs to double down on its Vision Zero initiative I wholeheartedly agree. <a href="https://bellevuewa.gov/city-government/departments/transportation/safety-and-maintenance/traffic-safety/vision-zero">https://bellevuewa.gov/city-government/departments/transportation/safety-and-maintenance/traffic-safety/vision-zero</a></p>	sandervalstar
<p>It seems like there should be larger apartments even with this option. Not everyone can live in a studio or one bedroom apartment.</p>	jkjpe
<p>This is the worst option. Clearly the current strategy isn't supporting the massive growth we've had and will have in the future. If our current strategy worked, we wouldn't have a housing crisis. It's bad for the long-term health of the city, since we won't be accommodating future growth in the best way. This is also the worst for the environment.</p>	chirag.k.k
<p>What we have now is not working. My friends and family simply cannot afford to live here.</p>	santiagosoz27
<p>Is this meeting the goal of 35,000 housing units?</p>	phyllisjw
<p>Why is the Bel-Red, Wilburton, Eastgate, and other new growth areas mainly studios and one bedroom housing units? Shouldn't there be more multifamily housing including condominiums, within the 40,500 housing units? 40,500 studio and one bedroom types of housing units, that's 65% of Bellevue's current 61,128 total housing mix. Also, isn't the goal 35,000 new housing units?</p>	phyllisjw