In-Person Questionnaire Provided at the December 5th, 2024, Public Information Session

See copy of questionnaire attached

Online Questionnaire Open to the Public Starting December 26th, 2024 [Results shown are as of February 1st]

Questionnaire is available to view here

Compliance with the state's middle housing bill would require six units per lot within a 1/4 mile of a major transit stop. Would you support the City allowing six units per lot within 1/2 mile of a major transit stop rather than the 1/4 mile required by the state? [online only]

- 44 total responses
  - 15 No
  - 1 Neutral
  - 28 Yes

Would you support the City expanding the additional density allowance required for major transit stops to include frequent transit service as well? (Note: this includes all bus service providing 4+ stops per hour.) [online only]

- 44 total responses
  - 9 No
  - 4 Neutral
  - 31 Yes

Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within 1/4 mile of frequent transit service?

- 54 total responses - 42 online responses & 12 in-person responses:
  - 18 No
  - 4 Neutral
  - 34 Yes
- Median number of additional units suggested: 4-6 [online & in-person]

Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within 1/2 mile of frequent transit service?

- 37 total responses (46 with additional respondents noted below) - 25 online responses* (32 with additional respondents noted below) & 12 in-person responses:
  - 11 No (13 with 2 additional respondents noted below)
  - 5 Neutral
  - 21 Yes (28 with 7 additional respondents noted below)
- *Note that there were an additional seven respondents that provided a suggested number of bonus units beyond six that they would support within 1/2 mile of frequent transit service, and an additional two respondents that responded zero additional units. The “Yes” or “No” question was deleted in error midway through the questionnaire being live temporarily but was restored.
- Median number of additional units suggested: 4-5 [online]

Compliance with the state's middle housing bill would require six units per lot be permitted when providing two affordable units.

<u>In-Person questions:</u>

Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within 1/4 mile of Regional and Countywide Growth Centers and Neighborhood Centers? [in-person]

- 12 total responses
    -

<u>Online questions:</u>

Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within 1/4 mile of neighborhood centers when providing two affordable units? [online]

- 44 total responses:
    - 12 No
    - 5 Neutral
    - 27 Yes
- Median number of additional units suggested: 4

Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within 1/2 mile of neighborhood centers when providing two affordable units? [online]

- 44 total responses
    - 17 No
    - 6 Neutral
    - 20 Yes
- Median number of additional units suggested: 4

Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within 1/4 mile of Regional and Countywide Growth Centers when providing more than two affordable units? [online]

- 44 total responses
    - 12 No
    - 3 Neutral
    - 29 Yes
- Median number of additional units suggested: 4

Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within 1/2 mile of Regional and Countywide Growth Centers when providing two affordable units? [online]

- 44 total responses
    - 17 No
    - 5 Neutral
    - 21 Yes
- Median number of additional units suggested: 4

Open Responses [online]:

Allow as much housing to be built as possible, we have a housing crisis. The prices are extremely high, and we need an increase in supply to bring those prices down.
Would love to units designed for families. 3 bedrooms with shared community play structures and activity spaces
Relying on "frequent transit service" is questionable when transit providers continue to decrease service.
The more opportunity for housing, the better. 1/4 mile is not nearly inclusive enough, and I support expanding it to 1/2 mile distance from the relevant City features.
REQUIRE CITY OF BELLEVUE PHYSICAL OFFICE ADRESS AND RESIDENCE TO DEVELOPER/CORPORATE OWNERS. NO OUT OF AREA DEVELOPERS. BELLEVUE JOBS FOR BELLEUVE WORKERS THAT ARE BELLEVUE RESIDENCE
The question about additional units beyond 6 is pretty vague. My answer would be determined on what the additional housing would be and what the lot sizes are.
I'm ok with higher density allowed near transit stops, as shown in your maps. But I do not support any higher density allowed near every bus stop in Bellevue, because that is virtually every square inch of Bellevue. To expand in the areas served by bus transit stops in single family neighborhoods, you should ask for a majority vote to allow such in each development area/neighborhood where that bus stop exists, where you wish to expand increase density of housing.
Please do not allow high rise apartments/condos everywhere. Six units per property is a big increase in residential density without suffocating residential areas with high rise people and cars and completely changing the feeling of a neighborly community.
n/a
Build more high rise multi use condo living for higher density
As a 20 year old about to graduate college, housing affordability is top of mind for me, among other things such as finding a job. To avoid ossifying the city, you need to continue to advance housing development. You don't need to be Seattle, but you can be Ballard or Capital Hill. Smaller lots, more homes per lot, etc. You have to go beyond the state's minimum provisions. It's Bellevue for Christ's sake. Don't tell Seattle, but you're better than them. You're a leader, and you have to take the lead. Seattle is hemming and hawing at the state's housing bill. You can avoid that, avoid pricing people out, avoid the massive homeless and drug problem they have by making life affordable and in reach.
Higher density housing (other than single family detached) should be focused in the downtown, regional centers and along major routes, not in neighborhoods. The circle approach to measuring desity is flawed. It should not be based upon a radius. There should be a specific increase in density based upon land uses, not just allowing medium density almost everywhere. We live here because we like the character and density of Bellevue. If we had known this was coming we would not have purchased our home here. We do not want to live in a city that has middle or higher density almost everywhere.
Middle housing is desperately needed near transit and growth centers. Really no reason to restrict densification in these areas
I would recommend looking at re zoning south Bellevue neighborhoods surrounding the Factoria countywide growth center for multifamily.
This is a bad idea. We don't want to look like New York. We don't want to look like Ballard.
More affordable housing options is critical for the community.
None

Non-market rate construction is often not feasible for small builders given a cost to benefit analysis due to the high costs associated with construction and development and uncertain holding times needed to locate a buyer who qualifies for the discounted units. These units also can drive down the cost of the market rate units making the entire project more difficult to underwrite.
N/A
Mandated # of affordable units per new development in Bellevue
You've not clearly defined the term "lot". Lots that I'm familiar with vary significantly in size. Different size lots would vary in capacity to comfortably fit multiple living units. Consequently, I think it is inappropriate to generalize with the sort of questions posed in this survey. I therefore highly question the credibility of results taken from this survey.
I understand the need to grow housing, but I prioritize the neighborhood nature of the City of Bellevue.
Need to allow rezoning of light industrial areas in south Bellevue for affordable housing to replace current building uses
As a resident and a real estate broker, I support higher density. What is frustrating, is that builders today are only building one large replacement home and tearing down smaller homes. These new laws are to encourage middle housing, while at the same time we are tearing down our stock of older smaller homes that could be rehabbed for way less money. We don't need more 3000+ sqft homes that cost $3 million built on lots that used to have a smaller 900-1400 sqft home. We are spending more money and energy to build new middle housing where the existing smaller/older housing stock could saved. I do a lot of rehabs with clients to keep these homes in the community but am fighting an uphill battle with builders offering more and more $$ to tear down a perfectly good house. If builders would be required to increase density (replacing a single family with duplex/triplex, etc), that would at least be progress. This existing inventory of smaller homes is going to be lost forever.
bonus housing above HB1110 requirements should focus on providing affordable units (either by income level or unit size) and focus ideally on providing more family-oriented housing (2-3+ bedroom unit types). common complaint i hear from friends about our area is only housing options are expensive SFR or one-bed apartments.
Until there are more safe, reliable, and dry public transportation services as well as increased parking and driving possibilities, I do not support increased density as it is being described. Families in newer density areas cannot rely on buses to get to child care, schools, medical appointments, grocery shopping, after school practices/activities and work all in one day and in a timely way. This is not an unusual type of day for any working family and is not feasible with buses. When it is dark from 6:30 am to 4:30 pm, taking a bus for any if not most of the above activities is not safe.
The numbers are honestly entirely arbitrary - I'm not an expert on what unit number is required in order to make stuff pencil out. I think it's a little weird that you're asking uninformed community members to provide this information and perspective, because really what I want to see is more housing diversity. I'm honestly fine with apartment buildings in these areas as well - we need a ton more housing, there are ways to build more units while preserving trees and neighborhood character, just make it easy to build. I recognize the state providing only 2 additional units as an affordability bonus might not be enough, so please choose whatever number makes the most sense to get the most housing out of the deal.
Increasing densities beyond the state mandated levels is completely inappropriate.
It is not in my capacity to balance the number of additional units with their potential effects. Outside of safety and sustainability, I don't think density caps are necessary at all. I believe staff will arrive at a reasonable number.
Allow enough far and lot coverage to enable family sized units

I have searched around Bellevue to buy affordable housing near the light rails and with some walkable aspects and have not found anything. Please help me stay on the Eastside and build housing for everyone.
Adding additional units within the state required makes sense, but expanding this to 1/2 mile does not. It would turn Bellevue into Seattle. If residents wanted to live in a densely populated city we would have moved to Seattle. We like our large trees and green spaces. it is impossible to maintain this canopy if you have a densely populated city outside of the 1/4 mile state requirement.
I support higher density homes/apartment homes near light rail transit and major transit corridors to allow for lower income workers and family live here in Bellevue. As a almost 40 year Bellevue resident the Bellevue planning department fees are far too high and far too many home builders are allowed to buy up lower priced older homes and build $3M+ mega homes adding to the affordability crisis.
This is long overdue! Both single-family houses and units in Downtown towers are super expensive, and the kind of housing described here barely exists even though it is cheaper to build and maintain than high-rises (=> more likely to be affordable to at least someone). I literally cannot wait for my property tax to finally go down.
Consider expanding denser development across entire city and abolish single family only zoning
We should allow duplexes and nice town homes everywhere.
So, for me the problem with higher density is not having more neighbors. It is the issue of the city allowing fewer parking spaces than are really needed, with affordable housing. Ask Bianca Siegel in the Clerk's office about what's happening now that the affordable Polaris at Eastgate has residents. She & I are members of PorchLight Community Advisory Group. This topic was discussed in our Jan. 9 meeting. Lots of frustrated business owner members in the area voiced real frustration. People own and use their cars. Has Planning Dept ever done a report of # of cars per housing unit in Bellevue? I think that would be enlightening. I take transit when I go to Seattle, sometimes multiple times a week. However, I have to drive to S. Bellevue P&R to get the bus, light rail when it opens across I90. I live ~1 mile from Eastgate P&R and if Sound Transit had more frequent service at night, I'd use it. But I'd still have to drive there.
I would like to see more density and low rise apartments along arterials with public transport, but not in favor of expanding to 1/2 mile as this would increase traffic on residential roads. We already have low rise apartments on one side of some arterials, why not just allow them on the opposite side. Building low rise apartments along arterials would help with noise suppression for residential areas. Bellevue doesn't have many sidewalks on residential streets, so any increase in density should require off street parking. Too many cars parked on residential streets would become dangerous for pedestrians.
Our frequent transit stops located within neighborhood centers are the best locations to create housing opportunities
I strongly support efforts to increase densification in Bellevue and decrease barriers to housing development. I think the city should consider rezoning the areas near South Bellevue Station, in particular, to permit development of skyscrapers and dense housing development.
Allowed number of units should scale with number of affordable housing provided. So people are incentivised to build housing for people who can't afford to pay millions for a place to live.
With the housing crisis and return to office mandates we need to encourage housing density to compliment mass transit opportunities.

Buildability of more units per House Bill 1110 is compromised with current parking and tree requirements. Has research been done to determine how many post wwii subdivisions exist that have covenants that allow only one dwelling unit per lot? For the residential lots without those covenants, it may be prudent to allow higher density everywhere in order to 'make up' for lack of increasing normal (not affordable) units on the restricted lots.
Grow in the areas designated for growth and such as the BelRed District, the Spring District, the Wilburton Vision Implementation. This is tremendous growth surrounding Wilburton. Comply with the CAC recommendations which then CM Barksdale signed off on and not intrude on the single-family residential zones. There is enough growth surrounding Wilburton neighborhoods. Do not allow development to intrude into the riparian corridor.

Demographics of Online Respondents

- 69% Homeowners
- 22% Renters
- 9% Other

Neighborhoods Represented:

- Downtown
- Lake Hills
- NW Bellevue
- Woodridge
- Spirit Ridge
- Fairmont
- West lake Sammamish
- Enatai
- Overlake Village
- Monthaven
- West Bellevue
- Somerset
- NE Bellevue
- Crossroads
- Bridle Trails
- Vuecrest
- Eastgate
- Phantom Lake/SE Bellevue
- Wilburton
- Newport Hills
- Kirkland
- Cougar Mountain
- Wilburton

Middle Housing Opportunity Areas Questionnaire

1. Please select which describe you:
   - ☐ City of Bellevue resident
   - ☐ Work in the City of Bellevue
   - ☐ Visit the City of Bellevue

2. Do you rent or own your home?
   - ☐ Rent
   - ☐ Own
   - ☐ Other

3. If you reside in the City of Bellevue, in what neighborhood do you live?

4. Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within ¼ mile of frequent transit service?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ Neutral
   - ☐ No

5. If yes, how many additional units beyond six would you support?

6. Would you support the City allowing more than six units per lot within ½ mile of frequent transit service?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ Neutral
   - ☐ No

7. If yes, how many additional units beyond six would you support?

8. Would You support the City allowing more than six units per lot within ¼ mile of Regional and Countywide Growth Centers and Neighborhood Centers?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ Neutral
   - ☐ No

9. If yes, how many additional units beyond six would you support?

10. Would You support the City allowing more than six units per lot within ½ mile of Regional and Countywide Growth Centers and Neighborhood Centers?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ Neutral
    - ☐ No

11. If yes, how many additional units beyond six would you support?