

OPEN SPACE AND NATURAL SYSTEMS QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES – ENVIRONMENT POLICY MOVES

Planning Commission | April 10, 2024

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1471530	Remove redundant policies. It seems this would create more efficiency and reduce costs from overlaps or conflicting policies.		
1471546	Updates to move cross-departmentally for stream rehab and maintenance.	Enhancing and maintaining stream corridors and buffers for wildlife habitat should be the overarching goal of these policies.	Enhancing and maintaining stream corridors and buffers for wildlife habitat should be the overarching goal of these policies. Secondly, changing the zoning for the area should provide for the human need to be in nature. Many of the proposed zoning changes are for mixed-use residential or dense residential and don't appear to include parks, forests, trails, playgrounds, or community spaces.
1471571	None, need more parks near the Spring District and make the roads safer for pedestrians.	Need more parks near the Spring Districts. This area (124th & Belred) is also very dangerous for pedestrians even with the recent improvements. Cars don't pay attention and will look to turn right or left despite pedestrians having the right of way. Have witnessed several incidents that were within a split second of being severe or deadly.	Big disconnect between west belted and downtown that needs to be resolved in terms of walkability (in a safe manner) and parks/outdoor space.
1471588	All of the above updates look good except for the second about removing regulatory barriers. This project should protect the environment as much as reasonable.		Progress plus environmental protection.
1471597			To consider Bellevue is still a very car necessary city. More parking, not less

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1471597	<p>Remove redundant policies. For every new rule or law the City makes they should remove an old rule or law.</p> <p>Also flow control to prevent flooding.</p>	<p>Do not waste my tax money on Runaway Warming due to CO2 or over regulate.</p> <p>Hear is a good idea that almost every one could agree on, ban and disable all existing wood fire places and wood stoves in Bellevue, not because of the CO2 but because of the actual bad pollutants that they release. Ban and disable all existing gas fire places because they are a waste of energy.</p>	
1471606	<p>All sound like good ideas to help with water flow in a city that has lots of rain!</p>	<p>What about trees and foliage, or is that covered in another section?</p>	
1471616	<p>Removing a lot of bureaucracy and making it easier to build is very important, which most if not all of these do</p>	<p>Re-examine the whole concept of the Bel-Red street grid. Find a more flexible solution that works toward connectivity goals. Development of the neighborhood will occur organically and in a non-linear way - the street grid is far too rigid a solution and limits some opportunities for growth and development.</p>	<p>You should not listen to regular 'people', the people lack expertise in planning, they don't have a long term vision, they have selfish interests to keep their own property values high, etc.</p>
1471622	<p>Removing extraneous regulation to better facilitate development and growth, while still keeping a priority of ecological function and resilience.</p>		<p>Educate themselves properly on the practicality issues that some existing policies and codes have, by talking to stakeholders (landowners and developers) who understand the constraints.</p>
1471633	<p>I am very interested in taking care of and supporting the environment.</p>		
1471690	<p>Too many regulations and it is too expensive to handle-</p>	<p>Give immediate 24 hour approval for probable low carbon builds.</p>	<p>Keep all traffic corridors open. Our traffic lanes are too expensive to lose them for proven in effective bike lanes.</p>
1471734	<p>All of them. Refining and simplifying are important improvements that allow projects to be funded and completed.</p>		

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1471734		Policy around transportation and housing density should be considered as well. Denser housing keeps urban sprawl in check and investing in public transit and alternative modes of transportation (like cycling) will limit unnecessary road expansion and allow for more green space and trees along thoroughfares.	Limiting added pavement (via open parking lots & expanded roadways) is the best way to preserve green space
1471764	Updates to implementation policy to work cross departmentally to develop detailed rehabilitation and maintenance plans for stream corridors. -I like that there's a focus on the stream corridors. Having these are good for the environment and are nice to look at		
1471844	Uh, how can I answer what sounds good in this vacuum? STREAMLINE WHAT policies? Explore and remove WHAT barriers? (Are all barriers bad? Didn't the city create those? Redundant policies? Just who did you hire to create this survey and such a poor question???????	BelRed is not in a bubble. Changes made there will affect my neighborhood, Wilburton. We know first-hand traffic issues, problems created by poor decisions elsewhere, etc. We know your ill-thought-through vision to create narrow roads and create huge buildings along 116th is setting up for a slew of issues for Wilburton roads, parks and sense of calm. The comments you are throwing out about drainage sound nice, but you don't offer much reality of what you mean. You draw a nice creek by Early World -- but it has taken you forever to fix your bridge issues allowing access to that vital business for parents. You can talk such changes, but if water regulations are not included in your planning, you are in for a big surprise.	This area you are discussing is not a walled enclave. Nor is the area along 116th. Nor is the Wilburton. You need to have a clear understanding that IF you do X, it will affect those other ares.
1471850	All	No	Thank you!

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1471882	<p>Updates to look for opportunities for regional surface and stormwater facilities that provide for a more coordinated and effective approach to flow control and water treatment.</p> <p>This resonates with me as I care deeply about what goes into our streams, creeks, rivers, and our lakes that we live on and our family swims in. While the statement resonates, it's very unclear what exactly it's trying address. Sounds like bunch of words that aren't actionable nor measurable.</p>	<p>We need to carefully monitor and control what flows into our water systems and lakes.</p>	<p>Discuss actions that will ensure preservation of our natural waterways and large bodies of water.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1471929	<p>We need to reduce ground water rising within the City of Bellevue.</p> <p>The exploration of permeable surface inclusion during City Street planning could facilitate reduction in flood issues</p> <p>The creation of rain garden's (see Bellevue Botanical Gardens research) street side could support retention of high events.</p> <p>Roof gardens/street gardens/vertical gardens could produce urban food reducing the need for carbon emissions to produce reduction in CO 2 levels are currently at critical levels within Somerset.</p> <p>There is a need to review UN SDG 2030 goals for WASH for all members of COB Community.</p> <p>The City of Bellevue is a small city at a critical position regarding the well-being of children's long term health due to air pollution in a post Covid time frame.</p> <p>We are also at risk of critical damage due to all hazard events. There needs to be robust consideration and discussion with COB emergency management teams.</p>	<p>Cross departmental working is essential to facilitate this approach</p>	<p>Youth involvement, insight from elder's should be sort</p> <p>Development of safe spaces for community as proposed within current work in COB Community Center's without Wall's is a future Forward global model which could be shared beyond COB for evaluation at State and National level.</p> <p>There is a significant need to affordable housing for First Responders, Veteran and social housing for low income families must be included to provide equity with COB. Allocation mental health community integration is essential. Again this is an opportunity for achieving UN "future forward " evidence based architectural city modeling.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1472008	Updates to look for regional surface and stormwater facilities that provide for a more coordinated and effective approach to flow control and water treatment IS NOT AN ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT! In fact, it is instead protection of homes/commercial buildings.	Update to implementation policy to work cross departmentally to develop detailed rehabilitation and "maintenance" plans for stream corridors should instead say "work across departments to develop detailed RESTORATION and rehabilitation plans. There is a big difference between restoration and rehabilitation. Study after study shows that human manipulation (rehabilitation) of streams does not work. (Corps/EPA/Ecology studies to begin with). In addition, maintenance needs to be further defined and/or another word should be used.	
1472134	Each appears appropriate based on my interpretation.	Set measurable benchmarks.	
1473352	These are all appropriate policy moves. I would pick rehab and maintenance plans as #1, clarify objectives as #2.	It is very important to consider protection and expansion of the tree canopy.	Work to develop a city you would want your children and grandchildren to grow up in!
1473475	Updates to remove redundant policies covered in Volume 1 of the Comprehensive Plan that apply citywide. Hope we can improve the implementation efficiency of Bellevue 2044 so people can start enjoying the results faster		
1480420		Storm water treatment should be important. I believe stormwater should be treated before it drains into our natural waters to provide the healthiest water for the public.	
1480432		Public safety	Stop crime

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1486178	<p>Updates to implementation policy to work cross departmentally to develop detailed rehabilitation and maintenance plans for stream corridors. In general, any depts working independently never fully succeed so communication must occur and opportunities for input be provided to fully understand the impact of a decision. This would ensure success.</p>	<p>These policies must involve the developers of the buildings and share ownership (including costs) to implement design and maintenance long term. The city (and the tax payers) should not solely fund the solutions.</p>	<p>Growth is important and unavoidable but giving the developer's control (ex. mowing down all trees just to clear the lot) does not have to happen - see Parkshore design in Kirkland, they are incorporating even downed logs on backside into landscape design. Putting in efficient appliances, solar panels, heat pumps, etc. and making it a long term investment benefits them too. Taxpayers should not suffer huge annual increases to cover their investments.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1490892	<p>All of the above cross-departmentally, with clear steps outlined for all parties to read and understand. Cohesiveness in planning. I've had experience, many years ago with lack of coordination between different people in the same department interpreting maps and rules differently and ultimately scuttling expensive building plans. I understood the reason for the ultimate plan denial, but would have appreciated consensus before spending \$200,000 among three different plan reviews of building plans on something that very clearly would run afoul of environmental rules. I have also experienced (again, a long while ago) variability in requirements for storm drain maintenance and enforcement thereof over the course of years. from lack of care and oversight to the complete opposite.</p> <p>All of this is the long way to say I applaud and support the goal of greening the city, but I feel that the left hand and the right must right work with a clear understanding of all the moving parts, and that all the moving parts are operating under the same rulebook.</p>	<p>Incorporation of incentives for both developers and homeowners to green up their properties, either new or existing.</p>	<p>Continue to develop clear overall vision with easy to understand rules for end goals and implementation across all departments, and make them public-friendly. Not just in terms of your vision, or public meetings, but providing the residents the assistance and support to do this on a personal basis. Formulate plans and resources for the individual residents on how they can integrate the overall concept into their personal lives i.e. assistance in planting water wise and native plants at home, incentives for neighborhood by neighborhood projects, individual assistance in terms of more widespread tool-libraries etc.-a integrate this into long-range projects, allocate resources on a micro-level. We give neighborhood grants for pocket-parks and other amenities, can the same be done for each separate neighborhood. Can the City distribute to the individuals in that neighborhood who wish to do so an environmentally-friendly amenity to their yards, (i.e seeds, or starts, or a coupon with a local nursery for supplies) to help make the homeowner personally invested in the direction Bellevue wishes to go? Also: require developers to install roof-gardens or plant walls, as part of the permitting process- or other, similar building ideas, and perhaps incentivize them to do so.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any ideas or considerations unique to BelRed you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioner and other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1532811	I've got about a 160 IQ, no kidding, and I'm reasonably well-informed, and I still can't detect a shred of meaning in that first point. The second and third are more or less communicative. The fourth was written by Humphrey Appleby. Just tell the people you need a drainage czar. Congratulations on writing the fifth one in English.	After reading that I still can't tell if the city intends to restore Goff Creek or not, nor whether I should trust its sincerity if it does.	<p>Nobody has a clue what you're trying to communicate, except that it has something to do with drainage and therefore either runoff or the creeks. Or perhaps both? We haven't had a serious drainage problem since your predecessors fixed the 20th Street culvert, like, 15 or 20 years ago, so it must have something to do either with mitigating pollution or with restoration.</p> <p>If, at any moment during the years and years I was a Scout in this town, somebody from the city had told my scoutmaster, "We need help clearing invasive snails from our creeks," we'd have been there with buckets and galoshes all wet season. You wanna bring the salmon back, get the trash grates out of the creek. You want the snails gone, get people in the creek. It's not a policy area, it's just a bunch of moderately wealthy people's backyards.</p>