

November 2, 2021

To: LCA Members

Re: Recap of October 25th DADU working meeting and Board votes regarding LCA's submission to the City of Bellevue

On October 20th in advance of the October 25th working meeting, Craig sent out emails to each of the City Council members as well as candidates for the Nov 2 election soliciting their position on DADUs. A second objective of the email was to increase the awareness of LCA with the City. All Council and candidates responded with the exception of Council member Stokes who did not respond to our request nor a follow up sent to him on October 25th. In addition, email replies, a zoom meeting was held with Council member Barksdale on October 22 and a conference call was held with Council member Nieuwenhuis on October 25th. Their combined input was incorporated into the working draft circulated to members prior to the October 25th meeting.

At the Oct 25th meeting many members shared insights into the proposal to include DADU in NW Bellevue as well as concerns that staff and the planning Commission did not address these concerns leading up to the Planning Commission's approval. At the meeting 55% of members were in attendance include 66.6% of Board members.¹

During the meeting the summary feedback from City Council members was shared, (attached to this document). There was consensus and strong support of the approach outlined in the current draft letter with the exception raised if we should state we represent the views of Lochleven since we do not have the majority of residents as paying members. This was debated as other members disagreed pointing out LCA has been very open and transparent on posting the issue on Facebook, NextDoor, the LCA website and email to over 150 people who live in Lochleven. Craig expressed concern that he feared talking this approach until we have 51% of residents becoming paying members would impede efforts going forward. Mark suggested an alternative "saying the letter is from the LCA board, not on behalf of LCA.

There was consensus to accept this change and the letter was edited during the call to reflect these changes as well as including narrative embracing the positive attributes of DADUs. An unresolved issue was the minimum rental period. Participants on the call agreed the intent of DADU was not short-term Airbnb type usage and rental terms floated from 30 to 180 days as the minimum rental period. Other members suggested we should not prohibit DADU for office or business purposes. After discussions this suggestion was retracted realizing such usage was not consistent with the goal of expanding affordable housing.

An outreach strategy was briefly discussed for how each member can independently reach out to Council members to help amplify our voices. An action item was taken we all need to become more proactive and reach out to neighbors and post flyers. These will be on the agenda of the Nov 10th member meeting.

Following the call Board member Hatmaker shared additional research which led to additional three conditions to be submitted for board approval; 1) height restrictions, 2) a sunset clause and 3) city enforcement. These were incorporated into a draft circulated Oct 26th. Below is a summary of the votes for each of these changes.

¹ Board members in attendance included Mike Hatmaker, Paresh Rajwat, Mark Walters and Craig Spiegle. Absent were Joyce Doland and Steve McConnell.

LCA Board Members Vote							
Proposed Amendments to Letter to COB regarding DADU in NW Bellevue							
Board member	Joyce Doland	Mike Hatmaker	Steve McConnell	Paresh Rajwat	Craig Spiezle	Mark Walters	Final
Vote Received	10/31 5:20 pm	10/31 8:36 am	10/30 4:52 pm	10/30 8:05 pm	11/1 9:06 am	11/1 9:19 am	
1. DADU Height a. DADU height limited to the lessor of 15 feet as measured by the average elevation of the primary structure, or no greater than the height of the primary structure. b. DADU height limited to the lessor of 15 feet or no greater than the height of the primary structure. c. Remove any height restriction	b	a	a	a	a	b	Include avg elevation
2. Minimal Rental Period a. 60 days b. 90 days c. 120 days	b	c (or any selected by the majority)	b (I could go along with any of the periods)	c	b (or longer)	c	120 days
3. Sunset Clause - Include a sunset clause of 4 years, providing time for the City to re-assess the impact to neighborhoods, code compliance, and effectiveness in meeting the objective of expanding affordable housing. a. Approve b. Do not include	a	a	a	a	a	a	Include sunset clause
4. City Enforcement - The City shall fund and support annual code compliance monitoring of all approved DADU a. Approve b. Disapprove	a	a	a	a	a	a	Fund code compliance
5. Inclusion of Board members as co-signers a. Yes b. No – Do not include my name	a	a	a	a	a	a	Include all names

On November 2, the final draft was circulated to Board members for final review prior to the planned distribution to City Council on November 3. Concurrently the draft was shared with LCA member Doug Leigh who has deep subject matter expertise in land use issues.

Updated 10/25/21 – Updated 5:45 PM - Comments posted in order of receipt.

[Email sent to each COB Council Member & Candidate](#)

Summary of Comments (draft)

Respondent	Council	ADU Rest	ST Rentals	Parking	Setbacks	Tree Canopy	Comment
Lynn Robinson	✓		✓	✓			"my position is your position" Requested follow up, no reply
Jeremy Barksdale	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Hosted a zoom call
Gina Johnson			✓	✓		✓	
Ruth Lipscomb		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Dexter Borbe		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Offered to host a zoom call
Jared Nieuwenhuis	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Spoke on 10/25
Conrad Lee	✓						Rec comments on 10/26
Janice Zahn	✓						Rec comments on 10/26
Jennifer Robertson	✓	Feels should be decided by neighborhood and not enough data to support DADUs					
John Stokes	✓						No response

From: Robinson, Lynne <LRobinson@bellevuewa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 6:53 PM

To: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>

Subject: RE: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

Hi Craig, my position is your position. We are here to represent our community. I personally have no dog in this fight, but share your concerns about short term rentals and not creating room for parking. We are a bit constrained by recent state law that our city must adopt.

I thank you for this letter and hope that you will continue to communicate with the council as we review the recommendations. Happy to meet with you and staff anytime. Lynne

From: Barksdale, Jeremy <JBarksdale@bellevuewa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 8:18 PM

To: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>

Subject: Re: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

Craig,

Thanks for your note. I'm happy to discuss. Please let me know what date and time works best for you by clicking on a date and time via the following link.

<https://calendly.com/d/chg-j8w-rg8/30-minute-community-meeting-online>

Sincerely,

Jeremy

From: Gina Johnson <connect@drgina4bellevue.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2021 1:55 PM
To: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>
Subject: Re: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

Hello Craig and Lochleven Community,

I live nearby in Old Bellevue and cherish daily walks through the Lochleven neighborhood and Goddard Park. Many Bellevue community associations have reached out with similar ADU/DADU upzoning concerns, especially within NW and NE Bellevue.

While there is a growing need for affordable housing and aging in place options, I do see parking challenges and transient accommodation as a concern which our current council/my opponent has not addressed. Spillover parking onto surface streets poses significant traffic congestion and safety issues which must be considered.

Preserving Great Neighborhood agreements for character, quality of life, and tree canopy appears to have been replaced with a focus on transit oriented, lower cost, high-density development. I support limited ADU/DADU options for owner-occupied, aging in place scenarios with adequate off-street parking, tree canopy preservation, and building occupancy requirements. A challenge in meeting this goal will be the new WA State House Bill 1220 which allows shelter housing in most parts of every city; Bellevue City Council has updated ordinances in compliance, Councilmember Lee voiced concerns, my opponent did not.

I value the conversation and hope to be of service as your representative voice and elected councilmember. Thank you for voting!

Best,

Gina

From: Ruth Lipscomb <ruth@ruthlipscomb.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2021 10:30 PM
To: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>
Cc: info@ruthforbellevue.org
Subject: RE: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

Hello Craig,

As we all know, Bellevue is experiencing tremendous growth. In order to continue to be a vibrant city, with a diversity of employment opportunities and reasonable commute times, we need to increase the housing supply so that anyone who works here can live here. Right now, only a fraction of our workers live in the city, and many of our skilled professionals and essential workers are being priced out of both renting and purchasing. The kids who grow up here are leaving the area because they don't see a future where they can eventually own a home.

We are currently around 16,000 housing units short and King County has drafted future growth targets that specify the need for 35,000 more housing units in Bellevue by 2044. For these reasons, I'm in favor of allowing higher densities near transit hubs like downtown, the Spring District, and the Bel-Red corridor. The size and height of buildings definitely needs to taper down significantly as it gets close to existing neighborhoods, including near your neighborhood.

But just increasing density in the core of the city won't be enough. We need more options for people who would like to live in neighborhoods but can't afford to buy a single family home, and for the homeowners who already live there

and need more flexibility for changing housing needs. I would like to see detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs) allowed in neighborhoods, with limitations so that they fit in with existing houses. Limitations should at least include wider setbacks, lower height, size restriction, tree protection, parking requirements, and a ban on short-term rentals. I look forward to seeing your list of recommendations, too. Small DADUs would allow existing homeowners to add space for adult kids, extended family, childcare providers, or elder caregivers. Rent from long-term tenants could help offset rising property taxes. Seniors could move into a DADU on their lot and rent their larger house to a growing family.

On larger lots, I would also like us to consider small scale duplexes (basically, houses with two front doors) to allow two families to buy in neighborhoods at a much lower price point than a traditional single family house. Duplexes would also offer an option for seniors who want to downsize and stay in their current neighborhood. These are the kinds of options that will allow residents with more moderate incomes to live in the city.

On a related note, there are existing zoning categories (R-1 and R-1.8) that allow for a second house, called a “guest cottage” on a single lot. There are several areas throughout the city with this zoning, mostly in Bridle Trails. The code says that these cottages may only be occupied by guests, family members, or domestic servants, and can never be rented. From my walks around many neighborhoods, I know that the rental restriction is not being adhered to nor enforced. Cottages have been built recently that are as large as a normal house and very close to both the existing house and to the property line, which makes them look like the lot has been subdivided. I would like to revisit and tighten those rules to not allow a quasi-subdivision, but to make sure that all types of second housing units fit into the neighborhood where they are located.

The issue of equity is also very important to me. When our zoning effectively limits our highest-performing schools to being attended by kids from families that can afford to buy single family houses in those areas, we’re not providing equitable opportunity for everyone. Allowing DADUs that could be rented by a single parent, or a duplex that could be purchased by a wider range of families, brings economic diversity to our city. The most recent census data shows that while Bellevue overall is growing more diverse, the different census tracts within the city are becoming more homogeneous, both racially and economically. That’s not the direction we should be encouraging through our zoning laws.

I know there is a lot of fear around the words “increasing density,” especially in existing neighborhoods. We have control over how we add new residents in smart and equitable ways. I’m proposing a very light increase in density, in small housing units, spread throughout our communities. These changes alone will not solve all of our housing affordability needs, but they will offer more shapes and sizes of homes for people at more income levels, for renters and for first-time homebuyers.

We also need to talk about property values. The #1 reason that the value of existing homes has appreciated over the last few decades is that Bellevue has been a place where both businesses and employees wanted to relocate and stay. If we don’t manage growth in a way that allows a diversity of professions to live in the city, the cost of living and/or the lack of employees who want to make long commutes will put a serious damper on our local economy. That will do more to hurt our property values than will the existence of a couple of backyard cottages and a duplex on our block.

I’m happy to answer questions or hear residents’ ideas and thoughts. Please reach out anytime.

Best,

Ruth Lipscomb

From: Dexter Borbe <borbe4bellevue@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2021 10:22 AM
To: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>
Subject: Re: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

Hi Craig,

Thank you for reaching out, and for understanding the balance needed between creating more housing and keeping the neighborhoods desirable.

DADUs add to the available stock of dwelling units, although it's not one I would fall on my sword for. When Mercer Island approved ADUs and DADUs back around 2008-2009, it created a little less than 130 housing units in the next 4 years. Given we have about 6 times the number of housing units, but that we already have ADUs allowed by ordinance, I estimate around 200-300 DADUs out of our ~32,000 or so single-family homes, or a little less than 1% DADU take-up.

I agree with prohibiting short-term rentals less than 6 months – That's not what we want DADUs for if we want it to be actual housing (i.e. we don't want them to be AirBNBs).

Off-street parking makes sense, especially in areas like NW Bellevue where many streets require a Restricted Parking Permit. I agree that granting the RPP for this "induced parking demand" would beat the purpose of requiring off-street parking. I assume many homes that can accommodate a DADU would also have driveway parking. However, in other neighborhoods without an RPZ restriction, I don't know how we would enforce off-street parking as the primary homeowner or their family may park in the street anyhow.

I agree with preserving tree canopy, although I would be in favor of allowing the replacement of trees removed for this purpose instead of a complete ban.

DADUs have already been incorporated in the LUC 20.20.125 with their own specific section defining setbacks and dimensional standards.

Affordable Housing Provisions - The LUC provisions for affordable housing today are specifically aimed at multifamily development and duplexes/triplexes as part of an entire subdivision proposal, so it's hard to think about what this part of the question means for DADUs. If the intent is to prevent DADUs from using affordable housing provisions to skate around dimensional standards, then I am in favor of preventing such loopholes (I don't like loopholes in legislation). Let's legislate and code for what we actually want DADUs to be like.

I don't think they should be rented out for non-residential purposes, as the intent is to generate more affordable housing for everyone.

As for home-based business – that is tricky because people can register their primary home today as a location of business, especially people who have a professional practice (e.g. CPAs or lawyers) who work from home, and unenforceable. Is the intent to avoid outside traffic in the neighborhood from patrons visiting said businesses?

I think it's a scary proposition as we don't know what changes it will bring to each neighborhood (although we can look at Mercer Island as an example as they have some history). I understand each neighborhood can still create its own covenants with its homeowners or update them with regards to DADUs. Again, I don't expect this to be a very large change for the city as a whole. You might get 5 DADUs out of your 500 homeowners today, or less.

I'm happy to discuss more over the phone or Zoom if you like. I hope I have given a thoughtful response, and I am thankful for your appreciation for the balancing act we need to make between creating more housing and keeping neighborhoods desirable.

Sincerely,

Dexter Borbe

Candidate - Bellevue City Council Position 2 borbe4bellevue@yahoo.com <http://www.borbeforbellevue.com>

From: Robertson, Jennifer S. <j.robertson@bellevuewa.gov>

Sent: Monday, October 25, 2021 4:35 PM

To: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>

Subject: Re: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

Dear Craig,

FYI I'm not on the ballot this year. I strongly supported allowing neighborhoods to self-determine whether they want DADUs as part of the Neighborhood Planning project. When those come to council, I will consider it. From what I've learned, there may not be enough data to support adding DADUs in the two neighborhoods that are currently being planned. But I haven't fully studied where the two NAP areas are on that issue. If the NAP areas want them, I'm happy to support. I tend to side with the neighborhoods on this as it will not be a significant new source of housing and Bellevue has up zoned our growth corridors to provide the need for additional housing, so we should be able to leave our SF neighborhoods intact. Thanks for writing.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Robertson

From: Zahn, Janice <JZahn@bellevuewa.gov>

Sent: Monday, October 25, 2021 11:25 PM

To: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>

Subject: Re: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

Hello Craig,

Thanks for reaching out. I know the staff have been working on neighborhood planning in NW and NE Bellevue. This item has not yet come to the city council.

I would welcome meeting with your community to learn more about your neighborhood and specific feedback.

Let me know if that is of interest, in person or via zoom.

Thanks, Janice

From: Lee, Conrad <CLee@bellevuewa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2021 12:22 AM

To: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>

Subject: Re: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

Hi Craig,

Sorry I do not recall getting any messages from you. But I certainly am happy to discuss your concerns with you and others. I have lived in Bellevue Somerset area for 54 years and value the importance of preserving our neighborhoods and their characters. There are increasing demands for more housing options, affordable housing and low income housing, including my opponent who pushed up the housing prices. There are many ways to address these problems. We have to weigh them thoughtfully. The Council, including me, is exploring a number of them. I always listen to the people who are affected to come up with the best solutions. I would love to do the same here. Doing it at election time is not ideal because it may influence and distorts the candidate's response. However, I hope I have earned your trust and hope you can trust me.

Best Regards,

Conrad Lee

Email Sent to City of Bellevue Council Members and Candidates

From: Craig Spiezle <craigsp@agelight.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 4:28 PM
To: Bellevue City Council Member and Candidates for City Council
Subject: Your Position on DADU in NW Bellevue

I am reaching out on behalf of the Lochleven Community Association, (LCA), representing over 500 households and 1,200 residents in NW Bellevue. We have several suggestions consistent with existing ADU requirements. These include but are not limited to prohibiting of short-term rental (less than 6 months), require off-street parking, prohibiting access to RPZ parking permits, maintain the existing tree canopy and prohibit tree-removal for building structures, prevent classification of DADU as being defined as affordable housing consistent with existing code for ADUs, (LUC 20.20.128), require DADU to meet or exceed existing requirements as specified by 20.20.125, and prevent DADU from being established for use as used as a home-based business or rented out for any commercial purposes. We plan on finalizing this list and submitting a formal letter to you by November 5th.

In advance of the upcoming election and Council vote scheduled in mid-November, we are asking for your support and clarification of your position.

Combined with the spill-over effect from the growth of downtown, the Pinnacle development and application to re-zone 100th Ave NE to mixed use, the character of our neighborhood continues to be impacted. Please respond by Monday Oct 25 so we may share your position with our membership.

Craig Spiezle
On behalf of the Lochleven Community Association