

**My name is Christine,
I live on Gooding Avenue at the top of King Mountain.
I am absolutely opposed to the rezoning of the 130 acres
on the Western flank of King Mountain if this rezone is
predicated on the assumption of providing access via
James Street Road.**

**In my opinion, the proposal to use James Street Road for
access to an “urban village” on the Southwest flank of
King Mountain is truly a bad idea, and unconscionable
for a myriad of reasons.**

**1) Let's examine the math. The proposed urban village
is supposed to have a maximum of 3500 housing units at
full build-out, population of about 9300
residents. Add another say 400 persons to work in the
stores, offices and restaurants. Add another transient
population of perhaps 1000 per day who will visit the
commercial enterprises and friends.**

**Add another say 400 vehicles that would simply transit
from Van Wyck or Stuart diagonally to James (and vice
versa) as a short cut from Meridian to Sunset or
Hannegan. Add another 200 +trucks of all descriptions
per day to service the commercial enterprises.**

**Let us very conservatively assume each resident would
undertake 1 egress and 1 ingress per day. So, adding all of
the factors, a rough estimate is a traffic load of circa
22,200 vehicular cycles would occur every day, including
trucks. Split between Van Wyck (or Stuart) and James,
this would mean an increased traffic load (in excess of the**

underlying, existing load) per day of perhaps as many 11,000 extra per day vehicles on James Street.

1) The intersection at James and Bakerview is already at capacity. Backups routinely occur now throughout the day on James and Bakerview at the intersection, and not simply at rush hours. No left turn lanes exist on James at Bakerview, North or South.

For instance, 2:20 PM, Tuesday February 13-25-30 car backup on James heading North at Bakerview. At 4:40 PM, on the same day, 20 car backup on James heading South through the intersection. And Bakerview heading East at James routinely experiences 20-25 car backups, and not just at rush hour. With the existing traffic load now, the James/Bakerview intersection is a traffic nightmare. Drivers routinely take mad chances with impaired line of sight, “jack rabbit” left hand turns in front of oncoming traffic, and simply running red lights. The idea of trying to funnel another 11,000 vehicles per day (including a plethora of heavy trucks) through this intersection is in my view tantamount to madness. To even attempt to accommodate such a surmised traffic load, Bakerview would have to be widened to four lanes from Deemer to James. James would have to be widened to four lanes from from Bakerview all the way to Gooding. I believe the existing proposal only calls for James to be four lanes only from Bakerview North to Kellogg. You simply

can not transit 11,000 vehicles per day on two lanes between James at Kellogg and James at Kearney & Gooding. James would also have to be widened to four lanes from Bakerview to Sunset. The costs involved would be astronomical. Just one “for instance”: on James, just North of Bakerview, the narrow roadway has no shoulder. On either side for about 200 feet the sides fall off into sharp pitch ravines. The ravines could not simply be filled in, as the grade level on the other side of the ravines is much lower than the roadway. A four lane “freeway” type bridge would have to be built, and this bridge alone could easily cost \$2,000,000, perhaps far more. Just buying the right of way from James to Gooding could easily be a nightmare. And moving all of the utilities such as fire hydrants, water lines, power and telephone poles would be extremely expensive. And widening James to Kearney/Gooding to four lanes would necessitate removing about 9 existing homes in the Spring Creek development, and a few other homes on the East side of James also.

2) The existing logic and topography of the King Mountain neighborhood militate against such a huge increase in traffic load. To accommodate such huge number of vehicles on James North of Bakerview to Kearney & Gooding James would need to become four lanes with stoplights at Kellogg Road, King

Avenue, Frances, and Gooding Avenue. Otherwise, the residents would never be able to make a left turn onto James against a constant stream of traffic. As it is now, making a left turn from Frances onto James is like playing Russian Roulette due to line of sight obstruction, the hill between Kellogg and Frances.

3) Such an additional huge traffic load in the King Mountain neighborhood would ruin the livability factor for everyone in the area. Enough already! I guarantee that if even one of the city traffic engineers were now living in the King Mountain neighborhood, they would never propose or even suggest using James Street for a major thoroughfare. In my estimation, this proposal simply can not be allowed to persist. In my opinion, the city of Bellingham should not spend even one more dollar attempting to push this agenda. In my estimation, it is simply a wrong approach. I would challenge any of the Bellingham City council members, or any of the City of Bellingham traffic engineers to come and spend an hour with me walking James between Bakerview and Kearney/Gooding. As the semanticist Korzybski said: “the map is not the territory.”

4) A far more practical access to the “urban vaillage” may be to establish a right of way corridor through the woods North from Bakerview, just East of

Deemer ...