September 30, 2021

Attn: Kathy Bell, Senior Planner

City of Bellingham
Planning and Community Development Department

210 Lottie St. Bellingham WA 98225

Re: Planned development (PDP 2019-0015)/Design review (DR2019-0036)/Critical area permit (CAP2019-0037)/SEPA checklist

Project location: 4413 Consolidation Avenue/Area 17/’Cityview’

Kathy,

Enclosed please find additional, revised and updated documents per the Request for Information issued June 24, 2021. Per the RFI, we were directed to provide either a) a parking demand analysis or b) a market study. We chose to hire a qualified professional to prepare a parking demand analysis that evaluates the proposal with an occupancy consisting of college students (attached). Also per the RFI, the proposal has been amended as necessary to reconcile the findings and conclusions of the analysis (see amended site plan and project narrative).

Please note that we are unwavering from our previous statements that this complex will not be occupied solely by college students. However, to comply with the clear directive of the RFI, our parking demand analysis and subsequent mitigation measures assume that every future Tenant at Cityview will be a student.

Sincerely,

Morgan

[Signature]

Morgan Bartlett, Jr.
Director
Madrona Bay Real Estate Investments, LLC

The referenced parking demand analysis is SEPA MDNS Ex.A.12 Parking Demand Analysis (NunesUeno, September 2021)
September 30, 2021

PLEASE NOTE: This narrative has been revised from the previous version dated March 12, 2021.

Project Objectives/Narrative/Design Review for multi-family apartment complex known as CityView, Bellingham, WA.

Parcel number: 3803321721750000

The proposed project is located at 4413 Consolidation Avenue, Bellingham WA 98229. The site is +/-11.15 acres.

Unit count: 106 (all 3 bedroom, +/-1,170 SF each). Type A units: 6. Type B units: 70 Type C unit: 30

Puget Neighborhood, Area 17. Zoning: Residential Multi, Planned

DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES:

Our goal is to provide high quality apartments, in a safe and convenient location, with on-site amenities. Multi-family vacancy rates continue to hover at 1-2%, pushing rents to an all-time high. CityView’s design will provide a welcome alternative to many Tenants facing high priced, outdated, and ‘zero amenity’ living options. This project will increase the current short supply of multi-family infill housing, a primary goal of Growth Management proponents. In turn, we believe it will help to lower the high living costs now faced by low-middle income Tenants.

PROJECT NARRATIVE:

The proposed project includes 3 buildings. Buildings A & B (20 units each) are identical 2.5 story, 35’ foot tall (height definition #1) residential multi-family buildings. Each building (A and B) consists of 4 walk-up ‘daylight’ residential units on the basement level. The upper two levels contain 16 residential units. Each building has 4 secure entrances, 3 stairwells, and a riser/utility room. Building C is a 5.5 story, 65’ tall (height definition #1) residential multi-family building. Building C consists of 6 walk up ‘daylight’ residential units on the basement level. The five upper levels contain 60 residential units. The building has 4 secure entrances, a riser/utility room, 3 stairwells and 2 elevators (1 gurney), as well as 3,000 SF of interior common usable area.

Total building area GSF is +/-160,000 SF (mid-wall to mid-wall), over 3 buildings. Lot coverage, including surface parking/drive lanes, buildings/walkways, and exterior usable space, is minimized at 51.4%. To avoid excessive clearing and to minimize the destruction of existing vegetation (per BMC 20.38.020), 48.6% of the site will be left in open space.

All three buildings have the main entrance located on the 2nd floor (Level 3), and centrally located on the east side of the buildings. Secure outdoor covered mailboxes are located in 3 convenient locations throughout the complex. A leasing/management office is located in the lobby of Building C, in addition to 3,000 SF of centrally located common area.

Two garbage/recycling enclosures are located mid-property with ADA routes to each. A large area of exterior common usable space (+/-40,600 SF) is located along the western boundary. This area is strategically located to maximize the buffer to our Nevada St./Marionberry Ct. neighbors. This usable area will include a loop system walking/jogging trail,
picnic tables and park benches. Landscaping will provide a relaxing environment. *Please note: Per BMC 20.32.040 f(2)a, Cityview’s 43,600 SF of total usable space far exceeds the required usable area of 26,500 SF (106 x 250).

106 units, all 3 bedrooms, require a total of 212 parking stalls. 249 surface parking stalls are proposed, including 7 accessible (2 van accessible) and 13 electric vehicle charging stations. Additionally, 8 spaces provided via Consolidation Ave. improvements (north side only). The total number of bedrooms is 318, putting our stall/bedroom ratio at .81/1. Per the Parking Demand Analysis (dated 9/30/21), multiple mitigation elements will be employed. One of these elements is the installation of two automatic gates. These gates separate paid tenant parking from guest parking. 219 parking spaces are located within the gates, 212 for tenants (106 units x max 2 paid stalls per unit), plus 7 for property management, maintenance etc. 30 additional stalls on site, as well as 8 spaces on Consolidation Ave. will be for visitor use (See updated Site Plan dated 9/30/21).

Ingress/egress is via Consolidation Ave. Consolidation Ave. will be improved to ¾ city standard from Nevada St. to fully abut the 45th St right of way. 30’ is dedicated along the Consolidation Ave. frontage, to 46th St. No parking and/or structures are located within the subsequent setback. City approved street trees will line the sidewalk of the Consolidation Ave. improvements. A fire lane loops from the entrance, and exits back to Consolidation Ave. A secondary fire lane (gated) is provided via the Nevada St connector. Riser rooms are located on the north end of each building. An emergency generator is located to the east of Building C.

160 bike racks, both interior and exterior, are located throughout the complex. Two cargo bikes will be provided by property management for resident use. Each building will contain a bicycle repair station. A bicycle wash station will be located near the main complex entrance (See submitted Parking Demand Analysis dated 9/30/21 for further details on related mitigation elements).

All utilities are available. City water, sewer and storm are in both Consolidation Ave. and/or Nevada St., both abutting the property. The project’s primary storm outfall will be via Nevada St., near the proposed bio cell treatment facility. Power, phone, cable and natural gas are all available via Consolidation and/or Nevada St. Adequate fire flow is available via an 8” main in Nevada St. and/or the 10” main in Consolidation Ave. Per City IQ, 70 PSI is available from the 10” main in Consolidation Ave.

Comprehensive Plan/Puget Neighborhood Plan:

The Bellingham Comprehensive Plan: Housing Chapter identifies goals and policies for new development. The CityView Development aligns with many of those goals:

- **Goal H-1**: Ensure that Bellingham has sufficient quantity and variety of housing types and densities to accommodate projected growth and promote other community use goals. *CityView will provide a unique housing choice that appeals to a variety of tenants. See Action Item 1; Residential Use.*
- **Policy H-3**: Encourage well-designed infill development on vacant land or underutilized properties.
*The large subject site is currently vacant and the development will bring needed infill within the popular Puget Neighborhood.

- **Goal H-2:** Foster housing that is safe, healthy, livable, and affordable for all income levels in all neighborhoods. *CityView will provide a safe, healthy, livable and affordable option. See RFI Response 22: Public Comment “Affordability” for details.*

- **Policy H-15:** Support fair and equal access to housing for all persons, regardless of race, religion, ethnic origin, age, household composition or size, disability, marital status, sexual orientation or economic circumstance. *CityView will be open to all qualified tenants under the Federal Fair and Equal Housing Act.*

- **Policy H-28:** Protect and connect residential neighborhoods to retain identity and character and provide amenities that enhance quality of life. *The Consolidation street improvements and the construction of the multi-modal trail to 46th St will connect residential neighborhoods within the Puget neighborhood. The addition of the trail will enhance the quality of life by providing additional recreational opportunity.*

- **Policy H-31:** Promote high-quality design that is compatible with the overall style and character of the established neighborhood. *CityView has been designed to achieve neighborhood compatibility per the Multifamily Design Review Handbook. See Action Item 10: Neighborhood Compatibility.*

- **Policy H-38:** Increase the open space requirements for multi-family development. *CityView will provide 1 acre of exterior common usable space as well as 3,000 SF of interior common usable space. In addition, over 50% of the site (5.42 acres) will remain in its natural vegetated state. See updated Site Plan and Aerial.*

The Puget Neighborhood Plan recognizes the value of preserving existing green space and the scenic character of steep hillside. The subject site is adjacent to the ‘Hawley Property’ on the northern site boundary. This Property is owned by the City and is an open space west of Puget St. and east of Nevada St. The northern 1/3 of the subject site will remain as green space, expanding the existing open space (see Aerial). CityView’s site disturbance area is limited to the western half of the site, while easterly hazardous slope areas remain undisturbed.

The Puget Neighborhood Plan identifies goals for development within the Neighborhood. CityView design reflects many of these goals:

- **Parks, Recreation & Open Space Goal 2(E):** Construction of a trail within the Consolidation Avenue right-of-way from Puget Street to Nevada Street. (F) Encourage Developers to provide neighborhood trail connectors to improve non-motorized transportation links as development occurs. *The proposal includes construction of a multi-modal trail between Nevada St. and 46th.*

- **Parks, Recreation & Open Space Goal 3:** The Puget Neighborhood should continue to use practices which protect and preserve the environment.
*Over 50% of the site will be remain undisturbed native vegetation. Environmentally sensitive areas of the site will be preserved and protected.

- **Utilities/Drainage Goal 1:** All water channels should be kept open and supporting water flow at all times. *There is existing drainage flow from Puget St. to Wetland B, this will remain undisturbed. Drainage outflow from a storm pond located above the south end of the site will be collected at 45th St. Please see updated Prelim. Stormwater Plan.*

- **Utilities/Drainage Goal 2:** All new developments should be constructed consistent with the recommendations of the Watershed Master Plan, the Stormwater Comprehensive plan and stormwater development standards. *See updated Preliminary Stormwater Plan.*

- **Drainage Policy A:** Any new major development should submit a drainage plan in conformance with the City’s storm water management code for approval by the Public Works Department. That plan should be implemented prior to, or concurrent with, development with the full cost of the plan being at the developer’s expense. *A Prelim. Stormwater Plan has been submitted and will be implemented concurrent with development at the developer’s expense.*

- **Drainage Policy B:** Storm sewers with run-off control should be installed at future development sites. *See updated Prelim Stormwater Plan.*

- **Drainage Policy C:** Creeks should be maintained for further protection of aquatic resources. *Adherence: The existing drainage outflow on the site will be protected and all appropriate wetland buffers will be observed. Please see updated Prelim. Stormwater Plan, updated Critical Areas Report.*

- **Transportation Goal 1:** Expand Puget Neighborhood Transportation options to more fully support pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel for mobility within the neighborhood. By improving Consolidation Ave to 45th, curb and sidewalk improvements will increase pedestrian mobility. These street improvements also provide easier access for future development of the south side of Consolidation Ave. between Nevada St. and 45th. Additionally, the multi-modal trail will connect via Consolidation Ave to 46th St., and ultimately to the Samish Crest Trail. The CityView complex will include 160 bicycle parking spaces, which will help to promote bicycles as an alternative mode of transit. Additional elements will be utilized to encourage bicycle use, including bike repair stations located in each building, a bicycle washing station located near the main entrance, and quarterly visits by a bicycle shop for convenient tenant maintenance (See Parking Demand Analysis dated 9/30/21 for details).

- **Transportation Policy 1:** Develop and promote safe, efficient and appealing access for all users as redevelopment occurs in the urban village (Lakeway/Lincoln area). Access for non-motorized traffic within any commercial, multi-use or multi-family development should be direct to destination, easily accessible and safe. *The creation of the multi-modal trail within the Consolidation ROW will provide a safe, direct and easily accessible route from Nevada St to 46th, with connection to the Samish Crest Trail.*

- **Transportation Policy 6:** Promote the construction of sidewalks where they would connect neighborhood residents to services, or high-frequency transit, separate foot and motorized traffic, and/or provide needed connectivity.
*Consolidation Ave. improvements from Nevada St. to 45th St. will provide increased connectivity. Additionally, the multi-modal trail will extend further to 46th St and existing neighborhood connectors.

- Transportation Policy 8: Identify and develop or improve pedestrian pathways in the undeveloped public rights-of-way (ROW) where they can improve pedestrian connectivity within long residential blocks. Provide low-impact surface mitigation that would improve rocky, narrow footpaths that can be muddy or slippery. Locations include Consolidation Avenue between Nevada St and 46th.

  *This trail will be completed per both City and Parks Department standards. See Prelim. Trail Plan*
Puget Neighborhood Plan, Area 17:

“This is a largely undeveloped area, which includes a new multi-family complex south of Whatcom Street, wetlands, hillsides and areas, which are relatively flat. The area is an ideal multiple housing area, being convenient to town, parks and commercial areas. Higher densities should be allowed on the level, dry areas, while the wetlands and steep areas should remain open. Water lines for development within this area must be carefully designed to provide adequate fire flow.”

Design review standards for Area 17, Puget Neighborhood are extremely limited. Therefore, we turn to the COB Multifamily Design Review Handbook for design guidance:

DESIGN REVIEW:

I. SITE DESIGN
A. Orientation
   Requirement: Orient buildings to public streets and open spaces in a way that corresponds to the site’s natural features and enhances the character of the street for pedestrians.
   Adherence to Guidelines: Due to the site topography, (15-20% west to east grade) any proposed buildings on this site must be elongated due north/south. The project includes two vehicle entrances and three pedestrian entrances at the front of the site (Consolidation Ave). Pedestrian routes allow easy access via minimally sloped sidewalks that do not go through any parking lots (ADA compliant). Both the pedestrian and vehicle entries will be lined with City approved street trees, to add color and interest. The western (main) entrance to the complex will be enhanced with a site sign, as well as additional lighting and landscaping.
   The site plan contains 3 buildings (A, B & C). Building B is adjacent to the large exterior common usable area. Both buildings A & B are oriented to this CUA. The main entrance to each building is centrally located on the east side, and clearly marked with special lighting and landscaping. Additional entrances are on the west side of each building, as well as stair towers at each end. All buildings have been oriented to the southwest to minimize shadow casting on adjacent properties. CityView’s large outdoor usable area (nearly 1 acre in size) is located along our western border. Please see updated Site Plan, updated Landscape Plan, Aerial and Rendering.

   Satisfies all Orientation Guidelines.

B. Neighborhood Connections
   Requirement: Provide functional pedestrian and vehicular connections to existing neighborhoods.
   Guidelines: CityView’s pedestrian connections to Consolidation Ave. allow a safe walking route the entire distance to Lincoln St. Our ‘loop system’ parking design, as well as sidewalks in each lot, provide connectivity throughout the complex. A total of 160 interior and exterior bicycle racks are conveniently
located near each building. In addition, bicycle repair stations, a bicycle wash station and two cargo bikes for tenant use are provided.

Three pedestrian routes from the complex are proposed to Consolidation Ave. These sidewalks connect all parking lots and buildings to the entrances. All walkways will be visible from the parking areas. Walkways through parking areas/drive lanes are minimized (exception: ADA routes to garbage/recycling facilities).

Consolidation Ave. is to be improved to ¾ city standard from Nevada St. to fully abut the 45th St. ROW. A pedestrian trail will provide safe multimodal connection from Nevada St./Consolidation Ave. to 46 St. and ultimately to the Samish Crest Trail. Please see updated Site Plan and updated Preliminary Trail Plan.

Satisfies all Neighborhood Connections Guidelines

C. Parking Location and Design

Requirement: Minimize the impact of parking facilities on the fronting street, sidewalk and neighboring properties by designing and locating parking lots, carports, and garages so that they do not dominate the street front.

Guidelines: The property fronts on Consolidation Avenue. No carports or garages are proposed. Surface parking areas have been broken up into six lots (A-F). No lot, except C & F, includes more than 8 contiguous stalls without a landscaping strip. All lots have been designed to ensure ease of pedestrian circulation to building entrances, site amenities, garbage & recycling enclosures and Consolidation Ave. Two vehicular points of ingress/egress are proposed via Consolidation, with one continuous looped lane around the buildings.

Lots A and B are located to the east of Buildings A and C, far from our westerly neighbors. Lot C has been pushed easterly. A large common area along our western border adds buffer. Building B shields Lot D from both our Nevada St. and Marionberry Ct. neighbors. All westerly facing stalls in lots C and E are headlight screened with a solid 4’ vinyl fence. Marionberry Ct. will be further screened with a dense replant along the northwest border of Lot F. Please see updated Site Plan dated 9/30/21, Aerial and Landscape Buffer Plan.

Satisfies all Parking Location and Design Guidelines

D. Clearing and Grading

Requirement: Preserve significant natural features whenever feasible and minimize changes to the natural topography.

Guidelines: The existing grade of the site is +/-15-20%. Parking lots and buildings are located to minimize cut/fill. +/-48.6% of the site will be left in open space. The steep slopes on the eastern boundary of the site will be untouched. The boundary between the site improvements and the western boundary will be minimally graded and cleared, with large stumps remaining. Please see updated Site Plan, updated Landscape Plan, updated Prelim Grading Plan, updated Tree Retention Plan and Aerial.
Satisfies all Clearing and Grading Guidelines

E. Fences and Walls Adjacent to Streets
Requirement: When using fences or walls, use designs and materials that will maintain a pedestrian scale along streets or public walkways.
Guidelines: No fences will be installed adjacent to any public street. Required retaining walls near Consolidation Ave. (project front) will be stamped/decorative if visible. The main entrance to the complex will be enhanced with a site sign, lighting, landscaping and street trees. Please see updated Site Plan, updated Landscape Plan and updated Rendering.

Satisfies all Fences and Walls Adjacent to Streets Guidelines

F. Open Space and Recreational Area
Requirement: Locate and design usable space to encourage its use for leisure or recreational activities.
Guidelines: The exterior common usable space has been relocated and re-designed as one large (+/- 40,600 SF) contiguous area on the southwest portion of the site. Recreational amenities added to this area include a walking/jogging trail, picnic tables and park benches. The interior common usable areas are centrally located within Building C, providing an additional 3,000 SF to Tenants/Guests. Please see Floor Levels.

Satisfies all Open Space and Recreational Area Guidelines

G. Mailboxes, Site Lighting and Bus Stops
Requirement: Locate and design functions such as mailboxes and bus stops to promote ease of use and safety. Provide lighting adequate for the function without creating excessive glare or light levels.
Guidelines: Keyed exterior/covered mail and package boxes are located conveniently throughout the complex. These locations to be approved by the U.S. Postal Service. Low intensity lighting is provided for entries, walkways, parking lots and trash enclosures. Parking lot lights are downward facing, no more than 18’ feet in height, and directed away from the sky, dwelling and neighboring development. Any flood lights will be shielded to reduce glare. Building lights to be mounted no higher than 10’ above ground level, and internally lighted translucent awnings will not be used. CityView will not be directly served by either WTA or any school bus. However, the project will be connected to a continuous sidewalk leading to Lincoln St., which is served by both WTA and Bellingham School District bus stops. Please see updated Site Plan, updated Landscape and Lighting Plan.

Satisfies all Mailbox, Site Lighting and Bus Stop Guidelines

H. Trash and Recycling Storage
Requirement: Provide adequate screening for trash and recycling facilities associated with multifamily developments.
Guidelines: 2 large trash/recycling areas are proposed within the project, both located away from Consolidation Ave. and the complex entrance. These areas are enclosed with durable, 6’ block walls on 3 sides. Two of these block walls are screened with landscaping. Walk-in access is designed to allow visibility into the area by Tenants approaching the entry. Design and location of both areas to be approved by SSC. Please see updated Site Plan.

Satisfies all Trash and Recycling Storage Guidelines

I. Landscape Design, Overall Project
   Requirement: Provide landscaping that is in scale with the buildings and spaces, and compliments the function of the space.
   Guidelines: Exposed concrete and/or block retaining walls shall be textured to provide visual interest. Terraced walls to be landscaped to add color and enhance appearance. Larger nursery stock will be used where feasible to provide quicker results.
   Areas of building modulation will be landscaped with low water consuming plants/shrubs. A large outdoor common area is provided and enhanced with a walking/jogging trail, picnic tables, and park benches to create a comfortable park-like feel. All main building entries will receive special plantings in conjunction with ample lighting to create a pleasant and safe corridor. Site disturbance is minimized at just 51.4%. A +/- 20 ft strip along a large portion of our western boundary will be densely replanted. Street trees will be added along our Consolidation Ave. frontage to create a welcoming entrance to the complex. Wherever feasible, plants/trees/shrubs requiring low amounts of water, chemicals and fertilizers will be used. Trees and shrubs planted near windows or patios/porches will be sized to avoid blocking ingress/egress or impeding views. Finally, all buildings are abundantly landscaped at ground level. Please see updated Site Plan, updated Landscape Plan, Landscape Buffer Plan and Rendering.

Satisfies all Landscape Design, Overall Project Guidelines

J. Landscape Design, Parking Areas
   Requirement: Use landscaping to help define, break up, and screen parking areas.
   Guidelines: Canopy trees with shrubs/ground cover to be installed within parking areas, minimum 1 tree per 8 stalls (only exception is lots C & F, see site plan). Landscaping will add privacy and screening to our Nevada St./Marionberry Ct. neighbors. Wheel stops, curbs and walkways are designed to protect landscaping from vehicles. Landscaping is provided between buildings, sidewalks and parking areas to create a natural transition between uses. Please see updated Site Plan dated 9/30/21, updated Landscape Plan, Landscape Buffer Plan and Rendering.

Satisfies all Landscape Design, Parking Area Guidelines
K. Signs
Requirement: Minimize the amount of signage needed to identify the multi-family development.
Guidelines: One site sign, lit with indirect lighting, is to be located at the main entrance of the complex. Sign design compliments the building style, via the use of similar architectural details. The maximum size of the sign is 8’x 12’, making it easy to read but within proper scale to the complex/buildings. Please see updated Site Plan and updated Landscape Plan.
Satisfies all Sign Guidelines

L. Sidewalk Design
Requirement: Design sidewalks to be consistent with the existing or proposed street design for the subject area.
Guidelines: Consolidation Ave. will be improved to ¾ City standard to fully abut the 45th St. ROW. Curb, gutter, sidewalk and street trees will be installed to City standard. The new sidewalk along Cityview’s frontage will connect to the existing sidewalk at Consolidation Ave./Nevada St. Please see updated Site Plan and updated Prelim Engineer Plan.
Satisfies all Sidewalk Design Guidelines

M. Site Drainage
Requirement: When open storm water facilities are proposed to be located on the site, minimize negative impacts on natural site features and incorporate them into the overall landscape scheme.
Guidelines: No open storm water facilities are proposed. A stormwater vault will be located under parking lot D. Stormwater will be treated via a stormwater treatment bio-cell located at the low point of the site, within the westerly buffer area. Stormwater runoff from the Consolidation Ave. street improvements will be collected and treated separately. Please see updated Site Plan, updated Prelim Engineering Plan and Prelim Stormwater Plan.
Satisfies all Site Drainage Guidelines
II. BUILDING DESIGN

A. Neighborhood Scale
   Requirement: The scale of those portions of the building facing an existing developed neighborhood shall conform to the scale established in the neighborhood or the scale identified for the district.

Satisfies all Neighborhood Scale Guidelines

B. Neighborhood Compatibility
   Requirement: New buildings should reflect some of the architectural character of the surrounding buildings when locating in a neighborhood where the existing context is well defined.

Satisfies all Neighborhood Compatibility Guidelines

C. Privacy
   Requirement: Orient buildings to provide for privacy, to the extent practical, both within the project and for adjacent residential uses.
   Guidelines: Building A is 2.5 stories. It is set back +/-160’ (mid-point average) from Cityview’s westerly boundary. Building B is identical to Building A, it is set back +/-90’ (mid-point average) from Cityview’s westerly boundary. Building C is set back +/-240’ (midpoint average) from Cityview’s westerly boundary. Building C lies to the east of the smaller Building B. Building B is designed and located to transition from the westerly single-family homes. A densely forested re-plant, is strategically placed along a large portion of the site’s westerly border, adding privacy and separation. No decks are proposed. To maximize privacy for adjacent westerly homes, upper floor units are designed with a 6’ slider protected by a 42” railing (Juliet balcony). Tenants will have access to plenty of fresh air, while minimizing impact to neighbors’ privacy. Finally, windows within the complex are placed so that Tenants cannot look directly into adjacent units. Please see updated Site Plan, updated Landscape Plan, Landscape Buffer Plan and Rendering.

Satisfies all Privacy Guidelines

D. Façade and Articulation
   Requirement: Use architectural features that break up blank, flat walls and roofs and give the building a human scale.
   Please see updated Site Plan and Rendering.
Satisfies all Façade and Articulation Guidelines

E. Windows

Requirement: Provide articulation of the building façade by using well-proportioned and spaced windows.

Guidelines: Each upper floor unit contains a 6’ slider in the living room, protected by a 42” railing. The exterior lines created by these Juliet balconies add attractive vertical proportion to the building façades. All bedrooms contain at least one 3’x5’ single hung window, adding vertical lines, as well as a typical residential appearance. Windows have been added to the north and south walls of each building, as well as the east and west facades. In addition, large windows have been added to each building’s central core. The overall wall to window ratio is designed to reflect what is customarily seen in Pacific Northwest style residential buildings. Please see Rendering.

Satisfies all Window Guidelines

F. Building Foundations

Requirement: Design a building foundation to blend visually with the site.

Guidelines: All building foundations are designed to blend visually with the site. This is achieved by minimizing exposure via backfill and landscaping. An array of siding styles and/or stamped concrete are proposed to blend landscaping with the building. A 2’-3’ stone veneer base adds architectural interest. Finally, any foundation areas where +/-2 feet are exposed, proper spacing and species of landscaping will be used for cover. Please see Rendering and updated Landscape Plan.

Satisfies all Building Foundation Guidelines

G. Entries

Requirement: Clearly define the main entrance of the building, orient it to a pedestrian walkway and enhance safety through lighting and visibility.

Guidelines: The main entrances are centrally located on the east side of each building. They are defined by directional signage, large covered areas, and ample walkways leading to each entrance. These entrances are well lit, lined by landscaping, and clearly visible from the adjacent parking lots and drive lanes. The basement floor entrances are centrally located on the west side of each building. These entrances are also clearly defined, with sidewalks leading to doorways. Directional lighting (downward facing) helps guide tenants and guests. Two additional secure entries are located on the north and south stair towers of each building. Again, non-invasive lighting and clear pathways lead to these additional points of pedestrian ingress/egress. Please see updated Site Plan, updated Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan and Rendering.

Satisfies all Entry Guidelines
H. Building Materials
   Requirement: Use durable exterior finish materials that provide visual detail, reduce the perceived scale of the building through texture or pattern and appear similar to those used in the neighborhood.
   Guidelines: 2 different types of durable vinyl siding are proposed: horizontal (6”-7” reveal) and vertical. An array of siding colors will be used, and the basement level will feature 2’-3’ of stone veneer. These various siding components, in addition to multiple colors and stone veneer, add a ‘Pacific Northwest’ style. This design is similar to the existing neighborhood and helps reduce the perceived scale of the buildings (See RFI Response 9: Neighborhood Scale for a detailed response). Please see Rendering.

Satisfies all Building Materials Guidelines

I. Garages and Accessory Buildings
   Requirement: Design garages and carports in a way that does not dominate the streetscape or obscure building entries. Accessory buildings shall be subordinate in scale to the main buildings.
   Guidelines: No garages or carports are proposed. Please see updated Site Plan.

Satisfies all Garage and Accessory Building Guidelines

*****************************************************************************

Per the Request for Information dated 7/6/2020, demonstrating compliance with the applicable regulations of the Bellingham Municipal Code (BMC) was requested. Each of the 3 BMC’s are included below, with details regarding CityView code compliance.
BMC 20.38.020 Purpose and intent.

A. Generally. The planned use qualifier is intended for areas which are adaptable to flexible development and/or where review of pending development proposals is necessary to ensure that adequate provisions are taken to minimize possible detrimental effects. The “planned” use qualifier is intended to provide a procedural framework which:

1. Permits diversity in the location of types of structures;

   Cityview will provide housing diversity within the neighborhood of single-family homes and mid-rise multi-family units. The complex has 2 smaller buildings (2.5 stories, 20 units) and 1 larger building (5.5 stories, 66 units).

2. Promotes the efficient use of land by facilitating a more economic arrangement of buildings, circulation systems, land use and utilities;

   The site has been designed to facilitate both vehicular and pedestrian travel within the complex. The parking lots are broken up and arranged in a loop system. Sidewalks from each building connect to Consolidation Ave for pedestrian access. See updated Site Plan and Aerial.

3. Preserves to the greatest extent possible the existing landscape features and amenities and utilizes such features in a harmonious fashion;

   The site design leaves 5.42 acres of the 11.15 acre site as undisturbed greenspace, preserving over 50% of the existing landscape features. See updated Site Plan, Tree Retention Plan/Map and Aerial.

4. Addresses site-specific opportunities and concerns;

   Site specific opportunities include:
   - The large 11.15 acre site allows increased setbacks, especially along the site’s westerly border.
   - The large site also allows for a tree retention plan that leaves 5.42 acres as native forest.
   - Construction of a multi-modal trail from Consolidation Ave to 46th St.
   - The ability to provide a large exterior Common Usable Area/Re-plant Buffer of +/- 1 acre.

   Site specific concerns include:
   - Two existing wetlands ‘A and B’. Both will remain undisturbed and buffered.
   - The steep slopes on the eastern site boundary, which will remain undisturbed.
   - Privacy for Cityview’s Nevada St. and Marionberry Ct neighbors. This is addressed through increased setbacks, a +/-1 acre buffer and a thick re-plant on the western boundary.

5. Lessens development impacts to adjacent areas through site design and necessary mitigating measures.

   The site design strives to minimize and mitigate impacts on neighboring properties. Specific strategies include increased building setbacks, a thick re-plant buffer along the western site boundary, strategic placement of a 2.5
story transition ‘Building B’, as well as the retention of +/-5.42 acres of undisturbed native vegetation. See updated Site Plan, updated Landscape Plan, Landscape Buffer Plan and Tree Retention Plan/Map.

B. Residential Multi. In addition to the above-stated general purpose, the planned residential designation (PR) is intended to provide flexibility in site and building design for a harmonious variety of housing choices, including manufactured homes, within an environment where more usable open space or recreational opportunities are possible beyond that which could be provided within the scope of conventional regulation.

The CityView site is 11.15 acres, which allows the project to provide abundant usable and open space. 48.6% of the site will remain as native vegetation. +/- 1 acre of exterior usable space will be minimally graded, with large stumps remaining to retain the native understory. The construction of a multi-modal trail from Consolidation Ave to 46th St. provides recreational opportunities.

C. Commercial. In addition to the above-stated general purpose, the planned commercial designation (PC) is intended to accommodate retail and personal service establishments of a citywide nature or regional nature and to provide flexible design standards which will ensure compatibility between the site and the development, as well as between the development and the surrounding area.

N/A

D. Industrial. In addition to the above-stated general purpose, planned industrial (PI) designation is intended to accommodate certain industrial uses in areas where special consideration and sensitivity must be taken for physical site conditions and their relationship to less intense surrounding uses.

N/A

E. Areas Not Designated Planned. An application may be brought for any area designated residential, commercial or industrial to have its land use designation changed to a planned use qualifier concurrently with submittal of an application for planned development pursuant to BMC 20.38.040. [Ord. 9490 § 2, 1985; Ord. 9024, 1982].

N/A
BMC 20.38.040 Procedures

A. Planned development applications shall follow the procedures in Chapter 21.10 BMC.

B. Decision/Planned Development Contract.

1. The decision shall address all development aspects necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare including, but not limited to, the following:

a. Appropriate permitted uses and/or special conditions on the uses.

   The site is zoned multi-family, planned. The CityView proposal is an appropriate permitted use within the zoning classification.

b. Height restrictions on structures.

   No structure exceeding 35 feet under height definition No. 1, lies within 200 feet of the site plan boundary. Building C, at 65 feet under height definition No. 1, lies outside of this height restriction boundary.

c. Yard requirements.

   All setbacks exceed the Residential Planned Minimum Yards, especially along the westerly border (Nevada St./Marionberry Ct.). Building A is setback 160-190 feet, Building B is setback 67-130 feet and Building C is setback 200-250 feet.

d. Sign regulations.

   Per the Design Review Handbook, the amount of signage needed to identify a multi-family development should be minimized. There will be one low monument sign, lit with indirect lighting, located at the main entrance of the complex. The maximum size of the sign will be 8’x12’, making it easy to read, but within proper scale to the complex/buildings.

e. Street, utility and other public improvements both adjacent to the site and off site, which may be necessary as a result of the proposal.

   Consolidation Ave. will be improved to ¾ City standard to fully abut the 45th St. ROW. Curb, gutter, sidewalk and street trees will be installed to City standard. All utilities are available. City water, sewer and storm are in both Consolidation Ave. and/or Nevada St., both abutting the property. Power, phone, cable and natural gas are all available via Consolidation and/or Nevada St.

f. An exhibit specifying building area, parking area, curb cut locations, buffer areas if necessary, or any other feature or requirement which may need to be graphically depicted.
See included updated Site Plan, updated Prelim Engineering Plan, updated Tree Retention Map, updated Grading Plan, updated Trail Plan and Landscape Buffer Plan.

**BMC 20.38.050 Standards**

**A. Generally.**

1. All planned applications submitted shall be in conformance with the minimum standards herein specified. These are minimum standards and may be increased for a particular planned proposal where more stringent standards are necessary to protect neighboring properties, conform with existing development in the area, preserve natural resources or sensitive environments, provide for orderly development or conform with the comprehensive plan.

   CityView exceeds all minimum standards herein specified. It is recognized that due to CityView’s proximity to existing single-family homes (of which most were built on multi-family zoned property), more stringent standards are necessary to minimize and mitigate impacts to these neighbors. It is also recognized that conforming a multi-family zoned project to single-family homes built on the same zoning presents multiple challenges for all affected parties – the City, the neighbors and the property owner/developer. In light of this inherent problem, multiple steps have been taken to exceed minimum standards. Notable: 50% of the site left as native forest; standard setbacks greatly exceeded along the westerly border; a thick buffer replant located along the same property line; a 2.5 story transition building ‘B’ placed strategically to buffer CityView’s westerly neighbors, and a +/-1 acre usable area placed near the rear yards of Nevada St. neighbors in lieu of an additional 20 unit, 2.5 story structure. Many more steps have been taken to minimize and mitigate impacts to the existing neighborhood. These are outlined in all RFI Action Item answers, the project narrative, and both Comp Plan and BMC conformity answers.

2. Any exceptions to these standards must be approved by the hearing examiner only after written submittal by the applicant detailing the reasons why the standards cannot be met. Grounds for exceptions shall be limited to those justifications for variances contained within Chapter 20.18 BMC. Exceptions to the comprehensive plan in regards to use and residential density designations shall not in any instance be granted by the planning director unless upon proper change of land use classification petition and procedure.

   No exceptions to these standards have been requested. No setback or height variances are requested.

3. All planned developments must conform additionally to any more stringent minimum standards provided within the applicable neighborhood plan.

   Please see the Narrative, pages 3 and 4 ‘Puget Neighborhood Goals’.

4. There shall be no minimum or maximum property size restrictions for planned proposals. However, in order to simplify and coordinate planning efforts, it is recommended that planned commercial or industrial proposals should be at least four acres in size. Planned commercial or industrial proposals on less than four acres should only be permitted when surrounded by streets or major environmental barriers or by a demonstrated inability to obtain cooperation of adjacent property owners. Regardless of the size, the standards herein or the intent of the standard shall be satisfied to the fullest extent possible.
CityView’s site is 11.15 acres. This relatively large property size allows the opportunity to provide greater setbacks, more usable space, and retention of 50% of the site as native forest.

5. Special Conditions.

a. Special Districts. The following terms identified as special conditions in the land use classification system refer to overlay zones or additional regulations which may be applicable to a land use area where the term appears:

i. “Shoreline.”

ii. “Flood.”

iii. “View.”

iv. “Clearing.”

Where no ordinance covering one of the above terms has been passed or shoreline master plan has been approved by the city, these terms shall not be applicable. In areas where one of the following terms are stated in the land use classification system, compliance with the provisions of the respective regulation will be required pursuant to the terms of that program or ordinance:

N/A. No ordinance covering one of the above terms applies. However, CityView complies with BMC 20.38.050(B)(4), height restriction boundary.

b. Special Concerns. The remaining words identified as special conditions in the land use classification system are special concerns which are site-specific in nature. The designation of a special concern in an area will not result in any requirements being imposed on development proposals in that area pursuant to this title other than those which require discretionary permits. Rather, these special concerns identify problems which may form the basis of conditions to be attached to a development proposal pursuant to discretionary approval under this title (variance, conditional use, or approval pursuant to the planned or institutional development regulations), subdivision approval (long plat), or the State Environmental Policy Act (Chapter 43.21C RCW as implemented by city Ordinance No. 8515, as amended).

Any conditions attached to the discretionary approval of a project pursuant to this section shall be based upon the special concern as explained by language (if any) contained in either the introductory paragraph to the area classification system or in the preceding text as well as the goals of the comprehensive plan and shall be attached only to satisfy the appropriate standards for issuance of such approval; provided, that any conditions to proposals which are based upon such special concerns shall be formulated so as to allow the reasonable use of property for a purpose to which it is suitably adapted.

6. Prerequisite Considerations.

a. Purpose. Prerequisite considerations are enumerated in the neighborhood plan land use classification system of the comprehensive plan in order to prevent the overcrowding of land in relation to the existing provision of essential services, to lessen congestion of streets, to provide for orderly and coordinated development, to conserve and restore
natural beauty and other natural resources and facilitate provision of adequate transportation, water, sewerage, and other public services.

b. Effect.

i. Prerequisite considerations are items which shall be addressed by the responsible official in conjunction with any proposal not exempt from the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) or by the decision-making body in regard to those projects which require discretionary approval.

ii. Any conditions attached to discretionary approval of a project pursuant to this section shall be based upon the prerequisite consideration as explained by language (if any) contained in either the introductory paragraph to the area classification system or in the preceding text of the neighborhood plan, as well as the goals of the comprehensive plan.

iii. Conditions based upon prerequisite considerations shall be formulated to correspond to the degree of impact which the specific development proposal is anticipated to have upon the situation giving rise to the prerequisite consideration; provided, that conditions to proposals which are based upon such prerequisite considerations shall be formulated so as to allow the reasonable use of property for a purpose to which it is suitably adapted.

iv. In the event a mechanism exists which will ensure that a prerequisite consideration will be satisfied at an appropriate time, the responsible official or decision-making body may approve the development proposal conditioned upon such future performance. Where the responsible official or decision-making body decides that the prerequisite consideration is inapplicable to a development proposal and attaches no corresponding condition, the rationale for such decision shall be specifically set out in findings of fact.

c. The city of Bellingham shall adopt a capital improvement plan which shall address specifically the prerequisite considerations delineated in the Bellingham plan and include a priority within which the developmental problems recognized by the prerequisite considerations should be resolved.

B. Planned Residential.

1. For all land designated residential, the following standards shall apply.

2. Range of Uses Possible. Any of the following uses may be permitted in a planned proposal within a residential general use type designation; provided, that any of such uses shall not be permitted where prohibited within the applicable neighborhood plan. Certain uses may also be excluded from a particular planned residential area if such use(s) are found by the planning director to be incompatible with the surrounding area or unsuitable to the particular site. The final decision shall set forth the uses permitted for the subject property.

a. Single-family dwellings.

b. Duplexes.

c. Multifamily dwelling units.
d. Manufactured home parks.

e. Short-term rentals, per BMC 20.10.037.

f. Private or public parks, playgrounds, trails, private recreational facilities, recreational vehicular storage areas and open space restricted to usage by the occupants within the planned area.

g. Mixed use if specifically listed in the neighborhood land use plan.

h. Public utilities located in a public right-of-way or easement.

i. Any conditional use permitted in the residential multi designation, Chapter 20.32 BMC.

j. Attached accessory dwelling unit (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.036).

k. Detached accessory dwelling unit (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.036).

l. Confidential shelters subject to the provisions of BMC 20.10.047.

m. Wireless communication facilities, subject to the provisions of Chapter 20.13 BMC.

n. Co-housing, subject to the standards of BMC 20.10.048. The planned development process of this chapter shall apply.

o. Community public facilities, other than publicly owned parks, trails and playgrounds, subject to consideration of the factors in BMC 20.16.020(K)(4)(c).

p. Certain temporary shelters, per Chapter 20.15 BMC.

q. Certain interim housing, per Chapter 20.15A BMC.

3. Density.

a. For planned projects within a residential general use type, the maximum number of units possible shall be determined by dividing the size of the subject property by the area density designated in the applicable subarea of the zoning table pursuant to Chapter 20.00 BMC. This resulting figure represents the maximum number of units possible and cannot be exceeded without obtaining a density bonus or having the density designation of the area changed by city council. Partial units shall not be counted as a full unit. For example, a figure of 34.3 units possible shall result in a maximum of 34 units allowable.

Please see RFI Response dated 3/12/21, Action Item 12 for density clarification.

b. For planned projects within a residential general use type which have no density specified in Chapter 20.00 BMC, Zoning Tables, the number of allowable units shall be determined by the director and specified within the final decision.

c. Density Bonus. As stipulated in Chapter 20.00 BMC, Zoning Tables, a density bonus may be obtained for a multifamily development proposal that has not previously been granted a density bonus under a different development proposal. A density bonus shall not establish a density greater than the maximum specified density of the applicable subarea.
Please See RFI Response dated 3/12/21, Action Item 12.

A decision to allow a density bonus shall be based on the benefit and quality of the features offered to obtain a bonus and determined to provide project elements that are in addition to the minimum development aspects listed in BMC 20.38.040(B) and this section. The director may impose conditions to ensure that an approved bonus results in a public benefit.

A density bonus may be obtained up to the amounts listed below:

i. Up to a 50 percent bonus for the purchase and transfer of all or part of the development rights of a parcel identified as meeting any of the following criteria:

(A) A parcel, tract or land area declared as a suitable density donor by city council resolution.

(B) A parcel with a valid planned development permit which provides for a development right transfer.

(C) A parcel previously zoned for residential uses that, due to the adoption of subsequent governmental regulations and as determined by city council resolution, is unlikely to achieve even 50 percent of the original allowable density, resulting in the loss of the city’s potential infill capacity.

ii. Up to a 50 percent bonus when a project is able to provide at least one-half of the total unit count of the project as affordable housing, as defined by the city council resolution, inclusive of a provision to maintain said housing as such for a reasonable duration determined by city council.

iii. Up to a 50 percent bonus for the redevelopment of an area considered in need of revitalization as declared by city council resolution.

iv. Up to a 25 percent bonus for the development of a neighborhood park and related improvements identified in the comprehensive plan or that satisfies the needs of the immediate neighborhood as determined by the director.

v. Up to a 15 percent bonus for providing at least 15 percent additional open space that is not otherwise restricted from development by environmental regulations.

vi. Up to a 15 percent bonus for restoring a degraded natural area that would not otherwise require restoration or enhancement through a planned development or critical areas permit, which would provide significant public enjoyment if enhanced.

vii. Up to a 10 percent bonus for providing enhanced perimeter buffering of adjacent, less compatible uses.

4. Building Height.

a. No structure shall exceed 35 feet under BMC 20.08.020, height definition No. 1, when within 200 feet of the site plan boundary lying adjacent to any residential general use type area not designated planned.

Building A (2.5 stories, less than 35’ height) is within the 200 foot site plan boundary. Buildings B (2.5 stories, less than 35’ height) and C (5.5 stories, 65’ height) are located outside of this site plan boundary. See updated Site Plan and Site Sections.
b. Except for the limitation above, there is no expressed general height standard for the remainder of the property. Final height standards shall be determined by the planning director.

5. **Open Space.**

a. A minimum of 25 percent of the total site area shall be left as open space; except that a minimum of 10 percent of the total site area shall be left as an open space for an office use allowed in mixed areas having a residential density equal to or denser than 1,500 square feet per unit; or

48.6% of the site is being left as native forest. In addition, a +/- 1 acre exterior common usable area is located along the site’s western border (Nevada St./Marionberry Ct.). See updated Site Plan, Rendering, Aerial and Landscape Buffer Plan.

b. Achieve a green area factor (green factor) score of 0.6 in accordance with BMC 20.12.030(E).

c. Landscape-based LID BMPs may count toward open space requirements.

6. **Usable Space.** Usable space in an amount equal to that required for a proposal the same number of units under BMC 20.32.040(F) shall be required. Active recreational facilities may replace usable space requirements if approved by the planning and community development director.

26,500 SF of usable space is required per BMC 20.32.040(F) – 106 units x 250 SF per unit = 26,500 SF. A large (+/- 1 acre) exterior common area/trail is located between the site improvements and the western site boundary. This area will be minimally graded with large stumps and native understory retained. A loop system walking/jogging trail, picnic tables and benches will be added. 3,000 SF of interior usable space is spread throughout the 3 buildings, bringing the total usable space provided to 43,600 SF. Please see updated Site Plan, Rendering & Aerial.

7. **Yards.**

a. Planned development proposals shall meet the following building setbacks as shown in Table 20.38.050(A) – Residential Planned Minimum Yards:

All minimum setbacks have been met and/or greatly exceeded, especially along the site’s western boundary (Nevada St./Marionberry Ct.). Please see updated Site Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yards</th>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front and Side Yard</td>
<td>40 feet CL</td>
<td>Setback measured from the centerline (CL) of the street right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback on a Flanking</td>
<td>50 feet CL – if a designated street arterial</td>
<td>Setback measured from the property line (PL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>20 feet PL – Property line(s) abutting a residential single zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side and Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 feet PL, plus five feet for every 10 feet or fraction thereof over 35 feet in height</td>
<td>Setback measured from the property line (PL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 feet PL – Property line(s) abutting a residential single zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

1. Only those portions of the building that exceed a height of 35 feet must meet the additional setback measured from the property line to the subject building wall.

b. **Exception.** Permitted yard encroachments identified in BMC 20.10.080(B) may extend into a standard required yard; provided, that the encroachments meet the adopted building codes and minimum vision clearance triangle on a corner lot.

   No encroachments are proposed.

8. **Parking.**

   a. Proposals for planned development shall satisfy all parking regulations for similar uses contained in Chapter 20.12 BMC.

   All parking regulations per BMC 20.12 have been exceeded by 21%. 212 parking spaces are required (106 units x 2 stalls required per unit = 212 stalls). 249 parking spaces have been provided on site, with 8 additional parallel parking spaces provided via the Consolidation Ave. improvements. Total parking provided = 257.  See updated Site Plan dated 9/30/21 and Prelim Engineering Plans/Consolidation Ave. street improvements. Also see Parking Demand Analysis dated 9/30/21 for parking mitigation elements.

   b. No parking area shall extend within 15 feet of any property line abutting a residential single zone.
No parking areas extend within 15 feet of any property line abutting a residential single zone. See updated Site Plan.

c. General “parking areas” shall be illustrated on the planned proposal site plan. Final detailed parking plans shall be submitted for approval at time of building permit application. If at such time the planning director determines that there is insufficient space within the area to meet parking requirements, contained in Chapter 20.12 BMC, areas designated as building areas may be used, the project may be reduced in size or density so that such parking requirements are met and/or the applicant may apply to the planning director for a modification of the site plan exhibit pursuant to procedure set out in BMC 20.38.040.

All proposed parking areas are detailed. See updated Site Plan dated 9/30/21 and Prelim Engineering Plan/Consolidation Avenue street improvements. Also see Parking Demand Analysis dated 9/30/21 for parking mitigation elements.

9. Landscaping. Proposals for planned development shall satisfy all landscaping requirements for similar uses contained in BMC 20.12.030 (see also subsection (B)(11) of this section on environment), except as follows:

The yard area between a parking facility and any street shall be landscaped and include an evergreen hedge. Hedge plantings shall be spaced not more than two feet on center and designed to be maintained at a height of at least two and one-half feet and not more than three feet in height. A screen is not required along a street if the adjacent zone is of a different general use type.

All landscaping requirements per BMC 20.12.030 have been met. See updated Landscaping Plan and Landscape Buffer Plan.

10. Signs. One sign, which may be indirectly lighted, may be located near the main entrance roads on private property. Such sign shall not exceed 50 square feet in area. Message shall be limited to the name of the planned project only.

One, indirectly lit, monument sign will be located near the main entrance on Consolidation Ave. The maximum size will be 8x12, in proportion to the buildings. Message shall be limited to the name of the project only.

11. Environment. Existing drainage courses of significance (as identified in the goals and policies document of the comprehensive plan), topography, significant treed areas and other natural features should be saved, preserved and enhanced to the greatest extent possible consistent with reasonable and appropriate use of the subject site.

Existing drainage courses, as well as the two identified wetlands A and B will be preserved and buffered. Hazardous slope areas will be avoided. +/-50% of the 11.15-acre site will remain native forest. A thick buffer re-plant will be added along the site’s westerly border. See updated Critical Areas Report, full Geotechnical Report, updated Tree Retention Map/Plan, updated Site Plan, updated Prelim Storm Report and Landscape Buffer Plan.

12. Comprehensive Plan Elements. Planned project proposals should be designed in close coordination with the city of Bellingham’s comprehensive plan.

Please see updated Narrative, pages 2-4 for comprehensive and neighborhood plan consistency.

a. Streets and utilities should be designed to fulfill reasonably anticipated future need and be located to enable the continued orderly and reasonable use of adjacent property. Streets and utilities should be extended to the property line unless it is clearly demonstrated that the extension will not be needed for development of adjacent property.

Consolidation Avenue will be improved to ¾ city standard to 45th St. City water, sewer and storm abut the property via Consolidation Avenue. See updated Prelim Engineering Plan/ and updated Prelim. Stormwater Plan.

b. Dedicated width of rights-of-way shall comply with minimum city requirements.

The City required 30/ ROW dedication along the project’s Consolidation Avenue frontage has been provided. See updated Site Plan.

c. Streets should be improved to the standard required by Ordinance No. 8027 unless a standard is specified in the circulation plan of the comprehensive plan; provided, that the planning director may approve streets which are consistent with neighborhood standards.

Consolidation Ave. to be improved to 45th St to ¾ standard, as specified in the circulation plan of the comprehensive plan. See updated Site Plan, Prelim Engineering Plan/Consolidation Ave. street improvements.

d. Pedestrian Circulation. Unless waived for reasons of infeasibility or impracticality by the technical review committee and the planned contract, the following shall be required:

i. A sidewalk shall be constructed within all abutting city street rights-of-way. A local improvement district (LID) commitment may be required in lieu of construction if the city determines immediate construction is not warranted.

A sidewalk will be provided in the Consolidation Ave. ROW along the site’s frontage to 45th St. See updated Site Plan, Prelim Engineering Plan/Consolidation Ave. street improvements.

ii. Walkways shall be required linking building entrances to parking areas, sidewalks and other building entrances in the complex and, where appropriate, to open space/recreation areas. If no sidewalk is constructed or exists, the connecting walkway shall extend to the proposed location of a sidewalk or to the edge of the pavement located in the right-of-way.

Sidewalks connect all buildings and parking lots to the building entrances, common usable spaces and to the Consolidation Ave ROW. Please see updated Site Plan.

e. A planned development proposal shall comply with city ordinance related to curb cuts and arterial streets access.

See updated Site Plan and Prelim Engineering Plan/Consolidation Ave. street improvements.

f. Dedication of public streets, easements, or park (or other) open space may be required.

14. Other Codes. Other codes may have to be followed such as the subdivision code, binding site plan ordinance or mobile home ordinance. Dedication documents may have to be filed at the auditor’s office.
15. *Homeowners’ Associations.* If the applicant intends to deed any open space or recreational facilities to a homeowners’ association, then the applicant shall submit with the planned proposal application a declaration of covenants and restrictions that will govern such association.

The remainder of BMC 20.38.050 applies to Planned Industrial and is not applicable to this multi-family project.
March 12, 2021

Attn: Kathy Bell, Senior Planner
City of Bellingham
Planning and Community Development Department
210 Lottie St, Bellingham, WA 98225

Project location: 4413 Consolidation Avenue/Area 17

Kathy,

Enclosed please find additional, revised and updated documents per the Notice of Incomplete Application and Request for Information issued July 6, 2020. Per the most recent granted extension, the due date for these materials is April 2, 2021.

Each RFI Action Item has been addressed, and any documents from the prior submittal requiring modification are included.

Please note: We are requesting the OPTION to build this project in 2 phases. The initial phase would include Buildings A and B, along with all required street/trail improvements, site/storm infrastructure, fire lane access road, exterior common area, retaining walls, landscape buffers, and tree plan. Phase 1 would also include the foundation/slab work for Building C and completion of Lots C, D, E & F. Parking lots A and B would remain graded only, to be used as the construction entrance/exit for Phase 2. Phase 2 includes the completion of Building C as well as landscaping adjacent to Building C.

Sincerely,

Morgan

Morgan Bartlett, Jr
Director
Madrona Bay Real Estate Investments, LLC
CityView Apartments: Applicant response to Notice of Incomplete Application and Request for Information dated July 6th, 2020

All documents crossed out were revised and resubmitted with September 2021 submittal
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Date of Notice: July 6, 2020

Date of Notice of Complete Application: 3/9/2020

Project Location: 4413 Consolidation Avenue / Area 17, Puget Neighborhood; Residential-Multi, Planned with a 5,000 sf/unit overall density requirement.

Applicant: Morgan Bartlett, Jr.; 424 W Bakerview Road, Ste. 109, Bellingham WA 98226; (360)527-2777

Property Owner: Irving H Jr & Joan F Hawley TR; PO Box 29270, Bellingham, WA 98228-1720

Application Type: Planned development (PDP2019-0015)/Design review (DR2019-0036)/Critical area permit (CAP2019-0037)/SEPA checklist (SEP2019-0039)

The Planning and Community Development Department (PCDD) has reviewed the application(s) referenced above. It has been determined that these application(s) do not supply sufficient information to prepare a SEPA threshold determination, technical analysis for Planning Commission review and permit decision compliant with applicable regulations of the Bellingham Municipal Code (BMC) and Comprehensive Plan.

BMC 20.38.020 (A) states the planned use qualifier is intended for areas where review of pending development proposals is necessary to ensure that adequate provisions are taken to minimize possible detrimental effects and to provide a procedural framework which:

1. Permits diversity in the location of types of structures;
2. Promotes the efficient use of land by facilitating a more economic arrangement of buildings, circulation systems, land use and utilities;
3. Preserves to the greatest extent possible the existing landscape features and amenities and utilizes such features in a harmonious fashion;
4. Addresses site-specific opportunities and concerns;
5. Lessens development impacts to adjacent areas through site design and necessary mitigating measures.

BMC 20.38.040 (B) provides development aspects that must be, at a minimum, included in a permit decision, including a determination whether the proposed use is appropriate, height, yards, signs and infrastructure to ensure the proposal protects the public health, safety and welfare and authorizes the permit to be conditioned to ensure compatibility with the city’s adopted code and policy documents and to mitigate direct impacts resulting from the proposal.

BMC 20.28.050 (A) states that the code provisions of the planned development chapter are minimums and may be increased for a particular proposal where more stringent standards are necessary to protect neighboring properties, conform with existing development in the area, preserve natural resources or sensitive environments, provide for orderly development or conform with the comprehensive plan.

With all land use applications, it is the applicant’s burden to demonstrate how a proposal meets code and addresses public concerns. It is strongly recommended that all responses provided to the information below take into consideration how the proposal, including any new information, addresses the specific code references above.
**Required Actions:**
To continue review of the above application(s), please submit the following information electronically to the city of Bellingham via permits@cob.org and copy kbell@cob.org:

**Residential Use**
Although not explicitly stated in the application materials, the proposed units are arranged in a layout consistent with the national trend for purpose built student housing and by its design, the units are likely to be rented by three persons not living in a traditional family unit. Adopted city codes and policy documents are based on the assumption that residential dwelling units will consist of households containing the historic, traditional family unit. The application materials do not provide sufficient information for the city to evaluate if the proposed use is appropriate or if the impacts from this type of residential use are adequately mitigated.

**Action item:** To fully assess the proposal for compliance and consistency with the code provisions stated above, submit a detailed response how the proposal with its unit layout is anticipated to function. If known, please include the anticipated terms of rental agreements, including duration, occupancy limitations, parking assignments, etc.

*See included ‘Action Item 1: Residential Use’ for detailed response.*

**Critical Areas**
The following RFI items are based on a site visit on June 26, 2020 with city staff, the applicant, and the applicant’s consultants. The consultants included the project engineer, wetland biologist, licensed geologist, and ISA-certified arborist. City staff included the project manager, an arborist, and environmental planners. The purpose of the site visit was to look at the site characteristics while discussing the consultants’ reports submitted for the proposal.

Public comments on the proposal express multiple concerns about the geologic stability of the site, drainage issues, wildlife and tree loss, among others. This RFI takes those concerns into account.

1. A geohazard assessment of the site was done and a report prepared and submitted with the applications (Geologically Hazardous Area Site Assessment, GeoEngineers, January 17, 2020). According to the geohazard report, the site has a typical slope of 20 to 22.5% with a thin band of slopes greater than 40% along the eastern margin. Slopes less than 30% are not considered erosion hazards as defined in BMC 16.55.420.A. Slopes equal to and greater than 40% are considered landslide hazards as defined in BMC 16.55.420.B. The report described discreet areas of erosion hazard but these were not identified on the map.

**Action Item:** Provide an existing conditions topographic site map with the landslide hazard area (already mapped) and the erosion hazards (slopes 30%-40%). Provide the same map overlaid with the current development proposal.

*All landslide hazard areas (as defined by BMC 16.55.420.B) and erosion hazards have been identified and mapped in the included full Geotechnical Engineering Report.*

2. The geohazard report states, “A geotechnical engineering report for the project will be completed at a future date as the project goes to design.” Based on public comments expressing concerns about the geology of the site, and more specifically, slope stability and drainage (surface and groundwater), a geotechnical report is warranted at this point.

Critical area report requirements for technical information should be provided now to enable the project engineer and project geologist to coordinate their mitigation measures and to address public concerns.

A geotechnical engineering plan for the proposal has been completed by GeoEngineers, per BMC 16.55.440.A-16.55.440.B.
See included full Geotechnical Engineering Report.

3. BMC 16.55.460.A.4 prohibits removal of vegetation from an erosion or landslide hazard area or buffer unless otherwise approved. The city anticipates that some of the development footprint clearing will be in an erosion hazard; no clearing is planned for the landslide hazard.

The seasonal restrictions limit clearing between May 1st and September 30th. Much of the public comment, as well as statements in the geohazard report, is about surface and groundwater drainage once the development site is cleared of vegetation.

**Action Item:** The project geologist and engineer should provide specific BMPs for timing of the site clearing and grading. In addition, they should recommend measures to mitigate onsite and offsite drainage problems and make recommendations for the management of large volumes of excavated materials (stockpiling, transport, erosion control, etc.).

BMP’s are included in both the Geotechnical Engineering Report and the updated Preliminary Storm Report. Please also see the attached letter from Cascade Engineering Group, ‘Exhibit A’.

4. Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan (SSP). The SSP includes past studies and development proposals. Though some of the geologic information is the same, the SSP should include the geohazard report done for this proposal. Similarly, the project referenced (Figure 2) should be for the current proposal, not an earlier version.

According to the geohazard report, the primary erosion hazard at the site is from temporary conditions created during construction. The SSP report recommends that temporary erosion control measures should be used during construction depending on the weather, location, soil/rock type, and other factors. Public comments based on local observations express concerns about an increase in drainage problems on downslope properties.

**Action Item:** The project geologist and project engineer should collaborate to devise site specific BMPs to control surface and groundwater runoff during and after construction. Provide a section in both the geohazard report and the SSP that address BMC 16.55.440.A.2.i. “An analysis of proposed surface and subsurface drainage, and the vulnerability of the site to erosion.” [Note: This section of the BMC is part of the request under the second action item under “Critical Area” above.]

BMP’s are included in both the Geotechnical Engineering Report and the updated Preliminary Storm Report. Please also see the attached letter from Cascade Engineering Group, ‘Exhibit A’.

5. Tree Removal Plan. At the June 26th site visit, the arborists agreed on a hazard management approach for several tree groupings identified by the project arborist. The agreement was based on likelihood of tree survival, changes in hazard risk level, and opportunities to improve tree canopy over time. The goal of the arborists, city staff, and the applicant is to maintain healthy forest stands and associated understory and minimize risk to residents and buildings from tree failures.
**Action Item:** Amend the tree retention plan to annotate the specific management strategies for the stand of hardwoods on the north end, the seven Douglas fir trees, and the trees in the zone between the development and the neighboring properties fronting Nevada St. Identify trees that will be girdled and cut specifically as wildlife trees or provide a generic strategy about how wildlife trees will be chosen and created.

*See amended updated Tree Retention Plan.*

6. The trail connecting Consolidation Ave. to Puget St. is proposed in the Tree Retention Area. The trail design and location have not been finalized. The final design and location should be determined in the field with the project arborist, geologist, and engineer reviewing the potential location. A coordinated review will ensure that tree retention, drainage, and site stability concerns will be addressed.

**Action Item:** Make a note on the development plans that the trail location will be reviewed by the city after the three consultants have reviewed and commented on its design and location.

*A site visit took place on Tuesday, February 23rd, with the arborist, civil engineer, geologist and developer in attendance. The trail design and location were determined based on site slope, tree retention, drainage and site stability. It has been noted on all plans that the trail location has not been finalized.*

*See updated Preliminary Trail Plan.*

7. Tree Replacement Plan. The site visit clarified the need to locate replacement trees within the retention area, as opposed to the planting strip along the parking lot. The site’s logging history left a deciduous dominant forest of trees that are neither long-lived nor particularly robust. Therefore, the replacements should be native conifers chosen for the site conditions, such as Douglas fir, Grand fir, and western red cedar. Vine maple trees would be suitable along the westernmost edge of the “Tree Retention Area” (Sheet L1).

**Action Item:** Revise the Tree Replacement plan to include 130 trees, mostly native conifers, to be planted throughout the “Tree Retention Area”. The proposed replacement trees shown on L1 should be considered as part of the landscaping requirements specified in BMC 20.12.030 but not “replacement trees”.

*The Tree Replacement plan has been updated to include 130 trees planted throughout the Tree Retention Area. These include 30 Pacific Yew (Taxus brevifolia), 52 Mountain Hemlock (Tsuga mertensiana), 37 Excelsa Western Red Cedar (Thuja plicata excelsa), and 11 Vine Maple (Acer circinatum).*

*See updated Tree Replacement Map and updated Landscaping Plan.*
**Design Review**

Pursuant to the Multifamily Residential Design Review Handbook, the following building design standards are not met and the proposal shall be revised to address the action items:

A. **Neighborhood Scale**

Requirement: The scale of those portions of the building facing an existing developed neighborhood shall conform to the scale established in the neighborhood or the scale identified for the district. All stated guidelines are applicable to this requirement.

**Action items:** The buildings do not conform to the existing scale of the developed neighborhood. The building design shall be revised. This could be accomplished by revising the proposed buildings to include at least three or more distinct modules with each module establishing its own design chroma including but not limited to a base, roof form, window pattern, siding materials, color scheme, entry configuration, balcony treatments, etc. Other considerations may include more, smaller buildings that incorporate these same design standards.

*See included document ‘Action Item 9: Neighborhood Scale’ for detailed explanation.*

B. **Neighborhood Compatibility**

Requirement: New buildings should reflect some of the architectural character of surrounding buildings when locating in a neighborhood where the existing context is well defined. All stated guidelines are applicable to this requirement.

**Action items:** The building elements listed in the guidelines must be incorporated into the modules noted above to form distinct modules that establish human scale and consistency with the established scale of the neighborhood. The building’s fenestration should relate to each of these building elements for each module. Modify the plans to comply with these guidelines.

*See included document ‘Action Item 10: Neighborhood Compatibility’ for detailed explanation.*

C. **Privacy**

Requirement: Orient buildings to provide for privacy, to the extent practical, both within the project and of adjacent residential uses. All stated guidelines are applicable to this requirement. The application materials did not include sufficient information to determine if the proposed hard and softscapes in the transition area between the single-family residences on Nevada Street and Marionberry Ct. and the site’s improvements (buildings, common usable areas, parking lots, etc.) provides a solid, visual evergreen buffer that screens these residences from the proposal.

It is strongly encouraged that the use and location of walls be placed to use the site’s existing grades in a terraced approach that will accommodate a mature evergreen landscape plan.

**Action items:**

1. Provide additional cross sections (typ.), no less than 6 sections, that demonstrate the view from the perspective of the single-family residences along the western edge of the proposal (on Nevada Street and Marionberry Ct.). The cross sections must include:

   • Clearing and grading limits.
   • Location and height of proposed retaining wall(s).
   • Landscaping at the time of installation, 5 and 10-year growth cycle and at maturity per the landscaping material required below.
In accordance with BMC 20.38.020(A.5), the transition area between the single-family residences on Nevada St and Marionberry Ct and the site’s improvements has been redesigned to minimize development impacts. Cross sections have been provided that demonstrate the view from these residences along the western edge of the proposal.

See Landscape Buffer Plan L4-L6.

2. Submit a landscape plan prepared by a landscape architect that demonstrates the single-family residences will be visually screened from the proposal. The landscape plan shall, at a minimum, include the following:
   - Clearing and grading limits in the transition area with an emphasis of retaining existing grades and/or vegetation and utilizing existing grades that necessitates lower retaining walls and fences in locations that maximize the potential to establish a visual buffer.
   - Height, location and design of proposed retaining walls and fencing. Per the design standards, clearing and grading should be minimized to reduce the height of retaining walls through terracing and benching with walls no taller than 5 feet, inclusive of the combined height of fencing.
   - Include plant species, size and quantity of landscaping in the transition area. The plant material shall be provided at a quantity that will provide a solid screen at maturity and include plant material that is predominately native evergreen trees and shrubs and include plants having seasonal interest for color and texture. The location of proposed retaining walls shall take into consideration the maturity of the landscape material.

Per BMC 20.38.040(B)(1)(f), an exhibit specifying the buffer area has been graphically depicted. Large retaining walls and fences from the previous proposal have been removed in favor of maintaining the existing grade to the maximum amount possible. Retaining walls in this area will not exceed 5 feet in height. The thick re-plant will provide a solid screen at maturity, with seasonal interest for color and texture.

See Landscape Buffer Plan L1-L6 and updated Preliminary Grading Plan.

**Planned Development**

Pursuant to Chapter 20.38 BMC, please address the following:

1. BMC 20.38.050 (B)(3) Density. The application materials include a density calculation based on the 176-unit reference shown on the recorded Cedar Ridge Division 2 final plat (AF# 202070360). On May 9, 2020, the application was amended via an email submittal requesting a density bonus pursuant to BMC 20.38.050 (B)(3)(c). The application materials must clearly state the proposed density.

   **Action item**: Provide a statement clarifying the requested method to determine the proposal’s base density.

   See included document ‘Action Item 12: Density Calculations’ for a detailed response.

2. BMC 20.38.050 (B)(8) Parking. The application materials state the proposal will provide 249 spaces for vehicle parking and 54 spaces for bicycle parking. The vehicle parking/bed ratio for vehicle parking is 0.78 and the bicycle parking/bed ratio is 0.12. Both ratios meet code but do not appear adequate to support the development.

   The proposed vehicle parking ratio assumes a quarter of the proposed beds are either not being occupied or occupied by a person not owning a car. Public comment has raised concerns regarding the lack of onsite parking and the impacts the overflow parking will have on the existing residential streets.
Additionally, under the same assumptions, only 54 occupants would have options to conveniently store a bicycle. Bicycle parking should achieve a bicycle space per bedroom ratio of 0.5. An increased ratio is needed to support the application’s justification that the site’s proximity to transit, services and recreational opportunities will reduce the demand of vehicular usage. This ratio is consistent with the city’s urban village standards that anticipate development similar to the proposal’s density and for sites conveniently located to those services listed in the application materials.

Although, not explicitly stated in the application materials, the unit layout is appropriately designed consistent with the national trend for purpose built student housing and by its design, the units are likely to be rented by three persons not living in an historic, traditional family unit. The parking standards in the Bellingham municipal code are based on an assumption that units are occupied by an historic, traditional family unit, not three persons living independently. The proposed ratio of both vehicle and bicycle parking spaces per bedroom does not provide adequate parking for proposal’s assumed use.

**Action item:** Revise the proposal to increase the proposal’s availability of both vehicular and bicycle parking, including but not limited to:

**Vehicle parking:**
- Construction of parallel parking along the northern frontage of the Consolidation Avenue improvements.
- Additional consideration could be to construct parallel parking along the southern frontage of the Consolidation Avenue improvements.

**Bicycle parking:**
- Construction of a separate bicycle storage building.
- Install bike racks in front of all ground floor units that accommodate 4 spaces for bicycles.
- Provide and/or increase bicycle storage located at or near each common building entrance.

The proposal has been amended to increase the availability of both vehicular and bicycle parking.

**Vehicle Parking:**

The previous proposal included 249 on site vehicle parking spaces, with a .78 space per bedroom ratio. 8 parallel spaces have been added along the site’s northern Consolidation Ave frontage, bringing the total number of spaces to 257. With 318 bedrooms, this results in an increased parking to bedroom ratio of .81.

The following methods and site proximity details combine to reduce vehicular reliance and usage.

- The project now contains 160 bicycle parking spaces, which achieves a .50 bicycle to bedroom ratio. The storage availability and ease of access for bicycles encourages bicycles as a means of transportation (See bicycle parking below for details).
- The project site is located within reasonable distance of public transit. The Lincoln Creek Park and Ride is approximately a 7 minute bike ride or a 13 minute walk. The site is also located within reasonable distance of shopping, restaurants and services (See Action Item 21 response for details). For example, Whole Foods and surrounding services can be reached via a 7 minute bike ride or 18 minute walk. The site location allows tenants to bike or walk to multiple destinations.
- Parking will be managed/regulated via parking passes.

**Bicycle Parking:**

Bicycle parking has been amended to a total of 160 spaces (interior and exterior, bringing the space to bedroom ratio to .5, per City recommendation). Additional bike spaces have been added relative to the unit count of each building, building design and access routes to Consolidation Ave.

The City strategies for bicycle parking were each analyzed for the project:
• In lieu of constructing a separate bicycle building, centralized interior storage has been added/increased proportionate to the number of units in each building. The interior bike rack locations allow ease of access as well as dry storage for all upper floor tenants.
• The basement ‘walk-up’ units of all buildings do not have access to the interior corridor, making exterior bicycle racks in front of them a logical addition. The western units on the 1st floor have access to the interior corridor and the centrally located interior bike racks.
• In Buildings A & B, bicycle storage has been increased at the eastern (central) building entrances through the addition of interior spaces. These locations provide convenient access for 1st and 2nd floor tenants. In Building C, bicycle storage is now located at each of the main building entrances. Interior racks near the western main entrance have been increased from 24 to 62.

In Buildings A & B, bicycle racks accommodating 4 bicycles each have been added in front of the 4 basement units. The main building entrances of A & B, located on the 2nd floor, have 4 exterior bicycle racks and 10 interior racks. Both buildings A & B now each have a total of 20 exterior spaces and 10 interior spaces (60 combined).

In Building C, bicycle racks have also been added in front of the 6 basement units. This building has exterior racks accommodating 10 bicycles at the eastern entrance to the building on the 2nd floor. There are exterior racks accommodating 4 bicycles at the western entrance. In addition, the basement level of Building C now has 62 interior hanging bicycle spaces. The basement location is convenient for all upper floor tenants of the building via elevator access. The total number of spaces for Building C is 100.

3. BMC 20.38.050 (B)(12) Comprehensive Plan Elements. The Parks, Recreation & Open Space (PRO) Plan chapter of the comprehensive plan identifies a trail corridor in the Consolidation Avenue right of way. The application proposes to fulfill this provision by constructing a trail from the Nevada/Consolidation intersection east to Puget Street. The PRO Plan identifies this trail segment terminating at the Puget/Consolidation intersection. The entire length of Puget Street abutting the site lacks pedestrian and bicycle facilities and is not a suitable location for the terminus of a multimodal trail.

The trail’s termination on Puget Street does not fulfill the intent of the PRO Plan to provide a continuous trail network or a safe connection to the Samish Crest Trail neighborhood connectors at the Byron/47th Street intersection. If stairs are proposed as part of this trail, the stairs should include a bike ramp (strap) so that bicyclists coming from the Nevada St. bike boulevard and many of the other recreational opportunities in the area may utilize the trail connection.

Action item: Amend the trail alignment to provide a safe multimodal connection to the Samish Crest Trail neighborhood connectors at the Byron/47th Street intersection via 46th Street by either: 1) Extending the trail in the Puget Street right of right of way from its proposed terminus on Puget Street to provide a connection to the existing cul-de-sac bulb in the 46th Street right of way or 2) revise the trail’s alignment to be entirely within the Consolidation Avenue right of way from Nevada Street to provide a connection to the existing cul-de-sac in the 46th Street right of way.

The Puget Neighborhood Plan: Parks, Recreation & Open Space Goal 2 is to provide neighborhood trails that provide accessibility and connectivity options within the neighborhood. One of the trail goals identified in the Neighborhood Plan is to connect Nevada St. to 46th St. via the Consolidation Ave. right of way. This goal will be met through the CityView site improvements. The trail alignment has been amended to provide safe multimodal connection to the Samish Crest Trail neighborhood connectors via 46th St.

See updated Preliminary Trail Plan.

The trail shall be designed to meet the parks and recreation department development standards.
4. BMC 20.38.050 (B)(13) Street, Utilities, Access and Dedications.

Consolidation Avenue-The extension of Consolidation Avenue from Nevada Street through the intersection of 45th Street is necessary to continue the orderly extension of public infrastructure. The preliminary engineering plans did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the design of Consolidation Avenue at the 45th/Consolidation intersection allows the reasonable extension of 45th Street south to serve the undeveloped, platted lots.

Based on the assumed demand for parking discussed above and to deter unauthorized parking along the southern edge of the Consolidation Avenue improvements, a vertical curb is necessary.

**Action item**: Revise the preliminary engineering plans as follows:

- Demonstrate the 45th/Consolidation intersection provides for the reasonable extension of 45th Street south to serve those undeveloped platted lots on 45th Street.
- Include parallel parking along the northern edge of the site’s Consolidation Avenue improvements.
- Include a vertical curb along the southern edge of the site’s Consolidation Avenue improvements.
- If parallel parking is to be provided on the side of Consolidation Avenue, please include these revisions as well.

*The preliminary engineering plans have been revised in accordance with 20.38.050 (B)(13). The revised plans demonstrate that the 45th/Consolidation intersection provides for the reasonable extension of 45th St. south. Parallel parking has been added along the northern edge of the site’s Consolidation Ave. improvements. A vertical curb is included along the southern edge of the site’s Consolidation Ave. improvements.*

**See updated Preliminary Engineering Plan.**

**SEPA Checklist**

1. In response to public comment and reports submitted with the application materials, the responses to the following SEPA checklist questions requires additional information that may also require revisions and/or additional mitigating conditions to adequately determine the proposal does not have a significant environmental impact:

   - **Water-3. C. 3) and 4) -**Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site?

   **Action item**: Please have a qualified professional respond to how the drainage courses of the surface flow, underground flow and onsite springs will be affected as a result of this development. Then address proposed measures to reduce or control the impacts. This is also further discussed above under the critical areas section of this document.

   *See updated Preliminary Stormwater Plan and letter from Cascade Engineering Group, ‘Exhibit A’.***

   - **Environmental health -7. b. 2) and 3) –** What types of levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis?

   **Action item**: Please respond to the long-term noise created by this project post-construction. Identify proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts.

2) *The completed project will result in normal occupancy noise in the immediate area. Residents will be required, per their lease, to conform to all City of Bellingham noise ordinances (BMC 10.24.010(E) and BMC10.24.120(C)).*
3) Building design and placement, vegetation and site design are used to reduce noise impacts.

The buildings have been oriented with main entrances facing east, away from the nearest neighbors on the westerly border. There are no balconies on the buildings, which limits occupancy noise. All buildings have exceeded the required setbacks (per BMC 20.38.050) from the western site boundary to further reduce noise impacts (Building A 160-190 ft, Building B 65-90 ft, Building C 210-250 ft).

The large barrier of undisturbed native vegetation will diminish noise for the properties to the east of the project. The thick re-plant screen on the western edge of the property, as well as the vegetated large CUA will provide noise insulation for the properties to the west of the project.

The main entrances into the complex have been located on Consolidation Ave and do not face any existing homes. Parking lots A, B & D are buffered to the west by the placement of the buildings. Parking lots C, E & F are buffered by the thick re-plant screen.

- Land and shoreline use: 8. a. – Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties?

**Action item:** Describe how the proposal will or will not affect the current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties.

The nearby properties to the east are single-family homes (Puget St.). To minimize impacts to their use, a large native vegetated buffer will remain between Cityview and these adjacent properties. This dense forest provides a physical, visual and noise buffer.

The properties to the west are both single-family residential and multi-family apartment complexes. Impacts to these uses are minimized by providing a thick re-plant screen along the western border of the site, as well as locating the buildings 65-250 feet from the property line.

The property to the north is owned and operated by the City of Bellingham as “Hawley Open Space”. This large tract will remain unchanged and will continue as an area of natural preservation.

The adjacent properties to the south are a combination of single-family homes and undeveloped land. Future development of the vacant land will impact the single-family homes, however their current use will be protected by Cityview’s large outdoor usable area as well as retained forest buffers.

- Transportation: 14.b. – Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, general describe. If not, what is the nearest transit stop?

**Action Item:** Revise to address consistency with other SEPA questions that the site is served within a reasonable distance to the identified transit station, shopping, restaurants and services.

The site is not directly served by public transit, however it is within reasonable distance. The Lincoln Creek Park and Ride is approximately a 7 minute bike ride or a 13 minute walk. The WTA routes with stops at this transit center include Puget St, Lincoln St, Western Washington University, Samish Way, Bill McDonald Parkway, as well as service to Mount Vernon. Select routes connect to Bellingham Station as well, for transfer service throughout the county. The transit center can be accessed via two routes, Consolidation Ave/Lincoln St and 43rd St/Byron. The Consolidation Ave/Lincoln St route has sidewalk throughout.

Shopping, restaurants, and services are accessible via public transit connections or within reasonable distance. Whole Foods Market and surrounding services is approximately a 7 minute bike ride or 18 minute walk. Lakeway Fred Meyer and surrounding services is approximately an 8 minute bike ride or 21 minute walk. Both shopping centers can be accessed via two routes. The Consolidation Ave/Lincoln
St route has sidewalk throughout. The Nevada St. route does not have sidewalk throughout and will be encouraged for bicycle transit only.

- Transportation: 14. f. - How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal?

**Action item**: Use the data from the TIA, include the daily and weekday PM peak hour total trips information from page 14 of the January 2020 TIA.

Provide a discussion in an addendum to the TIA that justifies the ITE classification used in the TIA for this proposal. This justification should consider the discussion above regarding typical occupancy of the units and the likelihood of persons living independently of each other and not as an historic, traditional family unit.

The ITE classification used is LU #221: standard multifamily housing mid-rise apartment complex. The definition for this category is a 3-10 story multi-family housing project. CityView is a 2.5 – 5.5 story multi-family housing project. Per the response to Action Item #1, CityView will house a variety of tenants and will be managed in strict compliance with the Federal Fair and Equal Housing Act.

See RFI Action Item 20: TIA Addendum.

- Transportation: 14. h. – Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts.

**Action item**: Provide a basis for demonstrating that bicycle parking for 54 +/- bicycles is an adequate number to effectively reduce or control transportation impacts based on how the site’s and geographic topography, proposed occupancy of the proposal and its intended occupants, will affect the overall measures to reduce or control transportation impacts.

Respond to how the future, anticipated reduction of ridership of transit facilities could affect the transportation impacts resulting from this proposal.

Additionally, include an analysis of the available pedestrian and bicycle facilities on Consolidation Ave and Nevada St and their sufficiency to safely get a project resident to the transit center, shopping, restaurants and services specified in the checklist.

(A) The previous proposal contained 54 bicycle spaces, which upon analysis by the City was determined to be inadequate (per the City comments in RFI Action Item #13). The current proposal amends bicycle parking to a total of 160 spaces, which achieves a .5 bicycle space to bedroom ratio.

As previously stated in the response to RFI Action Item 1, the complex will house a variety of renters. The bicycle parking needs of the tenants can be met in two ways. First, there are now 160 interior/exterior spaces throughout the 3 buildings. With an anticipated occupancy of 318, bike parking will be provided for 50% of tenants. Secondly, for tenants who want more storage, they have the option of leasing storage units (available on certain building levels), which they may use for a bicycle as well as other items.

All bicycle parking has been strategically located for convenient accessibility. Buildings A & B both have 4 exterior and 10 interior bicycle spaces located on Level 2. Building A has access to parking lot A and a sidewalk to Consolidation Ave. Building B has access to parking lot D and a sidewalk to Consolidation Ave. These buildings also have racks accommodating 4 bicycles each located outside of the basement level units (4 units per building x 4 = 16). Buildings A & B have a combined total of 60 bicycle parking spaces.
Building C has 10 exterior spaces located on Level 2, with direct access to parking lot B and a sidewalk to Consolidation Ave. The remaining 4 exterior spaces and 62 interior spaces are located on the basement level. These spaces are convenient for all upper floor residents via elevator access. Access to Consolidation Ave is via sidewalk. Access to parking lot C is via ramp. Bike racks accommodating 4 bicycles each have been added to the 6 basement level units (6 units x 4 = 24), bringing the total spaces for Building C to 100.

(B) It is recognized that there is a current trend in reduction of transit ridership. However, it is anticipated that access to a major Park & Ride facility at Lincoln Creek will continue to make public transit a viable transportation choice for CityView residents. The facility is heavily serviced by WTA with stops including Puget St, Lincoln St, Western Washington University, Samish Way, Bill McDonald Parkway as well as service to Mount Vernon. Select routes also connect to Bellingham Station for transfer service throughout the county.

The Consolidation Ave improvements, the trail location and accessibility, as well as the ample secure bicycle parking will make CityView an attractive option for alternative transit.

(C) The site is not directly served by public transit, however it is within reasonable distance. The Lincoln Creek Park and Ride is approximately a 7-minute bike ride or a 13-minute walk. The transit center can be accessed via two routes, Consolidation Ave/Lincoln St and 43rd St/Byron. The Consolidation Ave/Lincoln St route has sidewalk throughout.

Shopping, restaurants, and services are all within reasonable distance to CityView. Whole Foods Market and surrounding services is approximately a 7-minute bike ride or 18-minute walk. Lakeway Fred Meyer and surrounding services is approximately an 8-minute bike ride or 21-minute walk. Both shopping centers can be accessed via two routes. The Consolidation Ave/Lincoln St route has sidewalk throughout. The Nevada St route has sidewalk for +/-50%, making it suitable for bicycle transit. The Samish Way corridor and surrounding services (including Taco Time, McDonalds, Rite-Aid, Haggen, REI and more) is approximately a 10-minute bike ride and can be accessed via multiple routes.

The amendment to the trail alignment (per RFI Action Item #14) also provides safe multimodal connections to the Samish Crest Trail neighborhood connectors, providing additional recreation opportunities and routes. The Samish Crest Trail is situated in the 113-acre Samish Hill Open Space and features viewpoints of the city and Bellingham Bay. Future proposed improvements by the City of Bellingham would extend this trail further to Lake Padden.

2. Revise the checklist or provide additional documentation, as necessary, to respond to this Request for Information.

Public Comment
The city has received a substantial amount of public comment in response to the notice of application. These comments are located on the city’s web page.

The Planning and Community Development Department (PCDD) has reviewed the public comments and finds that they identify potential impacts to the abutting and surrounding areas, how the proposal is not consistent with the comprehensive plan and/or how the proposal does not comply with the municipal code. The application materials do not adequately address some of the concerns raised.

Some of the concerns will be addressed with responses to the action items above. The concerns that are more general in nature are equally important and require a response to evaluate the proposal’s impacts to the surrounding neighborhood and identify any mitigating conditions. In addition to the action items above, a
written response to the public comments is necessary to ensure compliance with BMC 20.38.020 (A), 20.38.040 (B) and 20.38.050 (A).

Public comments that are specific to a study and/or report prepared by a qualified professional and submitted with the application materials must include a response from the qualified professional who prepared the report and include a statement which concern the report is addressing.

**Action item:** Submit a response to the public comment. The format of the written response should either include a specific reference tying the response back to the name/date of the commenter or include responses by the general topics raised in the comment letters. The city has identified the general topics raised in the public comment letter to be related to, but not limited to, the following:

1. Drainage and stormwater runoff.
2. Impacts to critical areas and geologically hazardous areas
3. Traffic and pedestrian safety
4. Scale of proposal/Privacy
5. Parking-vehicle and bicycle
6. Comprehensive plan consistency
7. Social behaviors
8. Affordability

*Public comment general topics have been identified with responses attached. See Action Item 22: Public Comment.*

As noted above, with all land use applications, it is the applicant’s burden to demonstrate how a proposal meets code and addresses public concerns. It is strongly recommended that all responses provided to this Request for Information take into consideration how the proposal, including any new information, addresses the specific code and comprehensive plan references above.

Review of these application(s) cannot continue until this information is received and determined to be sufficient. Within 14 days of submitting the above information, the City will either determine that the information is sufficient or specify in writing what additional information is required. If the information is sufficient, processing of the application(s) will resume in accordance with BMC 21.10. This request for additional information is accordance with BMC 21.10.190 B. (4).

Pursuant to BMC 21.10.190 (C), the application(s) will expire and become null and void if all of the requested information is not submitted within 120 days from the date of this notice for request for information. At the applicant’s request, the PCDD director may extend this 120-day period in accordance with BMC 21.10.080(A). No further notice will be sent concerning this 120-day expiration timeline.
March 4, 2021

Ms. Kathy Bell  
Planning and Community Development Department  
City of Bellingham  
210 Lottie Street  
Bellingham, WA 98225

Subject: CityView  
Response to July 6, 2020 Request for Information

Dear Kathy:

This letter provides a response to your comments relating to civil design and stormwater management in your July 6, 2020 Request for Information regarding the subject project.

Following is a point-by-point response to the Request for Information:

**Critical Areas Comment No. 3**

BMC 16.55.460.A.4 prohibits removal of vegetation from an erosion or landslide hazard area or buffer unless otherwise approved. The city anticipates that some of the development footprint clearing will be in an erosion hazard; no clearing is planned for the landslide hazard. The seasonal restrictions limit clearing between May 1st and September 30th. Much of the public comment, as well as statements in the geohazard report, is about surface and groundwater drainage once the development site is cleared of vegetation.

**Action Item:** The project geologist and engineer should provide specific BMPs for timing of the site clearing and grading. In addition, they should recommend measures to mitigate onsite and offsite drainage problems and make recommendations for the management of large volumes of excavated materials (stockpiling, transport, erosion control, etc.).

**Comment Response**

The Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan (SSP), specifically Section 5.2 Minimum Requirement #2: Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention, has been revised to address this comment. A preliminary Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) plan is provided in the SSP's Figure 4, with accompanying site cross sections and TESC information provided in Figure 5. These figures show the type and location of typical BMPs that can be used during project construction. These BMPs provide recommended measures that will mitigate potential onsite and offsite drainage problems.
Critical Areas Comment No. 4

Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan (SSP). The SSP includes past studies and development proposals. Though some of the geologic information is the same, the SSP should include the geohazard report done for this proposal. Similarly, the project referenced (Figure 2) should be for the current proposal, not an earlier version.

According to the geohazard report, the primary erosion hazard at the site is from temporary conditions created during construction. The SSP report recommends that temporary erosion control measures should be used during construction depending on the weather, location, soil/rock type, and other factors. Public comments based on local observations express concerns about an increase in drainage problems on downslope properties.

Action Item: The project geologist and project engineer should collaborate to devise site specific BMPs to control surface and groundwater runoff during and after construction. Provide a section in both the geohazard report and the SSP that address BMC 16.55.440. A.2.i. “An analysis of proposed surface and subsurface drainage, and the vulnerability of the site to erosion.” [Note: This section of the BMC is part of the request under the second action item under “Critical Area” above.]

Comment Response
The SSP, specifically Section 5.2 Minimum Requirement #2: Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention and Section 5.4 Minimum Requirement #4: Preservation of Natural Drainage Systems and Outfalls, have been revised to address this comment. A preliminary Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) plan is provided in the SSP’s Figure 4, with accompanying site cross sections and TESC information provided in Figure 5. These figures show the type and location of typical BMPs that can be used during project construction. These BMPs provide recommended measures that will mitigate potential onsite and offsite drainage problems. As discussed in the SSP, these measures are also anticipated to reduce the amount of surface and subsurface flow that travels down the hillside.

Planned Development Comment No. 3

BMC 20.38.050 (B)(12) Comprehensive Plan Elements. The Parks, Recreation & Open Space (PRO) Plan chapter of the comprehensive plan identifies a trail corridor in the Consolidation Avenue right of way. The application proposes to fulfill this provision by constructing a trail from the Nevada/Consolidation intersection east to Puget Street. The PRO Plan identifies this trail segment terminating at the Puget/Consolidation intersection. The entire length of Puget Street abutting the site lacks pedestrian and bicycle facilities and is not a suitable location for the terminus of a multimodal trail.

The trail’s termination on Puget Street does not fulfill the intent of the PRO Plan to provide a continuous trail network or a safe connection to the Samish Crest Trail neighborhood connectors at the Byron/47th Street intersection. If stairs are proposed as part of this trail, the stairs should include a bike ramp (strap) so that bicyclists coming from the Nevada St. bike boulevard and many of the other recreational opportunities in the area may utilize the trail connection.
Critical Areas Comment No. 4

Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan (SSP). The SSP includes past studies and development proposals. Though some of the geologic information is the same, the SSP should include the geohazard report done for this proposal. Similarly, the project referenced (Figure 2) should be for the current proposal, not an earlier version.

According to the geohazard report, the primary erosion hazard at the site is from temporary conditions created during construction. The SSP report recommends that temporary erosion control measures should be used during construction depending on the weather, location, soil/rock type, and other factors. Public comments based on local observations express concerns about an increase in drainage problems on downslope properties.

Action Item: The project geologist and project engineer should collaborate to devise site specific BMPs to control surface and groundwater runoff during and after construction. Provide a section in both the geohazard report and the SSP that address BMC 16.55.440.A.2.i. "An analysis of proposed surface and subsurface drainage, and the vulnerability of the site to erosion." [Note: This section of the BMC is part of the request under the second action item under "Critical Area" above.]

Comment Response
The SSP, specifically Section 5.2 Minimum Requirement #2: Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention and Section 5.4 Minimum Requirement #4: Preservation of Natural Drainage Systems and Outfalls, have been revised to address this comment. A preliminary Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) plan is provided in the SSP’s Figure 4, with accompanying site cross sections and TESC information provided in Figure 5. These figures show the type and location of typical BMPs that can be used during project construction. These BMPs provide recommended measures that will mitigate potential onsite and offsite drainage problems. As discussed in the SSP, these measures are also anticipated to reduce the amount of surface and subsurface flow that travels down the hillside.

Planned Development Comment No. 3

BMC 20.38.050 (B)(12) Comprehensive Plan Elements. The Parks, Recreation & Open Space (PRO) Plan chapter of the comprehensive plan identifies a trail corridor in the Consolidation Avenue right of way. The application proposes to fulfill this provision by constructing a trail from the Nevada/Consolidation intersection east to Puget Street. The PRO Plan identifies this trail segment terminating at the Puget/Consolidation intersection. The entire length of Puget Street abutting the site lacks pedestrian and bicycle facilities and is not a suitable location for the terminus of a multimodal trail.

The trail’s termination on Puget Street does not fulfill the intent of the PRO Plan to provide a continuous trail network or a safe connection to the Samish Crest Trail neighborhood connectors at the Byron/47th Street intersection. If stairs are proposed as part of this trail, the stairs should include a bike ramp (strap) so that bicyclists coming from the Nevada St. bike boulevard and many of the other recreational opportunities in the area may utilize the trail connection.
SEPA Checklist Comment No. 1

In response to public comment and reports submitted with the application materials, the responses to the following SEPA checklist questions require additional information that may also require revisions and/or additional mitigating conditions to adequately determine the proposal does not have a significant environmental impact:

Water-3. C. 3) and 4) - Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site?

Action item: Please have a qualified professional respond to how the drainage courses of the surface flow, underground flow and onsite springs will be affected as a result of this development. Then address proposed measures to reduce or control the impacts. This is also further discussed above under the critical areas section of this document.

Comment Response
The SSP, specifically Section 5.4 Minimum Requirement #4: Preservation of Natural Drainage Systems and Outfalls, has been revised to address this comment. Section 5.4 discusses how the permanent stormwater system is anticipated to result in a reduction in the amount of surface and subsurface flow down the hillside and into the backyards of the homes fronting Nevada Street.

We trust this response answers your questions. Please contact our office with any additional questions you may have.

Sincerely,
CASCADE ENGINEERING GROUP, P.S., INC.

Craig R. Parkinson, P.E.
Principal Engineer

Cc: Mr. Morgan Bartlett
RFI Response: Action Item 1

**Action Item #1:** To fully assess the proposal for compliance and consistency with the code provisions stated above, submit a detailed response how the proposal with its unit layout is anticipated to function. If known, please include the anticipated terms of rental agreements, including duration, occupancy limitations, parking assignments, etc.

Cityview will be leased and managed with strict adherence to Federal Law. Under the Federal Fair and Equal Housing Act, it is unlawful to discriminate for housing purposes on the basis of familial status (Title 42/Chapter 45/Subchapter 1/sections a-e). In addition, per BMC 20.08.020, the City definition of “family” means one or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, or not more than three unrelated persons, living together within a single dwelling unit. To comply with these standards, CityView has been designed to appeal to a broad range of renters.

Cityview’s unit layout of 3 bedrooms and 3 bathrooms allows the use of both private tenant space and shared kitchen, living and laundry areas. This design will function well for a wide variety of tenants. The following are detailed and varied examples of how Cityview’s unit layout is anticipated (but not limited) to function:

**Scenario 1:** A young single professional named Joe works at a local grocery store. Joe makes an above average wage, but cannot afford to live on his own, as a studio apartment in a good neighborhood now costs about $1,500 per month. Joe’s coworker Ryan is in a similar predicament. Joe and Ryan realize they can live at Cityview for about $700 per month each, less than HALF of what it would cost to live on their own. They invite Ryan’s girlfriend April—a highly talented barista—to join them. They each enjoy their private bedroom and bathroom within the unit, while cooking meals and watching their favorite shows in the shared living space. Joe and Ryan commute to work, while April prefers to ride her bike or walk when the weather permits. All 3 roommates have a goal of saving enough money to buy a home, while enjoying their time living together.

**Scenario 2:** Amy, Jennifer and Michelle graduated from Sehome High School and decided to ‘stay local’. Amy attends Western Washington University, while Jennifer pursues a Culinary Arts degree from Whatcom Community College. Michelle has chosen to take a ‘gap year’ and some time to refresh after intense studies at Sehome. As roommates at Cityview, all 3 enjoy the quiet location and
walking/biking distance to Fred Meyer and the many shops at Lakeway Center. With their shared kitchen, Jennifer tests her ‘inspired recipes’ on her eager and willing friends. Amy, an avid hiker, takes daily walks throughout Cityview’s large outdoor common usable area, then tests her cardio strength via the project’s trail connection to Samish Crest.

Scenario 3: Yara is a mother to her twin sons Amar and Nadim, who just turned 15. In 2012, Yara and her then 6 year old boys fled to Turkey along with thousands of other refugees. In 2016, under the Obama Administration U.S. resettlement program, the family found permanent refuge in Washington State. Yara works part-time for DSHS, and has a passion for assisting others while spending quality time with Amar and Nadim. Through the establishment of Cityview’s “Safe Haven” program, Yara and her family live rent-free. 1 apartment at Cityview will be permanently set aside for this purpose, ensuring it functions as intended for many, many years. Another example of this unit function is the Marilyn Nold Scholarship, see madronabayllc.com/building community.

Scenario 4: Kayla and Brianna grew up together and have been lifelong best friends. Both recently graduated from college with honors. Kayla landed an entry level position at a major accounting firm, while Brianna is pursuing her Master’s in Political Science. Cityview is a perfect housing choice for them, as they have the third bedroom designed and set up as a home office/study. This way, they enjoy their own bedroom suites while building their careers and future safely from home.

******************************************************************
Each potential tenant will be required to complete an application and pass both background and credit checks. All leases will most likely be a 1-year term. There will be a max occupancy of 3 unrelated adults per unit, and parking will be managed/regulated via parking passes.

As seen on the attached Figure HH-1 from the United States Census Bureau, the percentage of married households (“historic traditional family unit”) have been steadily declining. Meanwhile, the non-family households have been rapidly
increasing. Housing projects like CityView provide housing options that reflect this trend. As specified by the attached chart updated 12/19 from the National Multifamily Housing Council, apartment households have a variety of configurations. These statistics support that the “traditional family unit” represents the smallest number of apartment households. Additionally, per the article referenced below and pie chart attached from the National Apartment Association, the largest percentage of today’s renters are starting out singles at 29%, with young adult roommates at 21%, perma-renters at 16% and middle-income boomers at 11%.

The Puget Neighborhood is a preferred location for many renters and the construction of this project will provide additional options within this desirable area. Per the October 2020 Bellingham Housing Statistics there are currently 2,740 residential dwelling units in the Puget Neighborhood. 55% of those units (1,507) are currently rentals per the City of Bellingham Rental Registration & Safety Program. The CityView project is within Area 17 of the Puget Neighborhood. Per the Puget Neighborhood Plan, this area is “an ideal multiple housing area, being convenient to town, parks and commercial areas”.

Figure HH–1
Percent of households by type

Renter Profiles in the U.S. Market

Starting-Out Singles: 28%
Pet People: 4%
Young Couples: 5%
Working Families: 6%
Moving On Up: 8%
Young Adult Roommates: 21%
Perma-Renters: 16%
Middle-Income Boomers: 11%
II. BUILDING DESIGN

A. Neighborhood Scale

The existing neighborhood features 1 and 2 story single-family homes. Building B (2.5 stories) has been strategically placed to provide a reasonably scaled transition between these homes and Building C (5.5 stories).

All 3 buildings have been analyzed for neighborhood scale.

Building A: This building is 2.5 stories and is set back +/- 160 to 190 feet from the nearest neighbors (over 6 times the required setback per BMC 20.38.050(A)). A thick re-plant screen has been added along the westerly property line (see updated Landscaping Plan). There is also a parking lot and a +/- 1-acre CUA between the building and the Nevada St. residences. The perceived scale of the building has been minimized through the creation of modules, see RFI Action Item 10: Neighborhood Compatibility for details.

Building B: This is the only building within the CityView complex that is both adjacent to and facing an existing neighborhood. Detail on Building B’s compliance with neighborhood scale is shown on the following pages, within the context of the Multifamily Design Handbook.

Building C: This building is set back +/- 210 to 250 feet from Cityview’s western property line. Modules have also been used in Building C to lower the visual scale, see RFI Action Item 10: Neighborhood Compatibility for details. The positioning of Cityview’s smaller Buildings A & B, heavily increased property setbacks, the addition of a thick replant screen along the westerly border, combined with the large outdoor common usable area, all serve to minimize and mitigate the scale of Building C.
**Requirement:** The scale of those portions of the building facing an existing developed neighborhood shall conform to the scale established in the neighborhood or the scale identified for the district.

The following Guidelines from the Multifamily Design Handbook have been applied to the exterior design of Building B in order to maximize scale compliance to the adjacent homes.

**Guidelines:**

1. Use house size building elements when locating a multi-family project within or adjacent to a neighborhood predominantly developed with, or zoned for, single family homes or duplexes by using any of the following methods:
   a. Placing 1 and 2 story units adjacent to existing 1 story houses and 2 and 3 story units adjacent to existing 2 story houses.
      
      **Building B**, adjacent to and facing the existing 1 and 2 story homes on Nevada St. & Marionberry Ct., is 2.5 stories.
      
      b. Using wall modulation and articulation to break a building into smaller sections that are similar in scale to the adjacent neighborhood buildings both in terms of height and width.
      
      **Building B** has been amended to incorporate vertical columns and horizontal sections.
      
      Vertical dividers have been created based upon natural breaks in the wall modulation to create columns similar in width to single family homes.
Horizontal sections have been added to divide the building into thirds, similar in height to single story family homes. The bottom section has a unique color scheme and creates a proportionate base. The center section features variation in module colors and siding. The top section has variation in module colors, siding and roof form.

c. Arrange and orient the building elements to appear similar in mass and scale to larger single-family houses in the neighborhood.

Building B now contains 3 distinct vertical columns and 3 distinct horizontal sections. The combination of these columns and sections results in the creation of 4 unique modules that are similar in mass and scale of the surrounding single-family homes.

Within these modules, building elements have been oriented to appear similar in mass and scale to the larger single-family homes in the neighborhood. Elements include, but are not limited to, ‘walk-up’ units, window configuration, and both hipped and gabled roofs (See RFI Action Item 10: Neighborhood Compatibility for details).

The 4 modules of Building B are shown (A1, B1, C1 & C3).
2. This requirement is applicable to infill multifamily housing where the neighborhood context is clearly defined by existing development or where the project is adjacent to a single family or duplex district. This provision will generally be less applicable if the neighborhood plan land use classification anticipates major redevelopment of the surrounding district to a significantly higher density and greater development scale.

Stepping down the height of a building section and using smaller repeating elements such as entry porches help large buildings fit better with adjacent single family neighborhoods.

Building B, shown below as a ‘stepped down’ transition to Cityview’s larger Building C:
B. Neighborhood Compatibility

**Requirement:** New buildings should reflect some of the architectural character of surrounding buildings when locating in a neighborhood where the existing context is well defined.

Per RFI Action Item 9: Scale, vertical columns and horizontal sections were defined to create unique modules. This strategy has been applied to all 3 buildings. The resulting modules are similar in mass and scale to the surrounding single-family homes.

**Buildings A & B**

- Section 1
- Column C
- Column B
- Column A

**Building**

- Section 1
- Column A
- Column B
- Column C
- Column D

The subject site is shown below as well as six highlighted examples of neighboring homes. These homes contain design elements that are replicated within the projects’ façade.
This is a 2 story home located on Marionberry Ct. This home features a stone base, two siding colors, vertical and horizontal siding, and a gable style roof.

This single story home is located on Nevada St. A distinct base is established via color and siding style. This home also features a covered entry, a hipped roof and stone accents.
This two story home, on Nevada St, features a hipped roof, stone architectural details, covered entry and two siding styles. The window pattern also features a large entry window, as well as both a single hung and a picture window on the second story.

This home is also located on Nevada St. Details of this two story home include two siding colors and styles, covered entry and both a hipped and gable roof. The window pattern in this home features two picture windows, a single hung window, larger upstairs window and entry door.

This is another example of a single story home located on Nevada St. This home displays a gable roof, covered entry, large entry window and use of two siding styles.

This two story home is located on 46th St. Characteristics include a gable roof, a single hung window above the garage and a covered entry.
Per the Guidelines outlined below, the following elements have been used within each module to accomplish Neighborhood Compatibility.

**Guidelines:**

1. **Use some of the following elements:**
   
   a. **Similar proportions and roof forms**

   Each vertical column has a distinct roof form, comprised of assorted hipped and gable roof lines. There are a total of 3 distinct roof lines in all buildings.

   b. **Similar architectural style and materials**

   Through the use of stone base, vertical siding and horizontal siding, each module features clear distinction.

   c. **Similar patterns and proportions of windows**

   Each module is comprised of its own individual window pattern to align with the neighboring single-family homes. Modules contain a combination of single hung windows, picture windows and sliding glass doors. Ground floor modules feature large entry windows.

   d. **Similar entry configuration**

   The ground floor units, facing West, are designed similarly to single family ‘walk-up’ units, featuring an entry door and window in lieu of a slider.

   e. **Similar architectural details or features**

   The use of strategically placed Pacific Northwest style colors/patterns (both horizontally and vertically), results in:

   - Lowering perceived scale of all buildings
   - Breaking up the building facades
   - Making the buildings proportionate to each other
   - Creating variations in color patterns to make the buildings more visually appealing
The specific measures used to accomplish these goals are:

- Horizontally, all buildings have been broken down into three sections. There is a clear color break between sections 1 and 2 and also between sections 2 and 3.
- The bottom section (Section 1) features a special dark siding that has been used to establish a proportionate base in each building.
- The modules each have a distinct color scheme.
- Sections 2 and 3 have color changes along each column divider, with no two vertically or horizontally adjacent modules featuring the same colors.

2. Employ design guidelines contained in the Neighborhood Plan.

There are no design guidelines contained in the Puget Neighborhood: Area 17 plan.

Using similar rooflines is one way to achieve better compatibility
Details of the individual modules contained within each building are shown below. These modules are mirrored on the opposite ends of each building.

Module C1: Buildings A & B (west elevation). This module is approximately 48 feet wide and 18 feet high, comparable to a single-story home. C1 contains 2 colors, both vertical and horizontal siding, and features a hipped roof line. With a total of 3 single hung windows, 2 picture windows and a sliding glass door, the window scheme is proportionate to a single-family home.

Module B1: Buildings A & B (west elevation). This module is approximately 44 feet wide and 18 feet high and contains both hipped and gable roof lines. The façade of this module is established through the use of two colors along with both vertical and horizontal siding. There are two single hung windows, four picture windows and one sliding glass door.
Module A1: Buildings A & B (west elevation). This center module is approximately 26 feet wide and 18 feet high, comparable in size to a small 1 story single family residence. The gabled peak over the center column is similar to the covered entries in the neighboring homes. A1 features 4 single hung windows and 1 sliding glass door. Two siding colors and styles are used in this module.

Module C3: Buildings A & B (west elevation). This ground floor module features a 3 foot stone base along with a dark colored siding specific to the entire first floor. C3 features a covered entry door, large entry window and 3 single hung windows. The size and style of this module is similar to adjacent single family ‘walk-up’ models.
Module D1: Building C (west elevation). This module is approximately 42 feet wide and 28 feet high, comparable to several two story homes within the existing neighborhood. D1 contains vertical and horizontal siding and 2 complimentary colors. D1 also features a hipped roof, and a total of 6 single hung windows, 4 picture windows and 2 sliding glass doors.

Module C1: Building C (west elevation). This module is approximately 44 feet wide and 28 feet high. This module contains both hipped and gable roof lines, similar to many of the homes within the established neighborhood. The façade of this module is established through two siding colors and both vertical and horizontal siding. The window pattern is comprised of four single hung windows, eight picture windows and two sliding glass doors.
Module B1: Building C (west elevation). This module shares a roof form, siding style and window pattern with Module D1 of Building C. The distinction for B1 comes via color scheme.

Module A1: Building C (west elevation). This center module is approximately 26 feet wide and 28 feet high. A1 features a gabled peak over the upper floor slider. The center column features two siding colors and styles. The window pattern is comprised of 8 picture windows and two sliding glass doors.
Module D3: Building C (west elevation). This section features two stories of dark colored siding to distinguish the building's base along with 3 feet of stone for architectural detail. Covered entry doors and picture windows are featured on the first floor, along with three single hung windows. The second floor window pattern includes three additional single hung windows, two picture windows and a sliding glass door. The entry door and window pattern is congruent with adjacent homes.
Action Item 12: Density Clarification

The current proposal, deemed 'Cityview' by developer Madrona Bay Real Estate Investments, includes 106 multi-family units. However, under certain conditions, the developer may choose to submit an amended or new proposal that includes up to 176 units. Therefore, the requested method to determine the proposal's base density is the 176-unit reference shown on the recorded Cedar Ridge Division 2 final plat (AF# 202070360). In no event shall the maximum density exceed the vested 176 (see attached Density Clarification and III. Order, Permitted Uses/Par. 2, page 25 Hearing Examiner Order dated 10/23/13).
May 11, 2020

Kathy Bell
Senior Planner
City of Bellingham
210 Lottie St.
Bellingham WA 98225

RE: 1433 Consolidation/Area 17/Puget Neighborhood. Residential Multi; Planned with a 5,000 SF per unit overall density. AKA 'Cityview’. Request for density bonus.

Kathy,

The area of the subject parcel is 11.15 acres, or 485,694 SF. Under the applicable density, the parcel is zoned outright for up to 97 multi-family units (485,694 SF / 5,000 SF per unit = 97.3 units).

Also, this property has been vested for an ADDITIONAL 79 units, to a maximum of 176 (see 'Density Clarification’, revised Cityview narrative at cob.org/cityview).

Our revised Cityview application reflects a substantial downsizing to 106 units, from our original unit count of 136. Per the vested density, our proposal is 70 units below the maximum.

In light of the above facts, the allowed density is at minimum 97 units. Our revised proposal is 106 units, just 9 over the density minimum of 97. Therefore, we are requesting ONE of the following density bonuses be granted:

1) Under BMC 20.38.050 (B)(3)(c)(v), we are requesting a density bonus in the amount of 15%. Nearly 50% of the site will be left in open space, far exceeding code requirements. Approval of this density bonus would increase our unit count (under current zoning) to 97 + 14 (15% of 97) at 111. Our proposed unit count would remain at 106.

OR

2) Under BMC 20.38.050 (B)(3)(c)(vii), we are requesting a density bonus in the amount of 10%. Our proposal already calls for enhanced perimeter buffering/screening (see Site Plan, Landscape Plan, cob.org/cityview. Approval of this density bonus would increase our unit count (under current zoning) to 97 + 9 = 106.

Thank you for considering our request. Please let me know if you need further information or if I can answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Morgan

Morgan Bartlett, Jr.
Director
Madronabayllc.com
**Density clarification:

The Hawley Replat, or Cedar Ridge Plat received Preliminary Plat approval in May 1994 in Bellingham Resolution No. 19-94. The plat included 46.71 acres and provided for a total of 123 units, including 64 single family lots, one duplex lot, one triplex lot, one fourplex lot, and a 50 unit multifamily tract. It also contained a 15 acre open space parcel that was dedicated to the City and a tract that was labeled Future Development. The tract labeled Future Development is the subject property. The plat conditions provided that additional public review would be required prior to the development of the reserve tract. No unit count was assigned to the Future Development tract in the Preliminary Plat Resolution. Division 1 of the plat contained the seven single family residences abutting Nevada Street north of Consolidation Avenue and immediately to the west of the subject property. Final Plat approval for Division 1 was granted in April 1996 in Resolution 26-96.

Division 2 of the Cedar Ridge Plat received Final Plat approval in July 2002 in Resolution 2002-24. Division 2 consisted of 48 single family lots, one duplex lot, one triplex lot, one fourplex lot, a 50 unit multifamily lot and a reserve tract (the subject property). The Final Plat Resolution shows a site plan identifying the subject property as Tract F Future Multi Site, See Sheet 4 of 4. Sheet 4 is not attached to the Final Plat Resolution. Sheet 4 as recorded with the Whatcom County Auditor has the notation: “176 units” on Tract F. Attachment 1 to the proposed Final Plat Resolution included in the City Council Agenda Bill, described in the proposed Resolution as the Site Plan, shows the same notation for Tract F, “Future Development (176 units)”.

In October 2004, Cypress Ventures, LLC requested a Plat Alteration and Subdivision Variance for a portion of the property located in Division 2 of the Cedar Ridge Plat. Part of the proposal was to transfer 3 units from Tract F (the subject property) to Lot 12 and Tracts C and D. The plat alteration was approved to allow further division of Lot 12 (the duplex site) and Tract B (the triplex site) so that the units could be developed on lots that would be individually owned. Tract C (the 50 unit multifamily tract) was also altered to allow single family attached, cottage, carriage and townhouse units on individual lots to provide an alternative to condominium or apartment development on the sites. The transfer of units from Tract F to Lot 12 and Tracts C and D was denied. The Order of November 29, 2004 indicates that the existing unit count (176) shall remain.

The maximum density for the entire 46.71 acre parcel included in the Cedar Ridge Plat under the Residential Multi, Planned, 5,000 square feet per unit designation was 406 units. If density was not clustered on the subject site by the Cedar Ridge Plat the subject property would be able to accommodate 97 units at 5,000 square feet per unit zoning.
18. Any Finding of Fact that should be denominated a Conclusion of Law shall be deemed to be a Conclusion of Law. Any Conclusion of Law that should be denominated a Finding of Fact shall be deemed to be a Finding of Fact.

III. ORDER

Planned Development approval, a Variance from Height Restrictions, a Wetland/Wetland Buffer Critical Areas Permit, and Multi-family Residential Design Review approval are granted for the subject proposal subject to the following conditions:

PERMITTED USES
1. The proposed use for Purpose Built Student Housing may be conducted on the site provided the units conform to the requirements for multi-family residential dwelling units and contain no more than three bedrooms per unit. The use of the property for four Boarding and Rooming Houses with 576 beds in 164 units, most of which contain four bedrooms, is not permitted.
2. The number of dwelling units on the site may not exceed 176; or the number of units to which the property is vested, whichever is less; provided that the number of units is limited to 164 unless the Applicant obtains a Transportation Concurrency Certificate for the requisite additional trips and complies with all other requirements of the Bellingham Municipal Code arising out of an increase in the number of units.
3. Occupancy of each dwelling unit is limited to one family, as defined in the Bellingham Municipal Code, which, with exceptions for disabled individuals and children with familial status, allows no more than 3 unrelated individuals.
4. Use of the property for the proposed Purpose Built Student Housing shall be consistent with the materials and representations submitted by the Applicant in support of the proposal, including, but not limited to, the following:
   a) Professional, on-site, 24-hour management,
   b) Lease agreements that establish a no-tolerance policy for unacceptable behavior that could result in undue disturbance to other residents and neighboring properties,
   c) Provision of a shuttle service for residents to and from the Park and Ride facility, WWU, downtown, and other locations, to reduce traffic to and from the site, and
   d) Provision of parking spaces at a ratio of at least 0.75 parking spaces per resident/staff (or the number required in Paragraph No. 9 below, whichever is greater).

SITE PLAN
5. Development on the site shall be generally as shown on Exhibit A, attached hereto, except as revisions are required to comply with the requirements of this Order, the Bellingham Municipal Code or a Critical Areas Permit issued with respect to the Geologically Hazardous Areas.
6. Any substantial modifications to the site plan or to the proposed structures will require additional review for compliance with Design standards and may require further review for Planned Development approval. The Director may determine that changes are significant enough to require a new Planned Development process.
7. A final site plan included in a building permit application shall include locations of buildings, driveways with landscaped medians, and parking; access location and design, preservation areas, continuous internal pedestrian connectivity from each building on site to the sidewalk in Consolidation Avenue; location and design of the footpath in the Consolidation Avenue and Puget Street rights-of-way; the location of any open stormwater facility; and the location of all usable and open spaces.
8. Outdoor recreational facilities, such as spas, pools, fire pits, sports courts, and other facilities, shall be shown on the site plan and shall be located and designed so that they are screened from view and noise transmission to neighboring properties. These facilities shall comply with all applicable health and safety regulations. Any proposed fire pit shall be subject to Fire Department review and approval. If location of these facilities result in any significant modification to the site plan additional design review may be required.
Public Comment

1) Drainage and stormwater runoff

The CityView site has been designed in accordance with BMC 20.38.050(B)(11), stating that "existing drainage courses of significance, topography, significant treed areas and other natural features should be saved, preserved and enhanced to the greatest extent possible consistent with reasonable and appropriate use of the subject site". More than 50% of the site (5.42 acres) will remain in its natural vegetated state. All hazardous slope areas on the eastern site boundary and wetlands will be undisturbed. The existing course of drainage from Puget St. to wetland B will be preserved.

See updated Site Plan, Civil Engineering Plan, Preliminary Stormwater Plan and Critical Areas Report.

Per RFI Action Items #4 and #5, the project geologist and engineer have provided specific BMP's for both the clearing and grading of the site as well as surface and groundwater runoff during and after construction. See RFI Response: Action Items #4 and #5.

Also included is a response from Cascade Engineering Group regarding some specific areas of comment. See Exhibit 'A'.

Also included is a response from Miller Environmental Services, LLC regarding some specific areas of comment. See Exhibit 'B'.
integrity of downstream channels and stormwater facilities. The proposed stormwater vault will incorporate a control structure to meter out stormwater discharge at the pre-development rate—meaning that rate associated with a forested condition. The metered discharge from the vault will then discharge into the city storm drain facility in Nevada Street. The final stormwater site design will include an analysis of downstream components of the existing storm drain system to ensure adequate capacity. Preliminary analysis indicates ample capacity of the existing storm drain system, and no changes to any downstream facilities are anticipated.

Comment 3: Concerns have been raised from westerly neighbors (Nevada/Marionberry Ct.) about existing flood problems in yards and crawl spaces. Please explain how our stormwater plan will help reduce and/or eliminate these issues.

Comment 3 Response:
The proposed project will capture all surface runoff currently flowing to the west from the development area. Runoff will be conveyed through an on-site storm drain system before discharging into the Nevada Street public storm drain facility. No runoff from the development area will discharge across the westerly property line. Properties directly west of the proposed development (houses fronting Nevada Street) may expect to see a significant reduction of surface runoff onto their property.

Properties on Marionberry Ct. bordering the subject property receive stormwater runoff from the existing wetlands, associated drainage basins, and/or ditches north of the development area. As the northern portion of the subject property will remain undisturbed, these drainage patterns will continue after completion of the project. The proposed project will not contribute additional stormwater to the northern, undisturbed, portion of the lot.

Comment 4: Several neighbors are claiming that clearing and grading this site will increase runoff and erosion. Please clarify how our grading plan minimizes these potential issues.

Comment 4 Response:
The primary erosion hazard at the site is from temporary conditions created during construction such as clearing, grading, excavation, and fill placement. Significant excavation of existing materials and placement of fill materials will occur as is required to achieve required grades. Provided typical erosion and sedimentation controls are implemented during construction, the project construction will not present a significant erosion hazard. Stormwater will be prevented from flowing across disturbed areas and will not be directed toward susceptible slopes during construction. Temporary erosion control measures are selected during construction depending on the weather, location, soil/rock type, and other factors. Temporary erosion protection (e.g., straw, plastic, or rolled erosion control products, sedimentation ponds) may be necessary to reduce sediment transport until vegetation is established or permanent surfacing applied. After construction all disturbed areas and embankments are required to be protected and/or vegetated before the rainy season. Appropriate best management practices (BMPs) will be incorporated into the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) by the civil engineer for the project. During construction, the contractor will be subject to Department of Ecology regulations, which require performance-based testing of turbidity at all discharge points. Proper construction practices and monitoring procedures will manage the risks to the standard of practice.
Comment 5: One comment pertains to the existing drainage ditch in the Consolidation Ave. ROW. It claims that our new trail will exacerbate the speed and volume of water running in this ditch. Can you please explain how we intend to collect this water via our Consolidation Ave. improvements, and redirect it into the City storm system? Finally, please clarify that our trail construction will not impact the existing drainage ditch.

Comment 5 Response:
The Proposed development will not add additional stormwater to the existing ditch. The trail will be located north of the existing drainage ditch in Consolidation Avenue. Stormwater runoff from the trail will follow the natural drainage patterns to the northwest and not contribute to the existing ditch.

The existing ditch and vegetation appear to be stable and there is no evidence of erosion. The easterly portion of the ditch will continue to function in its current state. At the end of the Consolidation Avenue improvements, stormwater from the ditch will be collected in a piped storm drain system within Consolidation ROW and discharge to the existing ditch near the intersection of Nevada St and Consolidation Ave. At the discharge point a stilling well will be installed for energy dissipation of the stormwater to ensure stability of downstream ditches.

We trust this response answers your questions. Please contact our office with any additional questions you may have.

Sincerely,

CASCADE ENGINEERING GROUP, P.S., INC.

Craig R. Parkinson, P.E.
Principal Engineer

cc: Mr. Morgan Bartlett
February 5, 2021

Morgan Bartlett, Jr. - Director
Madrona Bay Real Estate Investments, LLC
424 W. Bakerview Road, Suite 109
Bellingham, WA 98226

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE CRITICAL AREAS REPORT ON THE CITYVIEW PROJECT

Public comments were received on the CityView Project concerning the Critical Areas Report completed for the project (Miller Environmental Services; June 12, 2019). These include:

1. Comment stating that Wetlands A and B are continuous and require a Category 1 buffer with no averaging allowed. Commenter also states that the 100 foot buffer around Wetland A is not adequate due to an inaccurate habitat function score.

2. Comment expressing concerns that the stormwater system has not addressed other groundwater aquifers on the site.

The project site is located on a steep hillside dominated by upland coniferous/deciduous forest habitat as described in the critical areas report. This includes dominant species such as red alder (Alnus rubra) big-leaf maple (Acer macrophyllum), paper birch (Betula papyrifera), western red-cedar (Thuja plicata), Douglas fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii), ocean spray (Holodiscus discolor), low Oregon grape (Mahonia nervosa), salmonberry (Rubus spectabilis), Himalayan blackberry (Rubus armeniacus), snowberry (Symphoricarpos albus) and sword fern (Polystichum munitum). Observed soils throughout the area were primarily well drained loams, consisting of dark brown (10YR 3/3) loam over a brown (10YR 4/3) loam. This includes the area between Wetlands A and B. This area, between Wetlands A and B, contains a mixture of the species described above, non-hydrics soils and no indicators of wetland hydrology. The delineation site visit was conducted in April of 2019 (spring) and wetland hydrology was easily observed (where present) during the site visit – including within the delineated areas of Wetland A and B.

Additionally, the hydrology within Wetland B appears to be driven primarily by water moving downslope into Wetland B from a stormwater drain outfall along the western side of Puget Street. Hydrology within Wetland A appears driven by seepage of water out of the slope at locations in eastern portions (upslope) of the wetland. In general, water on the site moves west to east following the topography.

With respect to the Wetland A rating and habitat score, the rating form was included within the critical areas report including the rating form figures (Appendix D of the report). With respect to what we included on the Wetland A rating form: one habitat type was observed, forest – per the Ecology manual only the dominant Cowardin habitat type is noted – shrub or emergent forest understories are not counted as separate habitat types. Two hydroperiods were checked, saturated and occasional flooded, as was observed during the site visit and as expected from the steeply sloped nature of the wetland. Observed species richness appeared within the normal range for one habitat type and there was no interspersal of habitats as there was only one habitat type.
Habitat features noted included downed woody debris, standing snags, and no significant invasive species. The area within one kilometer of the wetland contained approximately 84 percent high intensity land use, as it is within a highly developed portion of Bellingham. The mapped habitat areas and spreadsheet were included with the rating form in Appendix D of the Critical Areas Report. Priority Habitats observed within the vicinity of the wetland included priority snags and logs and biodiversity areas/corridors. As noted, mature forest was not checked as the apparent density of mature trees in portions of the review area did not meet the size and density threshold and the area of mature trees (within Wetland A) was less than the 8-acre size threshold for this priority habitat type. It should be noted that the threshold size for a mature forested wetland is only one acre – much lower than the threshold for a mature forest priority habitat type.

The previously completed and submitted critical areas report addressed wetland and habitat conservation areas. The wetland delineation methodology followed the City required U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual and the Corps Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys and Coast Region. Generally, this includes the observation and documentation of hydrology at or near the ground surface – where the water influences vegetation. This is not specifically a survey for groundwater or aquifers. Utilizing the indicators within the methodology: type of vegetation, soils within the upper 16 to 20 inches of the soil profile and observations of hydrology indicators – aquifers would only be noted if they were at or near the surface and created wetland conditions. Any deeper groundwater or aquifers, below the criteria for wetlands presence would not necessarily be observable with this methodology. Within the framework of the methodology and work completed, the site was walked in the spring of 2019 and in 2013 (prior delineation). No other areas of obvious hydrology were observed on the property, other than the features noted and documented within the critical areas report.

Please contact me at (360) 255-5799 or ed@millerenvironmental.org if you have any questions or would like to discuss these findings.

Sincerely,

Ed Miller, PWS
Senior Biologist
2) Greenspace/Wetlands

Per RFI Action Item #3, a Geotechnical Engineering Plan has been completed for the current development. See Geotechnical Engineering Plan.

Two existing wetlands were identified on the site, per the Critical Areas Report. Both wetlands will be preserved with the required buffers.

A response from Miller Environmental Services, LLC is attached and addresses some specific wetland comments. See Exhibit ‘B’.

The site design leaves 5.42 acres of the 11.15 acre site as undisturbed greenspace. Select trees have been identified as hazards within this area and will be removed or minimized in height. Replacement trees will be planted at a 2.1 ratio. The site has been preserved to the greatest extent possible.

Also included is a response from Certified Arborist Patrick Sullivan regarding some specific areas of comment. See Exhibit ‘C’.

There is an existing man-made trail within the Consolidation Ave. right of way. The CityView improvements will include a safe multi-modal trail connecting Consolidation Ave to 46th St. See updated Trail Plan.
January 27th, 2021
Patrick Sullivan, ISA Certified Arborist
RE: CityView public comment response

To whom it may concern,

Public comment noted specific concerns in the following areas: responsibility for monitoring, removal of trees between the complex and neighbors, replacement species for hardwoods, and details shown on the Tree Retention Map.

Of the 65 Douglas Fir trees, 59 trees were identified for removal as they have both a high likelihood of failure and a high likelihood of impact. 6 identified Douglas Fir trees (see updated Tree Retention Plan & Tree Retention Map) will be reduced in height to mitigate severe impacts, with the main stem left for wildlife activity. This course of action does not require on-going monitoring and poses the safest option, with minimal disturbance while retaining an environment suitable for wildlife.

Due to the proximity to existing homes along Nevada St. and Marionberry Ct., trees located along the project's western border pose a safety risk to life and property. To eliminate this risk, this area will be cleared. Larger tree stumps will be retained and minimal grading will occur to create a native understory. In addition, this transition area will be replanted to provide a solid visual screen at maturity (see Landscape Buffer Plan).

Per the updated Tree Retention Map, the stand of hardwoods will be replaced with Cypress trees rather than Snowberry. For species diversity, both fast and slow growing species will be planted (Leyland and Hinoki).

The tree retention area is shown on the Tree Retention Map and refers to 5.42 acres of the entire 11.15-acre site. The grading area, also shown on the Map, will be cleared and graded per the project grading plan. The critical root zone protection area is shown on the updated Tree Retention Map and replacement trees have been moved to the tree retention area. The fencing line (along western edge of tree retention area) and method (silt fence) are shown on the updated Tree Retention Map.

[Signature]
Patrick Sullivan
Certified Arborist #PN-7123A
Certified Tree Risk Assessor
(360) 920-6285
Comments were received regarding the safety of neighbors in the vicinity of the CityView complex, due to increased traffic and narrow streets. The narrow streets are per City design, on page 16 of the Puget Neighborhood Plan, it is stated that the narrow streets create less impervious surface and stormwater impact, as well as provide a traffic calming effect to slow vehicles. As part of the CityView project, Consolidation Ave. will be improved from Nevada St. to 45th St., to the standard required by Ordinance 8027 (per BMC 20.38.050(B)(13c) ). These improvements will include curb and sidewalk, which will increase pedestrian safety.

Per BMC 20.38.050(B)(8), proposals for planned development shall satisfy all parking regulations for similar uses contained in Chapter 20.12 BMC. Per this code, the required number of vehicle parking spaces is 212. CityView provides 249 surface parking spaces on site and 8 additional parallel spaces via the Consolidation Ave. improvements (north side only). Parking will be managed through the use of tenant parking passes.

The design of the CityView complex will improve pedestrian and bicyclist access, to help diminish the effects of vehicular traffic on adjacent residential streets. This will be accomplished via:

- 160 convenient bicycle racks on site (a .5 bicycle to bedroom ratio), bicycles will be encouraged as an alternative method of transport. This is in accordance with the Puget Neighborhood Transportation Policies, PTP2, which states that, "Puget Neighborhood preference is to implement solutions that support a mode shift from motorized to walking, bicycling and transit".
- The construction of a trail between the subject site and 46th St. will provide safe multi-modal connection to the Samish Crest Trail. The Puget Neighborhood Plan identifies the construction of this trail as a parks, recreation and open space goal (PPG 2, Puget Neighborhood Plan, page 7).

Included is a response from Transpogroup that addresses some specific concerns related to the project TIA. See Exhibit ‘D’.
MEMORANDUM

Date: March 3, 2021

To: Morgan Bartlett

From: Dan McKinney, Jr and Kassi Leingang – Transpo Group

Subject: Response to Cityview Transportation Comments

The following memo provides responses to transportation comments received for the Cityview project located at 1433 Consolidation Avenue. This includes public comments regarding the two topics of Trip Generation and Traffic Volumes.

Trip Generation

Comments were received related to the use of the ITE land use category used for calculating trip generation.

Response: Trip generation for the proposed project was calculated based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017). This is the current edition of ITE’s Trip Generation Manual, a nationally recognized source for calculating trip generation rates and utilizes data collected throughout the county. The proposed project is a multifamily residential development with 106 units with no restriction to residents. The most applicable land use to the proposed development was ITE’s Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) (Land Use 221) which has the following description:

Mid-rise multifamily housing includes apartments, townhouses, and condominiums located within the same building with at least three other dwelling units and that have between three and 10 levels (floors).

The weekday PM peak hour Multifamily Housing trip rate is based on a robust dataset with 60 studies of other multifamily projects across the nation with numerous similarly sized projects and therefore provides the best information available to estimate trips for this proposed multifamily development. Additionally, ITE is the typical source utilized for calculating trip generation for developments within the City of Bellingham and both the use of ITE and the Multifamily Housing residential trip rate were coordinated with City of Bellingham staff for this development.

Traffic Volumes

Comments were received questioning the timing of traffic counts relative to Western Washington University’s academic calendar.

Response: Existing weekday PM peak period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) turning movement counts were conducted at the study intersections on June 5, 2019. These counts were collected while school was in typical session (prior to finals week) as the Spring quarter for Western Washington University went through June 14, 2019.
4) Scale/Privacy

Per RFI Action Item 9, a detailed response regarding Neighborhood Scale has been submitted. See RFI Response: Action Item 9.

Per the Design Review Handbook (C) Privacy: Buildings have been oriented to provide for privacy, to the extent practical, both within the project and for adjacent residential uses. The following measures have been taken to minimize and mitigate the impacts to neighboring properties.

- Generous setbacks have been observed on the westerly border. Building B (2.5 stories, closest to Nevada St./Marionberry Ct.) is 67 – 130 feet from the property line. Building A (2.5 stories) is 160 – 190 feet from the property line. The larger Building C (5.5 stories) is 200-250 feet from the property line.
- All buildings have been oriented with the main entrances facing east, away from the nearest neighbors on Nevada St./Marionberry Ct.
- On the westerly border, the site’s existing grades will be used in a terraced approach that will accommodate a mature evergreen landscape. A thick re-plant screen will be added along the site border. See Landscape Buffer Plan for details and cross sections demonstrating the view from the perspective of the single-family residences on the western border.
- The large barrier of undisturbed native vegetation (5.42 acres) effectively minimizes privacy impacts for the site’s eastern neighbors on Puget St. See updated Site Plan, Aerial, updated Landscape Plan and Tree Retention Map for details.
- Building B (2.5 stories) has been positioned as a transition building between Nevada St./Marionberry Ct. and the larger Building C.
- The large vegetated CUA is positioned between the parking lots and the western site border.
5) Comprehensive Plan Consistency

The Bellingham Comprehensive Plan: Housing Chapter identifies goals and policies for new development. The CityView Development aligns with many of those goals:

- **Goal H-1:** Ensure that Bellingham has sufficient quantity and variety of housing types and densities to accommodate projected growth and promote other community use goals.
  *CityView will provide a unique housing choice that appeals to a variety of tenants. See Action Item 1: Residential Use.

- **Policy H-3:** Encourage well-designed infill development on vacant land or underutilized properties.
  *The large subject site is currently vacant and the development will bring needed infill within the popular Puget Neighborhood.

- **Goal H-2:** Foster housing that is safe, healthy, livable, and affordable for all income levels in all neighborhoods.
  *CityView will provide a safe, healthy, livable and affordable option. See RFI Response 22: Public Comment “Affordability” for details.

- **Policy H-15:** Support fair and equal access to housing for all persons, regardless of race, religion, ethnic origin, age, household composition or size, disability, marital status, sexual orientation or economic circumstance.
  *CityView will be open to all qualified tenants under the Federal Fair and Equal Housing Act.

- **Policy H-28:** Protect and connect residential neighborhoods to retain identity and character and provide amenities that enhance quality of life.
  *The Consolidation street improvements and the construction of the multi-modal trail to 46th St will connect residential neighborhoods within the Puget neighborhood. The addition of the trail will enhance the quality of life by providing additional recreational opportunity.

- **Policy H-31:** Promote high-quality design that is compatible with the overall style and character of the established neighborhood.
  *CityView has been designed to achieve neighborhood compatibility per the Multifamily Design Review Handbook. See Action Item 10: Neighborhood Compatibility.

- **Policy H-38:** Increase the open space requirements for multi-family development.
  *CityView will provide 1 acre of exterior common usable space as well as 3,000 SF of interior common usable space. In addition, over 50% of the site (5.42 acres) will remain in its natural vegetated state. See updated Site Plan and Aerial.
The Puget Neighborhood Plan recognizes the value of preserving existing green space and the scenic character of steep hillsides. The subject site is adjacent to the ‘Hawley Property’ on the northern site boundary. This Property is owned by the City and is an open space west of Puget St. and east of Nevada St. The northern 1/3 of the subject site will remain as green space, expanding the existing open space (see Aerial). CityView’s site disturbance area is limited to the western half of the site, while easterly hazardous slope areas remain undisturbed.

The Puget Neighborhood Plan identifies goals for development within the Neighborhood. CityView design reflects many of these goals:

- Parks, Recreation & Open Space Goal 2(E): Construction of a trail within the Consolidation Avenue right-of-way from Puget Street to Nevada Street. (F) Encourage Developers to provide neighborhood trail connectors to improve non-motorized transportation links as development occurs.
  *The proposal includes construction of a multi-modal trail between Nevada St. and 46th.
- Parks, Recreation & Open Space Goal 3: The Puget Neighborhood should continue to use practices which protect and preserve the environment.
  *Over 50% of the site will be remain undisturbed native vegetation. Environmentally sensitive areas of the site will be preserved and protected.
- Utilities/Drainage Goal 1: All water channels should be kept open and supporting water flow at all times.
  *There is existing drainage flow from Puget St. to Wetland B, this will remain undisturbed. Drainage outflow from a storm pond located above the south end of the site will be collected at 45th St. Please see updated Prelim. Stormwater Plan.
- Utilities/Drainage Goal 2: All new developments should be constructed consistent with the recommendations of the Watershed Master Plan, the Stormwater Comprehensive plan and stormwater development standards.
  *See updated Preliminary Stormwater Plan.
- Drainage Policy A: Any new major development should submit a drainage plan in conformance with the City’s storm water management code for approval by the Public Works Department. That plan should be implemented prior to, or concurrent with, development with the full cost of the plan being at the developer’s expense.
  *A Prelim. Stormwater Plan has been submitted and will be implemented concurrent with development at the developer’s expense.
- Drainage Policy B: Storm sewers with run-off control should be installed at future development sites.
  *See updated Prelim Stormwater Plan.
• Drainage Policy C: Creeks should be maintained for further protection of aquatic resources.
Adherence: The existing drainage outflow on the site will be protected and all appropriate wetland buffers will be observed. Please see updated Prelim. Stormwater Plan, updated Critical Areas Report.

• Transportation Goal 1: Expand Puget Neighborhood Transportation options to more fully support pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel for mobility within the neighborhood. By improving Consolidation Ave to 45th, curb and sidewalk improvements will increase pedestrian mobility. These street improvements also provide easier access for future development of the south side of Consolidation Ave. between Nevada St. and 45th. Additionally, the multi-modal trail will connect via Consolidation Ave to 46th St., and ultimately to the Samish Crest Trail. The CityView complex will include 160 bicycle parking spaces, which will help to promote bicycles as an alternative mode of transit.

• Transportation Policy 1: Develop and promote safe, efficient and appealing access for all users as redevelopment occurs in the urban village (Lakeway/Lincoln area). Access for non-motorized traffic within any commercial, multi-use or multi-family development should be direct to destination, easily accessible and safe.
*The creation of the multi-modal trail within the Consolidation ROW will provide a safe, direct and easily accessible route from Nevada St to 46th, with connection to the Samish Crest Trail.

• Transportation Policy 6: Promote the construction of sidewalks where they would connect neighborhood residents to services, or high-frequency transit, separate foot and motorized traffic, and/or provide needed connectivity.
*Consolidation Ave. improvements from Nevada St. to 45th St. will provide increased connectivity. Additionally, the multi-modal trail will extend further to 46th St and existing neighborhood connectors.

• Transportation Policy 8: Identify and develop or improve pedestrian pathways in the undeveloped public rights-of-way (ROW) where they can improve pedestrian connectivity within long residential blocks. Provide low-impact surface mitigation that would improve rocky, narrow footpaths that can be muddy or slippery. Locations include Consolidation Avenue between Nevada St and 46th.
*This trail will be completed per both City and Parks Department standards. See Prelim. Trail Plan
CityView will house a variety of tenants. See RFI Response: Action Item #1 for a complete explanation about how CityView is expected to function.

CityView will be professionally managed by Real Property Managers, LLC, (www.rpmnw.com) owned and operated by Morgan Bartlett, Jr. (developer of CityView). All components of the Residential Landlord/Tenant Act will be observed and in addition, all rules of the lease will be enforced. This includes, but is not limited to the following examples taken from the current RPM residential lease.

- **Garbage:** Garbage service is limited to basic services only. Tenant agrees to dispose of their ordinary household trash by placing it in the trash receptacle (dumpster) provided by the Lessor. Any debris or discarded items on or about the premises will be removed at the Tenant's expense. Charges caused by noncompliance, including billing and administrative fees, may be withheld from the security deposit. Tenant is responsible for moving their household garbage to the dumpster. Any excessive or oversized items and/or furniture must be hauled away by the Tenant at their expense; failure to comply will result in a $200 per occurrence fine.

- **Illegal Use:** Tenant shall not use the Property for any illegal purposes. Any resident engaged in any criminal activity on or near the property may be immediately evicted.

- **Parking:** Tenants may park only in designated parking spots. All vehicles must have current tags, be licensed and in operable condition. Tenant parking passes will be distributed to manage the parking lot.

- **Noise/Nuisance:** TV, stereo and musical instrument volumes shall be kept low enough so that minimal noise escapes from the Residence. Tenant shall not create or permit any other nuisance on the Property. A $100 fine shall be imposed for the first violation. A $300 fine shall be imposed for the second violation. Upon notification of a third violation, the Tenant may be evicted and forfeit return of the security deposit.

- **Guests:** Tenant is responsible for the conduct of all guests on the Property and shall insure that guests comply with all rules.
The City of Bellingham Comprehensive Plan Land Use Policy LU-10 aims to “achieve a healthy mix of housing that is affordable to a wide range of incomes”.

Cityview’s unit layout allows each tenant to have private space (bedroom & bathroom) as well as access to the shared living room, kitchen, and laundry facilities. In addition, all Cityview tenants will enjoy both interior and exterior common areas. Ample bike storage will encourage residents to minimize vehicle usage, as Cityview is located within easy biking distance to shopping and services.

Due to these design features, Cityview will appeal to a wide range of tenants. However, the main attraction to Cityview will be economics. In Bellingham it now costs about $1,500-$2,000/month to rent a one-bedroom apartment, depending on location. For many people, regardless of age or job status, it is impossible to make ends meet under these housing circumstances. Alternative options need to be built that offer a nice place to live without an overwhelming price tag.

Cityview fills this need:

* As opposed to $1,500- $2,000 per month, each one-bedroom suite at Cityview will rent for $650-$800 per month.

* Tenants will be able to lease units as a whole, or individually. Most units will be leased to 2-3 people, depending on their needs and goals.**

* Cityview will appeal and cater to a wide range of incomes, from young professionals with limited resources, to 55+ ready to downsize, pay off the mortgage and skip the yard maintenance.

  - Cityview. Yes, it’s your space.

**See RFI Response: Action Item #1 for a complete explanation about how CityView is anticipated to function.
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE AND REQUIREMENTS
(Process Type II)

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY IN BLUE OR BLACK INK

Project Data:

1. Legal Description of Property: Tract F Cedar Ridge Div 2

2. Size of subject property is 4,465,694 square feet.

Land Use Classification:

1. Neighborhood Plan Name: Puget

2. Subarea Number: 17 General Use Type and Use Qualifier: multifamily, planned

3. Have you had a pre-application meeting with Planning Staff regarding this project? Yes
   Staff Contact: Kathy Bell

4. Description of the proposed project: 104 unit multifamily complex including indoor and outdoor usable space. 249 surface stalls provided. 8 via Consolidation Ave. improvements. (Northside)
Land Use Application

Check all permits you are applying for in the boxes provided. Submit this application form, the applicable materials listed in the corresponding permit application packet(s) and application fee payment.

- Accessory Dwelling Unit
- Binding Site Plan
- Clearing Permit
- Conditional Use Permit
- Critical Area Permit
- Minor Critical Area Permit
- Design Review
- Grading Permit
- Home Occupation
- Institutional
- Interpretation
- Landmark – Historic Certificate of Alteration
- Legal Lot Determination
- Nonconforming Use Certificate
- Parking Adjustment Application
- Planned Development
- Rezone
- SEPA
- Shoreline Permit
- Shoreline Exemption
- Subdivision-Short Plat/Lot Line Adjustment
- Subdivision-Preliminary Plat
- Subdivision-Final Plat
- Variance
- Wireless Communication
- Zoning Compliance Letter
- Other:

Office Use Only

Date Rvvd: ____________________________
Case #: ____________________________
Process Type: ____________________________
Neighborhood: ____________________________
Area Number: ____________________________
Zone: ____________________________
Pre-Ap. Meeting: ____________________________
Concurrency: ____________________________

Project Information

Project Address: 4413 Consolidation Ave
Tax Assessor Parcel Number (s): 380332 172175 0000
Zip Code: 98209
Project Description: 140 unit multifamily complex, including 7/14,600 SF of usable space, 249 surface parking stalls/8 via Consolidation Ave improvements

Applicant / Agent

Primary Contact for Applicant

Name: ____________________________
Mailing Address: ____________________________
City: ____________________________ State: ____________________________ Zip Code: ____________________________
Phone: ____________________________ Email: ____________________________

Owner(s)

Applicant
Primary Contact for Applicant

Name: Morgan L Bartlett, Jr.
Mailing Address: 424 W Bakerview Rd. Suite 109
City: Bellingham State: WA Zip Code: 98226
Phone: 360-547-2777 Email: morgan@modrembayllc.com

Property Owner(s)

I am the owner of the property described above or am authorized by the owner to sign and submit this application. I grant permission for the City staff and agents to enter onto the subject property at any reasonable time to consider the merits of the application and post public notice. I certify under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington that the information on this application and all information submitted herewith is true, complete and correct.

I also acknowledge that by signing this application I am the responsible party to receive all correspondence from the City regarding this project including, but not limited to, expiration notifications. If I, at any point during the review or inspection process, am no longer the Applicant for this project, it is my responsibility to update this information with the City in writing in a timely manner.

Signature by Owner/Applicant/Agent: ____________________________ Date: 3/12/2021
City and State where this application is signed: Bellingham, WA
MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL PLAN DATA SHEET

Provide the following information for the proposed development. Use definitions and calculation methods in BMC Title 20 Land Use Development.

If the project is located in a Planned land use district (Use Qualifier) or has applied for a City of Bellingham multifamily tax exemption, enter the development contract or application number:

☐ Not applicable  Contract/application number: PDP 2019-0015

Total number of units: 106

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1-bedroom</th>
<th>2-bedroom</th>
<th>3-bedroom</th>
<th>4-bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demolished units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total site area: 485,494 sq. ft.  Proposed Density: 41.582 sq. ft. of land area / dwelling unit
Lot coverage: 249,407 sq. ft.  51.4% of site
Open space: 236,287 sq. ft.  48.6% of site
Total useable space: 43,100 sq. ft.
  Private: 0 square feet
  Common: 43,100 square feet

Describe type of useable space provided: (decks, yards, recreation buildings, type of recreational facilities and equipment)

Interior common: 3000 SF of lobby, lounge areas,
Exterior common: +/- 40,000 SF improved with walking/jogging trail, picnic tables and benches

Total number of parking spaces proposed: 249 on site / 8 off site

☐ Garage parking spaces proposed  ☐ Carport parking spaces proposed

Check Yard Setback Options Taken:
☐ None  ☐ Side yard window wall  ☐ Rear yard window wall
☐ Side yard wall without window  ☐ Rear yard wall without window

Height of tallest building: 65 feet under definition #1  _______ feet under definition #2
CityView, multi-family apartment complex
Project Address: 4413 Consolidation Ave, Bellingham, WA

Project Overview
- Unit Tabulation: 106 units (all 3 bedroom) in three buildings (A, B & C)
  - Building A: 20 units, 2.5 story
  - Building B: 20 units, 2.5 story
  - Building C: 66 units, 5.5 story
- Building A: 1 Type A unit, 7 Type B units, 12 Type C units
  - Building B: 1 Type A unit, 7 Type B units, 12 Type C units
  - Building C: 4 Type A units, 56 Type B units, 6 Type C units
- Unit area: +/- 1167 SF x 106 units = +/- 123,702 SF
- Total Building Square Footage: +/- 160,819 (Building A 29,920 SF, Building B 29,920 SF, Building C 100,979 SF)
- Parking Required: 212 Stalls (106 – 3 bedroom units x 2)
  - Parking Provided: 257 (249 via lots A – F, 8 via Consolidation Ave. improvements)
  - 8 accessible (2 van accessible), 13 electric vehicle charging stations included.
- Bike Racks Required: 25 (249 x .10)
  - Bike Racks Provided: 160 (Interior-82, Exterior-78)
- Storage Lockers Provided: 70

Project Data
- Site Area: 11.15 acres
- Lot Coverage: 5.63 acres (50.5%)
- Open Space: 5.52 acres (49.5%)
- Exterior Lighting Plan: Low impact, downward facing, for both building and parking lots.
- Common Usable Space Required: 26,500 SF (106 x 250SF)
  - Common Usable Provided: Exterior – 40,600 SF, Interior – 3,000 SF
  - Total Usable Area Provided: 43,600 SF

Adjacent Property Uses:
- North: City owned open space
- South: single family homes, unimproved single and multi-family
- East: single family homes
- West: single family homes, multi-family apartment complexes

CPTED measures to be incorporated into building and site design
February 26, 2020

Attn: Kathy Bell, Senior Planner  
City of Bellingham  
Planning and Community Development Department  
210 Lottie St, Bellingham, WA 98225

Project location: 4413 Consolidation Avenue/Area 17

Kathy,

Enclosed please find additional, revised and updated documents per the Notice of Incomplete Application and Request for Information issued August 10th, 2019. Per granted extensions, the due date for these materials is March 9, 2020. Please note that we are no longer requesting a height variance, as no building taller than 35’ (per Def. 1) lies within the restricted height boundary line.

The project has been downsized from 136 units to 106, and now contains 3 smaller buildings instead of 1. 2.5 story buildings have been strategically placed on the site to transition from single family use (Nevada St./Marionberry Ct.). In addition, a +/-1 acre buffer has been added to our westerly boundary. Retaining walls, fencing and replanting within this area add privacy and separation. Parking adjacent to Cityview’s westerly neighbors will be headlight screened.

Each RFI Action Item has been addressed, and all application documents from the initial PDP submittal have been updated to reflect all project revisions.

We look forward to working with you, the City and neighbors to supply much needed infill housing, while minimizing impacts to current residents.

Sincerely,

Morgan

Morgan Bartlett, Jr  
Director  
Madrona Bay Real Estate Investments, LLC
CityView Apartments: Applicant response to Notice of Incomplete Application and Request for Information dated August 10th, 2019.
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NOTICE OF INCOMPLETE APPLICATION & REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Notice is hereby given that the Planning and Community Development Department (PCDD) has determined that the submitted applications associated with the CityView proposal are not sufficiently complete to begin review.

Date of Notice: August 10, 2019

Date Application Received: 7/22/2019

Project Location: 4413 Consolidation Avenue / Area 17, Puget Neighborhood; Residential-Multi, Planned with a 5,000 sf/unit overall density requirement.

Applicant: Morgan Bartlett, Jr.; 424 W Bakerview Road, Ste. 109, Bellingham WA 98226; (360)527-2777

Property Owner: Irving H Jr & Joan F Hawley TR; PO Box 29270, Bellingham, WA 98228-1720

Application Type: Planned development (PDP2019-0015)/Design review (DR2019-0036)/Height variance (VAR2019-0009)/Critical area permit (CAP2019-0037)/SEPA checklist (SEP2019-0039)

To complete the application, please submit the following information:

General
The building elevations need to be reconciled with the submitted renderings and responses to the design review standards must address the reconciled plans.

See revised Building Elevations, reconciled with the submitted revised Rendering. Responses to the design review standards address the reconciled plans. See RFI Response under Design Review: Site Design & Building Design, and updated Narrative.

Public Infrastructure
Revise the proposal as necessary to show the required 30-foot dedication of Consolidation Avenue from Nevada St to 46th St. This dedication will effectively establish a new property line for setback purposes.

Action Item: Submit a revised site plan showing the required dedication and compliance with all development regulations that are measured from property lines (such as parking).

See revised Site Plan, showing the required dedication and compliance with all development regulations that are measured from property lines (no parking in setback).

The construction of Consolidation Avenue to 3/4 -city standard of a residential access street from Nevada St to fully abut the 45th Street right of way with ADA compliance for sidewalk connectivity is required. The proposal did not include these improvements.

Action Item: Submit preliminary engineering drawings demonstrating compliance with the required Consolidation Ave improvements.

See Preliminary Engineering Drawings demonstrating compliance with the required Consolidation Ave improvements.
Pursuant to BMC 20.38.050 (B)(13)(d), a pedestrian facility is required to connect the required Consolidation Ave improvements to Puget Street.

**Action Item**: Submit preliminary engineering showing the proposed location and design of this pedestrian facility.

**See Preliminary Engineering Trail Plan showing the proposed location and design of this pedestrian facility.**

**Critical Areas**

The geohazards report (University Ridge Student Apartment Development, GeoEngineers, April 29, 2013) was not produced for this project. While the geologic conditions of the site were described, the current proposal has not been evaluated. See the geohazard report requirements for the site plan, hazards analysis and more in BMC 16.55.430-16.55.460.

**Action Item**: Submit the required geohazard information, developed by a licensed geologist, described in BMC 16.55.340—16.55.460 for this proposal.

**See included geohazard information, developed by a licensed geologist, described in BMC 16.55.340-16.55.460 for this proposal.**

The wetland mitigation plan proposes the purchase of mitigation bank credits for mitigation for Wetland B. Mitigation banking is allowed when criteria in BMC 16.55.360 D are met. Criterion D 6 is not met: “The director determines that the wetland bank provides appropriate compensation for impacts.” With no known opening of the Lummi Nation Wetland and Habitat Mitigation Bank, the proposed mitigation credit purchase does not provide appropriate compensation.

The project is avoiding clearing and grading more than half the site. Knowing that the site plan is likely to change, based on code requirements, avoidance should be considered as an option. Buffer reduction or averaging is another option as long as it meets requirements for each in BMC 16.55.340 C.

**Action Item**: Explore avoidance and other means of maintaining the wetland. If there are no viable options, provide a mitigation plan that meets criteria for mitigation in BMC 16.55.350.

The revised Critical Areas Report: Wetland Mitigation Plan no longer proposes the purchase of mitigation bank credits.

The Site Plan has been revised to avoid disturbance of Wetland B, and maintain the required setback/buffer averaging, signage and split rail fencing.

**See revised Site Plan and Critical Areas Wetland Mitigation Plan.**

The Critical Area Report describes the drainage flowing from the east side of Puget St. to the property where it flows into Wetland B. It does not describe the drainage flowing from Puget St. down the Consolidation right-of-way where a trail is proposed.

**Action Item**: Describe the drainage flowing in the Consolidation right-of-way. Show where crossings and/or culverts are proposed, if any.

The drainage flowing in the Consolidation Ave. right-of-way is described in the Critical Areas Wetland Mitigation Plan (page 4; paragraph 1). Proposed crossings and/or culverts are shown on the Preliminary Engineering Trail Plan, as well as the Preliminary Engineering, Consolidation Ave. improvements.
There is no indication on the mitigation plan, or any of the site plans, where the conservation easement boundary will be. Similarly, a split rail fence should be proposed to protect the wetland and wetland buffer remaining.

**Action Item**: When finalizing the mitigation plan, incorporate the location of the conservation easement boundary and the location of a split-rail fence. Include a cost estimate for the split-rail fence for the required surety.

See the Conservation Easement Map, included in the revised Critical Areas Wetland Mitigation Plan. Per the Plan, no monitoring or surety is required as critical areas will not be disturbed (Critical Areas Report, Section 8.1 Mitigation Approach, #7). The location of the required signage and split rail fencing is shown on the CE map. See also the revised Landscaping Plan: Conservation Easement Map.

**Tree Retention**
The city adopted low impact development standards to reduce stormwater impacts citywide. The Land Clearing Chapter, BMC 16.60.080 B requires a tree retention plan.

**Action Item**: Provide a tree retention plan prepared by an ISA certified arborist that identifies the species and size of all significant trees (6” at dbh or greater) on and near the site. The retention plan should also identify all trees that will be removed and those that will be preserved. For those being preserved, provide a description and drawing of the fencing method to protect the critical root* zone during construction. All significant trees to be removed require replacements at a ratio to be determined by the city.

➢ Map significant* trees and identify the species.
➢ Locate structures and infrastructure to maximize tree retention.
➢ Identify trees that will be removed and those that will be retained.
➢ For those retained, draw the critical root zone** protection area.
➢ Show the fencing method used to install at the critical root zone.
➢ Show locations of underground utilities to ensure no conflicts with the critical root zone of retained trees (consider pipe boring to avoid conflicts).
➢ Identify locations for replacement trees (native species) to be located. Consider “Right tree, right place.” Replacement ratios will be determined by the city.

See included Tree Retention Plan prepared by an ISA certified arborist, which includes all above Action Item information. In addition, a Tree Risk Assessment is included in this plan.

**Zoning**
The application materials address the clearing special condition listed in the zoning table for Area 17, with the exception of demonstrating how the proposal minimizes the destruction of existing vegetation, encourages the incorporation of existing vegetation, and demonstrates how the proposed grading necessary to develop the improvements and infrastructure will not result in excessive clearing. Additional information is necessary to demonstrate the clearing special condition is met and fulfill the purpose of the planned development chapter pursuant to BMC 20.38.020.

**Action Item**: Submittal of preliminary grading plans and the tree retention plan required above is necessary to fulfill this request.

See revised Site Plan, Narrative/Site Design/Section D: Clearing & Grading, and Preliminary Grading Plan. See also Tree Retention Plan prepared by an ISA certified arborist.
The application materials do not adequately address the view special condition. The application materials must provide sufficient analysis to determine what, if any, view impacts the proposed development will have on surrounding properties.

**Action Item:** Please provide a view analysis that takes into consideration those properties located uphill to the east and south of the subject site.

See View Analysis that takes into consideration those properties located uphill to the east and south of the subject site.

**Planned Development**

The site plan does not show the required yards consistent with BMC 20.38.050 (B)(7). A twenty-five foot setback is not found in code.

**Action Item:** Submit a revised site plan demonstrating compliance with the required yards.

See revised Site Plan demonstrating compliance with the required yards.

The usable space does not qualify for the 2:1 ratio since the usable space does not contain significant recreational equipment.

**Action Item:** Revise the proposal to provide the required 34,000 sf of usable space compliant with BMC 20.38.050(B)(6).

Unit count has been reduced from 136 to 106. The required amount of usable space is 26,500 sf (106 units x 250 sf/unit). The proposal has been revised to provide 43,600 sf of usable space, compliant with BMC 20.38.050 (B)(6). See revised Site Plan and Narrative/Site Design.

BMC 20.38.050(B)(8) Parking. The parking stalls appear to be sized as 9' by 18'. For multifamily development, these dimensions can be reduced to 8.5' by 15' pursuant to BMC 20.12.030(C)(4)(e).

Parking may not be located in the front, side or side flanking yards. It appears some parking may be located within the required yard for Consolidation Ave.

**Action Item:** Submit a revised site plan demonstrating compliance with the required parking standards.

See revised Site Plan demonstrating compliance with the required parking standards (no parking is located in the required yards).

**Design Review**

Per BMC 20.25, multifamily design review is required. The project shall comply with all site and building design standards contained in the Multifamily Residential Design Handbook (Handbook). The comments below are standards from the Handbook that are not met.

**SITE DESIGN.**

A. Orientation - Orient buildings to public streets and/or open space. This standard does not appear to be met. As designed, the building is oriented to the parking lot and the parking lot is oriented to the street.

The Site Plan now contains 3 buildings (A, B & C). Building B is adjacent to the large exterior common usable area. Both buildings A & B are oriented to this CUA. The main entrance to each building is centrally located on the east side, and clearly marked with special lighting and landscaping. Additional entrances are on the west side of each building, as well as stair towers at each end. All buildings have been oriented to the southwest to minimize shadow casting on adjacent properties.
Due to the site topography, (15-20% west to east grade) any proposed buildings on this site must be elongated due north/south. The project includes two vehicle entrances and three pedestrian entrances at the front of the site (Consolidation Ave). Pedestrian routes allow easy access via minimally sloped sidewalks that do not go through any parking lots (ADA compliant). Both the pedestrian and vehicle entries will be lined with City approved street trees, to add color and interest. The western (main) entrance to the complex will be enhanced with a site sign, as well as additional lighting and landscaping.

See revised Site Plan and Landscaping Plan.

B. Neighborhood Connections – This standard does not appear to be met. Pedestrian facilities to Puget Street are needed and required though the planned development regulations.

A pedestrian trail to Puget St. (via Consolidation Ave.) will be provided.

See Preliminary Engineering Trail Plan showing the proposed location and design of this pedestrian facility.

C. Parking Location and Design – This standard does not appear to be met. While the parking lots are located at the sides, assuming Consolidation is the front for design purposes, the parking lots have not been broken up to minimize their mass or ease for pedestrian circulation; additional pathways connecting the parking areas to the walkways adjacent to the building are necessary to satisfy this standard. A final landscape plan will need to demonstrate how the parking lots will be screened from abutting and adjacent single-family residences.

Surface parking areas have been broken up into six lots (A-F). No lot, except F, includes more than 8 contiguous stalls without a landscaping strip. All lots have been designed to ensure ease of pedestrian circulation to building entrances, site amenities, garbage & recycling enclosures and Consolidation Ave. Two vehicular points of ingress/egress are proposed via Consolidation, with one continuous looped lane around the buildings. Lots A and B are located to the east of Buildings A and C, far from our westerly neighbors. Lot C has been pushed easterly. A large common area along our western border adds buffer. Building B now shields Lot D from both our Nevada St. and Marionberry Ct. neighbors. All westerly facing stalls in lots C and E are headlight screened with a solid 4’ vinyl fence. Marionberry Ct. will be further screened with a dense replant along the northwest border of Lot F.

See revised Site Plan and Landscaping Plan.

D. Clearing and Grading – To meet this standard and ensure the site is maximizing preservation of existing vegetation, a survey of the existing vegetation on site should occur to ensure development is being proposed in appropriate location. A tree retention plan pursuant to BMC 16.60.08(B)(4) is required. The effect of grading must be minimized by well-proportioned and design retaining wall associated with the parking lots, pursuant to subsection E – Fences and walls.

A tree retention plan produced by an ISA certified arborist is included, pursuant to BMC 16.60.08(B)(4). The existing grade of the site is +/-15-20%. Parking lots and buildings are located to minimize cut/fill. +/-48.6% of the site will be left in open space. Concrete retaining walls are limited to 4’-5’ in height whenever feasible, and stamped/decorative if visible. A 2:1 sloped re-plant will be located to the east of Lots A and B, to minimize changes to the natural topography and blend into the native forest.

See Tree Retention Plan, revised Site Plan, Landscaping Plan, Site Sections, and Prelim Grading Plan.
F. Open Space and Recreational Area – The proposal does not meet this standard. The outdoor usable space located on the east side of the building will be shaded much of the time; consider relocating this amenity where sun exposure is maximized. If the indoor common use areas are proposed for gathering purposes, consider locating them on the west side of the building for the same sun exposure comment above.

The exterior common usable space has been re-designed as one large (+/-40,600 SF) contiguous area on the western portion of the site. Recreational amenities added to this area include a walking/jogging trail, picnic tables and park benches. 26,500 sf of usable space is required (106 units x 250 sf). A total of 43,600 sf of indoor/outdoor usable space is proposed.

See revised Site Plan, Landscaping Plan and Rendering.

G., H., J. Overall, these are standards that can be met and must be incorporated with a final site and building design. The use of landscaping to screen and buffer the proposal, including the building parking areas and retaining walls supporting the parking areas, from the adjacent residences on Nevada should be given priority and shown on the landscape plan.

The exterior common usable area has been relocated to the western boundary. Nearly 1 acre in size, this large area adds buffer to the adjacent Nevada St./Marionberry Ct. homes. In addition, a +/- 20 ft strip along a large portion of this boundary will be planted to establish a densely forested screen. A retaining wall with a solid fence above will add physical separation. These combined measures, utilizing both man-made and natural elements, provide additional privacy to our westerly neighbors.

See revised Site Plan, Landscaping Plan and Rendering.

I. Landscape Design – Together with the street orientation, the building’s main entrance shall be emphasized with special landscaping, paving and lighting.

The westerly Consolidation Ave. complex entrance has been emphasized with a site sign, special landscaping and lighting.

See revised Site Plan and Landscaping Plan.

M. Site Drainage – Additional information will be needed with final engineer drawings to ensure the clearing and grading for the open facility is minimized and restoration of the disturbed area is maximized through buffer landscaping.

The open stormwater treatment pond has been replaced with a stormwater treatment bio-cell.

See revised Site Plan and Preliminary Stormwater Plan/Report.
BUILDING DESIGN

A. Neighborhood Scale – This provision is not met. The building does not incorporate design elements that are at a similar scale of the adjacent single-family neighborhood. The existing neighborhood has a very well-defined character consisting of 2 story elements and building features typical of Pacific Northwest housing.

The Site Plan has been re-designed to contain 3 buildings (A, B & C). Buildings A and B, closest to Nevada St./Marionberry Ct., are both 2.5 stories (not to exceed 35’ per Definition 1). These buildings are identical, each containing just 4 sections of 44’. These sections are similar in scale to adjacent homes (50’-60’ in width). The existing neighborhood homes are also similar in height to Buildings A and B, ranging from 1 to 3 stories. Cityview’s 2.5 story buildings are strategically placed to transition from the existing 1-3 story homes, to our larger Building C (5.5 stories, not to exceed 65’ per Definition 1). All buildings have basement units facing west, designed similarly to single family ‘walk up’ units. Additional single-family elements such as covered entries, assorted hipped and gable roof lines, and siding/window configurations help blend all buildings with the adjacent Pacific Northwest style residential homes.

See revised Site Plan, Landscaping Plan, Building Elevations and Rendering.

B. Neighborhood Compatibility – The architectural character of the surrounding buildings is well-defined. The proposal minimally addresses this standard and must be revised to incorporate the human scale elements of this defined character.

CityView’s rooflines, architectural style and details, assorted siding materials and colors, window sizes and patterns, as well as entry configurations (basement level ‘walk up’ units) are designed to be similar to the existing character of the Puget neighborhood.

See revised Site Plan, Building Elevations, and Rendering.

C. Privacy - This provision requires additional analysis. Distance alone does not privacy. The proximity of the parking to the single-family residences and the height of the building could result in privacy issues that require further analysis how mitigation should be provided.

Parking Lots C, D, E and F (closest to our westerly neighbors) are screened with densely planted landscaping. Headlight screening has been added to Lots C and E. A large (+/-1 acre) buffer/re-plant/usable space has been added along the project’s westerly border. This area not only adds distance to our Nevada neighbors, but also increases privacy. It contains a re-plant buffer, additional landscaping, as well as a retaining wall with fencing above to increase physical separation.

The project has been amended to include 3 buildings (A, B, and C) instead of 1. Building A is 2.5 stories. It is set back +/-160’ (mid-point average) from the westerly boundary. Building B is identical to Building A, it is set back +/-90’ (mid-point average) from Cityview’s westerly boundary. Building C is set back +/-240’ (midpoint average) from the westerly boundary. Building C has been strategically placed to the east of the smaller Building B, in order to increase privacy for our westerly neighbors.

No decks are proposed. To maximize privacy for adjacent westerly homes, upper floor units are designed with a 6’ slider protected by a 42” railing (Juliet balcony). Tenants will have access to plenty of fresh air, while minimizing impact to neighbors’ privacy. Finally, windows within the complex are placed so that Tenants cannot look directly into adjacent units.

See revised Site Plan, Building Elevations, Rendering and Landscaping Plan.
D. Façade and Articulation – This standard is not met. The building’s repeating pattern lacks modules of distinct design as guided in the Handbook and results in a monolithic building.

The project has been amended to include 3 buildings (A, B and C) instead of 1. Building articulation in these amended designs is achieved by modulating exterior walls. Maximum distance between modules is +/-26’, minimum module distance is +/-10’. A common, unifying design theme is proposed throughout the buildings. Conventional sized windows, covered entries (basement units), along with variation in textures and lines, are designed to reduce the perceived mass of the buildings and give them a human scale. Each modulation is stepped back a minimum of 4’. 3 different styles of siding are proposed: 1) 2’-3’ stone veneer (basement floors), 2) horizontal lap siding on the lower levels, and 3) vertical siding on the upper floors. A minimum of 4 different siding colors add further visual interest. Variation in gable and hipped roof lines is achieved by using an assortment of pitch and width.

See revised Building Elevations and Rendering.

E. Windows – This standard is not met. Staff does agree that the window spacing, size or placement is consistent with the neighborhood context. Window placement in the recessed portions of the building’s modulation does not meet this standard and should instead be placed on the outward portion of the module.

Windows have been added to the outward portion of each module. The centrally located common areas have been improved with large picture windows. Additional windows have also been placed on all end walls. The combination of these window improvements helps Cityview blend within the neighborhood context.

See revised Building Elevations and Rendering.

G. Entries – This standard is not met. The building entry should be an element of the overall building design that is celebrated with human scale elements such as change in materials (stone, brick, etc) that can and usually extends above the first two or three stories.

The main entrances, centrally located on the east sides, are defined by directional signage, and ample walkways leading to the lobbies. These entrances are well lit, lined by landscaping, and clearly visible from the adjacent parking lots and drive lanes. An oversized, covered walkway leads to each lobby. Variations in siding styles and colors extend to the roofline above the entries. The centrally located basement entrances are located on the west sides of the buildings. These entrances are also clearly defined, with sidewalks leading to doorways. Directional lighting (downward facing) helps guide tenants and guests. Two additional secure entries are located on the north and south stair towers of each building. Again, non-invasive lighting and clear pathways lead to these additional points of pedestrian ingress/egress.

See revised Site Plan, Landscaping Plan, Lighting Plan, Building Elevations and Rendering.

H. Building Materials – Additional detail is needed to determine compliance with this standard.

3 different types of durable siding are proposed: 1) 2’-3’ of brick veneer (basement level), 2) horizontal lap siding (lower floors) and 3) vertical siding (upper floors). An array of colors will be used to reduce the perceived scale of the buildings. These various siding components, in addition to multiple colors and stone veneer, add a ‘Pacific Northwest’ style.

See revised Building Elevations and Rendering.
SEPA Checklist
Revise the SEPA checklist to address the information requested in this notice and the following:

- Include in the project description the full scope of the proposal including all required public infrastructure, critical area review, use, parking access etc.
- The SEPA checklist instructions ask that the applicant “answer each question accurately and carefully”. It also says, “complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.”

The SEPA checklist does not provide complete answers to the questions. It is okay to list the studies relied on for the project but listing them as the “answer” to the questions does not provide complete and accurate information. For example, question #11 on page 2 asks for a brief description of the proposal. This description is what is used for the SEPA determination and needs to be provided by the applicant. Referencing the “elevations, site plans, and details attached” does not accurately answer this question. Include offsite improvements in the description also.

When the SEPA determination is made, it includes the checklist but not all the reports, so the other agencies and individuals reviewing the checklist won't have those reports to refer to.

It appears that the wetland “fill” will result from diverting the water source to the wetland. In the section “3. Water” provide specific information about the wetland, the water source, and the proposed diversion. Provide the square footage of wetland fill.

**Action Item**: Provide complete and accurate answers to the questions to include the entire scope of the proposal including the information requested in this notice. Instead of referencing reports and studies, list them in question #8 on page 2. Otherwise, provide the details needed from the respective reports.

See updated SEPA Checklist with complete and accurate answers, including the entire scope of the proposal including the information requested in this notice. All referenced reports and studies have been listed in question #8, page 2, SEPA Checklist.

Review of the application cannot commence until all of the above referenced information has been submitted. Within 14 days after submittal of the requested information, staff will determine the completeness of the information and shall notify the applicant whether the application is complete or specify what additional information is necessary. If all the requested information is not submitted within 120 days of the date of this notice (December 9, 2019, the application shall become null and void, in accordance with BMC 21.10.190(c). This is your only notice regarding the incomplete status of your application and no further notice will be sent concerning the expiration of the 120 day timeline.

Please contact the staff member listed below if you have any questions.

Name: Kathy Bell, Senior Planner E-mail / Phone: kbell@cob.org or 360-778-8347
DESIGN REVIEW CHECKLIST
(PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY OR TYPE IN BLUE OR BLACK INK)

To assist staff in review of a design review application, the following items must be complete.

Planning staff will help you determine which of these requirements are applicable. See instructions in this packet.

COMPLETE THIS CHECKLIST:

✓ Pre-application conference or waiver (if required)
✓ Pre-application Design Guidance Meeting by the Design Review Board
✓ Pre-application neighborhood meeting or waiver (if required)
✓ Transportation certificate of concurrency (if required)
✓ Land Use Application (attached)
✓ Environmental checklist (SEPA) (if required)
✓ Statement describing the development objectives.

A project narrative that includes:

✓ A detailed description of how the project meets each applicable design standard and guideline for the design area (Urban Village, etc.). For example, the narrative for a new building downtown would include a list of each applicable standard and guideline and how the project addresses each item. Print N/A for those standards/guidelines that don’t apply.

✓ A detailed description of how the project addresses any design guidance provided by the DRB or HPC.

(N/A) Any requested departures from the design standards, along with an explanation of how the departure criteria is met.

✓ Residential Multi Data sheet (attached)
✓ Photos of the site context showing the subject site and adjacent buildings, including the block face and the block face across the street
✓ Zoning compliance data (calculate required parking, lot coverage, open space, etc.)
✓ List new gross floor area: Ground floor: 30,596 Upper floors total: 140,233
✓ Value of new construction and exterior alterations: □ $50,000 or less  ✓ Over $50,000
✓ Legal description of the property
✓ Other land use permit applications required for the project
✓ One (1) full-size (24” x 36”) scaled, dimensioned plan set (more may be requested by staff)
✓ Eight (8) sets of 11” x 17” reductions of all plans, including colorized sheets
✓ Provide copies of the plans in an electronic format.
Application fee (DRB pre-application review fee credited if application is filed within 6 months of the DRB meeting)

Mailing list and labels (if Type II or requires Board or Commission review)

Submit information if the proposal is utilizing Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) / Purchase of Development Rights (PDR). Indicate the number to be transferred or purchased. Note that TDR/PDR may only be used within a City TDR/PDR receiving area.

Other required information: ____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST:

Provide a site plan containing the following information. This checklist is divided by type of development. Provide the information under each heading that applies to your project.

The Planning & Community Development Department may require additional information to evaluate the proposal.

Scale shall be standard architectural or engineering. The scale must allow clear depiction of all required information, typically between ¼" = 1' and 1/8" = 1'; and 1" = 10' and 1" = 40';

Existing Site Conditions

- Vicinity map
- All lot lines and site boundary dimensions
- Topography
- Critical Areas
- Streets, alleys, etc.
- Utilities
- Location, dimensions, gross floor area and use of existing structures. Indicate all structures to be demolished
- Distances between structures and property lines
- Location and design of all paving
- Walkways and bicycle paths

New Development

- Proposed lot lines
- Existing and proposed easements
- Proposed grading/final contours
- Location, dimensions, and use of proposed buildings and structures. Include decks, patios, fences and signs
- Distances between proposed buildings, parking areas and property lines
- Existing and proposed elevation contours at intervals of not greater than 5 feet. Provide 2-foot contours when requested by the Planning & Community Development Department
- Location, height, top elevation and width and design of existing and proposed retaining walls and rockeries. Cross sections may be required
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Location, dimension and number of parking spaces (including accessible spaces), bicycle parking, drop-off areas and driveway access

Proposed and existing pedestrian walkways and surfacing

All significant man-made or natural features (ponds, streams, etc.)

Proposed storm water detention and treatment features (swales, ponds, vaults, etc.) Size, location and type of facilities on this preliminary plan shall be consistent with City, State and Federal requirements for storm water management.

(Note: The preliminary plan shall be designed or reviewed by a Civil Engineer registered with the State of Washington for conformance with regulations. The City may ask for information to corroborate the preliminary design. Any regulatory deficiencies in the proposed storm water plan are wholly the responsibility of the proponent and/or the engineer. You may be required to apply for amendments to land use and design permits if there are changes in the final storm water facilities that affect the site design.)

All existing street and alley rights of way abutting the site. Include street name, width of right of way and location of existing improvements such as sidewalk, curb, medians, bus stops, overhead utility lines, street trees, street lights and street improvement width. Note any proposed changes to the street design

Location of existing and proposed utilities within the site such as sewer, water, gas and electricity

Location of existing fire hydrants

Proposed garbage/recycling collection areas and dimensions

Location and type of proposed exterior lighting, including parking lot and building

Location of proposed signs

Land uses, lot lines and approximate location of structures and pavement on abutting properties

Conceptual Landscaping Plan

Scale

Abutting street right of way to the curb

Location, height, and designs of rockeries, retaining walls and fences

Surface and subsurface stormwater facilities

Buildings and paving

Topographic contours - pre and post construction

Wetlands, ponds, streams and proposed buffers

Existing vegetation to be retained

General location and type of proposed trees, shrubs and ground cover

Commercial or Industrial Development

Identification of service truck access routes

Loading areas

Outdoor storage or display areas

Location and type of screening and buffering proposed

Critical Areas on or Adjacent to the Site

Areas of flood hazard (FEMA floodplain or floodway)

Wetlands on site and within 100 feet of the project boundary

Streams, ponds or lakes on site and within 200 feet of the project boundary
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Marine shoreline within 200 feet of the project site
Proposed wetland and water body setbacks and buffers
Conservation easements or other development restrictions/existing conditions affecting the site

ARCHITECTURAL PLAN CONTENT CHECKLIST:

New buildings and additions:

☑ Building elevations drawn at 1/8” = 1’ or comparable scale showing:
  ☑ All facades with shadowing to show modulation of wall and roof
  ☑ Door and window treatments
  ☑ Awnings
  ☑ Artwork
  ☑ Exterior lighting
  ☑ Building materials
  ☑ Type of window glazing
  ☑ Mechanical equipment and screening methods
  ☑ Colors, etc.

☑ Contextual street elevation showing the proposed building in relation to adjacent buildings

☑ Perspective drawings, color renderings or other three-dimensional representations to adequately illustrate the proposal. Models and/or material and color boards are recommended

☑ Dimensioned floor plans with uses labeled; include parking garage layout

☑ Signs

Exterior building alterations:

☐ A site plan is required if the project includes site alterations or if any proposed feature extends into the public street right of way

☐ Building elevations drawn at 1/8” = 1’ or comparable scale showing:
  ☐ All facades with shadowing to show modulation of wall and roof
  ☐ Door and window treatments
  ☐ Awnings
  ☐ Artwork
  ☐ Exterior lighting
  ☐ Building materials
  ☐ Type of window glazing
  ☐ Mechanical equipment and screening methods
  ☐ Signs
  ☐ Colors, etc.

☑ Clearly identify existing features to be retained

☑ Floor diagrams showing location of existing and proposed uses

(Note: After staff review of the application, additional materials may be required to fully illustrate the building and design features proposed.)
2019 Application for Multimodal Transportation Concurrency*

*All Applicants Please Note:
1. This is a Pre-Application Requirement with an evaluation fee of $10/pm peak hour person trip. Complete applications must be submitted to Permit Center with Concurrency Evaluation Fee (page 2).
2. Projects affecting arterials or intersections with low level of service (LOS) or that produce 50+ peak hour person trips will also be required to complete a full traffic study as per Section 11, Public Works Development Guidelines. Concurrency certificates shall not be issued prior to completion and acceptance of TIA by Public Works.
3. Projects abutting public right-of-way will be required to construct standard urban street improvements per BMC 13.04.
4. Projects will be required to pay 2019 TIF of $1.864/pm peak person trip in full at time of building permit issuance. A TIF estimate is provided at the bottom of page 2.

PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>CityView</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Address:</td>
<td>4413 Consolidation Ave, Bellingham, WA 98226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Number(s):</td>
<td>380332172175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrency Service Area (CSA) Number (See Map on page 3):</td>
<td>8-Puget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office___ Retail___ Industrial/Manufacturing___ Institutional___ Mixed Use___ Other___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross square footage of non-residential building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Date of Project Completion/Occupancy:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPLICANT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Morgan Bartlett, Jr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Madrona Bay Real Estate Investments, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>424 W Bakerview Rd Ste 109, Bellingham, WA 98226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>360-527-2777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:morgan@madronabayllc.com">morgan@madronabayllc.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the project applicant, I hereby acknowledge I have read this permit application and state that the information is correct and agree to comply with all City ordinances and State laws regulating activities covered by this permit application.

Applicant Name: Morgan Bartlett
Signature: [Signature]
Date: 2/15/2020
# Land Use(s) and Trip Generation

[Call Transportation Planner for assistance (360) 778-7946]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Description</th>
<th>ITE Land Use Code</th>
<th>Person Trip Generation Rate¹</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Commercial or Industrial Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Total New Person Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-rise Multifamily</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.64/unit</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Net New Person Trips =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urban Village Trip Reduction Credits (BMC 19.06.040 E.)**

In 2019, available only for projects located within the following mixed use Urban Villages: 
Downtown, Old Town, Samish Way, Fountain District, Fairhaven, Barkley Village, and 
downtown Waterfront District (see associated Urban Village maps)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Village location</th>
<th>(see associated Urban Village maps)</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**WTA Transit Proximity**

- Only One Transit Proximity Reduction Below May Be Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity Description</th>
<th>Frequency/Distance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fronts on a WTA GO line</td>
<td>15-minute frequency at doorstep</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ¼-mile of a WTA GO line</td>
<td>5-minute walk of 15-min frequency</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronts on a standard WTA line</td>
<td>30- to 60-minute frequency at doorstep</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ¼-mile std WTA line</td>
<td>5-minute walk of 30- to 60-minute frequency</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute Trip Reduction</td>
<td>State law requirement to employ various transportation demand management measures</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Optional/Voluntary Performance Measures to Reduce Vehicle Trips (Requires 2-Year Contractual Agreement)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Financial Feasibility</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTA bus pass purchase 2 years/$500 each</td>
<td>Only financially feasible for projects with 25+ total trips</td>
<td>1% per WTA bus pass</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share memberships 2 years/$500 each</td>
<td>Only financially feasible for projects with 13+ total trips (If Car Share Company exists)</td>
<td>2% per membership</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share vehicle provided on site</td>
<td>Car Share Company or Property Owner</td>
<td>2% per vehicle</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Land Uses**

100% Credit for previous land use

Total Reductions

Grand Total Net New Person Trips = 67.84

2019 Transportation Concurrency Evaluation = $10 / pm peak person trip. Evaluation Fee = 678.40

*TIF estimate below is provided out of courtesy and is only informational. TIF is not due until permit issuance.*

2019 Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) = $1,864 / pm peak person trip. Project TIF Estimate = 126,453.76