COB residents,

Never have I seen a neighborhood come together so cohesively to resist a development as I see my neighbors resist City View. And for good reason; it is not appropriate for this neighborhood. If more new apartments are needed in south Bellingham, they should be located in neighborhoods that support them and won’t suffer from them. Lincoln Street, Lakeway and Samish Way are more logical than the Samish and Puget neighborhoods.

In an effort to keep this letter brief, I'll just bullet point list other reasons why City View should not be built in the location currently proposed:

- Too much vehicular Traffic on neighborhood streets
- Area Parking will be overcrowded
- Excessive Noise
- Reduced values of nearby houses
- Student housing in family neighborhood

Thank you,
Mike Merrick
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Comment or Testimony
The CityView project does not belong in the proposed neighborhood. It will lower the house values in the Puget neighborhood. It will increase traffic on Puget. It absolutely should not be allowed to be built.
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Comment or Testimony
You have my letter on file. My position has not changed a bit. The renderings Cityview has supplied do nothing to show the actual scope of the size of these buildings in my backyard. This project is far oversized for our neighborhood and parking is completely inadequate for the number of people they intend to house and will spill over onto our street making it more dangerous for pedestrians and children. This is a family neighborhood and introducing dorm style housing is a big mistake. WWU is having decreasing in person enrollment even before the pandemic so there is not so great a need for this type of housing. What Bellingham needs is affordable single family homes and the City has very few, if any, incentives to build them. Families want neighborhoods and outdoor space and autonomy—not apartments and crowded living spaces. College kids can always rent houses together but families cannot afford this apartment complex or to rent houses in Bellingham. This type of housing is not what we need. Please do not let this project go through. If it goes through, a lot of the families will move out and sell to rental companies who will just rent to college kids and the neighborhood will completely erode. We’ve had our problems with college students in this neighborhood in the past and we are finally becoming more family and owner-occupied and the pride of our neighborhood is growing. Cityview would end that. This is not a good location for this type of housing, even if we did need it—the ground is very steep and wet from run-off. Deer, coyotes, hawks and eagles all use this area as they move between their ever decreasing pockets of habitat. The City has designated Nevada St as a safe bike route, but this will not be a SAFE bike route with 300 extra cars on these streets every day. The traffic count study that was done was at the very end of the academic year at Western when many students have dropped out from the Fall and Winter quarters or have completed their studies or have no finals so left school early. It was not an accurate study. Done in October, they would have found much more traffic as no one walks anywhere in the bad weather and enrollment at WWU would have been at a peak. Cityview just wants to slam this project through and the City of Bellingham needs to consider future use, neighborhood conformity, and quality of life.
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I do not want this in my neighborhood. The city has done very little to protect neighborhoods from this kind of negative development. We can see what has happened to Roosevelt Neighborhood. What about traffic on Puget Street? No one drives the speed limit of 25 mph now. We don't need these mega apartment buildings. Isn't there a way to house students in a better more aesthetic way.
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City View Project

We strongly oppose this project because of its potential severe adverse environmental and social impacts in our neighborhood.
The proposed dormitory/housing consisting of multiple 2-5 storey buildings for 300+ tenants does not belong in this small, quiet and family oriented neighborhood of young families and senior citizens.
We love this neighborhood because it keeps our balance, feels home and close to nature. We would hate to see those woods and trees destroyed to give way for this housing project.
Neighborhood traffic safety obviously is also a major concern since the existing streets are not designed to handle additional traffic caused by multiple vehicles from expected hundreds of tenants. Young children in the neighborhood like to play outside and ride bikes on our streets. We won’t feel safe with the hundreds of strangers coming and going in this neighborhood as a result of this huge housing project.
This project is not appropriate for this area. Please look somewhere else where it belongs.
Thank you!
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I do not see any transition area between the single family homes surrounding the proposed City View Apartment complexes. I believe when the development of this neighborhood requires a transition between housing types. Since the City View apartment complexes are surrounded on all 4 sides by single family homes, does it not require transitional housing types between the two. Especially on the North, South and west sides as these buildings will sit very close to the existing single family homes. During the Planning Commission broadcast on Sun. May 30th. It was explained that apartment buildings are not allowed in these zones. I do not see either plans nor space for the allowed type of housing required when going from single family homes to apartment buildings in an established single family neighborhood. It doesn't look appropriate or in compliance to me.
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To Whom it May Concern:

I am in opposition to the Cityview proposal because I feel it would be detrimental to the Puget/Nevada homeowners to put student housing apartments in the middle of an existing neighborhood of single-family homes (that is already surrounded by apartments on the west side). The traffic alone to this development would harm the essence of this single home family neighborhood.

Under the 2016 Comprehensive Housing Plan consideration for what type of home goes into this existing neighborhood should be of the utmost importance. There are little to no homes available for first-time home buyers in Bellingham and this area could be utilized to address that and help the existing homeowners at the same time. I realize it is zoned for multi-family so maybe duplexes are the answer.

Below are some bullet points from the 2016 Comprehensive Housing Plan that should be taken into consideration when approving a developer’s plan for the area:

- In 2015, Bellingham and its unincorporated UGA included about 42,000 housing units. About 44% of the existing housing stock in Bellingham is multi-family, and this percentage is expected to increase to about 50% by 2036. Citywide we are currently at about 50.3% multi-family housing (duplex, triplex, fourplex, and 5+ unit apartment and condo buildings). In the past five years (2015-2020) the city has issued permits for 4,223 housing units of which 3,200 were for multi-family types. The comp plan has put multi-family development at 51% so the growth of the past 5 years has nearly put us at that limit already.

The Housing Chapter provides a framework for promoting a diverse housing supply, protecting and improving the health and livability of the City’s neighborhoods, and making adequate provisions for the current and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. The City must foster housing that is affordable to those at all income levels - from those who are homeless, to low income and workforce families, and those earning higher wages.

Bellingham’s housing stock is aging, with nearly one third of the stock over 50 years old. More than half of the housing stock was built before 1980. Residents value the preservation and enhancement of their homes and neighborhoods and derive a sense of place from them. Some community members are concerned about the potential impacts of infill projects on existing neighborhoods, while others support well-designed infill as a strategy to preserve undeveloped land in rural areas and foster transit, better amenities and housing affordability.

- Policy H-28 Protect and connect residential neighborhoods to retain identity and character and provide amenities that enhance quality of life
- Policy H-31 **Promote high-quality design that is compatible with the overall style and character of established neighborhoods.**

Since most of the new single-family homes built on this side of town have been in a higher priced income bracket (ie. Lopez and San Juan developments) it would be very desirable to have townhomes or duplexes put in this area (like those in Cordata and behind Costco) to meet the needs of the Comprehensive Housing Plan put into place in 2016, helping the housing shortage and helping the existing neighborhood flourish while controlling the impact of traffic and green space. The water coming down the hill into this neighborhood also needs to be addressed when this area is developed too but I'm hopeful the city will make the best possible decisions for us and our beautiful city.

Sincerely,

Shawn Flaherty
908 Puget St.
To whom this may concern,

We reside at 110 South 46th Street - which directly abuts the Southeast corner of the proposed CityView Dormitory Project. As such, we clearly have our own very personal reasons for objecting to this large scale construction project - i.e. plummeting home value and the noise associated with living immediately next to hundreds of college students and a parking lot larger than that at Whole Foods.

However, beyond our own selfish concerns, there are multiple reasons why this gigantic project is a mistake for this neighborhood. I am only going to list three:

1. **Neighborhood location:** Although this location has been deemed appropriate for multi-family housing (which is clearly needed in Bellingham), it is interesting to note that the proposed CityView project only abuts single family homes. Families who bought these homes likely knew that this heavily treed property could eventually be developed - but not for giant dormitories completely removed from other multi-family dwellings.

2. **Automobile & parking issues:** As most recently presented, this project will clearly result in more automobile traffic and more on-street parking on nearby Nevada Street, Consolidation Avenue, Puget Street, 46th Street and 47th Street - which are really not capable of managing more traffic or parking.

3. **Neighborhood scale & compatibility:** These are huge buildings - the largest of which is 70 feet tall and > 300 feet long. The developer's submitted documents regarding neighborhood compatibility actually attempts justification based upon roof gables and picture windows of nearby houses. To suggest that these structures fit into the neighborhood landscape is ludicrous.

We are firmly opposed to this project for these and many other reasons - of which the Puget Neighborhood Working Group have done an excellent job of addressing. Thank you Puget Neighborhood Working Group for your diligent work, and for looking out for our neighborhood. I urge the Planning Commission to thoroughly review the available information, and carefully consider the short & long-term outcomes this project will have on this portion of Puget neighborhood and its residents.

We regret not being able to attend the June 3 meeting. Thank you for reading our letter and considering our opinions.

Sincerely,

Lon and Susan Swan
110 South 46th Street, Bellingham WA 98229
(360) 393-8450
lswan@gmail.com
swans.five@comcast.net
Dear City of Bellingham,

I am a new homeowner on Consolidation Avenue and I am writing about the planned CityView project. I have two areas of concern:

1. Increased traffic
2. Wildlife habitat

By adding 106 units within a block, I would expect to see increased traffic along Consolidation Ave. Given that children are regularly riding their bikes along the street, people cruising too fast down this hill are a major safety concern for me. If the project proceeds, there should be multiple speed bumps put in to prevent any children from being injured due to through traffic.

The other aspect is wildlife habitat. Currently that green area provides a gateway for animals that live in the interurban area to the east to access habitat along Whatcom Creek. We have several large owls--not certain of the species--that live nearby and call at night. We have also seen turkey vultures in the area. I would like to be certain that these animals are not put at risk and their habitat is not lost through this development.

Sincerely,

Jemma Everyhope-Roser
4307 Consolidation Ave
Bellingham WA 98229
CityView Dormitory Project

June 1, 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

We own the home and live at 120 South 46th Street, Bellingham, WA 98229, next door to Lon and Susan Swan.

We moved here in 2020, attracted by the relatively quiet residential nature of the neighborhood. If we had wanted to live next to hundreds of college students (or unrelated individuals living three to a unit), then there were places nearer the WWU campus we could have chosen.

We oppose the CityView Dormitory Project for the same reasons (unsuitability of neighborhood location, intractable auto and parking issues, and incompatibility of scale) stated in Lon and Susan's May 31, 2021 email submitted to cityview@cob.org

Sincerely,

Stan and Victoria Hodson
120 South 46th Street
Bellingham, WA 98229
(805) 701-0757
stanhodson1118@aol.com
victoria.hodson@sbcglobal.net
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Comment or Testimony
1. Affordability
For many students, the cost of living is not affordable, so the easy and obvious solution is to double up per room. Live-in boyfriend/girlfriend/partners will result in this 3 bedroom, 3 bathroom unit design. Apartments need to be practical, 3 bedroom and 1.5 bathrooms is more than enough for a unit. Students will learn to share, manage a schedule, and coexist with other people. We have families in town living in old homes that have 3+ bedrooms and only a single bathroom (or 1.25 bathroom). Student priorities need to be education, studying, and working a part time job! Students shouldn’t be wasting their money on living spaces with “views”. Go socialize and enjoy the free views at one of our many beautiful parks in the city, such as Boulevard or Zuanich.

Bellingham is always priding itself as a green city. Apartments need to be no frills, provide the basic amenities, and be strategically located where students will be set up for success. Conveniently located near campus, grocery stores, downtown, bike lanes, sidewalks, and bus routes. Students will be less reliant on vehicles, save money on gas, and potentially be able to give up their vehicle and car insurance payments.

Perhaps a handful of families with chose to rent at Citiview, but the majority of families cannot afford to rent a 3 bedroom, 3 bathroom unit. In addition to not being affordable, it’s not practical to have 3 bathrooms and this model doesn’t align to Bellingham’s pride on being green. Too many bathrooms is just wasted living space. The housing market in Bellingham is insane right now and has been for the past several years. We needs more affordable single family homes in this town so seniors and families have the ability to move from being a renter to a homeowner. There are enough apartments popping up in town to accommodate students, especially when you consider the increased number of students studying remotely from out of town or from a family residence.

2. Drainage and stormwater runoff.
I rented a place off Milton Street for almost five years so I’ve witnessed the drainage and stormwater runoff issues as I walked or rode my bike to work. Runoff issues occur on the east end of Byron Street (which turns into a steep gravel dirt road), along S 44th St (which lacks sidewalks and drainage for roadway runoff), on the east end of Consolidation Ave (which is the at proposed CitiView entrance), and along the south end of Nevada Street (which receives runoff from Consolidation Ave and S 44th St). At times, water overwhelms the roadside drainage on S 44th St. The amount of water feeding into the roadside drain surpasses its max capacity, causing water to run over onto the roadway on S 44th. There are streams that run between a number of homes on the east side of S 44th St. There were times when I walked along S 44th St that I could hear the loud sounds of babbling water- I can only imagine what is going on in the backyard and in the crawlspace. At times, the water runoff from the east end of Byron St and east end of Consolidation covers the roadway in dirt.

When it’s below freezing, the roadways ice over where there are drainage and stormwater runoff issues, especially where Byron St intersects S 44th St, along S 44th St, and where Consolidation Ave/S 44th St/Nevada St intersect. I was driving to work one ice day and I came across a man lying in the roadway where Byron and S 44th St intersect. He was clearly in a lot of pain and he couldn’t get back onto his feet. I am very aware of the poor drainage in this area, so if it’s icy, I know to avoid walking on the concrete surfaces in this area as much as possible and to walk on the grass lawn of the corner property (144th S 44th St). I helped the man back to his feet and directed him to the grass. Also, the sidewalk on Byron just...
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Planning Commision,

I am extremely disappointed in the developer's (Morgan Bartlett) revised proposal to your Request for Information from July 6, 2020. You stated in your notice: **With all land use applications, it is the applicant's burden to demonstrate how a proposal meets code and addresses public concerns.** The surrounding neighborhood was very clear in over 200 responses to his earlier proposal that the size of the project in numbers, height of the buildings and layout of the apartments does not fit with the current neighborhood. There was an openness to a project that would actually fit with the current scale of the Puget neighborhood (townhomes, smaller buildings, true family apartments and not 106 3 bedroom units in large buildings to be rented by the room to unrelated people.) Mr. Bartlett chose to disregard the comments.

The concerns remain. He lists the 5.5 story 65 ft. Building C being 210-250 ft. from the western property line. He doesn't mention the increase in elevation where that building would be set. It would completely tower over the existing neighborhood homes and the 8 ft. replacement trees he proposes.

The 106 units with 318 rentable rooms would bring a large amount of traffic into the area. Parking would leak onto the existing neighborhood streets, as would noise from the complex. There would be increased safety issues for children playing in the existing neighborhood with the large increase in traffic.

Concerns remain with almost all aspects of his response to the July 6, 2020 RFI-- the geohazard assessment, geotechnical engineering plan, tree removal and replacement, parking, ingress/egress and other areas. I refer you to the thoughtful response which was submitted by the Puget Neighborhood Working Group for a full discussion of all of these concerns.

I remain in opposition to the CityView project as it is currently proposed and hope you also recognize that the latest proposal does not meet what you outlined in the July 6, 2020 RFI.

Respectfully,

Greg Halleen
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Comment or Testimony
Comprehensive plans talk about preserving the character of existing neighborhoods. Allowing a large private, un-supervised student dormitory to be built smack dab in the middle and surrounded on all sides by single family homes destroys the character of my neighborhood. [regardless what the developer calls it, rent by the room housing is structured for students] This age group has not had the life experience yet to understand the negative impact of loud music, laughter and yelling, racing up and down streets at all hours has on neighbors. Because the police do not have the resources to enforce the noise ordnance, drunken parties and speeding laws, it falls on the city to engineer in such curtails into the development of neighborhoods. i.e. location of such complexes, speed tables on neighborhood roads etc. This statement is based on the issues and living conditions of this area the mid to late nineties. The city's resources to combat this has decreased over the years. [Speaker from the police department in the early 2000s explaining to us that they simply do not have the manpower to respond to non life threatening calls. I personally resent being driven from my home by inappropriate and irresponsible to the city's citizens, development of this type in this spot. This type of development would be better served being built on the west side of Lincoln street.

Puget neighborhood Plan requires a transition area between land uses. This has been put into place by transitioning between apartment complexes to town houses [triplexes, duplexes etc.] to single family homes beginning on Lincoln St clear up to Nevada St. Aesthetically this all blends together nicely. But going from single family to an overpowering apartment complex with just a row or two of trees separating them does not blend the land uses together. [developer’s rendering of the complex is way off scale and fails to show how it actually will fits into the tract of land] It is destructive to the look and feel and safety of this area. And as in the past [late to mid 1990s] promises an increase in harassments of people out walking or driving the speed limit, property damage, trash. This type of development in the middle, surrounded on all sides by single family homes does not preserve the character nor enhance the neighborhood. It promises to migrate this area back into a trouble area that the city does not have the resources to combat.
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Comment or Testimony
I was very disappointed to read Mr. Morgan’s reply to the questions given to him by the city. All he did was reword the question and say he would or wouldn't do that. If his responses were answers on a high school essay test he would of failed.
The panning department has failed to answer the numerally asked question concerning how this tract of land went from zoned for 85 units to 176 on acreage that has been reduced from 12 to 11. [area survey maps] I think we as citizens of this city have a right to know.
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To whom it may concern,

I am writing as a very concerned citizen that will be directly impacted by the inappropriate proposal for the City View apartment complex in the Puget Neighborhood. Our home at 802 Nevada street is directly below the proposed project. I have two young children and my greatest concern is for the safety of my own family as well as the safety of others regarding this project. Currently, the intersection of Nevada and Consolidation streets is dangerous. I have been nearly hit in my car and while walking by motorists that fail to stop or even yield at posted stop signs. I greatly fear that the massive increase in traffic will and the potential accidents that may result and I fear for the safety of my own children and that of others that live and play along Nevada Street. If this project is to go through something major would need to be done to address the safety of this intersection. Furthermore, I worry that the connecting streets cannot handle the increased traffic and further safety issues will ensue. People already illegally park on Consolidation Avenue often causing dangerous conditions where visibility is limited and there is not enough room for cars to safely pass by. With increased use the dangers of this street and others will only be increased.

My next concern is the environmental impacts this project may have including hydrology and the impact that may have on surrounding habitat as well as current drainage systems. While I have limited experience with hydrology, I do have an environmental studies degree and know that an impact to one aspect of an environment can have profound impacts to the rest of an ecosystem. I worry that the proposed project will affect groundwater flows and will in turn affect the trees that will be left standing as can be seen with another development just down the road. Some of the trees that could be affected are very large and should they become weakened, -or die could fall on our house harming my family. This is a genuine fear I have after seeing the tree die-off at the bottom of Consolidation Avenue in relation to the new apartment complex on Ashley Street, a complex that is much smaller than the proposal for City View. We watch each year as the hill that is our back yard slips a little further and am concerned that this is an indication of the movement of the slope beyond our property. If the slope is moving, even if it is slowly moving how will that impact the safety of my family and those residing in the proposed project?

My final concern is that this project is not consistent with the neighborhood and the density of the project is inappropriate given the single-family nature of the neighborhood currently. It is my understanding that compatibility with surrounding property is outlined in the city’s codes, this in no way is compatible with the way the Puget neighborhood, Nevada Street in particular, was developed. The housing options outlined in the city’s infill toolkit would be much more appropriate development of this land. As it would maintain the feel of the neighborhood and would not overwhelm already troubled streets. The proposed dormitory style units would house over 300 individuals overwhelming our neighborhood and drastically changing the culture of the place we call home. I also feel that the need in Bellingham is for affordable family housing to ensure Bellingham remains a family friendly community as currently the housing market continues to price out families of low or median income. I want to live in a community where everyone can be successful and can afford to live. I want to live in a place that celebrates equity and does not promote capitalistic endeavors to benefit wealthy investors.

I beg of you to not approve this proposal. We love our home and our neighborhood and want to provide a place where our children can feel safe growing up. We were barely able to afford our home when we purchased it and would not be able to afford another home in Bellingham given current market prices. I
love Bellingham, my husband grew up here and I would be devastated if we were no longer felt safe or comfortable in our home due to inappropriate development. Please do what you can to protect the culture of our neighborhood. We are a diverse group of people that care deeply about where we live.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jacque Barnett
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Comment or Testimony
Please, Please, Please do not permit the City View development to work extended hours. This development sits two close to homes to allow construction to take place on weekends and extended hours of the day. There is too much tree cutting, construction vehicle traffic, vehicle backup alarms, sawing hammering and so forth to not give the people of the neighborhood a break on weekends and evenings. This project is in close proximity to homes on all sides and the construction noise will be overpowering. I plead with the city to show some consideration to the residents of this neighborhood and not permit extended construction hours.

Files
Documents or images related to your comments.

Email
pcsrwba@yahoo.com

Your email address will only be used to send you a copy of this comment and any official notifications related to this topic.

Date
6/1/2021
Public Comment

Name
Tina Janni Zuccaro

Choose Topic
CityView Project

Comment or Testimony
As residents and homeowners in the Puget Neighborhood since 2008, my husband and I are deeply concerned about the adverse impacts to our community that the CityView Project would bring. We've already experienced higher volumes of traffic on Puget/Consolidation, due to vehicles heading to the synagogue, as well as the residential developments off San Juan Blvd that are taking the short cut, rather than accessing their neighborhoods via Yew Street. This has also resulted in vehicles traveling at faster speeds that endanger our pedestrians, pets, children and wildlife. Furthermore, when homeowners have politely asked vehicles to slow down, they've received rude responses from driver’s speeding through our streets.

We are also concerned about the other types of activity that such a development could attract and the increased visibility into our neighborhood. Within the last few months, we've had increased incidents of prowlers and attempted theft on W. Pacificview Dr. that have resulted in police calls. Additionally, a car prowl and theft occurred on a vehicle parked near the trailhead by the synagogue. Items from that car were found strewn along a section of W. Pacificview Dr. Consequently, the CityView Project is not a welcome addition to our area and we stand with our neighbors who oppose this development.
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Comment or Testimony
I oppose the development plan for CityView, echoing all the concerns raised by others in the Puget neighborhood. In addition to the listed concerns, the proposed amount of non-family residents and their cars increasing traffic on Nevada (at a rate of at least 249+ cars anticipated, with frequent trips up and down the street for school, work, and errands) is a significant concern because as a homeowner on the corner of Nevada and Marionberry, within the first three months of living here two cars hit the light pole on my easement, resulting in the pole cracking, visibly leaning towards my home the city has not fixed in over three months from report date and locate complete. On any given day, I see many cars nearly miss the roundabout turn that if missed places a car up on the sidewalk, hitting the pole, or in my yard or house. Given the existing setup of Nevada and the traffic it already struggles to support, more traffic expected due to the planned development entrance/exit being just a few houses up from the roundabout increases the safety risk for my home and the neighbors who walk the established sidewalk.
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Comment or Testimony
To Whom It May Concern,

Strictly from the standpoint of a homeowner, I could fill paragraphs with emotional pleas to stop the CityView project. My husband and I recently purchased a home on Nevada Street doing so in large part because of the quiet, single family home neighborhood surrounding the property. It both saddens and makes me anxious to think about such a huge development being built so close to my residence.

However, emotional pleas mean little when considering the reality of a project like CityView. The most important facts to think about are the multiple impacts such a project would have on a variety of very real issues. Stormwater management, sewer and garbage surges, increase in noise and traffic, the ability of the police and fire departments to provide adequate service for the large population planned for the project, and the negative effects of both environmental and conservation matters stemming from the project need to be carefully considered. Further, CityView is out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. I am firmly against CityView moving forward, but would ask, if it does, that all of the above issues be most thoughtfully addressed and the negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood be mitigated.

Perhaps a development a quarter to a third of the proposed size with the remainder of the area being designated “public green space” with walking and biking trails along with ample parking for both the green space and the CityView project might be considered.
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City View does not meet the city standards for new construction in existing neighborhoods. By a mile. And it never will. Just one of the smaller buildings in the current plan would be far out of character with the neighborhood and would violate both the Comprehensive Plan and the In-fill Development Toolkit that we, as citizens, should be able to rely on in making our own decisions about where to invest and live.

Rather than simply saying NO when the City View monstrosity was first proposed, more than TWO YEARS ago, the City has engaged in what we call an infinite loop:

1. Developer submits a plan that is clearly inconsistent with City guidance, is based (where it is based on anything) on incomplete and out of date “studies," and ignores the structural weaknesses of the planned construction, damage to the environment and the surrounding neighborhoods, and the violations of city guidance.
2. City planners ignore all of this and ask for input from the citizens they are paid to serve.
3. We citizens provide that input, almost all of it strongly opposing the tenementization of our town. We point out the shortcomings of the plan, the violation of city guidance, the inadequacy of content that was found lacking when first presented a decade ago. We do the research, make the arguments, tell you where to look and what to look for. (Do you look?)
4. City responds to Developer, stating why the proposal is insufficient, violates city guidance, and has not succeeded in changing reality. City tells Developer what he must add or change, all of which will be ignored.
5. Developer requests, and City approves, extensions of time in which to not respond to the shortcomings. Don’t know why it takes so long to submit the same proposal. Repeat this step several times.
6. Go to step a.

It's confusing to us why this has dragged on for years when it appears so obviously to be a terrible idea.

The City at some point evidently thought it made sense to pour much time and effort into developing a Comprehensive Plan and a toolkit for infill development. I assume that the intention was to give the planning director and his mignons guidance for what the city saw as its communal vision for what our town was and what we value and want to maintain. So why couldn’t we exit this vicious loop the first time we completed step c? We knew then that the proposal was out of compliance in numerous fundamental, dangerous, unfixable (How do you make a tenement look and function like a family home?) ways, and that the citizenry was opposed to waiving our growth plan in order to let the carpetbaggers destroy our neighborhoods. Done.
Can we speak frankly? I’m sure I’m not the only person who is increasingly irritated by reading the same fictions about this proposed building over and over.

1. This housing is designed for students (plus, now, three refugees . . . .). No one else will live there. This is transient housing for students.
2. As in most high-density housing, and certainly in student housing, 300 bedrooms does not equate to only 300 tenants. Let’s quit pretending that there would be only 300 students in residence. Five hundred is probably an underestimate.
3. The students are not going to be hiking to campus, the store, restaurants, etc. They will be driving cars. Two parking spaces per bedroom, minimum, if the streets are to remain passable.
4. If parking spaces for a building cost extra rather than being included as part of the rent, many tenants will park on the street. We have seen this already--Can’t pretend we don’t know.
5. Planting baby trees will do nothing to hide this thing. Look at the scale of it on your own website. The neighborhood houses have been here since the start of this century or before, and none have yet disappeared behind the foliage.
I've already written about traffic and density and drainage and landslides and parking and noise, so I started thinking about what might lie in the future if our planning hierarchy actually feeds us to this developer. It led me to do some reading about the various eruptions the tenement movement in the 20th century -- what governments thought they were doing and what actually happened. Some well-meaning politicians, some corrupt, money-grubbing conmen, but no good outcomes.

Bottom line, if this City View project is approved somehow and gets built and is a success, initially, from the Developer’s viewpoint, the surrounding neighborhoods will be destroyed for all the reasons that have been stated again and again.

If it is approved and gets built or partially built and is a failure in any one of many possible ways (not finished, sparsely occupied, collapses, faulty construction, etc.), the surrounding neighborhoods will be destroyed. As a succession of tenements-are-the-answer campaigns in our large cities has verified, what is left behind when the buildings fail is not pretty. The City is left to deal with the mess.

Either way, money into the pockets of the out-of-town developer and whatever middlemen are greasing his path; money out of the pockets of the citizens. Some of us will pay on the upside as the bulldozers move in, and all of us will pay to clean up the mess.

That seems to be the way it works.
To whom it may concern,

I do not want to see this massive apartment complex developed in the this neighborhood as its just out of place for any reasons that I have stated earlier.

However, a big one for me is the following:

1. Lack of sufficient road width and sidewalks. A walk to the mailbox for me or riding up the Byron/44th St. road network places us at risk of being hit. Where are we to walk, on this street with higher traffic loads in dark conditions with immature distracted students? Without wider street and sidewalks we are fodder waiting to be hit. This is just plain commonsense. When this area was developed in 1995, the developer when bankrupt to my understanding which is why the street is narrow with no sidewalks. Allowing this development not creating a condition for developer to pay for these necessities is not acceptable. As I stated before, if I am hit, I will go after the party that hit me and secondarily to COB for allowing this condition to persist doing nothing about it. Cycling around 5k miles/yr having been involved in motor vehicle collisions 3x, I know what to do. Please refer to the photos I have attached.

Other issues with the development I have are listed below:

1. Creation of student housing blight/ghetto. These parties never mow and landlords just do not care.
2. More parties/noise as students are not respectful
3. Spillover student parking from cityview
4. Most likely increased conflict as students/homeowners do not share the same values.
5. Commonsense here. Simply put, the development needs to be placed in another area with sufficient street/road infrastructure. It is stupid to think that any homeowners are happy with this inconsiderate proposition.
6. Again, please rezone the Hawley Tract to single family, light/heavy industrial. Please, anything other than students would be tolerable.
7. From this, why is the most amazing part of neighborhood spend on a student housing when it could be enjoyed as a city park offering great city/bay views from middle of town. It was the inconsistency of COB not knowing what area should be, apartments/single family housing. As I’ve stated before, the two options do not mix.
8. Please don’t allow this. I am 62 retired not wanting to move. I have moved all my life for job experience and etc. A betrayal from COB on this issue will force me to move.

Ok that is it for now.

Please assess photos I’ve sent pertaining to street width and lack of sidewalks.

One photo is of intersection of 44th/Consolidation looking north.

The other photo is of 44th Street looking south. Obviously, no sidewalk.

Sincerely,
Jim Le Galley
124 S. 44th St.
Bellingham, WA 98229
360/421-6909
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WHEN IS ENOUGH ENOUGH?
A city vacancy rate of 1-2% was given by City View. I truly doubt that to be the case unless they did not take into consideration the MANY monolith apartment buildings that have recently been completed in the City limits or have been recently approved by the city or under construction. Planning Commission could you please request these numbers from whatever sources necessary and pass along to our neighborhood association?

LOSS OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER
Already many homeowners on Nevada and Marionberry have moved because these large buildings LOOMING over our neighborhood would forever change the character of this neighborhood. I am starting to prepare my home and property for sale in case City View is approved. At the age of 75, I would not have thought I would have to figure out another place to live due to some multi-story buildings being built on a HILLSIDE directly behind my back fence. I love Bellingham and moving will take a toll on me. When will the City start taking into consideration the will of the residents? I ask sincerely. When City View referenced 2740 residential dwelling units in the Puget Neighborhood, 55% of those being rentals, it does not mention what percentage of those are already in the Lincoln Street to Puget Street area. This area is becoming saturated with large buildings with little regard to the single-family dwellers. As much as I love Bellingham, I cannot recommend anyone to move to Bellingham if they like the character of a single-family neighborhood. THIS is where the Bellingham Planning Commission can make a difference and take a stand to represent those of us who are not “big enough in numbers” to implement a change in our neighborhood. We would like to see that the City Planning Commission cares enough about the single-family owners to keep the high-rise buildings to a reasonable concentration in this area of the Puget Neighborhood.

LAYOUT
I don't see much difference between this 3bedrm/3bath w/common kitchen/living room layout compared to the proposed University Ridge 4bedroom/4bathroom layout that was denied approval because of the difficulty new owners would be less likely to find renters with this layout.

ONSITE Management
Will there be an ONSITE Manager to take our noise or other complaints or must we call the Bellingham Police Dept every time there is a problem?? There should be. The city should demand it so they will not be overcome with noise/parking complaints etc., from neighbors.

TRAFFIC STUDY
Was another traffic study completed? If it was, it could not possibly give a clear picture of normal neighborhood traffic during this past pandemic year. I still have all the concerns as previously written if this complex is built with 300+ individuals driving about. Lack of parking is already a problem on Consolidation and Nevada streets. Consolidation is not wide enough for the cars that park on both sides AND two lanes of traffic. What will be done to improve walking capability on 44th street between...
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I have lived in the neighborhood for over 15 years now and I don't believe the City View project is a good fit for the area. We already have significant issues with ground water coming to the surface in the area near the project. This water flows over the road almost constantly and in the winter it freezes thus creating an even worse driving hazard.
I am also concerned about traffic congestion on residential streets that are already busy.
While I believe we should be looking to build more homes in the city, I am concerned with the current project seeming to disregard the natural conditions of this area.
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Three questions I have re: the CityView project. I live in Marionberry Court close to where the project is planned.

1. In your March 12, 2021 letter on page 3 you state that "over 50% of the site (5.42 acres) will remain in its natural vegetated state." However, on page 1 of the same letter you mention that the project site is +/- 11.15 acres. Simple math indicates that 5.42 acres is not more than half of 11.15 acres. Please clarify.

2. The 12' wide emergency access road leading down to Nevada Street is to be a maximum of 15% grade. Federal road signs indicate that 6% is a steep grade and trucks should use caution going downhill. How can your access road be more than twice as steep? Will the gates at either end be locked with access limited to emergency vehicles? If private vehicles were to use the road they would not be able to squeeze past each other going in opposite directions, especially since you indicate there will be "stamped concrete walls on either side of the 12' wide roadway.

3. You mention fines for people leaving trash around the grounds or for creating excessive noise. Will Real Property Managers LLC be the enforcers of these rules? How will they enforce the rules?