Aven, Heather M.

From: MY - mayorsoffice@cob.org
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 10:07 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: FW: Please Stop City View

From: Tresa Mariotto <mariocart85@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 9:59 AM
To: CC - Shared Department <cc@cob.org>; MY - mayorsoffice@cob.org <mayorsoffice@cob.org>
Subject: Please Stop City View

More pictures from my daily walk
Sent from my iPhone
This project seems totally out of character with the density and the neighborhoods style of housing. The amount of increased traffic on Nevada (a very small narrow street) not to mention the adjoining streets out to the main thoroughfares will be overwhelming. Overwhelmed with moving cars, and with the number of extra cars trying to park near there on the street as there is not enough onsite parking for this project, much less for guests and visitors, and with increased bicycle travel as well with all those units, I am very concerned about road safety for the neighborhood. The water mitigation for this area needs to be seriously addressed as the cement covering of ground will hugely impact the neighborhood absorption rate. The large size and density also will effect the neighborhood feel and effect the housing values surrounding this area that is mostly single family!
I am writing to you to bring to your attention expert assessment of the CityView application documents. This assessment contains critical findings that can help CoB avoid future challenges to its decisions on the proposed project. I hope you find them useful.

Sincerely,

Nabil Kamel, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Environmental Studies
Huxley College of the Environment
Western Washington University
Nabil.Kamel@wwu.edu
https://huxley.wwu.edu/people/kameln

**Summary:**
The information is pertinent to the SEPA checklist revised 2/26/2020. Answers are incomplete, misleading, and/or erroneous. Consequently, the document is not credible and cannot serve its intended purpose "to determine whether the environmental impacts ... are significant." CoB should reject it and require resubmission, as they did with the original (as per p.9 in RFI response document).

Similarly, the tree retention plan/map fails to include several required components (as per p.3 in RFI response document). The principal omission is location/identification of trees that would be retained and trees that would be removed. Location of trees to be removed is required to determine whether plan complies with Critical Areas Ordinance protection of landslide hazard areas. Plan also includes many other deficiencies and distortions -- e.g., "replacing" mature trees with shrubs.

Request for Information response: Many responses refer to the above documents, which are deficient as noted.

**Detailed Analysis and Comments:**

**Tree Retention Plan**

Plan would replace large canopy dominants w/ small understory trees
c.f. p.3, Request for Information & RFI response
"Identify trees that will be removed and those that will be retained."
-- plan fails requirement: does not show trees that would be removed on 5.73 acre project footprint
-- does not show critical root zone for retained trees
-- does not show fencing method to install at critical root zone
-- replacement trees (Thuja plicata) along west side not provided sufficient root protection

At the northeast corner of development, notes "Stand of hardwoods replace with 452 snowberry":
  Installing shrubs would not replace stand of mature trees.

Most replacement trees would be small understory species. Those cannot "replace" large mature canopy dominants that would be removed.

Note in eastern portion of site:
"(65) hazardous trees to be removed and replaced"
This contradicts wetland mitigation plan assertion that 48% of property would be retained as natural habitat. Removing (so many) trees in that part of the property does not constitute protection or retention.

Some "hazard trees" to be removed are likely within buffer area of landslide hazard area (steep slope, 40%). CAO requires retention of all trees within buffer. Cannot determine whether tree removal would violate CAO because tree retention plan does not locate trees to be removed.

SEPA Checklist

1. Earth
   (b) steep slope (40%): adequate buffer?
   Buffer from building footprint: yes, would meet CAO requirement
   Buffer from ground disturbance during construction: uncertain, no information provided
   Buffer from (hazard) tree removal: uncertain, tree locations not provided

3. Water
   (a) surface water
   (1) wetlands: wetland B "artificially created"?
   There is no credible information or basis for assertion. Wetland mitigation report does not mention "artificial".
   Moreover, while states they are disjunct, independent on site expert inspection shows that the wetlands are continuous. This means that the entire wetland unit requires a category I buffer, which would be inviolate and no buffer averaging allowed. This larger buffer would extend into the proposed development. As such the development application/plan would have to be rejected or substantially modified. Evidence of wetland continuity includes, but is not limited to, obligate wetland plants growing in the area "between" the wetlands and consistent soil color and texture.
   (d) site disturbance +/- 50% does NOT "minimize" impacts

5. Animals:
   only "deer" marked. Ignored all birds, including songbirds, which are abundant in the area.
   Although not regulatory issue, gross omissions show applicant accuracy and diligence with the checklist
   (c) Migration route? "No." YES -- site is part of the Pacific flyway
   (e) Invasive animal species "none" -- not credible (eastern gray squirrel, eastern cottontail rabbit, starlings, ...)

14. Transportation
   (f) Number vehicle trips/day = 68
   This figure is not credible, given the 106 units with 249 parking spaces.
   (h) measures to control transportation impacts
54 bike racks compared to 249 parking spaces is not a credible measure. Development plan caters to private vehicle use, without credible plan to support/encourage other modes or mitigate traffic impacts. Severely underestimates traffic impacts (i.e., 68 vehicle trips/day).

15 Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services

"Walking/biking will be encouraged (only 2 parking stalls assigned to each unit) to reduce auto traffic."

When compared to 1/2 bike parking/unit and parking space for every resident in development means:
-- w/ essentially unlimited parking, driving would be more convenient than bike/bus,
-- would not "reduce auto traffic" and not "encourage" walking/biking.

Proposed measures do not reduce or control impacts

Conclusions:

(1) SEPA checklist, tree retention plan, wetland mitigation report documents contain so many omissions, errors, or misleading statements that they are not credible. They must be revised/resubmitted before CoB makes any responsible decisions about the proposal. (See list of some deficiencies, above.)

(2) Wetlands A and B are continuous. This means that the entire wetland unit requires a category I buffer, which would be inviolate -- no buffer averaging allowed. This larger buffer would extend into the proposed development -- so the development application/plan would have to be rejected or substantially modified.

(3) The 100 ft. buffer around wetland A is not adequate. Wetland mitigation report and development plan use 100 ft. buffer around wetland A, which would follow from a low habitat function score (>3-4pts). Given the inadequate reporting of habitats, a higher habitat score would require wider buffers, 150 - 200 ft. [BMC 16.55.340(B)]. The wider buffer would extend into the proposed development -- see point (2) above.

(4) Tree retention plan and hazard tree removal. As noted above, the plan is likely to remove "hazard trees" that are within the required buffer [at least 50 ft.; BMC 16.55.460(A)(1)] around 40% slopes along the eastern portion of the property. Trees and other vegetation within that buffer cannot be removed [BMC 16.55.460(A)(4)].

Nabil Kamel, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Environmental Studies
Huxley College of the Environment
Western Washington University
Nabil.Kamel@wwu.edu
https://huxley.wwu.edu/people/kameln
Aven, Heather M.

From: MY - mayorsoffice@cob.org
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 8:53 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Cc: Bell, Kathy M.
Subject: FW: City View Development

From: Sara Poindexter <Sara.Poindexter@patagonia.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 6, 2020 9:01 AM
To: MY - mayorsoffice@cob.org <mayorsoffice@cob.org>; CC - Shared Department <cc@cob.org>; Grp.PL.Planning And Development Commission <planningcommission@cob.org>
Subject: City View Development

Hello,

My name is Sara Poindexter, thank you for taking time to read my concerns regarding the new City View Development.

My husband and I signed our life away in January on our first home. Like any first time home owner, we were nervous and exited. We were already renting the home we bought on the corner of 44th and Consolidation, but if felt different the day we signed the papers. We love it. We love the location, we love the neighborhood, the mini view of Canada, and especially the green space behind our house. We don’t have children yet, but I’ve imaged a couple of kids exploring the woods, spooking deer, and watching the leaves change with the seasons. I feel sad thinking that image is fleeting. Green spaces contribute to healthy community, especially during the current pandemic. The green space has been our refuge.

I understand there is a housing shortage in Bellingham, and that everyone should have access to a home they can afford. However, this neighborhood can’t safely support it. The traffic around the neighborhood is surprising. I cannot image how 250 or so more cars zipping around every day is possible. The streets our narrow, parked cars already line it, it’s already impossible to make a left turn on Lakeway and Lincoln at certain times of the day.

Thank you for reading this email and I hope for the sake of our community and neighborhood that City View is reconsidered.

Thanks,

Sara Poindexter

Sara Poindexter-Sales Rep-PNW
Phone: (530) 651-4486

*Due to the COVID-19 virus and our desire to see its speedy end through social distancing, Patagonia’s Sales Team will be working from home for the near future. We remain available by email, phone, or Skype and are eager to help you while staying off the road. Please reach out with any questions or needs and please stay safe*

View inventory and place orders @ b2bsales.patagonia.com

Our Dealer Services team remains available every week Mon-Fri (excl. holidays) at 800.866.4595 and by email at elcap.service@patagonia.com. Please copy your Sales Rep on ALL Dealer Services communication. Thank you!
Please! Don’t build city view. It’s will ruin our already busy neighborhood! I beg of you not to build here...

Josh Lambert, RN, BSN
Aven, Heather M.

From: MY - mayorsoffice@cob.org
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 12:39 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: FW: City View

From: Tresa Mariotto <mariocart85@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 12:24 PM
To: CC - Shared Department <cc@cob.org>; MY - mayorsoffice@cob.org <mayorsoffice@cob.org>
Subject: City View

Please don’t let our neighborhood be surrounded by more garbage
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Teresa,

I’m happy to share these photos with the Planning Department and specifically the City View comments. For future comments please send them to cityview@cob.org
Thank you for sharing your concerns.

Brooksana Raney
Executive Assistant to the Mayor
City of Bellingham
360-778-8100
mayoroffice@cob.org

My incoming and outgoing email messages are subject to public disclosure requirements per RCW 42.56

Many in our community are seeking information in this quickly changing situation. We invite you to visit Whatcom Unified Command website, https://whatcomcovid.com/ This website is a one stop location to provide the most current information regarding COVID-19 efforts.

From: Tresa Mariotto <mariocart85@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2020 9:26 AM
To: CC - Shared Department <cc@cob.org>; MY - mayoroffice@cob.org <mayoroffice@cob.org>
Subject: City View

Please don’t allow this! Attached you will find the photo of the dumpster at Ashley street apartments 2 days after pick up. The second photo is following this weekend! Where there was once fields and trees in life there is Garbage this is with the Cityview will invite to our neighborhood view
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Tresa,

You are welcome to send messages to Mayor Fleetwood’s office regarding this project, or on any topic you feel is important. The intention of my message, suggesting you send to the City View project email, was to ensure it is received as a public comment on the project. It didn’t appear your last message had gone to that address. Your input is valuable and important. Thank you for taking the time to share your comments and photos.

Best,
Brooksana Raney
Executive Assistant to the Mayor
City of Bellingham
360-778-8100
mayorsoffice@cob.org

My incoming and outgoing email messages are subject to public disclosure requirements per RCW 42.56

Many in our community are seeking information in this quickly changing situation. We invite you to visit Whatcom Unified Command website, https://whatcomcovid.com/. This website is a one stop location to provide the most current information regarding COVID-19 efforts.

I received an email behalf of the Mayor’s office advising me to direct my emails to the City View email. Perhaps implying not to bother the mayor or the council. After responding I would comply I decided against it. The Mayor and Council are elected and I am a tax paying home owner. My neighborhood is being walled in by apartments and the intense amount of garbage and disrespectful for home owners that goes with renters. They are often transient and not stakeholders. The studies on traffic done by the City View planners were conducted when WWU was not in session.

I am still waiting to read any environmental studies done. Behind our homes lies a wildlife corridor. And with the destruction done to make room for Elwood Edge. Safe green spaces are running thin.

It was windy this AM so the crap and the garbage photographed early this week has now blown all over the connecting streets and yards. Do you think any of the renters are going to pick up? Below I have inserted a picture of the crap left out by our mailboxes. This home was once owned by a dear friend and family, but one meeting with the City View people and the greedy city planners who were clearly blind to Constituents concerns, caused her to move to the county- The home was turned into 6 rental units! And guess what they do with the crap that does not fit!

Yes, I am mad. I have a right to be! Trust me I am no lunatic! I am asking you why we need more rentals invading neighborhoods especially those with no sidewalks or street lamps. I am asking why I have to walk by mountains of garbage and be mindful of speeding cars. Or cars parked in the middle of the street and blocking driveways because too many renters are crammed into a home. I am asking why we have to consider moving so my young son 19 months or...
even our pets won’t be killed in the street with no sidewalks. Why his wagon has to pass by junk piled on a corner!

There is no good answer! Why should our quality of life be diminished? Why not cram it all not Alabama Hill or Northshore! This is wrong and if my emails and photos make you uncomfortable... Good!

Don’t send a patronizing response, save it.

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Ms. Bell,

I am writing in regards to the proposal to build a concentrated, multi-family housing in a forested, wetland slope in the Puget Neighborhood. This project concerns me for a variety of reasons: First, increasing impermeable surfaces on this slope could lead to increased stormwater runoff that could impact the houses below and bring more sediment into our streams. Second, impacting this forested wetland will have negative consequences to wildlife and the environment. This tract of forested land is currently acting as an important refuge and wildlife corridor for many species. Keeping these tracts of forested land intact is critical, once they are removed they are gone forever. The mature trees in this stand are also acting as important carbon sinks and climate moderators. Third, the proposed complex is out of character to the rest of the area. This neighborhood consists of single-family homes and the addition of over 300 people and their vehicles will totally change the character of this neighborhood.
While I know we are suffering from an affordable housing shortage problem in Bellingham, I don't feel that this is the place to be building concentrated housing units. This area is ecologically too sensitive and vulnerable. Please find a more suitable place to build these housing units.

Thank you for your time,
Kirsten McDade

EMAIL
kamcdade@gmail.com