I would like to express my support of the opinions of the Puget Neighborhood Working Group in opposition to the proposed Cityview Project.

Cityview is:

1) Inappropriately placed, towering over the homes of Nevada St. only ~100ft away at times. This proposal is disrespectfully and disproportionately close to the homes of Nevada St and Marionberry Ct with the parking lots of these apartments laying just over 50ft from the foundations of the adjacent homes.

2) Out of character of the Upper Puget Neighborhood. (1-2 story homes and small/medium multifamily complexes stepped immediately to a 5 story mega-tower perched on the hillside)

3) A disproportionately dense dormitory style 2 apartment, suited for college campus, surrounded by a sea of small family homes.

4) Would overly strain neighborhood roadways and further tax the already troubled intersections of the narrow Lincoln St and Nevada St with Lakeway Dr. Traffic lights at both intersections would be absolutely necessary as well as considerable widening and improvement of both streets.

No reasonable person can look at the plans & scope of the Cityview project and honestly believe that this is an appropriate scaled development for this neighborhood. I implore you not to saddle the upper Puget Neighborhood with this disproportionate, battleship sized dormitory complex.
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Comment or Testimony
Why did the planning Dept. spend thousands of our tax payer's dollars on devising a comprehensive plan for the development of neighborhoods and not follow it. I would expect a government entity to walk it's own talk, follow it's own's rules. But this is not the case with the Hawley farm tract F parcel 3080332 172175 where the City View student housing development is proposed. It fails meeting the rules of being consistent with existing neighborhood with a five story building. [all others are 2-3] It fails the 200ft transition between dwelling types with what looks like two rows of trees. It fails on the transition between dwelling types by not moving from single family homes to town houses. to apartments. [as the existing neighborhood does]. City codes say that apartments may not be built in transitions zones, yet okay here. It fails on must be compatible with the existing neighborhood by being high density vs the zoned medium density. Fails on being a multi family dwelling by being a rooming house rent by room temporary student housing. Fails on must be compatible with existing neighborhood due to nuisance noise from loud living. City has a noise ordinance against nuisance noise of 50 ft. 24/7 hours but no way to enforce it. Until it can, the city should not allow building that creates such noise in residential areas surrounded by single family homes, building in animosities through dwelling types. Neighborhood roads are 25mph and again the city has no way to enforce this law. Even garbage trucks and school busses speed through our street. 300+ more cars speeding through our neighborhood makes it unsafe for those with kids, pets and backing out of our driveways. There is no sidewalk at the mailboxes on Consolidation Street, with 300 more speeding cars weaving around cars parked on the street makes going for the mail dangerous. No other neighborhood of family homes is subjected to freeway level traffic. I was under the impression that Bellingham's planning division is to ensure that neighborhoods are developed in accordance to the comprehensive plan and guide developers to comply with said plan. To ensure growth keeps with the character of each neighborhood therefore the enhancement of our city. City View does not comply with keeping with the character, is not compatible nor is it consistent with the structure and density of our neighborhood. I believe that both the developer and the City Planning departments must be held accountable to the neighborhood residents and the development plans that so much of our tax money went to create.

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
6/11/2021
Public Comment

Name
Robert Steve Woody

Full name or organization

Your name is required for identification as a part of the public record.

Choose Topic

CityView Project

Topics available for online public comment are listed above. If no topics are listed, there may be opportunities for public comment on various topics through email, letters, and public comment periods during meetings.

More information on this topic can be found at https://www.cob.org/cityview
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I am concerned that the approval of this project will have a substantial negative impact on the city of Bellingham and its taxpayers.
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A good idea...In The Wrong Location

Steve & Carol Woody
832 Nevada St, Bellingham. WA

stevewoody@ yahoo.com
425.503.6999
Will the additional traffic put our children at risk?

Nevada St to Lakeway is too narrow for heavy traffic and a stoplight at Lakeway will be necessary.

Who will pay to widen 64th to handle the students driving to WWU?

Consolidation should be upgraded before any construction.
In Bellingham, it rains or snows, on average, 158 days a year.

The nearest bus stop is at the base of a steep hill; half a mile away. Fred Myer’s is .7 mile away and it is a 47-minute hike to Western.

Can you visualize 308 young professionals or students hiking through a pouring rain, on a dark cold winter’s morning? With a biting wind coming down out of the Frazier Valley, to get on a bus that will take them to work or school. And then, on the way home, to hike back up the steep hill. It’s like climbing 8 stories. With a soggy bag of groceries or a backpack stuffed with books...that seems highly unlikely. Most of the 308 will be flooding our streets with their vehicles.

Would you allow a 6 story factory, with over 300 employees, in the middle of a residential neighborhood?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Beds</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed % with 2 People</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Residents @ 100% Occupancy</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Occupancy Rate*</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupancy</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Vehicles</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cars</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # Trips: weekday*</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Number of Trips*</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comprehensive Housing Market survey, March 2017, page 10
*Work, school, visitors, shopping, deliveries (UPS, pizza, ETC) and recreation
To whom it may concern,

Since COB was indecisive about planning in general area, i.e. apartments or single family dwellings, many single family homes have been used as student rentals where no yard care has been done. Calls to COB neighborhood compliance has resulted in no action. As such, the visual blight continues unabated.

See attached pics of homes on 44th St.
To whom it may concern,

I've lived in area for 25.5 yrs. Years ago, there was very little student car parking on both Consolidation/Byron St. until cob approved eastwards apt and another large complex off Consolidation.

If City View is allowed, it will get worst causing conflict and thus possible pedestrian/motor vehicle accidents. These roads are incapable of handling any more traffic especially from unsafe driving students on narrow guage streets.

Pics are from consolidation/Byron:
To whom it may concern,

Pics listed below illustrate proper placement of newly co strutted apartments buildings in Bellingham. They are off large atrerials with bike lanes not in area with single family housing where conflicts will occur.

Why is cob deviating from what it has done correctly until city view.

Again, as I've stated before, anything but student housing, more single family, light/heavy industrial is fine with me. Readon being, it will be quiet at night.

Best option here, is to turn the Hawley Open Space into a cob city park instead of an apartment complex unappreciated by students.

Please rezone turning space into Hawley City View cob Park to be enjoyed by all.

Sincerely,

Jim Le Galley
To whom it may concern,

I read in building proposal there is about 50 bicycle parking spaces. From my experience being here 25.5 yrs, students are incapable. Case in point, students across the street drive everywhere never walking or cycling. When the cycled down the hill, they walked back as they were incapable.

To think that they will begin cycling moving into city view is just wishful juvenile thinking.

I myself am 63 cycling up the hill is no barrier to me swimming a mile 6 days week cycling everywhere.

Pics is of me in e. Alberta my rig.

Also, what will be status of bike sparrows Byron/45th st/Nevada once city view is present. With high traffic, it will be more hazardous to ride.

Sincerely,

Jim Le Galley
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**Comment or Testimony**

The destruction of a neighborhood and the cost to taxpayers are more important than the greed of a developer.
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To whom it may concern,

I've been here 25.5 yrs and am dug in invested in this location and do not wanna move.

Please make a good decision as it will affect all of us single family owners for years. If intolerable, I would expect cob to create a fund to reimburse single family owners who were forced to leave for the pain/suffering cost to move elsewhere. As in the end, the cob did not exercise a duty of care to all and would be perceived as negligent/liable for any/all damages resulting from a poor decision. If I am forced to move, it would not be in this city or perhaps in this state as being betrayed one would feel this situation could occur again anywhere in cob.

Sincerely,

Jim Le Galley
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You might be doing the developer a huge favor declining his permit. Fewer students are on campus. Cost of lumber is three times higher and, over the long haul, only a small number of students are going to put up with the march up Consolidation. Especially from October to May. If he were to move the project to Lincoln, with a bus stop at the front door and Fred Meyers next door. It would make more since.
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I thought our goal is to create 7 urban villages that would reduce traffic by locating dense population centers at transportation and retail locations. If completed, this project will add hundreds of drivers to plug our roads, cost our city millions of dollars in infrastructure and destroy the quality of life in the Puget neighborhood.

On a dark winter’s night, when a family of four is killed trying to make a left turn onto Lake Way, or on a morning before sunrise, when a car, rushing to school or work, hits a group of kids dressed in black, waiting for the school bus at the corner of Ashley and Consolidation, are we going to say it was worth it to place 308 students and young professionals on a hill in the middle of a residential neighborhood?
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Please see and include into Public Comment the formatted letter attached. Sincerely, Brian McNitt
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June 11, 2021

To: City of Bellingham Planning and Community Development Department ("Planning Department") & Planning Commission ("Planning Commission")

This letter comes in three parts: a request to the Planning Department and Planning Commission, observations on the CityView application process to date, and a concern about a specific conflict of interest represented by one member of the Planning Commission.

**Part 1: A simple request for due diligence by the Planning Department and Planning Commission.** As has been promised, please:

1. Review all Public Comments going back to 2020 which generated the City’s Notice of Incomplete Application and Request for Information (RFI) on August 10, 2019.
2. Review the RFI response in light of these comments. Individuals of the Puget and Samish neighborhoods raised the concerns — the August 10, 2019 RFI simply encapsulates them.
3. As such, for each concern raised and included in the RFI, please ask the individual Public Commentors if the RFI response indeed adequately satisfies their original concern.

If the above does not happen then the RFI process is internally invalid; it would not answer the questions the individual Public Commentors asked.

**Part 2: Observations on the CityView application process to date...**

**The density question.** To date, the density challenge has not been answered. How can a ruling on any proposal be made ahead of an official density ruling?

**Matter of incomplete RFI.** As you will find in your review of Public Comment, the comment that generated and is the RFI — and in reviewing the RFI response you will find the design and substance from the original proposal remains unchanged. Given this, how could the RFI be considered complete?

**Planning Commission Scott Jones’ observation and sentiment is shared by every member of the Puget and Samish Neighborhoods that has commented** — that the high level project as proposed is not inline with Bellingham’s need for actual family homes, is not inline with the makeup of the existing row of single family homes on Puget St., Nevada St. and Marionberry Ct, and in effect would transfer the **full impact** of catch up infill upon single family home owners on Puget St. Nevada St. and Marionberry Ct.
It’s not just a City project, it’s an exquisitely personal predicament for these individuals, families and property owners. If approved, what are they actually supposed to do?

**A final observation. There has been no communication, no collaboration, between neighbors in the Puget Neighborhood and Samish and Morgan Bartlett.** While it is clear the existing RFI is incomplete and the density challenge remains unaddressed, it is also clear that much opportunity exists for improved communication between the property owner, Morgan Bartlett, and his neighbors.

While I may not ultimately be the right individual, I have reached out to Mr. Bartlett to inquire how the RFI could be amended to better address Scott Jones’ concern, the concerns of the immediate Puget St. Nevada St. and Marionberry Ct. residents, the Puget and Samish Neighborhoods, and families relying on the City of Bellingham Planning Department to provide affordable family first housing.

**Part 3: Existing conflict of interest on the Planning Commission**

While there is no rule prohibiting it, Jed Ballew’s participation on the Planning Commission represents a clear conflict of interest. Jed Ballew is a board member of the AIA WA Council, a lobbying group for commercial architects in WA State. From the AIA WA Council website Mission Statement (source: http://aiawa.org/about/):

The American Institute of Architects Washington Council (AIA WA Council) is a member-driven professional society for architects and associate architects in the State of Washington. AIA WA Council is the state arm of the National AIA and is focused primarily on policy and advocacy.

AIA WA Council works on behalf of architects by representing the profession on a broad spectrum of issues, including but not limited to climate action, professional liability, licensing, taxes, affordable housing, and employment. Further, AIA WA Council promotes the interests of architects through the Architects Political Action Committee (APAC), which contributes to state candidates whose work aligns with our mission and goals.

Established in 1962, AIA WA Council was formed with the belief that the architecture profession required a single state advocate with a clear, consistent voice to both government and industry. In this role, AIA WA Council lobbies; maintains relations with the Governor’s office, legislators and legislative staff; builds coalitions with state agencies, organizations, consumer groups, and other public bodies; tracks legislation that impacts architects and the practice of architecture; clarifies and informs members about legislative, regulatory and policy activities; and protects the legal welfare of architects.

Today, AIA WA Council continues to serve as the architects’ voice on state government affairs in Washington. Our eight-member governing Board of Directors, who represent the members in each of Washington’s four state components and two state sections, is composed of architects from a variety of backgrounds, firm sizes, and locations, making AIA WA Council a part of a network that includes more than 3,000 architects, associate architects, and related professionals across the state.
Is Morgan Bartlett a contributing member to Jed Ballew’s organization? Given the AIA WA Council mission statement, could Jed Ballew’s participation be considered a conflict of interest? I am afraid it is.

Given the incomplete RFI, the unanswered density challenge, unaddressed questions of equity and impact on individual families, and the unaddressed need for actual family housing in Bellingham the current CityView is incomplete. Still, I remain optimistic that a more creative and collaborative solution can come, if stakeholders are willing. In the meantime, please don’t settle for what isn’t right.

Sincerely,
Brian McNitt
Puget Neighborhood
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Comment or Testimony
I listened to the comments and presentation about the City View project at the last Planning Commission hearing. While we need housing, and higher densities can be achieved in the Puget and Samish neighborhoods, this particular project is out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. I believe that incremental change is the best way to bring people along, and to not make massive mistakes in planning and implementation. A "step down" approach to adjacent neighbors with townhouses that are of similar heights would both encourage the family use that is imagined and create a transition that is more appropriate to existing uses. Properties of this size could be developed in stages, it is unfortunate that such a large and imposing structure is proposed at one time.

The question for the Commission was to identify areas of concern for staff to address. One that was not mentioned is the view shed of this development. How far will the building and the lights be seen over the city? With a name like City View, I'm guessing the city is going to be seeing it very clearly. On King Mt. it is my understanding that screening was proposed by the developer, but weak contracts or permits have allowed the developer to strip all trees, and the large and growing scar on the mountain is visible from far and near. Please think about the landscape effects of these large buildings, especially on the hills surrounding town-the look and feel of the city can be ruined by jutting boxes on hillsides. Our Climate Pledge must also be considered in this case, and maintaining canopy coverage should be a priority.

Looking at the map, it is also clear that this forest is a remaining greenway connection down the ridge. I understand that portions of the land will be set aside, but it is unclear if the width of that set aside is sufficient to provide habitat corridors. If neighbors say they can see houses already on the other side of the corridor, it seems unlikely that what remains after development would be useful to support wildlife movement. This may not be a new topic, but the wildlife list submitted was insufficient and the habitat requirements of common animals in our area should be considered carefully.

Finally, after hearing much talk about the 3 bath/3bed units, I can only say that a diversity of unit types is the only way to be resilient to future housing needs. We are inundated by this apartment type because that is the most profitable, but when student numbers shrink or WWU decides to build more units themselves we will have a very unbalanced housing stock. The Samish Way Urban Village is being built out and I imagine there will be many more proposals for this dormatory type building. Please think about the future when allowing buildings that are not well suited to changing needs.

Thank you for your consideration,

Robin Thomas
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