To Whom It May Concern,


I am against approving the application for a "new residential multi-family project on a vacant 11-acre parcel generally north of Consolidation Avenue between Puget and Nevada Streets in the Puget Neighborhood." They are marketed multi-family, but most likely, will be rented out to students, per bedroom, at market rates.

This is not how the city should solve the housing crisis. Also, I have been to the area. It is filled with fir and other types of trees, providing secure drainage for run-off while providing a home for wildlife and nature. Please do not allow a developer to take advantage of our area.

Thank you,
Hilary Cole
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Name: Beth Kealy

Choose Topic: CityView Project

Comment: I strongly appose this development moving forward for three reasons:
1. Traffic increase- the current access roads would see a tremendous increase of vehicle traffic. Consolidation and Nevada would be very congested
2. Lack of “fitting in” with single home look and feel- a huge complex doesn’t fit this space in a road of single family dwellings. The complex would hover high and above the current homes causing home owners to feel “looked in upon”.
3. Devastating consequences of removal of mature trees and vegetation. This could have geological implications, runoff issues, and at the very least a loss of nature beauty to the area in which the residents in this neighborhood cherish.
If something is to be built in this location, a much smaller plan is needed to honor and respect the Puget neighborhood and its quality of life. I love this neighborhood. But a project like this would deteriorate the character and identity of the Puget neighborhood as a quiet, calm and peaceful space.
| EMAIL       | bkealy4@q.com |
**Entry Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Bruce &amp; Trish Stevens - Samish Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHOOSE TOPIC</td>
<td>CityView Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>CityView will become a de facto off-campus WWU student dormitory totally unsuitable for a residential neighborhood. This comment is not mere speculation. It is based on our experience with a property next door that was purchased by the parents of students attending WWU for their housing. The parties, noise, vehicle congestion, and littering were untenable for our family with four school-age children. We are not begrudging the students their fun. We were college students once, too. But we lived on-campus, and so had no impact on other non-students. That will not be the case here, unfortunately, if this project moves ahead. The character and life quality of the Puget, and to some degree, the Samish, neighborhoods will be adversely affected. CityView must not be approved!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bruze98229@comcast.net">bruze98229@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 29, 2020

Kathy Bell  
Senior Planner  
Planning and Community Development Dept.  
210 Lottie St.  
Bellingham, WA 98225  
kbell@cob.org; cityviewcob.org

Rick Sepler  
Director, Planning and Community Development Dept.  
rmsepler@cob.org

Dear Ms. Bell and Mr. Sepler:

The York Neighborhood Association Board of Directors (the YNA Board) met on April 29, 2020, via an open public virtual meeting. An agenda item we discussed was the City View development project in the Puget Neighborhood (PDP2019-0015/DR2019-0036/CAP2019-0037/SEP2019-0039).

Last year, the City Council heard many, many speakers at a meeting regarding this development proposal. Many residents in the Puget Neighborhood — and others — voiced and continue to have differing views on this project.

Normally, the prescribed process would allow all views to be properly aired and weighed in going forward with this project’s consideration and beyond.

However, public meetings have been banned in the State of Washington by order of the Governor. The City Council responded by suspending Open Public Meetings as defined by State law and City ordinance. Instead the Council is conducting its businesses in a manner which expressly precludes the normal and appropriate level of public interaction and does not conform to State law or City ordinance and is outside what is customary, correct or right for a process of this type.
Regarding the State restrictions, the latest pronouncement from the Governor was to extend many of the restrictions until May 31. The pronouncement gave indication that the restrictions will be reviewed in the interim and could be curtailed sooner or extended further.

Obviously, some City business must proceed adapting to the situation. However, to bring business of this type and this project forward at this time under these aberrations in process is inappropriate and defies the intent and meaning of an “open public process” and democratic transparency.

Aggravating this situation and further corrupting the letter and intent of the process, the deadline for public comments as announced in the Notice of Application is May 8, 2020, and it is impossible for the neighbors and other members of the public to meet prior to that deadline.

The YNA Board understands there is no intent to abrogate the Open Meetings law or applicable City ordinances, on the part of the Council or the City Administration. However, regardless of intent, there has been a break from longstanding normal process, without adequate adaptation or accommodation to the exclusion of Puget Neighborhood and Citizens at large from meaningful participation.

For at least all the above reasons, the York Neighborhood Association Board urges the Planning Department and City Council to suspend consideration of this proposal until such time Open Public Meetings resume in a manner adhering to the letter as well as the intent of State law, City ordinance and according to customary precedent.

Further, we urge you to postpone the timeline for this project until after such time as an Open Public neighborhood meeting may be facilitated and held.

Thank You for Your Consideration,

[Signature]
Thomas R. Scott
President, York Neighborhood Association
On behalf of the YNA Board of Directors

CC: Kevin Jenkins, President, Puget Neighborhood Association
    Mayor Seth Fleetwood
    City of Bellingham Council Members
    Steve Abell, President, Samish Neighborhood Association
**Entry Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Carla Jennings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHOOSE TOPIC</td>
<td>CityView Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COMMENT         | Hello, as a home owner in the Samish Hill neighborhood, I oppose this project for the following reasons:  
* Impact to wetlands  
* Impact to the neighborhood along Nevada Street - specifically driveway coming between two houses on street  
* Increased traffic on Consolidation Ave., which already contains numerous parked cars and speeding traffic  
* Increased traffic on Nevada Street and Byron, as well as other neighborhood side streets as people use the neighborhood as a cut-through  
* Inadequate parking (106 3-bed units means at least 3 people per unit, and 3 cars per unit - minimum number of parking units needed is 318, plus visitors)  

Thank you for your consideration.

Carla
| EMAIL        | carla.r.jennings@gmail.com |
As a member of the Samish community, I am concerned about the amount of traffic that will be coming through an already busy neighborhood. Consolidation already has overflow parking on it from apartments and housing, narrowing it to about 1 lane most days, and to add over 200 more vehicles to this neighborhood is not good for the safety of drivers, walkers, commuters or cyclists. The amount of run off from a new building project would negatively impact our community and the free space enjoyed by all would be forever destroyed. Where are the ‘extra’ cars for the complex going to park? This has already been an issue with a new complex that was built against community wishes in our neighborhood, where vehicles now park along the creek illegally. The lack of realistic planning is also a problem here as these money making complexes try to squish in as many people as they can, without thinking of the actual logistics.

Keep our community safe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th><a href="mailto:melissatillson@yahoo.com">melissatillson@yahoo.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

City of Bellingham
Public Comment

Entry Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>John Westenberger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHOOSE TOPIC</td>
<td>CityView Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>A large apartment complex at the upper end of Consolidation is not in the interest of all the single family home owners that make up this area. The traffic, pollution, noise and unsightly views for those adjacent to this proposed project should render it unsuitable. The area should contain only single family homes. Don’t destroy our peaceful neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Marcwestenberger@yahoo.com">Marcwestenberger@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Kathy,

Concerning the site plan/ application. I reside at 801 Queen St and would like to see the projected elevations relative to how they might affect property views located along Puget Street and subsequently Queen Street. Unfortunately we live in an area where it matters, and values could be affected.

I would also like to know if this complex will have any direct access to Puget Street and also what type of housing this will be (market based or low income)

Thank you for any additional info.

Jeff Woods

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,
My name is Chet Zender and I have resided at 1042 Moore St since 1998 with my wife & daughters. I am very concerned about the new proposal by Morgan Bartlett to build in our area. This has been a single family home area and I can understand townhouses or small (4 unit complex) new construction but this project has a real potential to ruin a great single family residential neighborhood. I hope you will strongly consider rejecting this proposal before its too late.
Thank you
Chet Zender
Regarding your Notice of Application for development at 4413 Consolidation Avenue:

This is a terrible idea.

To cram three large apartment buildings in a single-family neighborhood will cause a great deal of additional traffic on very narrow streets which on the most part lack proper sidewalks. It is already difficult to avoid collisions because Puget street also must accommodate School Buses, Trash Trucks and Mail Delivery Trucks all of which make constant stops on a steep hill with bad sight lines.

Worse still, the very tight curve on Consolidation which turns into Puget Street is already quite dangerous and the addition of an entrance allowing a great deal of traffic to enter Puget just below the curve is a recipe for disaster.

In addition, the large amount of constant extra daily vehicle traffic from these apartment buildings to and from Nevada Street onto Lakeway will be another serious concern. It is already difficult to enter Lakeway at Nevada. That area is a constant bottleneck. So many more vehicles trying to access Lakeway is bound to cause accidents.

The acreage in question could easily contain several additional single-family homes which would not add an immense amount of dangerous traffic to the streets.

I have talked with many of my neighbors, and do not know a single person who wants such a large development built on those few acres. However, I believe everyone living in the Puget neighborhood would welcome several more single-family buildings to the area.

Perhaps Mr. Bartlett would consider developing those eleven acres into another single-family addition rather than trying to once again force another proposal for large and inappropriate buildings into our neighborhood.

Jenny Clark

724 E. Pacificview Dr. Bellingham, Wa. 98229

5743 nj @gmail.com  call 360-599-7212
Dear City Council,

As a resident and former board member of Sehome Neighborhood Association, I object to the new “multifamily” development in Puget neighborhood. This is a pleasant, quiet community of primarily small craftsman-style houses that would be very disrupted by a student dormitory masquerading as a multifamily apartment building. The fact that it rents by the bedroom reveals the developer’s true intention; no family with children could afford to do that. The zoning there has never been clarified, and needs to be.

In researching the history of Madrona Bay Real Estate, LLC, I find that the sole employee, Morgan Bartlett, also owns Cityscape apartments at Bakerview Square. That development was originally designed as a hotel near the airport, but changed to apartments, and was built on critical areas wetlands. I do hope our new Council and Mayor will be more diligent in enforcing environmental and coding laws. I can only imagine how soil disruptions on that hill might create untoward water flows to the single family residents below….. and of course those folks will pay the price. (I am looking at the hill now as I write this).

Most of us have grown accustomed to making comments that go nowhere, as big money and developers always win. I’m hoping this trend will turn around. I am adding further information from a 2015 post in Noisy Waters NW/investigative journalist Dena Louise, for background on Bartlett:

I do not know anything about this developer, but I know it is unlikely that Mr. Bartlett shares the liberal values of city residents. The Madrona Bay website lists many charities to which the company participates. The charities primarily assist children and youth. Several of these charities are connected to Christian organizations that provide aid to third world countries, such as World Vision and Childcare International. These charities have been criticized as not being open about the fact that they are proselytizing in exchange for aid when soliciting donations and of violating Red Cross protocol regarding religious conversion. Another charity, Young Life Ministries, has been criticized as cultist and unaccepting of gay members, as well as sending kids to camp without advising them that it was religious until they arrived and could not leave.

The Environmental Working Group lists Bartlett, on a webpage entitled Who Owns The West, as someone who benefits from a 132-year-old federal mining law that gives away precious metals, minerals, and even the title to the land itself for less than $10 an acre. Morgan Bartlett Jr owns the minerals under an estimated 160 acres of claimed land in Arizona, giving him more total land holdings (claims and patents) than 80.4% of all other mining interests. He would have acquired ownership of precious metals and minerals on U.S. public land for about $2 per acre, and maintains possession of the claim with a small per-acre fee, typically $5 each year. Morgan Bartlett Jr pays no royalties to the federal government for metals and minerals mined from this land.

I do not have proof, as we did with Costco, that backroom deals occurred, but it seems at least possible, and more evidence may appear as the development process moves forward, officially. But I also thought that as incentives and
subsidies for developers become a larger and larger priority for the city, people should have a better idea of where their tax dollars are going and who it is that are developing the new mega apartment complexes.

I don’t believe Bellingham needs yet another cookie-cutter, privately-owned student housing. What we need is affordable housing for families, and publicly-supplied housing for students. (who hopefully will be able to return this fall). Our urban villages are a step in the right direction.

Thank-you,

Dianne Foster,

Sehome Neighborhood
May 5, 2020

Mr. Rick Sepler
Director, City Planning and Community Development Department
210 Lottie Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

Re: City View private for-profit dormitory complex

Dear Mr. Sepler:

It is clear that the proposed City View complex will function as a private dormitory just as does the Lark Bellingham (formerly NXNW) complex on Lincoln Street. In both complexes the floor plans are set up for just this purpose: Each bedroom has a private bath and will be leased under separate contract.

extracted from the FAQ section of Lark Bellingham website:

“Nearly all the residents at Lark Bellingham are students at Western Washington University. The per-person contracts are also designed with students in mind.”

Applying requirements for family apartments is wrong for City View. These will not be multi-family apartments. Taking family housing requirements for things like new peak hour person trips, total new vehicle trips per day, and parking from ITE reference manuals and BMC 20.12.010B3 will misrepresent the actual situation that will occur. Surely there must exist reference data suitable for the type of housing City View will actually be: a complex of 318 bedrooms occupied by college students with nearly all owning a vehicle.

Mr. Chris Comeau, Transportation Planner at Public Works, kindly advised me that parameters used in the City View TIA and Multimodal Transportation Application are based on “hundreds of similar land uses across the U.S. over decades”. I have no reason to question that, but unless these averages are for similar private off-campus dormitory land uses then the parameters are not valid for City View. Using family housing averages is fine as a starting point but parameters must be adjusted to reflect the common sense reality of what City View will be.

Parking is of particular concern to me. Mr. Comeau rightly pointed out that students living at City View may use public transit to travel to and from campus. How many will actually do this is unknown, but regardless of the number, it is the nature of upperclassmen to have cars. These cars will have to be parked - somewhere. If there is no room on site, the only other choice for overflow is street parking. The developer’s proposal shows that there will be 249 parking slots on site. With 318 student residents, nearly all of whom will have cars, parking will be in great demand. This will tempt the owner to charge for parking slots, and if that’s what he wants then I say go for it. However, he should not be permitted to dump City View residents’ and guests’ overflow parking for 70 or more cars onto the surrounding neighborhood streets. This invites car prowls, litter and noise, minor accidents, and the risk of obstructing emergency vehicles.
The idea that there should be one parking slot per bedroom is not unique to City View. It is, in fact, comparable to other student apartment complexes east of campus. Two examples of this are in the area of 32\textsuperscript{nd} Street south of Sehome Village. Note that both of these are closer to campus, shopping, and bus service than City View, yet parking demand is high.

In one example, a manager of Villa 2 Apartments on 32\textsuperscript{nd} St. comprising about 130 one-bedroom units told me “parking is huge” when she talks to prospective tenants. Her property has 150 parking spots. Her observation was that in addition to the normal discussions of monthly rent and lease requirements, being able to offer ample parking was a huge selling point.

In another example, Pomeroy Ct. apartment complex on Ferry Ave. comprises 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom units for a total of 105 beds. Tenants are normally 95-100\% college students. The complex has 107 numbered parking places. This manager said that visitor parking, especially on weekends, is a “nightmare”. Weekend visitors, assuming they respect the tenants’ own spaces, are forced to park on the street or in other parking areas, where cars may be subject to towing or car prowls. It seems quite reasonable to expect the demand from City View student residents for parking spaces will be quite similar.

If the developer of City View refuses to accept responsibility to provide adequate on-site parking for all future tenants then he will be dumping substantial overflow parking onto residential streets in Puget and Samish Neighborhoods. This is patently unfair to current residents and should not be allowed to happen.

Sincerely,

Steve Abell
Member, Puget Neighborhood Preservation Work Group
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