

Public Comment Tracker – Fountain District (Includes comments received through Friday 6/11/10)

| Item # | Date Received | Name | Public Comment | Staff Recommendation NC = No change to proposal C = Change to proposal | Planning Commission Recommendation NC = No change to proposal C = Change to proposal |
|--------|---------------|---|---|--|--|
| 1A | 4/13/10 | Flip Breskin Cherry Street Columbia Neighborhood | <p>Ms. Breskin expressed concern that if parking is removed from one side of Elm and Northwest traffic lanes will appear visually wider and traffic speed will increase, adversely affecting pedestrian safety especially for children crossing the street on their way to school. She said that speed has increased on Cornwall Avenue as a result of parking removal on one side.</p> <p>Ms. Breskin cited that on-street parking tends to slow traffic down, and that cities like Portland and San Francisco leave parking on the streets when it is needed by the surrounding businesses or residences, serving to calm traffic by making the street seem narrower. She cites Page 27 of the 1996 "Portland Bicycle Plan." *</p> <p>* The 1996 Portland Bicycle Master Plan was updated in February, 2010 and can be found at the following link: ftp://ftp02.portlandoregon.gov/PBOT/Bicycle_Plan_for_2030/Plan_Documents/Complete_Plan/Portland_Bicycle_Plan_for_2030_as-adopted.pdf</p> | <p>NC: Because the existing widths of Elm and Meridian Streets from curb to curb are only 44' and are not sufficient for two travel lanes, parking on both sides of the street and striped bike lanes, staff and the public had the difficult task of developing a proposal that would serve pedestrians, bicyclists, residents and businesses, in addition to the automobile.</p> <p>The Transportation Element of the City's 2006 <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> specifically lists Northwest, Elm, and Dupont as a "high priority" corridor for bike lanes. The goal of parking removal on Elm Street between Broadway and Connecticut is to implement this <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> Element, and increase safety for bicyclists on a key north-south bike arterial route by designating a portion of the roadway solely for bicycle traffic. Bike lanes help to separate motor vehicle and bicycle traffic, increase driver awareness of cyclists, and increase predictability of bicyclist and motorist movements.</p> <p>Compromises were necessary, and resulted in the final proposal to retain parking on both sides of Meridian to serve the more intense commercial activity and encourage pedestrian use in conjunction with the proposal to remove parking on one side of Elm Street to increase bicyclist safety by striping bike lanes. The proposal is that Elm Street be marked with 8' wide parking spaces striped on one side of the street, allowing for two 6' wide bike lanes and two 12' travel lanes as illustrated on Page 29 of the <i>Subarea Plan</i>, which elaborates that "The main goals are to prioritize the bicyclist, and to narrow the perceived width of the street by adding bulb-out crossings, landscaping and</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p><i>street trees, as well as striping bike lanes and on-street parking spaces.”</i></p> <p>On Page 30, the <i>Plan</i> also identifies the policy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Narrow the perceived width of arterials by striping parking spaces, and where possible, bike lanes.</i> <p>The <i>Subarea Plan</i> proposal for parking removal considers the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Along streets with lower-density development (Elm as compared to Meridian) parking is often underutilized, resulting in stretches of wide travel lanes, encouraging higher speeds and unpredictable motor vehicle and bicycle travel paths. Striping the street face demarcates the bike lane from the parking lane and the auto travel lane, and effectively narrows the width of the motorist travel lane from 14’ (or 22’ when there are no cars parked on the street) to a 12’ travel lane. ▪ The <i>Subarea Plan</i> proposes that curb bulb-outs with street trees be constructed on the parking lane side of the street to improve pedestrian crossing safety, create the opportunity to add street trees and streetscape, and to physically narrow the width of the street ▪ Additionally, the <i>Subarea Plan</i> proposes enhanced crossings (with flashing lights) for Elm / Northwest at Connecticut Street to improve safety for pedestrians traveling east / west across the arterial. <p>With the implementation of the proposed improvements it is predicted that driver behaviors will be more compliant with the 25 mph limit than what is currently observed.</p> <p>Regarding the assertion that traffic speeds have increased on Cornwall Avenue since parking was removed on one side to accommodate the installation of bicycle lanes – this is not supported by actual traffic</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>counts conducted before and after removal of parking. To date, the Public Works Department has not received complaints from residents or businesses about increased traffic speeds.</p> <p>It is anticipated that with the proposed improvements to the Elm Street corridor traffic speeds will actually decrease.</p> | |
| 1B | 4/13/10 | Flip Breskin (cont) | <p>Ms. Breskin identified that there are parallel, quiet streets a block away (Kulshan & Peabody) that could be used for bicycles more safely. She expressed strong support for bulb-outs and good crossing signals.</p> | <p>NC: The Dupont / Elm / Northwest corridor provides a crucial connection for bike commuters between downtown Bellingham and areas north of I-5 and provides access to Whatcom Community College, Bellis Fair Mall and the Cordata area. Kulshan and Peabody Streets are appropriate for slower-moving local (neighborhood) bicycle traffic that includes children and less-experienced riders within the Fountain District area, but do not provide the broader high-speed commuter link through the urban village.</p> | |
| 1C | 4/13/10 | Flip Breskin (cont) | <p>Ms. Breskin wrote that visible and easily accessible parking is essential to the future of small businesses located in the houses along Elm Street, and is concerned that these businesses will fail if they lose on-street parking. She added that in the future, bus service may be more widely utilized and parking will be less necessary, but that this is not currently the situation.</p> | <p>NC: Staff considered the impacts removing parking on one side of the street would have to businesses along the Elm Street corridor.</p> <p>The current on-street parking use was surveyed in the summer of 2009, and showed that only 10 and 30% of the parking spaces along Elm Street were occupied between during the day (see the <i>Fountain District Urban Village Parking Capacity Study, December 2009</i> on the City website: http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/urban-villages/fountain-district/fd-meeting-materials/2009-12-parking-study.pdf). This survey, while not exhaustive, does reflect the parking habits between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm on both weekdays and weekends. This reflects that additional capacity may be available to accommodate additional on-street parking as the area continues to develop.</p> <p>The decision to remove parking was also based on the existence of alley access to properties, and the analysis</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>of the number of spaces that could be accommodated by residences and businesses in the rear of existing buildings. It was determined that four spaces, including one handicapped space, could be provided on a 50' wide lot.</p> <p>After evaluating the potential impacts that could result from removal of parking on one side of the street, the original proposal to designate the entire stretch of Elm Street between Broadway and Connecticut as a Commercial Transition area was altered to include only the area south of Monroe (currently zoned Multi-Family / Offices Allowed) and the five historically commercial properties north of Monroe.</p> | |
| 1D | 4/13/10 | Flip Breskin (cont) | <p>Ms. Breskin suggested that as a worst-case scenario the City might consider removing parking for an hour at rush hour, but allow for parking the remainder of the day. She observed, at 10:30 PM on a Wednesday night, at least 24 cars parked along Elm Street between Broadway Ave. and Connecticut Street, and pointed out that this illustrates the numerous residents that could potentially be impacted by parking removal. She also said that people using wheelchairs would be adversely impacted by having parking removed on their side of the street, especially on an arterial such as Elm Street.</p> | <p>NC: Removal of parking during peak hours is typically only done to increase vehicle capacity and reduce congestion, whereas the reason for removing parking on Elm is to install bike lanes. Removal of parking during peak hours would provide a bicycle facility for approximately two hours per day and create an enforcement issue for parking violations, as well as the inability for bicyclists to have dedicated space on the street when parking restrictions are not observed.</p> | |
| 1E | 4/13/10 | Flip Breskin (cont) | <p>Ms. Breskin noted that there is no proposal to remove on-street parking in Fairhaven and asked why the Fairhaven District was treated differently than the Fountain District.</p> | <p>NC: The Fairhaven District is different from the Fountain District in several ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fairhaven is far more densely developed with commercial retail stores and residences, both of which necessitate more on-street parking than is necessary in the Fountain District. 2. The Fairhaven commercial core is not bisected by two principal arterial streets, as is the Fountain District. The Dupont / Elm / Northwest corridor connect Columbia, Cornwall Park, Birchwood, and other northern neighborhoods with downtown services. | |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>3. Fairhaven has a core grid street system with small blocks and stop signs at every intersection. This results in very slow vehicle speeds, which allows bicyclists to travel at the same speed as traffic, eliminating the need for bike lanes.</p> <p>4. Bike lanes already exist on several of the arterial streets that lead to the Fairhaven commercial core, such as Boulevard / 11th; Old Fairhaven Parkway; and Donovan / 10th. Bike lanes will be required on both sides of West Harris as new development is proposed.</p> | |
| 2A | 4/13/10 | Louise Bjornson Birchwood Neighborhood | Ms. Bjornson expressed concern that removing parking from Elm / Northwest would adversely affect residents and businesses on the street, and that the <i>Fountain District Urban Village Subarea Plan</i> policies were contradictory, stating “more parking is needed” while also proposing to “remove on-street parking.” | <p>NC: The <i>Subarea Plan</i> identifies that parking is needed in the Commercial Core and that strategies to maximize on-street parking should be utilized (see Page 30 of the <i>Plan</i>; Public Parking Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Wherever possible, add on-street parking to the Commercial Core of Meridian Street and all side streets.</i> <p>The goals of policies outlined in the <i>Subarea Plan</i> strive to strike a balance between the sometimes-conflicting objectives of pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, residents and business owners. In seeking this balance the <i>Subarea Plan</i> prioritizes the pedestrian and motorist in the Commercial Core along Meridian, and the bicyclist on Elm.</p> | |
| 2B | 4/13/10 | Louise Bjornson (cont) | Ms. Bjornson said it is critical to the success of the area businesses and the urban village to be accessible to pedestrians and have parking available for customers and residents. | NC: See Staff Response #1C | |
| 2C | 4/13/10 | Louise Bjornson (cont) | Ms. Bjornson expressed concern that speeding on Elm and Northwest will occur if parking is removed, stating that cities like Portland and San Francisco leave on-street parking for businesses and residences to slow traffic down | NC: See Staff Response #1A | |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | -- that people tend to speed without cars parked on the street. She said she was concerned about pedestrian safety, especially for children crossing the street on their way to school. | | |
| 2D | 4/13/10 | Louise Bjornson (cont) | Ms. Bjornson asked why the Fairhaven District is treated differently than the Fountain District, seeing as there is no proposal to remove on-street parking in Fairhaven. | NC: See Staff Response #1E | |
| 3 | 4/26/10 | Nick Hartrich Sustainable Connections | Mr. Hartrich wrote that he did not see any reference to LEED ND in the conclusions page. | NC: See pages 15-17 in the <i>Subarea Plan</i> for a summary of the project's LEED-ND analysis. | |
| 4 | 4/26/10 | William Boyd City of Bellingham Fire Chief | Chief Boyd pointed out that there was a lot of mention of WTA, but did not see any consideration for emergency response needs as part of the transportation corridor proposal. | C: Accommodating the needs of the City's Fire and Emergency Response Vehicles was tantamount in planning for the circulation and transportation element of the district. The last sentence of the first paragraph on Page 23 of the <i>Subarea Plan</i> will be edited to read as follows: "Meridian and Elm Streets both serve the City's Fire and Emergency Response vehicles and Whatcom Transit Authority (WTA) bus service on a continuous basis." | |
| 5A | 4/26/10 | Renee Ragsdale Peabody St Cornwall Park Neighborhood | Ms. Ragsdale asked for clarification about the zoning change in the RT1 (Residential Transition 1) area, saying that she was unable to find specifications for building heights, FAR, etc. She added that on Page 18 of the <i>Subarea Plan</i> BMC 20.28 Infill Housing is cited as a guide for development in the RT1 zone, and asks where this document can be found. | NC: Upon the adoption of the Infill Housing code (BMC 20.28) in August of 2009, all areas zoned "Residential Multi-Duplex" permitted the new housing types of Small House, Smaller House, Cottage, Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit, Carriage House and Duplex. The Infill Housing Guidelines go into more detail about each of these housing types, including allowable building heights and FAR, and can be accessed on the City website at http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/growth/urban-infill-toolkit/2009-07-27-exhibit-a-clean%20copy.pdf or in the Permit Center in City Hall. Pages 4 and 5 of the proposed Development Regulations (BMC 20.37.220, Table .220-A: Permitted Uses) identify which types of housing are allowed in both the RT1 and RT2 areas. | |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| 5B | 4/26/10 | Renee Ragsdale (cont) | Ms. Ragsdale expressed concern about the 55-foot height limit for the Haggen "Opportunity Site," and the potential for increased noise and light pollution that might result from such a large structure. | <p>NC: In composing the development regulations for the Commercial Core, Commercial Transition and Opportunity Site areas, staff analyzed how impacts to the abutting Residential Transition areas could be minimized in regards to increased height, traffic noise and light pollution effects.</p> <p>For details, see Page 8 of the Development Regulations (BMC 20.37.230C.2) to review how the increased height is proposed to be mitigated and how commercial development will interface with adjacent residential areas. See Page 14 (BMC 20.37.280) for the guidelines for lighting design in the Commercial Core and Commercial Transition areas.</p> <p>In regards to increased noise pollution from the commercial areas, this will be lessened as development occurs and buildings replace the vast surface parking areas that line Meridian and create "noise bounce" to the adjacent residential areas.</p> | |
| 5C | 4/26/10 | Renee Ragsdale (cont) | Ms. Ragsdale expressed concern about the potential for increased parking in the Residential Transition areas, which may overflow from the Commercial Core and Commercial Transition areas. | <p>NC: Potential impacts to residential areas from overflow parking in the Commercial areas were considered and are addressed in the <i>Subarea Plan</i> Public Parking Policy on Page 30: "<i>Consider creating a Residential Parking Zone (RPZ) if needed to limit parking encroachment from Commercial areas into adjacent residential streets as development occurs.</i>"</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|---|--|--|--|
| 5D | 4/26/10 | Renee Ragsdale (cont) | <p>Ms. Ragsdale asked about how the poor drainage on Peabody and other residential streets will be addressed in the plan.</p> | <p>NC: Many of the residential streets in the urban village area do not have curb and gutter (or storm drains) and thus, during the rainy season experience poor drainage in the planting strip between the sidewalks and the auto travel lane. This problem is often made worse by cars parking on the planting strip, compacting soils and decreasing natural drainage capacity.</p> <p>The <i>Subarea Plan</i> calls out this issue on Page 26, under <i>Streetscape Policies</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>On residential streets where curb and gutter do not exist, encourage private property owners to demarcate the travel lane, parking spaces and planting strips, or form Local Improvement Districts to fund street improvements. Standards for upgrading streets should be consistent with the predominant character of the neighborhood.</i> <p>While there is currently no funding to construct stormwater and drainage improvements on residential streets, the City will make a concerted effort to fund the construction through grants and other strategies. However, grant funds may not be sufficient to pay for all street improvements.</p> | |
| 6 | 5/4/10 | Elizabeth Hartsoch Columbia Neighborhood | <p>Ms. Hartsoch expressed support for removing parking on Elm and Northwest, saying that she frequently bikes on Elm/Northwest and disagrees with the assertions that removing parking will speed up traffic. She stated that traffic is already too fast on this corridor, and that she frequently has difficulty crossing Northwest with her son on the way to preschool.</p> <p>She continues that Elm / Northwest is so wide that the parking is not a sufficient traffic calming measure. Traffic calming is needed, but it is not provided by existing parking. Because on-street parking is underutilized, bikes riding on the corridor are squeezed between cars travelling in the middle of a too-wide lane and the occasional parked car sticking out from the side. Ideally, the corridor would</p> | <p>NC: The proposal removes parking on one side of Elm Street, adds bike lanes, and implements calming measures to slow traffic and increase pedestrian access and safety.</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | benefit from removing parking on one side, adding bike lanes, and implementing effective calming measures to slow traffic and increase pedestrian access and safety. | | |
| 7 | 5/10/10 | Colleen Hyde Park Street Columbia Neighborhood | Ms. Hyde commented that she is opposed to the Fountain District plan, and is concerned that similar developments in Vancouver and Seattle have led to more neighborhood crime. She also said that Park, Elizabeth, and Walnut Streets are full of potholes, and tax dollars should go for neighborhood street repairs. She also wondered why no speed bumps are allowed. | <p>NC: Plans for the urban village will create the opportunity for a small increase in housing density, which may create more housing option choices and serve a population that is more diverse in range of incomes, ages and lifestyles.</p> <p>The streets in need of repair cited by Ms. Hyde are outside of the Fountain District Urban Village boundaries, and were not addressed in the Subarea Plan.</p> | |
| 8 | 5/10/10 | Jonathan Knowles | <p>Mr. Knowles identified the <i>1996 Portland Bicycle Master Plan</i> as an excellent reference from a major bicycling community, and noted that Bellingham City planners should use this document when planning for a bicycling community. He summarized that the document identifies that in creating Safe Biking Riding and Bike routes, parked cars have been shown to create a traffic calming effect. He says that traffic speeds have increased on Cornwall Avenue as a result of the wider lanes that were created when the bike lanes were installed, and that speeds on Cornwall now average between 30 MPH and 40 MPH in a posted 25 MPH limit. Faster car traffic equals unsafe bicycling.</p> <p>He expressed that he feels the city planners are focused on increasing traffic volumes and speeds through our neighborhoods to get cars downtown rather than bike safety. Painted Bike lanes achieve this result in defining wider traffic lanes. Rather than looking at alternate modes of transportation to the new Waterfront District that is predicted to bring thousands of people into the city daily, it would appear that planners are focused on how to get more cars in and out. Eyeing streets like Sunset, Cornwall, Northwest, Elm and Meridian as 2-lane thoroughfares.</p> <p>Mr. Knowles said that the focus should be to keep our</p> | NC: See Staff Response #1A | |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | neighborhood safe, intact and preserving its history and character for our families and future generations. | | |
| 9A | 5/12/10 | Lorraine Wilde Victor Street Columbia Neighborhood | Ms. Wilde wrote in support of the changes to improve the multi-modal use of the Fountain District Urban Village, specifically changes to increase the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. She identified that she and her children bike, walk, bus, and drive through the area on a daily basis. She said she has read the arguments opposing the proposal to include bicycle lanes on Elm Street, one argument being that traffic speed has increased since bike lanes were included along Cornwall Avenue. She notes that no formal study has been completed to confirm or deny this assertion, and that it is important for city long-term planning to determine if increased car traffic speed is indeed an unexpected side effect of bike lane introduction. She proposed that an inexpensive, yet adequate, study be conducted along the area of the recent Cornwall Avenue upgrade to increase the information base available for future decision-making. | NC: See Staff Response #6 | |
| 9B | 5/12/10 | Lorraine Wilde (cont) | Ms. Wilde encouraged the introduction of signage warning of pedestrian crossing, limited sight distance, or other appropriate warning, or potential traffic revision near the intersection of Elm / Northwest at W. North Street. | NC: The <i>Fountain District Urban Village Subarea Plan</i> recommends that an enhanced crossing (pedestrian-activated flashing light) be added to the intersection of Connecticut Street and Northwest Avenue to improve the ability for pedestrians and bicyclists traveling east/west to safely cross the arterial. The preferred crossing was identified at W. North Street, but due to the inability to mitigate the physical obstacles at this intersection, Connecticut was selected as the preferred and safest crossing. | |
| 10 | 5/12/10 | Mary Corcoran and Don Trosset Northwest Ave. Columbia Neighborhood | Ms. Corcoran and Mr. Trosset wrote that they own a house on Northwest Ave. near the W. Illinois intersection and are concerned that parking may be removed from their street. They are concerned that residents without large driveways will have difficulty when having company, etc., and ask that the City does not make Northwest Avenue a thoroughfare, as it is currently very busy and traffic already moves above the speed limit. | NC: See Staff Response #1C and #1A | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--|---|--|--|
| 11 | 5/13/10 | Rae Edwards Lettered Streets Neighborhood | <p>Ms. Edwards asked for clarification regarding the purpose of the proposals, below, and asked if the goal was to help move people through the neighborhood to the waterfront.</p> <p><i>“The three key proposals presented to the Transportation Commission for recommendation include the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Elm Street preferred alternative to remove parking on one side of the street to allow 5-foot wide bike lanes to be installed on each side;</i> 2. <i>Adoption and implementation of a Bike Boulevard concept designed to enhance bicycle and pedestrian movement into and through the area; and</i> 3. <i>Proposed alterations and improvements to Fountain Plaza Park and Monroe Street right-of-way to enhance community space.</i> | <p>NC: Northwest and Meridian are both currently classified and function as “principal arterial streets” with high volumes of daily traffic. These principal arterials are also primary fire and emergency medical response routes, major connections to the downtown area, and Northwest is a high-frequency transit route. The goals of the <i>Fountain District Urban Village Subarea Plan</i> policies are to enhance these streets without compromising their ability to function as principal arterials, emergency response routes, and transit routes. While Elm / Northwest and Meridian may be affected by future development on the waterfront, the <i>Subarea Plan</i> proposals are not connected to the waterfront planning.</p> | |
| 12 | 5/13/10 | Peter Roberts Columbia Neighborhood and President of the Eldridge Society for History and Preservation | <p>Mr. Roberts writes that during last month’s quarterly meeting of The Eldridge Society for History and Preservation there was a 100% consensus and a request that he draft a letter requesting not to remove any parking along Elm Street to accommodate bike lanes. He said that comments included: <i>“It is not fair to the businesses located there”</i> and <i>“The cars will go too fast.”</i> He also said that parents of school aged students voiced concern for their children’s safety if cars would be moving much faster because of the wider appearing roadway.</p> <p>He stated that it does not make sense that the City in its proposal for the Fountain District <i>Plan</i> is calling for more parking, but that they are proposing to take away parking.</p> | <p>NC: See Staff Response #1A</p> | |
| 13A | 5/14/10 | Mary Ellen Grimes Lettered Streets Neighborhood | <p>Ms. Grimes asks what “BMC” stands for.</p> | <p>NC: BMC is the acronym for "Bellingham Municipal Code"</p> | |
| 13B | 5/14/10 | Mary Ellen Grimes (cont) | <p>Ms. Grimes asks if the school property on Dupont Street (currently zoned “Public” and proposed to be included in the Commercial Transition area) is still owned by the school district, and if it is still used as an administration</p> | <p>NC: The Bellingham School District still owns the property and uses it as an administration building. It was included in the Commercial Transition area in the event that if it did change ownership it could be</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | building. | developed – or adaptively reused – as any of the allowable uses within the Commercial Transition designation. | |
| 13C | 5/14/10 | Mary Ellen Grimes (cont) | Ms. Grimes asks about the goal for the two properties now proposed as “Commercial Transition” at the corner of Girard and J Streets. She asked if the northeast lot, currently zoned Single Family but used as a parking lot, and whether it would be allowed to continue to be used in this way. | NC: In designating the small section on Girard at J Street the location and existing conditional uses of the properties were considered. Under the Commercial Transition designation the use of the property as a “Parking Facility” would not be permitted. | |
| 13D | 5/14/10 | Mary Ellen Grimes (cont) | Ms. Grimes asks why the Commercial Core designation has crossed Broadway into the Lettered Streets at Girard (ends at the small Commercial Transition designation), and if there is a particular reason for that area to be Commercial Core. | NC: The “notched” section along Broadway was included in the Commercial Core area because it includes a parcel that is contiguous with the commercial building (restaurant) that is located within the Commercial Core. | |
| 13E | 5/14/10 | Mary Ellen Grimes (cont) | Ms. Grimes asks what “Minimum Lot Size - None” on Page 7 of the Development Regulations BMC 20.37.220 “Permitted Uses” means. | NC: The “None” for minimum lot size in Commercial Core and Commercial Transition zones means that there is no minimum lot size requirement for commercial development in these areas. | |
| 14 | 5/17/10 | Sara Stamey | Ms. Stamey stated that the on-street parking should be retained. She is in agreement with Ms. Bjornson’s research, and feels that Cornwall has become more dangerous for bicyclists since the on-street parking was removed. | NC: <i>See Staff Response #1A</i> | |
| 15A | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | She expressed concern that the decisions being made today “could change the sense of small town community forever,” and encouraged the historic nature of the Fountain District to be preserved. | NC: Preservation of the historic buildings along Elm Street (in particular those contributing to the Eldridge Historic District) and along Meridian was a primary consideration in planning for allowable FAR, height, parking requirements. Staff created special development code for modifications and additions to existing buildings to meet the preservation goals for the Commercial Core and Commercial Transition areas. See proposed BMC code 20.37.230 for details. | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | |
| 15B | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>She wrote that she thought there should be a larger Commercial Core area with the following boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meridian from Broadway to Illinois - Elm St to Northwest from Broadway to Connecticut (including the triangular property) - & inclusion of Elm and Kulshan as well. <p>She stated that the plan that calls for a smaller core with transition areas along Elm street is acceptable.</p> | <p>NC: The boundaries for the Commercial Core and Commercial Transition areas were based on analysis of current zoning, existing conditional use permits, parking availability and input from property owners in the adjacent residential areas.</p> | |
| 15C | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>Height Limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - She would not like to see anything above two stories throughout the entire area (except perhaps the Haggen and Fountain Drug properties) <p>She stated that in an effort to keep the existing neighborhood character, the height limit should not be changed. She pointed out the size of the lots and stated that in order for anything to be developed in the Fountain District, lots would have to be combined; in her opinion, this action would not only change the character of the neighborhood, it would not be favorable to the local small businesses.</p> | <p>NC: Current height limits in the Commercial Core are 35'. In the Commercial Transition areas current maximum allowable heights range from 35' to 45'. Single-family homes in the surrounding residential areas are also limited to 35' feet. A maximum height set at 25' would make many existing buildings non-conforming.</p> <p>Regarding lot consolidation, many parcels along Meridian have been consolidated over the years, although there are still many that retain the smaller 50' x 100' square foot size. Special design standards have been proposed in BMC 20.37.230 to encourage adaptive reused of existing buildings, with the goal of maintaining the smaller converted houses and preserving the varied, eclectic character that currently exists.</p> <p><i>Also see Staff Response #15A.</i></p> | |
| 15D | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>She expressed her concern about Connecticut Street being considered a major bike route. She pointed out that if stop signs were removed so the bikes did not have to make frequents stops, which would mean cars would not have to stop either – she emphasized the dangerous situations this could cause.</p> | <p>NC: Bike boulevards provide slower speeds on calmer streets. Low-traffic neighborhood streets optimized for bicycle travel allow free flow travel for bicyclists by orienting stop signs to keep bicyclists moving, but not without also adding discouraging cut-through motor vehicle traffic by adding traffic circles, chicanes and</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | diverters to slow motor vehicles and improve safety for bicyclists. | |
| 15E | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>She raised the following concerns and comments about parking :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow for one parking space for every adult allowed in a unit. - Do not reduce parking requirements. - On-street parking is dangerous. - The traffic calming ideas (on-street parking, bulb-outs, etc.) will make it more difficult for emergency vehicles to travel the arterial street. <p>She stated that the automobile will not be eliminated anytime soon, and many residents need these for jobs outside of the Fountain District or to accommodate their work schedule. She also expressed concern that if “adequate parking is not planned for” then business parking lots and parking on the street will become an issue.</p> | <p>NC: In the Commercial Core parking requirements are proposed at 1 stall per 500 square feet of commercial space and 1 stall per residential unit, with additional parking required if the unit has two or more bedrooms. Staff took into consideration on-street parking availability (shared parking) as well as access to transit and bike infrastructure. Staff’s proposal does not assume the automobile will be eliminated. The proposal is to encourage more transit, bike and pedestrian options to encourage less automobile use. Bellingham Fire Department personnel worked with staff on the street proposals and have approved of the street designs, including the bulb-outs. The bulb-outs provide additional safety for pedestrians crossing Meridian and Elm / Northwest.</p> | |
| 15F | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>Design Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not interested in the strip mall approach <p>She stated that she does not agree that the Fountain District needs design requirements to make everybody feel safe. She encouraged that the design requirements should be flexible, limited in number and reasonable (take into account unintended consequences).</p> | <p>NC: The Urban Village Design Guidelines proposed for the Commercial Core and Commercial Transition areas of the Fountain District Urban Village are designed to steer new development away from the “strip mall” approach (which incorporates low-density, auto-centric design that often puts broad expanses of surface parking between businesses and the pedestrian sidewalks).</p> <p>The Urban Village Design Guidelines, adopted by City Council in 2009, are designed to allow for creativity and flexibility of new development design, and incorporate time-tested environmental design principles that maximize pedestrian safety.</p> | |
| 15G | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>She encouraged that the concept of easements and shared driveways be kept to a minimum to decrease the chances of issues being raised when a change of owner occurs or</p> | <p>NC: Encouraging shared driveways in the district is a policy designed to address two needs: 1) to enhance the pedestrian experience increase pedestrian safety and 2)</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | difference of opinions exist. | to maximize on-street parking opportunities. | |
| 15H | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>She commented on the suggestion that landscaping makes people feel safer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trees in a commercial area could block the visibility of surrounding businesses. - Hedges and bushes could actually cause one to feel unsafe when walking by in the dark. - Landscaping between businesses would be more appropriate for the neighborhood character | NC: Landscaping design and selection of plant materials within the street rights of way will take into consideration visibility to businesses as well as safety. | |
| 15I | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>She stated that although Peabody, Russell, and the area behind Haggan are zoned mixed-use, the single-family homes should be preserved. She suggested that the height limit of 45' be reduced to only allow for 2-story buildings.</p> | NC: See staff response #15C | |
| 15J | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>Mixed-use Units:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should not be required in the Fountain District, this kind of use does not belong everywhere - Who is the priority, business or residential tenant? - Who would be asked to leave if irresolvable issues were to arise. - Residential tenants should not be allowed to impact the business. | NC: The proposal does not require mixed-use. A stand-alone commercial building is allowed. Commercial uses are required along Meridian Street, between Broadway and Illinois. Issues between commercial and residential tenants would be resolved through the property owner. | |
| 15K | 5/18/10 | Villene Lansberry | <p>She expressed the importance of allowing for things that businesses need in order to thrive, and not put major restrictions on things like signage or parking. She also pointed out that road dividers and street trees are not "generally business friendly".</p> | NC: Design guidelines for signage and parking are essential in urban village design. Urban Village Design Guidelines and pedestrian-friendly improvements such as crosswalks, wider sidewalks, street trees and pedestrian-scaled street features have been proven to revitalize commercial districts in cities across the nation. | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------------|--|---|--|
| 16A | 5/18/10 | Bill Lynch | He expressed his concern about the removal of the parking along Elm St. He stated that as a business owner, it is important for him to have parking in front of his establishment. | <p>C: Parking on one side of Elm Street is proposed for removal. However, maximizing parking on side streets in the Commercial Core and Commercial Transition areas is encouraged.</p> <p>To clarify this goal, staff recommends that the following language be added to Page 30 of the <i>Subarea Plan</i>, <i>“Public Parking Policies”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u><i>“Development of on-street parking on side streets within the Commercial Core and Commercial Transition areas is encouraged, where space allows, through the creation of diagonal parking.”</i></u> | |
| 16B | 5/18/10 | Bill Lynch | He suggested that Kulshan and Elizabeth Streets be considered for the bicycle routes and not Elm or Meridian. | <p>NC: Elm Street has been identified in the <i>2006 Comprehensive Plan</i> as an important element of the citywide transportation network. Dupont / Elm / NW is identified as a key bicycle arterial route (not only providing local access for residents of the Fountain District), and serves as a commuter route that provides access to services along those streets, as well as a key connection between downtown and areas north of I-5 (Guide Meridian/Cordata area) - areas with high bicycle trip demand.</p> <p>Bike lanes on arterial streets provide commuters with direct links, faster connections, and more efficient travel. Bike boulevards provide a different experience - slower speeds, calmer streets - that is more comfortable for less-experienced cyclists, children, and families travelling together. It is important to provide both facilities - bike lanes and bike boulevards (also trails). They serve different user needs and will ultimately help achieve greater mode shift.</p> | |
| 17A | 5/18/10 | Emily Weiner | She suggested that the height limit be “at the discretion of the Planning Director” on the Haggen and Fountain Drug sites. | <p>NC: The 55’ maximum height limit on the Haggen site was based on public input, economic viability and feasibility studies, in addition to analysis of height, density and parking impacts to surrounding residential areas. The Fountain Drug (aka Galleria) site was also</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----------------|--|---|---------|
| | | | | <p>studied in this way, and it was determined that 45' was a more appropriate height given the constraints of the area.</p> <p>Setting a limit on height at the Opportunity Site provides predictability for the property owner, as well as for property owners in the surrounding residential areas.</p> | |
| 17B | 5/18/10 | Emily Weiner | She expressed her support for the development of additional water features along Meridian Street, and suggested including incentives for future developments. | <p>NC: On Page 17 of the <i>Subarea Plan</i>, 3.1. <i>Development Character Policies, Site Design Policies</i> the following two policies are called out: “Develop sites to create an interesting and comfortable environment for pedestrians,” and “Construct buildings adjacent to the sidewalk, except when setback to accommodate plazas, outdoor dining, wider sidewalks and / or enhanced landscaping.” While the <i>Subarea Plan</i> does not identify a specific fountain theme, it does not preclude these from being built by private property owners.</p> | |
| 18 | 5/19/10 | Elke Daugherty | Submitted the results of the survey she conducted. | <p>NC: See staff response to comment #24A-PH, below.</p> | 5/20/10 |
| 19 | 5/20/10 | Flip Breskin | She expressed her concern about the fact that a follow-up traffic study has not been conducted on Cornwall after the on-street parking was removed. She suggested that this concept be evaluated before doing the same thing along Elm Street. | <p>NC: Public Works Department evaluates arterial traffic speeds every two years and has not found a substantial increase on Cornwall Avenue with the removal of parking and addition of bike lanes.</p> | |
| 20 | 5/20/10 | Steven Choat | He expressed his opposition to removing parking and installing bike lanes along Elm Street. He stated that his business relies on the parking during the day, and homeowners utilize the parking through the night. He pointed out that although he does offer parking in the back of the building, it is not enough to meet the customer demand. He commented on the additional professional offices that have renovated homes that might have otherwise been torn down or fallen into disrepair. He expressed his concern about the removal of parking forcing | <p>NC: See staff response to comment #1C</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | these businesses to relocate. | | |
| 21-PH | 5/20/10 | Sara Snow | She expressed her concern about the parking being removed from Northwest / Elm. She commented that this street contain many small homes that were built in the early 1900's. She stated that the driveways are narrow and often do not fit more than one car; therefore parking on the street is necessary. She also pointed out that the homes on the east side of Northwest do not have alley access like those homes on the west side do. She mentioned that if the on-street parking was removed that would make it difficult for residents to have garage sales or people over to their homes. | NC: The current proposal does not remove parking from Northwest Avenue north of Connecticut Street. The proposal to remove parking was based on the availability of alley access to all homes between Connecticut and Broadway, the area proposed for parking removal on one side of the street. | |
| 22-PH | 5/20/10 | Jim Strattman | He expressed his support for the project and the proposed infill. He requested that Halleck (south-end of Peabody) be considered for traffic calming devices to detour traffic from spilling over into that residential area. | C: Staff recommends the following policy language be added to Page 24 of the <i>Subarea Plan</i> under "Circulation Policies": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>"Consider creating traffic calming devices to discourage traffic from cutting through the residential area on Halleck Street at the south end of Peabody Street."</u> | |
| 23A-PH | 5/20/10 | Mark Keller, President of Columbia Neighborhood | Submitted written comment – He expressed the Neighborhood Associations support for the proposal. He commented on the design standards and staggered setbacks and stated that they "will improve the aesthetics of the commercial district while preserving the character of nearby residential properties". He pointed out that greater residential density would improve sustainability and provide a base of support for local businesses. He stated that, in the opinion of the neighborhood, the streetscape and public realm improvements will encourage more pedestrian and bicycle traffic. | NC: No comment | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------|--|---|---|--|
| 23B-PH | 5/20/10 | Mark Keller, President of Columbia Neighborhood | He also stated that the association would like to see greater residential density than the plan provides for, including the allowance of building higher than 55' on the two sites that are currently limited only by the discretion of the planning director. | <p>NC: An increase in housing types and options has been proposed for the Residential Transition and Commercial Transition areas. The proposal is based on existing zoning, current Conditional Use Permits, and public input.</p> <p><i>Regarding the Haggen Opportunity Site, see staff response to comment #17A.</i></p> | |
| 24A-PH | 5/20/10 | Elke Daugherty | <p>Submitted written comment with attachments – She expressed her support for the revitalization of the Meridian commercial corridor and the adjacent residential areas. Although she supports many of the objectives presented in the plan, she commented on some concerns as well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - She commented that at the meetings she attended, the majority of the opinions regarding height in the core and at the opportunity site at Haggen, stated 45' and 55' were too extreme for the context of the neighborhood. <p>She submitted her own personal survey done of 47 households along Vallette, Peabody, North, Kulshan, and Jefferson Streets and reviewed the results with the Commissioners.</p> | <p>NC: A range of opinions was expressed regarding height limits along Meridian Street. Staff took into account all perspectives on this issue when developing the proposal, including those preferring higher or lower than the proposed 45' height limits.</p> <p>It was determined that the best height was at 45' in the Commercial Core area, with associated design standards. The development scenarios tested revealed this height as appropriate for the existing scale of the Meridian Street corridor and the design standards developed to maintain privacy and light for the adjacent residential areas.</p> <p>The proposed design standards contain a provision that development in the Commercial Core and Commercial Transition areas abutting a residential area must set and step buildings back where they interface with any residential areas.</p> | |
| 24B-PH | 5/20/10 | Elke Daugherty | <p>She expressed her concern that the allowance of duplexes would increase the number of rentals in this single-family neighborhood.</p> <p>She commented that if the Commercial Core were allowed to redevelop at 35', two stories of residential could be added on top of new commercial development, allowing the preservation of her neighborhood.</p> | <p>NC: The proposal makes no change to the existing zoning in the Cornwall Park Residential Transition 1 area. Currently, the Infill Housing Guidelines are applied to all new and converted duplex housing.</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------|----------------|--|---|--|
| 24C-PH | 5/20/10 | Elke Daugherty | <p>She stated that the height and bulk couldn't be accommodated on most of the existing lots with the proposed height changes without lot consolidation happening. She suggested that a Design Review Commission be developed in order to "provide real oversight to the development that will occur." She pointed out that the pictures in the packet do not accurately reflect the width of Meridian, nor the fact that the lot sizes in this area would not accommodate the required setbacks for the trees shown. She suggested that the Commission limit the height to 35' and allow only ADU and carriage housing forms from the infill toolkit.</p> | <p>NC: A five-member citizen and professional Design Review Board is in place and will be overseeing new development projects. RMC Architects worked with various lot sizes in the area to assist staff in determining the feasibility of various height and FAR thresholds. The height and FAR proposed can be supported on some lots in the area. A lower height and lesser FAR can be expected on smaller lots.</p> | |
| 25-PH | 5/20/10 | Mark Tucker | <p>He expressed his support for a bike route to be considered along Peabody St.</p> <p>He stated that he is not in favor of duplexes or lot consolidation.</p> <p>He suggested the density remain consistent throughout a larger area: 4 blocks east of Meridian and about 4 blocks west of Elm St., which would allow the density to be a bit more spread out.</p> | <p>NC: See staff responses to comments #24B-PH and #15C.</p> <p>In the area west of Meridian (Columbia Neighborhood), several Infill Housing Toolkit types have been proposed, with the objectives of 1) allowing a small increase in density and 2) of providing more housing options.</p> | |
| 26-PH | 5/20/10 | Lee Posthumus | <p>She stated that allowing a 45' height limit in the Commercial Core would impact the view that she and her neighbors have of Lummi Island and Mt. Baker. She requested that a 45' height limit be imposed on the Haggen site.</p> | <p>NC: Impacts to views from private property were not studied as part of the master planning process.</p> | |
| 27-PH | 5/20/10 | Jim Green | <p>He commented that removing the parking along Elm St. would have a negative impact on his business, both for customers and employees; as well as for the tenants above his establishment. He expressed his support for the redevelopment of the park; however, cautioned the commission to consider the consequences of not supplying enough parking for the visitors.</p> | <p>NC: Parking removal on the Monroe Street right-of-way was suggested by several participants during the public planning workshops. However, because of the scarcity identified in the Parking Study in the southern end of the district, the final proposal is to make improvements to the Plaza Park and Meridian / Monroe intersection streetscape, with a maximum loss of no more than two parking spaces.</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------|---------------|---|---|--|
| 28A-PH | 5/20/10 | Peter Roberts | <p>Submitted written comment - He submitted the second page of the survey conducted by Sara Snow. He also read a letter written by Louise Bjornson:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The letter stated that the removal of on-street parking from Elm and Northwest would “speed up traffic and further endanger both pedestrians and bicyclists”. She also commented on the impact it would have on the homes and businesses along that corridor. She pointed out that on-street parking provides a traffic calming effect. She requested that the commission consider retaining the parking along Elm and Northwest. <p>He encouraged the commission to consider the idea of shared lanes and cautioned them against the unintended consequences that the removal of parking could have. He read his written submittal: <i>See comment #12</i></p> | NC: <i>See staff response to comment #1A</i> | |
| 28B-PH | 5/20/10 | Peter Roberts | He pointed out that many homes in the Fountain District are historic and could be preserved as an adaptive re-use; however, without parking the value of those homes would be lowered. He reviewed the SEPA Determination of Non-significance with commissioners. | NC: <i>See staff response to comment #1C</i> | |
| 29-PH | 5/20/10 | Caryn Simmons | She expressed her concern about the increased height limit and suggested that it be limited to 25'. She commented on the negative impacts an increase in the height limit will bring: light pollution, view obstruction, plummeting property values, privacy, and inconsistent with the neighborhood character. She requested that the residents along Kulshan and Peabody Streets be protected from large buildings surrounding them. | NC: Lighting standards are incorporated into the proposal. The FAR proposed, which will likely require the need for surface parking, rather than structured parking, will result in open spaces on each site. Special design standards were incorporated to build on the existing Fountain District character and properties abutting the Commercial Core. Development regulations are proposed to allow more flexibility, increased density and reinvestment in the area. | |
| 30-PH | 5/20/10 | Roger Spero | He commented that in order to develop something that was well-planned and a beneficial addition to the neighborhood, the lot size is going to have to be large enough to accommodate the height. He stated that the height on the | NC: Some of the lots sizes in the area support higher FAR. There are also properties in the area that would not support high intensity development. | |

| | | | | | |
|-------|---------|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | | Fountain Drug site remain at the original proposal of 55'. | | |
| 31-PH | 5/20/10 | Lee Walkup | He expressed his concern about the negative impact that the removal of parking will have on the business owners in the neighborhood. He commented that the City does not appear to be supportive of the residents' request to not remove parking (i.e.: Broadway). | NC: See staff response to comment #27-PH | |
| 32-PH | 5/20/10 | Norm Chamberlin | He requested that his property, located at 1911 J St., be included within the Commercial Core Boundaries. He stated that this would allow him to develop his properties, which are adjacent to one another, in a manner consistent with the neighborhood character. | NC: The property at 1911 J Street was considered for the Commercial Transition area designation, but because of it is part of a single family-zoned street, it was determined that the more intense level of land use allowed with the Commercial Transition areas would not be appropriate. For the same reasons, it was not included in the Commercial Core area. | |
| 33-PH | 5/20/10 | Mary Varco | She expressed her concern that an increase the height limit to 45' or 55' would exacerbate an already troubled parking situation. | NC: Parking is required for all new development. See staff response to comment #15E. | |
| 34-PH | 5/20/10 | Dan Lorr | He suggested that the bike route be relocated four blocks west of Elm Street onto a more bike friendly road. He stated that as redevelopment occurs, the parking should be located underground which would allow for the height above ground to be retained at 35'. | NC: Only streets within the Fountain District Urban Village area were considered for north – south bike boulevards (Elm Street is the most westerly street within the boundary). Underground structured parking is encouraged, but is financially unlikely to occur due to the exorbitant cost that is not outweighed by three stories of development. | |
| 35-Ph | 5/20/10 | Aaron Booker | He expressed his concern about sprawl if we do not allow for infill in the established neighborhoods. He stated that the increase in height would allow for residential units to be located above businesses. He commented on the public process and pointed out to the commissioners that there was agreement on the height issue among the 100's of participants, even though they could not all attend the | NC: No comment | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------|---|--|-----------------------|--|
| | | | hearing. | | |
| 36A-PH | 5/20/10 | Frank Ordway, Chair of Transportation Commission | He reported that the Commission does endorse the proposal relating to the 3 portions of the Transportation Element of the plan. He commented that both the Public Works Department and the Police Department report that since parking has been removed from Cornwall, there has been no evidence that speed has increased or more accidents have occurred. | NC: No comment | |
| 36B-PH | 5/20/10 | Frank Ordway, Chair of Transportation Commission | He referenced previous testimony and mentioned that the experience of the Transportation Commissioners includes planning experience in both Portland and San Francisco. He then pointed out that allowing parking to remain on the street with bike lanes is the least desired outcome in these two cities, and only happens with no other option is possible. | NC: No comment | |
| 36C-PH | 5/20/10 | Frank Ordway, Chair of Transportation Commission | He commented that business owners that have experienced parking being removed from in front of their building, have reported an increase in customers since it is more comfortable for people to be there. He pointed out that the Transportation Commission is guided by the Comprehensive Plan, which mandates that the City plan for and meet multi-modal transportation goals. | NC: No comment | |
| 37A-PH | 5/20/10 | Therese Galligher | She stated that after several hours of observation and communication with surrounding neighbors she concluded that the population density, the easy access to services, and the relatively flat terrain that Northwest provides, makes it a great bicycle arterial. She pointed out that bicyclists would choose to use infrastructure, when provided, at least 85% of the time. | NC: No comment | |
| 37B-PH | 5/20/10 | Therese Galligher | She commented that even with the on-street parking, cars travelled faster than the posted speed of 25mph along Northwest. She emphasized the fact that traffic calming | NC: No comment | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------|--------------|---|--|--|
| | | | measures be considered along this arterial in an effort to allow the multi-modal goals to be accomplished. | | |
| 38A-PH | 5/20/10 | Cliff Palmer | He stated that he would like to see the height limit remain at 35' along Meridian in an effort to preserve the site lines. | NC: See staff response to comment #24A-PH | |
| 38B-PH | 5/20/10 | Cliff Palmer | He urged the bike lane not be planned along Connecticut, it does not follow the natural path bicyclist would take. | NC: The proposed bike boulevard is recommended for a combination of W. North Street and Connecticut Streets. The final route is yet to be determined. However, the arterial crossings are proposed for Connecticut at Meridian and Northwest, given the physical constraints of crossing Northwest at the North Street intersection. Because of this constraint, Connecticut Street is considered an important part of the route. | |
| 38C-PH | 5/20/10 | Cliff Palmer | He discussed some examples of unintended consequences, and suggested that the commission consider these when making a recommendation on the removal of parking along Elm and Northwest. | NC: No comment | |
| 39A-PH | 5/20/10 | Bill Henshaw | He stated that only the Hagen site and the Fountain Drug site (including a bit more land south of each) should be allowed to build to 45'. | NC: See staff response to comment #17A | |
| 39B-PH | 5/20/10 | Bill Henshaw | He suggested that land be found and developed into parking lots to accommodate for the parking being removed, since underground parking is not economically feasible at this time. | C: Staff recommends making the following change to "Land Use Classification #17. Parking Facilities " in BMC 20.37.220 Fountain District Urban Village – Permitted Uses from Not Allowed to as a <u>Conditional Use</u> in Commercial Transition areas. Use is permitted subject to the Conditional Use provisions specified in BMC 20.16 and to general requirements for the use and the use area. | |

| | | | | Land Use Classification: | Commercial Transition | Commercial Transition | Residential Transition 1 | Residential Transition 2 | |
|--------|---------|--------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | 17. Parking facilities | P | N C | N | N | |
| 39C-PH | 5/20/10 | Bill Henshaw | He suggested that the plan include language that would specifically state the sidewalks are needed, on both sides of the streets, from Cornwall to Lynn St. He pointed out that bike lanes and improvements to the streets can only happen once this infrastructure is in place. He requested that the traffic guidance at Broadway and Cornwall be made clearer. | <p>C: Page 39 of the <i>Subarea Plan</i> identifies the Capital Improvement costs <i>***includes costs of sidewalk construction on one side W. Illinois Street from Cornwall Ave. to Lynn Street.</i></p> <p>Staff recommends that the following policy language be added to Page 26 under “<i>Streetscape Policies</i>”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u><i>Construct sidewalks on both sides of W. Illinois Street from Cornwall Avenue to Lynn Street</i></u> | | | | | |
| 40 | 5/24/10 | Norm Chamberlin | He requested that 1911 J St. be included in the Commercial Core Area. He pointed out that this would allow the owner (who also owns property already proposed to be included in the Commercial Core), to “use the property in a more compatible way in the neighborhood”. He stated that by including this property it would also allow for a staggered step of transition instead of a large 100’ step. | NC: See staff response to comment #32-PH | | | | | |
| 41A | 5/25/10 | Flip Breskin on behalf of Dick Pratt | The author stated that, according to the studies he has researched, bicycle lanes improve cyclist safety. He commented on the fact that different designs require the consideration of different elements. He listed a website for further review. He commented that, in his opinion, on-street parking does have a traffic calming effect; however, other features for traffic calming could be looked into and implemented. | NC: No comment | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 41B | 5/25/10 | Flip Breskin on behalf of Dick Pratt | He commented that directness and level grade are important to cyclists, and upon looking at a map, he could not “see any good parallel routes that might be used as alternatives for Northwest Avenue.” He pointed out that a “complete streets” design with bicycle lanes is probably the way to go for Northwest Avenue. | NC: No comment | |
| 41C | 5/25/10 | Flip Breskin on behalf of Dick Pratt | <p>He stated that Elm Street, on the other hand, might have parallel options for bicyclist. He suggested the street to the west of Elm utilize the “bicycle boulevard” concept. He cited some statistics based on research done in Portland, OR which indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If a bicyclists shortest path to their destination was along a quiet street they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would not go out of their way to utilize a bike lane; - would go 14% out of their way to use a bicycle boulevard; and - would go 26% out of their way to use a paved off-road trail. - If a bicyclists shortest path to their destination was along a moderate traffic street they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would go 31% out of their way to utilize a bike lane; - would go 45% out of their way to use a bicycle boulevard; and - would go 57% out of their way to use a paved off-road trail. <p>He suggested that either Elizabeth St. or Walnut St. be considered for bicycle boulevard alternatives. He pointed out that Madison St. could be used to connect to Broadway, which could link the Bancroft St / Clinton St. trail with the bike lanes along Northwest.</p> | NC: <i>Regarding alternate north / south bike boulevard routes, see staff response to comment #34-PH</i> | |
| 42 | 5/26/10 | Steven Choat | He expressed his concern about the impact the removal of parking along Elm street will have on families and businesses in that area. He compared this action with how he felt the addition of bike lanes occurred on Cornwall Avenue. | NC: <i>See staff response to comment #1C</i> | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------------|--|---|--|
| 43 | 5/27/10 | Steven Choat | He pointed out that if parking were to be removed from Elm Street: property owners will be inconvenienced, home values will be impacted, and safety will be compromised due to the higher rate of speed. He requested additional background information that can be used as he prepares his opposition for City Council. | NC: See staff response to comment #1A and 1C | |
| 44 | 5/27/10 | Sara Snow | She submitted signatures of citizens who oppose the removal of parking along Elm Street. She stated that if the parking was removed one of her neighbors would not have anywhere to park her van, garage sales could not be held in the neighborhood, and businesses would have no where for their customers to park. She also suggested that, after her car was struck by a bicyclist, that they all be required to obtain a license and obey the traffic laws. | NC: See staff response to comment #21-PH | |
| 45A | 6/01/10 | Dean Martin | He commented on the importance of providing sufficient housing options in the City to prevent homes from being built on agricultural resource lands. He provided some supporting materials. He encouraged the Commission to raise the height limit to 45' in Fountain District's commercial areas and allow the Hagen's site and the fountain property to remain "at the Planning Director's discretion." | NC: See staff response to comment #17A | |
| 45B | 6/01/10 | Dean Martin | He suggested that in an effort to minimize the dependency on the automobile, parking spaces should be purchased or rented if needed by residents. He provided supporting materials for this concept as well. | NC: See staff response to comment #39B-PH | |
| 46A | 6/02/10 | Lee Posthumus | She submitted, in writing, the comments made at the May 20, 2010 hearing; as well as, pictures illustrating how the increased height limit would affect surrounding properties and her views. She measured the utility poles along Meridian with a clinometer and determined that the tallest pole was only 60' high with the tallest crossbar on the poles only reaching 40'. She also stated that the lowest insulator at the top is about 50'. | NC: See staff response to comment #26-PH | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | |
| 46B | 6/02/10 | Lee Posthumus | <p>She expressed her concern about the difference in FAR along Elm St and Meridian. She stated that in her opinion, the homes along Elm St. are being protected, but the homes along Meridian are not. She noted that an increase in height and FAR would quite possibly cause rent to be higher; thereby causing some of the smaller businesses to go “out of business.”</p> | <p>NC: The most appropriate FAR for both Meridian and Elm was extensively studied, and conservatively set at 1.5 and .6, respectively. Due to the commercial nature of Meridian Street, a higher FAR was set at 1.5 – considerably lower than the commercial areas in the urban villages of Old Town (3.5, or 5.0 with the use of floor area transfers and bonuses), and Samish Way (2.5, and up to 3.5).</p> <p>Over time a number of residential houses have been replaced by newer (and often larger) buildings and parking lots, driven by market preferences and economic trends. However, a number of the early 20th century residential houses remain, effectively converted into places of businesses, some of which have maintained success for decades.</p> <p>The development regulations for the Commercial Core were written with consideration of the public’s desire to create incentives to maintain these smaller, single-family housing forms and keep the eclectic architectural nature and numerous long-standing, smaller businesses along Meridian. The regulations and FAR were set with this objective in mind, while recognizing that a number of larger lots (150’ x 100’) as well as the smaller 50’ x 100’ parcels exist along the core. The proposed height increase from 35’ to 45’, combined with the FAR limits are designed to create opportunity, guidelines and standards for new development that is responsive to the existing context and surrounding residential area.</p> <p>The proposed regulations are also designed to provide incentives to maintain and sensitively adapt, rather than demolish, the smaller formerly single-family housing forms on Meridian’s smaller parcels. The ultimate goal of the regulations is to create incentives for adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and to produce new quality-designed developments, built to serve the multi-modal</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | nature of the commercial core. | |
| 46C | 6/02/10 | Lee Posthumus | She commented on the proposed increase in height leading to additional parking issues. She noted that even if the height were to remain at 35', additional parking or the encouragement of alternative transportation will be necessary. She suggested that staff consider developing a parking district and utilizing the parking lot behind Fountain Drug used for this purpose. | C: See staff response to comment #39B-PH | |