

PLANNING ACADEMY II
SESSION III
21 May 2008
OVERVIEW, CONTEXT & PURPOSE
POST-TEST COMMENTS

What was the most useful information you gained from Session 3?

- The LMN presentation was useful to the group – detailed, but...
- The map exercise was the most useful (“visualizing density”)
- The importance of fitting the variety of housing to the needs of the area
- The ideas and values that came with the dot exercise – like community gardens, green roofs, bike routes, light rail, etc
- That if people are objective, planning infill is EASY!
- That the city is prepared to change zoning without increasing amenities such as community gardens and open space
- Revision and new innovation
- More information about the different housing types; perspective from table members
- The great utility of alleys!
- Class definitions of types of houses
- Learning about the different types
- The several housing forms that need to be available
- Presentations (but why didn’t it happen before session 2 discussion)
- Listening to the element architect; at least all the housing types were explained
- The interaction on the dot maps was informative, but would have been nice to have a map of Bellingham in the exercise
- Clearer examples of the 4 high-density urban village and transitional area housing options
- Too dense is easy to do badly
- Perspective of/from other participants
- The different types of housing – locations of the many unit samples that can be used sprinkled throughout the neighborhood
- Higher density
- Explanation of multi-unit housing types; the least useful information was the abstract city mapping exercise
- Not a lot
- We are all on the same page
- People want gardens
- Side conversations with table members
- Overview of housing forms
- The person who did the presentation gave good info on the various types of buildings
- More detail on all types of housing
- Need for all different housing types to get best site specific design
- Solidified housing types and how they apply to where the best place they should be located
- One individual mentioned using the full “toolbox” – a concept that really helps mix up uses and create a diverse landscape
- Classified housing types
- Explanation of housing types and the table exercises.
- Better discussion
- Group exercise to locate “dots” (choices).
- Importance of alleys.
- Need to balance housing with open spaces, trails, creeks, etc.

- The actual application of deciding where to put various forms of infill and the exercise was very helpful.
- This was the best session so far- Maps and activities with actual building types are good mode for focused discussion.
- What little was said about LID
- Not much- Much too repetitive from session 1 and 2. Little value. Need to focus on bigger issues.
- That there are citizens out there that are actually beginning to embrace these alternative forms of denser housing.
- Everyone seems to philosophically agree about infill (would be good to do this with a map of Bellingham).
- Discussion of yield of product types.
- When real places aren't used nobody care where higher density housing types go.
- The thoughts of my fellow table members.
- Too much focus on the housing types, I think that mos will fit only in a few areas.
- Seeing how higher density can transition into single family homes in will established neighborhoods.
- More detailed info re: housing types and new housing types.
- How dreamy most folks are.
- The most useful information was the discussion about higher density products and the design/character constraints.
- Better understanding of housing types.
- Trying to place the different type of development on the map.
- Full representation spread of all the infill housing types in comparison of one another.
- Surprisingly- high amounts of agreement on broader issues.
- Dot work with discussion.
- Not sure- Lots of useful info.
- Discussion of pros and cons of each housing type.
- I honestly think that more valuable like landscape, topography, types of building of Bellingham (hypothetical) would have made it more meaningful.
- Definition of the various types of housing
- Community interest in detailed design accommodating density.
- Collaborative with group members. Time for discussion.
- I learned that each neighborhood has been given a particular number to work with in regards to units.
- The community planning exercise actually worked and convinced me that it is actually possible to plan in a consensus manner.

What topics or issues would you have liked to see discussed in more depth or detail?

- Transitional housing (fringe areas – neighborhood to corners)
- More dots would have been good to bring about this discussion
- Balancing the community so that it is still Bellingham
- Urban housing; Bellingham specific ideas; topography on the maps
- How to do the dot exercise in Bellingham
- How the process of coding changes will be assumed to be democratic
- How the city is going to specifically change the zoning – the process
- Design review – how it works; how quality housing can be guaranteed
- Discussion was satisfactory
- More discussion of mapping the housing types; how they would look on the map visually
- Design review, architectural guidelines
- Implementation – change how?
- Transitional principals from high density to single families
- Contradiction between re-energizing downtown and developing urban villages
- Commercial uses in urban villages

- How will neighborhoods make the next decisions
- Specific neighborhood infill
- Basic assumptions relating to infill
- This exercise would be much more beneficial for Bellingham if one of the 'infill' criteria equivalent to transportation corridors is habitat and recreation corridors, such an overlay would be a good opportunity to provide more realistic and fiscally viable environmentally friendly housing accommodation in our development code – something that will create consensus among developers and neighborhoods citywide
- Mixed use – need for support commercial and park spaces
- Individual slideshow examples shown – what was going on 'around' those
- Who decides what types of housing is used as infill
- How will design review work with these multitudes of new options?
- Design review/design standards
- Location and proximities – what does 5 min/ ¼ mile really mean in Bellingham? Some people thought ¼ mile would take 10-20 min – give us some examples
- How to reduce housing costs with infill
- How do you vest a sense of ownership by neighbors in neighborhood projects
- Housing forms last week, not this time
- How to spot zone
- How do we apply all of this information? How do we get the zoning change so we can build multi-family units
- Locations for different types codes that will permit different types and flexibility of applications
- Regulations which prohibit the proposed types
- Well maybe more insight into what the city is thinking over and above what we (participants) offer; how much weight will the suggestions carry as part of this academy
- We need to see current diversities by neighborhood, current zoned diversity along with current zoning map
- Urban Villages
- How the pretty pictures get into the codes. Specific Details of housing types; buffers, setbacks, lot coverage
- Pros and cons of various "tools"
- Topography, odd shaped lots and other "imperfections"
- Scale, F.A.R. for Bellingham
- The other components to successful infill.
- What neighborhood are you thinking of implementing these house ideas into? Or are you going to create some of these ideas in new neighborhood?
- More information about how to create greenery in urban areas through street trees, green walls (like Seattle), rooftop gardens, rain gardens, etc.
- Neighborhood maps – generalized with same exercise.
- LID
- How do housing styles affect neighborhood character? What is growth approach-fill in center and go outward or build in from boundaries or random infill? Will neighborhoods have say in what is built in their neighborhood?
- The economic realities that have as much influence on location as the items we discussed today. Who pays for community gardens?
- Some recognition of financing and market as they relate to the various products.
- Rate of build Vs. Expectations Vs. Reality
- How are we going to use those methods of housing design within Bellingham
- What will the adjacent areas be like, there must be some flow and contrast.
- Time to discuss design standards for each type of infill.
- Zoning changes necessary to encourage infill- Difference between infill and sprawl.
- Well planned tonight. Time enough to do exercise.

- The processes that will change zoning or procedures to implement new housing forms.
- I would have like to hear about objections and how to overcome them to the various products.
- Where all this will really fit in Bellingham. How well design review actually work?
- How parking influences how our buildings look and work the two do not compliment each other.
- What types of services are needed for each different infill type- cost, feasibility, burden of extra density, etc.
- Everything! We need to get detailed talks on design codes and standards and implementation.
- More group work- Less lectures.
- Open space requirements. Community gardens. Bikes and pedestrian facilities.
- How to fit the buildings in an appropriate way with a specific lot.
- We didn't need to repeat the infill section.
- Design review issues.
- How enforcement can be handled.
- Water issues, topography, other real-life issues with infill.
- How can the various types of housing (dots) be incorporated into Bellingham neighborhoods. The "dot" exercise was good, but was really only applicable for a couple neighborhoods in Bellingham. All the "dots" except perhaps "blue" 5 story buildings would work in most neighborhoods in town.
- Design guidelines. Development incentives.

Other comments about Session 3?

- It was very neat the way that many tables looked at solving open space, looked at alternative transportation and generally thought out of the box
- More dots!
- Good session
- Fun
- More table talk
- Less on review of low density
- Way too much intro! We sat for 2 hours!
- Good idea with the maps
- Too open ended – not reality based enough
- Kudos for better facilitation – having Linda at the door for sound control and as the main city public liaison was smart; still need to curb ambient noise
- Well done – information was clear and the project concise
- Enough time to discuss! Thank you!
- The map exercise was great
- Fun to do map
- More dots
- Better – much better than week 2
- Planning academy III should follow up on public infill incentives in core-area schools, affordable housing, natural open space/recreation corridors on city owned properties and public-private partnerships, starting with shifting transit and multi-story incentives downtown
- It would be good to know how the dot maps would be used – we had a hard time taking it seriously
- Thanks, great session
- Too much suggested regulator control to control "taste"; there must be flexibility to get great design solutions without prohibitively long processes
- I did not feel that it accomplished much of anything
- Good table exercise
- Thanks
- Good exercise!

- I feel the role play kept things lighter than last week.
- The first part went a little slow but the speaker handled questions well.
- Looking forward to more on urban villages where most of the multi and commercial housing types are most appropriate.
- Need to discuss how infill will occur and how it is controlled.
- Too much lecturing, not enough time for exercise. Reconfiguring our table was very helpful (table 7), but we missed Chris.
- Speaker needs to learn better presentation skills. Too many “umms” and pauses.
- More on neighborhood urban villages?
- Too much lecture.
- Too much talking up front.
- Much better tonight. Thank you.
- The base maps were not really detailed enough to be realistic. Cookies are excellent-please stop.
- Liked the activity that allowed us to apply the lessons.
- Would have liked more detail on the map and existing neighborhood conditions.
- More interaction!
- Much better than last week...We also had a better facilitator this week- Thanks!
- Nice job Nicole.
- All in all good- but we want to work with the landscape and natural features as well as the buildings.
- The overview of last weeks housing forms could have been a little shorter.
- First, we need more information about the case examples. For example, what is actually allowed with the existing is actually allowed with the existing city zoning and code. If we knew this, we could take these examples to our neighborhood. Secondly, the topic is what and where. This topic is focused on transitional areas and traditional areas need to be defined and explained. If they are truly “bridge” areas, then where does the bridge come from and where does the bridge go. If bridge areas form low density to high density in our area, then “Houston” we have a problem.
- It seemed that some of the presentation was too simplistic. We already knew much of the info, seemingly it was repeated for the TV audience?
- The map exercise was fun, buy it was a pretend map with pretend issues and undefined structures.
- The review of the various housing types was too lengthy and a little dry. It would have been more useful to have specific questions about each housing type from the participants.
- I’d rather see our local planners than the out of town “experts”.