

What was the most useful information you gained from the presentations(s)?

- Most arguments against various forms of infill are based on fear for assumptions about worst-case scenarios rather than examples of current problems. There is lots of discussion about bad infill that could happen in the absence of any evidence. For example, if you allow an ADU on a narrow lot, neighbors on either side will be crowded, won't have light for gardens, will lose shade from trees removed to create ADU. This is presented by group without any reference to actual existing examples. The logic of varying housing styles is lost in imagined bad scenarios.
- Lack of common ground or understanding in the group.
- The pretty cut sheets had very impressive and contradictory concepts-try again!
- Good information at presentation
- Stormwater management with low impact development presentation was clear, concise, and informative.
- Stormwater alternatives and green buildings
- Viewing the posters (large and Small) with their labels, definitions and photographs, using them in the discussion/voting to build my vocabulary and building a common vocabulary.
- I learned what the different building types are.
- General acceptance of ideas and new products.
- ADUs can create affordability for older owners
- Building and the use of parks and bike lanes for water runoff.
- Defining housing types
- Listening and learning from others; our WWU student was great to talk to!
- Breaking down types of similar housing, could be broader groupings.
- Graphs and writings describing various in-fill housing types
- Need for mixed-use proximity to services in neighborhoods.
- Differentiation of various options
- A more thorough understanding that Bellingham only has 2 different types of housing-would like to see more alternative housing options in Bellingham.
- Any design could work if well designed, sensitive to neighborhood character
- Actually, the stormwater presentation, though short, shed some good light on simple things that neighborhoods can do to minimize watershed impact.
- That the city does not allow most of the housing forms.
- More detailed look at a variety of infill styles.
- That more options are being explored.
- Understanding that our codes do need to be changed/revised
- Community is in consensus that transit access is imperative!
- We need to add service and amenities to neighborhoods so these infill housing types work.
- City council's goal to lessen SOV trips from 87-75% and FAR definition.
- City's willingness to consider and encourage new forms of housing
- Going through lists and talking about them.
- Stormwater 101. Why cut off Reilly just when it was getting interesting? Was this a last minute add-on? S.W.M. had nothing in the discussion.

- The prepared 11x17 infill description, which included photos
- Small-lot and cottage lot sites not altogether different from Lettered Streets and York, structural placement differs.
- Storm water info
- Neighborhood character will determine style and location of infill housing.
- Exercise, but couldn't talk with the time we had.
- Graphics of the several housing forms lists of criteria.
- FAR, housing type concepts
- Storm water management ideas were great and immediately applicable.
- Storm water was very interesting, very glad to see all options to the awful ponds now going in.
- Location and design criteria and need form more clarity on the standards and ranges and how they differ between "planners" and residents.
- People at our table hungry for cottage housing.
- The opinions of my table- Table 9- it was good to discover people actually want this type of development.
- Planning academy II process doesn't provide for analysis depth. Rankings are based on strongest personality at the table.
- Discussion on different housing types to small group.
- Shared opinions regarding proximity to sewers.
- Stormwater management
- Amending construction sites soils.
- Codes can reflect using older setbacks for more consistent neighborhood design.
- Info on housing. Reasons why codes are in place and needed to change.
- Details from planning staff, planning commission member.
- This concept will by difficult to sell to neighborhoods.
- Housing types, challenges, location and design criteria.
- Very little new information
- Improvements to the road by Lake Whatcom.
- Infill affects storm water-dramatically.
- Info sheets describing housing types.
- I found the talk on stormwater management so soothing I fell asleep.
- The ambiguity of language being used to manipulate the discussion.
- To beware of saying yes!
- Visuals on tables and easels with information.
- The group did not understand the point of the exercise. Most useful is definitions of housing types.
- The extensive limitations set by fed, state, and local regulation.
- Different styles of housing with pictures.

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

- Generating or designing code that would result in desired housing types and protect existing desirable types.

- We could have spent much more time in discussion in general, ranking vague material was difficult.
- Every topic required more depth and detail.
- Visual preference survey would have been helpful to get more accurate feedback from people.
- It makes sense for information based on the homework would be worked on or presented on. Instead we did an exercise on new information. Would have been good to have that information ahead of time.
- Housing types exercise was useless. We were asked to give detail analysis of something we had no time to digest.
- Brownscape development Vs. Greenscape development Vs. critical environment development/destruction.
- Difference of ownership of land for single vs. condo for instance.
- Townhomes?
- Detention ponds next to homes must be too close to property lines.
- Cars impact on the quality of infill development.
- Changing the zoning/codes to fit these in the neighborhood. The neighborhood association needs time.
- We need to discuss design to be sure there is a mix to prevent uniformity.
- Ownership
- How this type of housing prevents urban sprawl.
- Process of how Bellingham could change its regulations/codes to include those different housing types.
- Understand/Education of different types (definitions) is critical before discussion can take place.
- Would have liked to have had the handout of housing types emailed prior to meeting for review.
- Maintaining existing neighborhood character when existing character is crap. Good design solves most problems.
- The group had a wide variety of opinions so it was nice to have more time to discuss this time.
- Row housing and zero lot lines options.
- Have definitions and criteria for various types available before meeting so we'd be better prepared to discuss and rate.
- Would have preferred more instruction/examples before starting the group exercise and less time on storm water.
- Cumulative effect of infill on SW management- i.e. individual projects don't trip minimum standards, but cumulative impact does.
- Affordability not addressed adequately- how many of the next 31,600 people will have homes they can afford.
- Not enough time for lengthy complex assignment.
- Everything. This session was too rushed.
- Need more time to discuss housing types. We spent our time ranking rather than commenting on what was listed on the sheets.

- More specifics related to solutions. i.e. of the 30K population increase. Split owner-occupied Vs. non-owner occupied?
- Local examples on each type so attendees can see and visit (drive by)
- Importance of design
- How the city, county will learn to review and approve (regulate) these in fills without rigid prescriptive constraints.
- Infill (+) (-)
- Plenty of depth and detail. Too much.
- How do we define existing neighborhood standards and character? FAR, Architectural design standards.
- The types of houses. Needed more time.
- F.A.R.
- Zoning density
- Clearer consensus on “proximity” and “open space” definitions as they relate to the needs/demographics of the larger neighborhood in which a specific type of dwelling unit is built
- Stacked flats-may be more palatable (less intrusive) in S.F.
- More time to explain or brief attendees on housing types rather than storm water.
- All of them- All participants should rank all the factors and analysis done on larger database.
- Discussion about neighborhoods that would best be suited for various housing types.
- Make available in advance the table materials in advance of the meeting.
- The where- not the what kind of housing. The nice pictures are not necessarily what you will get.
- L.I.D. required city code for all new development.
- Court yard/cottage and carriage houses/ADU’s hard to distinguish code variations
- All
- Less storm water, more discussion of types.
- All- Its loud chaotic environment where whoever talks loudest gets their ideas heard. Also, to put developers, builders, and planners who are familiar with housing types and then limit time to learn and discuss these issues is grossly unfair.
- General discussion of ways to address uses of design.
- Much information is new or newish to me and I appreciate this.
- I really wish I would have understood exercise better. I just didn’t get the ultimate purpose and I wasn’t the only one.
- Regarding storm water, people need to understand how much property is involved. Say in a 5 acre development (12%+-), in an already improved area, i.e. downtown, what credits on impact fees and storm water are granted and if not why not.
- The discussion on how the various types of housing.
- We needed the overview of housing types before discussion
- Differences in different schemes. Explain the difference in ownership of land/house/access.
- Zoning/Code adjustments to allow and encourage locating services, groceries in neighborhoods. Allowing less car use. Variety of sizes of living units by allowing unequal size lot splits.

- Give real examples of the permit process for these housing types.
- How the city will make all this reality.
- The different dwelling units.
- Provide a glossary ahead of time.
- Lot, setback, service requirements of different housing types.
- Are cat houses/brothels appropriate in single family neighborhoods?
- Pros and cons of these housing forms. There is no chance to debate. Differences are buried in the requirement of consensus. Invitation list created a real estate industry majority.
- What about higher density row houses, etc?
- How might any of these criteria be developed into policies much less regulations?
- The criteria were not really criteria.
- Definitions of criteria-so our table didn't spend time debating semantics instead of working on the task.
- There is never time for discussion! Our group needed greater definitions.

6. Other comments about Session 2?

- Having materials ahead of time would have helped
- Needed more definitions. Too vague makes too many presumptions.
- Nearly completely frustrating. Makes on wary of the way this exercise will be used or misused in the future.
- Feedback from attendees was very superficial. No study of what works o doesn't work in other cities. The pictures handed out are nicer than what gets built. No discussion by the presenters of the impacts to the adjoining property.
- The ranking exercise was useless and a waste of time. The directions were unclear. Design and location were misplaced and should have been in other categories. Our whole table was unclear on the purpose and what knowledge we were to have gained from it, as well as what conclusions could be drawn from the results.
- Homework should be about what we're going to discuss, not what we already discussed. The rushed exercises make me wonder if our input is really wanted. My main criterion is to encourage owner occupied dwellings. Rentals encourage lack of community and investment in surroundings.
- Well planned and executed. Thank you. Good location, sound, refreshments. I was unable to attend Session I.
- Should be in consideration of what neighbors want or don't want.
- Great people! Worked together.
- The types of buildings for infill are interesting and dependent on locations.
- Great.
- Please give us more info before next meeting.
- How does this housing benefit a single residential area.
- Size of discussion groups are too large (10 persons).
- Interesting table discussions. No mention of co-housing that Bellingham already has which is like cottage housing with duplexes and five plexes.

- Need more time to understand types. Duplex/Triplex shouldn't have to look like one home. That's dishonest.
- Reduce ambient street noise (Shut doors). Also, facilitator (Nicole?) quickly lay ground rules. No cell phones, no talking when someone presenting, etc. Seriously, are we 5th graders?
- Need better understanding of current and future demographics with a view to projected need.
- Better timeline this time. Still need more time to discuss.
- When you do re-write the codes, keep in mind to put some limits on new infill so that existing single-family property values are not diminished.
- I would love to see some of these options in my neighborhood!
- City ought to have a "design center" that helps neighborhoods and individuals understand and aim for good urban design and building design. Need more urban parking standard and allow on-street parking to count.
- Our table grew from 6 to 10 people. We will have to sit on laps if we keep infilling!
- SNAFU or clusterfuck, what's the proper word? The session was poorly designed and presented in too close proximity to too many intelligent people. Come on!
- I'd hate to be the planners that have to implement all this.
- FARs in single family zones that encourage open space. To limit suburban housing types in established neighborhoods.
- More discussion about the what and where? I get the feeling that COB wants all types of infill un all neighborhoods now. All infill would be harmonious with existing neighborhoods by maintaining privacy greenspace and access to amenities.
- Bring in a list of our existing neighborhoods and show the different potential infill styles and locations within the neighborhoods that could be considered for each neighborhood. Helping to show our overall situation. Where generally the best place for each style knowing the general feel of each neighborhood.
- Thanks for effort. Need more dialogue time.
- Agenda too detailed, ambitious again. Many of the criteria were all essential, did not lend themselves to ranking.
- It was difficult to do group work when were at such different levels of knowledge. Our facilitator became impatient and from very excited to cranky. It would be helpful of the photos to list neighborhoods here in Bellingham that may typify these lot sizes, styles, etc.
- Need more time and information to discuss rating of criteria which is not well defined or not well-defined or on which there was consensus of how that criteria would be interpreted in terms of code changes, permitting process. Also: Assumptions re: "homeownership" is more important than housing of all types either owned, rented, leased, or time shared; need more input from renters who don't want the responsibility or maintenance of ownership.
- Still need bigger font on name tags.
- Not sure minority perspectives adequately addressed in exercise.
- Too noisy.
- Provide meeting subject info prior to the session which will allow added depth analysis of the participants.

- Greenfield development should carry a higher utility hookup charge. Incentives for infill schemes already adjacent to services and allow greater areas and coverage for infill.
- Not enough time to really rate styles.
- Carriage houses-not in small lot neighborhoods.
- Never enough time.
- It would have helped the group process a lot if we had access to information before today.
- Need information before arrival.
- Very difficult to talk together. Too noisy. Also people disagreed strongly and we couldn't work through the differences because we couldn't hear each other. The left us sort of "ticked off" with each other, sadly. Can we be re-assigned into new groups as a way of lightening up?
- Some facilitators need more training on this subject matter prior to them representing the news of their groups. Contributed to confusion and division in our discussion.
- The descriptions of the types of housing and lot sizes and densities did not fit with the housing types. The per/density did not fit, making it difficult to rank.
- I felt rushed.
- Entire session should have been on housing types.
- Never enough time...We need more discussion on the financial implications of developments, regardless of style on both developers/city/existing residents and new residents.
- Not enough time. Unclear expectations.
- Good presentation by both Tim Stewart and Bell Riley.
- Ignore requests/comments asking for material before hand. No one does homework.
- Throwing people together who do not have common understanding of concepts and expect them to do this exercise is not very realistic.
- Designed, executed to produce the desired results.
- The structure of the ranking tasks was designed to show support for allowing these housing types in single family neighborhoods. There is no room for opposition. There was no "location criteria" that says: Not adjacent to existing single family housing. I resent being used to manufacture consent. But surprise, the average homeowner wont accept it.
- Good job bringing so many different people together to talk about a very difficult subject.
- Homework did not fit the discussion. Very difficult to listen to everyone respond and come to consensus. Lots of varied ideas.
- The group at our table lacked the background or understanding to discuss the various types in a meaningful way, while being focused on NIMBY examples of what is wrong.
- Rank two items didn't really mean much. Descriptions often misleading, e.g. cottage homes were really clusters of cottages. Duplexes were really row houses.
- Need to clarify definitions of terms. Half story , "compatible=ambiguous term" our table struggled with it.
- We needed more time for discussion.

