

Aven, Heather M.

From: Elizabeth Mason <emason349@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:27 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: CityView development

To the City of Bellingham,

I write you today, once again, to protest the very dense development of the Hawley Tract. You are aware, no doubt, of the serious issues this development poses for the traffic, quality of life, and environment of the Puget Neighborhood. This is simply the wrong project in the wrong place.

New, however, to this discussion is that this is also the wrong time. With the economy of our city, state and country in a precarious position and with no known timeline for a return to normal -- should that ever really occur -- the city stands to be left with skeletons of buildings and scars on its landscape. WWU is not expected to be able to meet full enrollment numbers this coming fall. Nor, probably, are WCC and WTC. This developer has additional residence projects associated with institutions of higher learning in other parts of the country that surely will be affected by a downturn in student enrollment. Should the CityView project be interrupted mid-construction or be left only partially rented following completion, the city will be forced to accommodate the developer's requests for mitigation of certain requirements, whether they be financial or physical.

I urge the city to deny the requested development permits for this project. Do your due diligence in processing the application, as well as your due diligence to the citizens of Bellingham, particularly the Puget Neighborhood where I reside, and do not allow this project to proceed.

Respectfully,
Elizabeth Mason

Aven, Heather M.

From: Greg McKinney <greg1@purdue.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:48 AM
To: Bell, Kathy M.; Sepler, Rick M.; G.Proj.City View
Cc: Anderson, Lisa A.; Hammill, Daniel C.; Huthman, Hollie A.; 'PNA Board '; MY - mayorsoffice@cob.org
Subject: RE: CityView - Your Reply to Puget Neighbor Association's Request

Thank you, Kathy.

Please also add this to the record for public comments on CityView submitted before May 8.

With your reply below, I have now set up and sent communications to the Puget Neighborhood Association (PNA), far later than what any of us would like. The public comment period process has been a bit confusing, and with what seems like misleading statements. Fortunately, individuals and citizens groups have been active as well, so perhaps many Neighbors are aware of the fast approaching deadline for their most effective participation.

As I noted below, and with what you've confirmed, there are other process questions and concerns that may need to be addressed.

But first, let me clarify my perspective. I'm not a member of the Puget Neighborhood Preservation Work Group, nor do I participate in their discussions or tasks. I applaud their active involvement on an issue of concern, but I may not share all of their views. My main concern is process and communications, and supporting the efforts of the Puget Neighborhood Association to engage Puget Neighbors with accurate information for their effective participation,

Also understand, I lived and worked for nearly 4 decades in a university community larger than Bellingham, and with a land-grant state university much larger than WWU. I understand what it's like having students (...even undergrad students), student housing, student traffic, student neighbors, and student activities around; and honestly that causes me no great concern. I understand Bellingham will grow and change, has housing issues (for students as well), and will even push in-fill for density goals. And, it all may be uncomfortable at times.

My personal concerns with this development are the site conditions, traffic, fire/safety, infrastructure, zoning, and published Puget Neighbor plan issues; all the issues I believe raised in written comments by PNA with the University Ridge proposal. I'm concerned, if those issues also apply to CityView, they are probably not being addressed. With University Ridge, I don't think we tested how we could, if we could, get to the mitigation of those real concerns.

Specifically, my process questions and concerns raised now are:

1. You say: "municipal code does not give the city authority to extend the comment period". What does that mean? Does it specifically say the City cannot "extend the comment period" even under special guidelines, circumstances, and provisions; and through a designated authority? This situation may not warrant an extension, but I find it very amazing that there may be NO PROVISION to extend FOR ANY REASON or circumstance. That seems like a process flaw.

2. CityView is a complicated project, many documents are involved, there is a history, the developer has had many extensions, and many in the community (not just neighbors on Nevada) have an interest in the outcome. Why did you decide to set the public comment period to the absolute minimum?
3. We're in the middle of a worldwide pandemic. Everyone in our community is effected by this. In my immediate neighborhood, we've had perhaps 4 or more incidents of weapons violation, vehicle prowling, theft, package theft, vandalism (graffiti), and property damage (window shot) in about the last month in our area. Incidents seem to be running higher than normal. I've been focused quite a bit on working with our W Pacificview Block Watch group (26 homes), and we're trying to expand it to include E Pacificview, We're even trying to organize a network of home security cameras for mutual benefit. My point is, I'm a bit distracted, and haven't reviewed the University Ridge concerns for what may apply to CityView. I doubt I'm alone. I bet other areas in Puget Neighborhood and elsewhere are distracted by crime, bored kids, COVID concerns, family issues, jobs, bills, etc., etc.
Again, why did you decide to set the public comment period to the absolute minimum?
4. Governor Inslee has extended the stay-at-home order through May 31. You indicate the public meeting won't happen before then. Perhaps public gatherings will not be allowed for some period after May 31. I doubt you'll soon know exactly the form and format of the "public meeting" venue. Wouldn't it be better to let the public know how the meeting will be conducted to then make a choice on how to participate? Again, more reason to question why you decided to set the public comment period to the absolute minimum. And, it's more reason to be concerned about why a deadline can't be changed for any reason.
5. How can a process (plan) originally be set on April 24 with a date (May 8) for written comments, later the process (plan) is changed apparently under BMC authority, but then there is NO provision or authority within the City to revise a date set within the original plan. That seems like a major process problem or flaw.
6. I'm guessing it could be a month or more before there is a public meeting with the Planning Commission, and perhaps weeks after that for whatever authority to make a decision. So the application is packaged with written comments from May 8 or before, and then the package is frozen with the assumption nothing relevant will change. Again, there is NO provision under any circumstance, through any authority to extend the deadline or to add public input to the package, regardless of how many weeks or months before a public meeting and decision? That seems like a problem or a flaw.
7. In your reply you said: "code does give the city authority to accept public comment after the public comment period expires". But experience tells us it may not be used or somehow made available. So, how will these comments be considered and by whom, and how will that work within the decision-making process? I know you can't guarantee decision-makers will consider or even read post-May 8 comments, but you can't guarantee that for those from May 8 or before. How are comments in each group, May 8 or those after) handled?
8. BTW, can the developer submit a revised application, additional information, more information at your request, requested "corrections", or anything for any reason? If the answer to any of this is "yes", and there is no opportunity or provision for public review and comment on that material, that seems like another process problem or flaw.

It feels like there may be a lot of process problems and flaws, or at least questions to be answered. What am I not understanding?

Again, please also add this to the CityView record as public comments submitted before May 8. I've included cityview@cob.org in the distribution which should satisfy procedural requirements.

I welcome any reply.

Thank you.

Greg McKinney
813 W Pacificview Dr
Bellingham

From: Bell, Kathy M. [mailto:kbell@cob.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 1:29 PM
To: Greg McKinney; Sepler, Rick M.
Cc: Anderson, Lisa A.; Hammill, Daniel C.; Huthman, Hollie A.; PNA Board
Subject: RE: CityView - Your Reply to Puget Neighbor Association's Request

Good afternoon Greg.

Thank you for your follow up email. This email will provide additional information that you can take back to your constituents.

The municipal code does not give the city authority to extend the comment period for the proposal and, therefore, it has not been extended beyond May 8th. The city recommends all parties wishing to comment on the proposal to do so by this deadline. Providing public comment within the public comment period ensures your comments will be included in the city's environmental review and staff's technical report submitted to the planning commission.

The code does give the city authority to accept public comment after the public comment period expires. The city typically accepts public comment until a permit decision is issued or up to the close of a public hearing. The city intends to proceed with this status quo for this proposal and accept public comment on the proposal up to the close of the planning commission public meeting. The city can say with certainty that the public meeting will not occur in May and any public comment received in May will very likely be included in the city's environmental review and considered by the planning commission.

This following is the code section that establishes the 14-day comment period and authorizes the city to accept public comment outside of the 14-day public comment period:

BMC 21.10.210 (B):

The minimum comment period shall be 14 days following the date of notice of application, except for shoreline permits and Type V-A applications, which shall have a minimum comment period of 30 days; and except for short subdivisions consisting of five or more lots, which shall have a minimum comment period of 20 days. The city may accept public comments at any time prior to the close of the open record public hearing, or if there is no public hearing, prior to

the decision on the project permit. Except for a determination of significance (DS) under the State Environmental Policy Act and Chapter [16.20](#) BMC, the city shall not issue a final SEPA threshold determination or issue a decision or recommendation on a permit application until the expiration of the minimum public comment period.

Please let me know if you have additional procedural questions.

Take care.

Kathy Bell, Senior Planner
City of Bellingham
Planning and Community Development
Tel: (360) 778-8347
Website: www.cob.org

My incoming and outgoing email messages are subject to public disclosure requirements per RCW 42.56.

Tell us how we're doing!

[Permit Center survey](#)

Due to COVID-19 and in compliance with [City](#) and [Health Department guidance](#) the Permit Center is closed to walk-in customers effective Monday, March 16th until further notice.

Please utilize the Permit Center's online resources via <https://www.cob.org/services/permits>

For information regarding Construction Restrictions, please see [announcement](#).

From: Greg McKinney <greg1@purdue.edu>

Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 11:30 AM

To: Sepler, Rick M. <rmsepler@cob.org>

Cc: Bell, Kathy M. <kbell@cob.org>; Anderson, Lisa A. <laanderson@cob.org>; Hammill, Daniel C. <dchammill@cob.org>; Huthman, Hollie A. <hahuthman@cob.org>; PNA Board <board@pugetneighborhood.org>

Subject: CityView - Your Reply to Puget Neighbor Association's Request

Mr. Sepler,

Attached is Kevin Jenkins' request, submitted on behalf of the Puget Neighborhood Association (PNA), for an extension of the CityView public comment period.

Also attached is your reply.

It has been my job as Puget Neighborhood Association Board Secretary, web site administrator and content editor, and email administrator to collect information, compose and distribute communications to the Puget Neighborhood. I try to be complete, informative, and accurate to keep our Neighbors informed and involved on issues that may be important to them. I'm not representing the PNA Board here, but ***I'm raising concerns that I may not be able to do my job for the Board.***

The request was to "extend the comment period (from May 8) to 23rd of May 2020" for various reasons.

Your reply indicated that the Planning Commission Chair and you agreed to require a public meeting before the Planning Commission, which “effectively **extends the public comment period up to the close of the public meeting**”, and “This meeting will be conducted after the requested extension date of May 23.” Also, you said: “The Planning Commission meeting date **has not been established** at this time”.

That sounds to me like an extended comment period requested was granted, and the actual public comment period duration (deadline) is yet to be determined. I have verbally communicated that to neighbors who have come to me expressing concerns about the short notice especially in these times.

Now I’m hearing that the cut-off for written comments effectively remains May 8. I’m also hearing written comments submitted after May 8 will not be bundled with the application materials. And I’m hearing that the City online comment submission form for CityView may not be available after May 8.

Is any of this true?

If so, it feels that the reply to the Puget Neighborhood Association’s request was misleading. Additionally, it raises several other questions and concerns that may need to be addressed.

Greg McKinney
813 W Pacificview Dr
Bellingham

Aven, Heather M.

From: Karen Anderson <karen@alrtc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 11:49 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Opposition to City View project

Hello, my name is Drew Anderson and I live at 840 Nevada St, Bellingham, WA. My home is directly in front of this proposed development. Building C (6 floors) will tower 110 feet over my home. This is unacceptable. Our neighborhood cannot handle the increased traffic, noise, parking, parties, and college students. Our neighborhood is more of a family neighborhood where people walk their dogs and small kids ride their bikes on the sidewalks. The Cityview developer may be calling this multi-family construction, but it is in reality a dormitory for college students.

Our daughter and her husband and child currently live with us because they have been unable to find a house to buy. What Bellingham needs is more affordable single family houses- not apartments. When you have a child and a dog you need a home, not an apartment.

Our daughter is also a college professor at Boise State University. She has been informed by the Boise State Office of the Provost that "forecasts predict a 15-20% drop in matriculation across higher education. Longer term, strengthened online and adaptive capacity will position Boise State to better meet the needs of those who may prefer online or flexible learning after pandemic conditions subside.". Western Washington University would be in a similar situation where college students will not be returning to traditional classroom based education, but prefer online study. Western is currently building its own dormitory, as you know, and several new complexes have opened on Samish Way for college housing. These should be sufficient to meet the needs of the college. Besides, the middle of a residential neighborhood is not the place for this proposed project

City View fails to adhere to the Comprehensive Plan, which directs, "that new development is of a type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetics, and livability of neighborhoods." Further, "new development needs to take into account the context of the area and should result in an improvement to the surrounding neighborhood," and, "Establish and reinforce district and neighborhood characteristics recognized both within the community and throughout the region." City View clearly misses all these marks.

There are other problems for this development including unstable soils, water run-off, not enough parking spaces, and the increase in traffic. Contrary to what the developer would have us believe, everyone who lives there will drive their car down to the park and ride to catch the bus to school because the grade on Consolidation Avenue makes it too hard to walk up on the return trip. I have seen neighborhood kids go to catch the bus at the bottom of this hill for years and the parents always pick them up on the return trip because of the incline. Additionally, Nevada Street has been designated as a safe biking route to avoid traffic on Lakeway and Lincoln Streets. This will no longer be a viable option with all the cars coming out of City View. Sight is limited at the intersection of Consolidation and Nevada and one has to proceed carefully. How long until a biker gets taken out at this intersection? The stop sign at this intersection is frequently run down (just last week, again, in fact) and I think that's an indication of how traffic functions now- at a 3 way intersection - just wait until it is a 4-way.

We want to remain in our home. We do not want 3 giant buildings looming over us blocking the sun. The rendering the developer sent in makes it look like this project is in the middle of a woods. It is not. There is not sufficient space for much of a buffer between our house and the buildings. No trees will grow high enough to offset the slope of the property and the height of the buildings on that property. This is not an appropriate use for this property. The Zoning plan needs to be amended so that density conforms with the neighborhood. The outlying areas are where the apartment complexes are now and that's where they should remain.

Sincerely,
Drew Anderson

Aven, Heather M.

From: Nancy Wopperer <nancywopperer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 1:03 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: city view

I live at 821 Nevada st Bellingham wa 98229. Across the street from the proposed development .

This development is not the right place to put in 106 3 bedroom units in a family built neighborhood. The picture of the proposed buildings are completely out of character for our neighborhood. We are a family neighborhood with children playing in the yard and seniors working in there gardens, I am the first owner of my home purchased in the summer of 1992.

Please do not let this be built in a family neighborhood.

Thank you
Nancy Wopperer



May 6, 2020

Kathy Bell, Planner

Dear Ms Bell

I am saddened to see that another permit has been filed to construct a large student housing facility on (Tract F, Cedar Ridge Div 2). Puget neighborhood has been through two previous attempts to place similar facilities on this tract, Amcal, University Ridge (Ambling) and now City View. The area around the Cedar Ridge site presents unique challenges to the development of the site under its current designation as Residential, planned, 5000 sq ft per overall unit density. It is not clear in the record how the current density designation of the site was established. While the surrounding properties are similarly zoned, the neighborhood has been predominately built out with single family homes. In permitting the area to be developed in this manner, the city has allow the neighborhood to have the look and feel of a single family neighborhood when in fact it is not zoned as such. Many home owners in the area were surprised when they that learned under the current zoning, a large housing development, the 2013 proposal 547 residents and now 400+ residents, could be built abutting their single family home. Not to mention the design of the apartments, each with separate lockable bedrooms each having a separate bath, does not lend itself to family occupancy but is actually a de facto student dormitory. There are apparently many unanswered questions around many issues regarding this development including but not limited to traffic, parking and hydrology. It is not my intent to delve into any of these. I'm sure others will provide detailed input.

The current character of the area is consistent with the Puget Neighborhood Plan. That observation and the history of how the area grew to its current configuration is cited in the HE (Hearing Examiner) decision regarding the application by the Ambling Corp to develop the site into Student housing for 547 students in 2013. In their final decision the HE noted that development of that site must be done in a way that is consistent with the character of the neighborhood. While I respect the right of the property owner to develop their property as allowed by code, I feel that if in doing this type development on this site negatively impacts the neighborhood, the greater good which I feel is the existing neighborhood should be protected.

I not opposed to providing decent housing options for our student population. I am pleased with the addition of the North by Northwest facility that was built in our neighborhood on Lincoln Street adjacent the Fred Meyers. That facility is appropriately located and proving to be a viable solution to providing safe affordable housing for students. However, I do not see building a similar facility in the middle of what is essentially a residential neighborhood as a positive.

Throughout the city, I am seeing applications to infill similar properties located in Residential areas using a variety of development tools now available. "Cottage House" developments, with greater density than single family, have been proposed on Edward St in Samish Neighborhood and with the DOT property in Sunnyland. Both of these developments are utilizing the city's "infill toolkit" available to developers and both are designed to protect neighborhood character.

BMC20.38.050 provides the standards applicable to planned development proposals. This section provides that the standards are minimum standards and may be increased for a

particular planned proposal where more stringent standards are necessary to protect neighboring properties, conform with existing development in the area, preserve natural resources or sensitive environments, provide for orderly development or conform with the comprehensive plan. Planned developments must conform to any more stringent minimum standards provided within the applicable neighborhood plan.

I am therefore requesting that the city restrict any proposed development on the Tract F, Cedar Ridge Div 2 site to a density that protects the current character of the neighborhood by reducing the density allowed for by the current unit density to a number more appropriate for the immediate neighborhood. I am not advocating a rezone but rather a more clear definition of permitted density for that particular site. I am also asking that the city encourage the property owner and any developer to utilize the tools such as the infill toolkit to design a more appropriate development than has been proposed with this and previously attempts at development for this site.

Respectfully,

Steve James,
1372 Undine St,

.

Aven, Heather M.

From: Annie Welch <anniewelch53@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 4:02 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Opposition to City View Dormitory complex

I oppose the proposed City View dormitory complex above Nevada Street. This complex is much too big to be in a multi-family neighborhood. It would tower over the area and create erosion and drainage problems for the homes below. There is not enough parking with only 70 slots and would increase off street parking in the neighborhood. I have concerns about increased traffic flow especially given that there is a bus stop at the base of the hill. Students partying and the inevitable dumping and leaving of items on the street when they move out will devalue a lovely neighborhood.

I am hopeful the city will NOT allow the construction of this complex in the Nevada neighborhood.

Thank you.

Annie Welch
360-756-7502

Aven, Heather M.

From: Susan Bayer <susan.m.bayer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 6:50 PM
To: Bell, Kathy M.
Subject: Re: City View

Dear Ms. Bell,

I appreciate your timely response and information. While the Planning Department will be guided by existing codes and guidelines, it appears that I will need to make every possible extra effort to observe the Stay Home guidelines and still reach out to my neighbors on Puget and Queen Street. This community was deeply invested in coming together to actively protest the University Ridge proposal. I have no doubt that they will want the opportunity to communicate their positions regarding the City View Dorm project. I will do my best to let them know of the information pertaining to the timelines which you have kindly provided.

Thank you again for all that you do.

Very truly,
Susan Bayer

On Wed, May 6, 2020 at 3:40 PM Bell, Kathy M. <kbell@cob.org> wrote:

Hi Susan.

I wanted to clarify the city's response to the Puget neighborhood's request to extend the 14-day public comment period for the CityView proposal.

The municipal code does not give the city authority to extend the comment period for the proposal and, therefore, it has not been extended beyond May 8th. So the city is recommending all parties wishing to comment on the proposal to do so by this deadline. Providing public comment within the public comment period ensures your comments will be included in the city's environmental review and staff's technical report submitted to the planning commission.

The code does give the city authority to accept public comment after the 14-day public comment period expires. The city typically accepts public comment until a permit decision is issued or up to the close of a public hearing. The city intends to proceed with this status quo for this proposal and accept public comment on the proposal up to the close of the planning commission public meeting. The city can say with certainty that the public meeting will not occur in May and any public comment received in May will very likely be included in the city's environmental review and considered by the planning commission.

City staff recognize that these are trying times and we are all having to adapt to this 'new normal'. Since we are not able to engage with the same social manners given the Stay Home Stay Healthy order, may I suggest that you reach out to the Puget Neighborhood Association representative with your concerns to see how this organization can provide assistance. The city will also continue to provide updates on the CityView webpage and I encourage you to occasionally visit this web site for any updates: <https://www.cob.org/services/planning/neighborhoods/Pages/puget-cityview.aspx>

The city will mail a notice of the planning commission public meeting to the property owners adjacent to the proposal and to those who have provided comment once a date and venue have been set for the meeting.

Please let me know if you have additional procedural questions.

Take care.

Kathy Bell, Senior Planner

City of Bellingham

Planning and Community Development

Tel: (360) 778-8347

Website: www.cob.org

My incoming and outgoing email messages are subject to public disclosure requirements per RCW 42.56.

Tell us how we're doing!

[Permit Center survey](#)

Due to COVID-19 and in compliance with [City](#) and [Health Department guidance](#) the Permit Center is closed to walk-in customers effective Monday, March 16th until further notice.

Please utilize the Permit Center's online resources via <https://www.cob.org/services/permits>

For information regarding Construction Restrictions, please see [announcement](#).

From: Susan Bayer <susan.m.bayer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 12:41 PM
To: Grp.PL.Planning Mail (planning@cob.org) <planning@cob.org>
Subject: City View

Dear Mr. Sepler and Ms. Bell,

I would like to convey my disappointment over the decision to allow Public Comment submissions for the record only until May 8, 2020. It is not a reasonable position. Puget Neighborhood should be granted an extension for this issue. During this current self quarantine crisis, allowances should be made for the difficulty we have with respect to notifying our community of your deadline.

Please do not assume that the majority of our neighborhood is 'in the loop' through social media like Nextdoor or the BNC Facebook page. The majority of my neighbors are not. Additionally, while I know many, I do not have their email addresses or phone numbers. In the past we have gone old school. We prepare a written alert or notice which we go door to door with to inform each other of such an issue like City View. Creating a mailing list with postage would be costly to me. I don't know if I can even make copies at Copy Source or if it's closed now.

By not allowing adequate and reasonable time for COVID 19 creative contacting, you are in fact betraying the trust the community has a right to expect of the Planning Department. I respectfully urge you to extend the comment period until the end of May.

Very truly,

Susan Bayer

825 Queen Street

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 6:12 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Annie
Attachments: Public Comment - 167.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|--------------|---|
| NAME | Annie |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | Way to much traffic in this area, along with senior community just below the site, too much noice since the apt project was built next to Fred Meyers, trees weren't replace and now you can hear the traffic more...build more apts towards the college...leave the trees alone which add something to this area |
| EMAIL | Tinzelmoon@yahoo.com |

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:29 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Jeff Cedarbaum
Attachments: Public Comment - 168.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| NAME | Jeff Cedarbaum |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | I do not think it is a good idea to build a large apartment complex in an otherwise quiet neighborhood of single family homes. The traffic and pedestrian infrastructure does not currently exist to manage that many more residents, and it would drastically change the nature of the neighborhood. There are better places in Bellingham to build large housing developments that do not require destroying neighborhood green spaces or changing the character of an otherwise quiet neighborhood. |
| EMAIL | jcedarbaum@gmail.com |

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 11:07 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Brian Benjamin
Attachments: Public Comment - 169.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| NAME | Brian Benjamin |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | Just because the applicant requests a variance to build a 5.5 story building in a residential neighborhood does not mean that the COB needs to agree with nor support such a major development. If all three bldgs were 2.5 stories high, I believe this would be more fitting of the neighborhood. If the applicant cannot make enough profit from three-- 2.5 story apt complexes, perhaps he should choose another site. |
| EMAIL | renuremodelingco@comcast.net |

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 12:55 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Resident of Samish Neighborhood
Attachments: Public Comment - 170.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| NAME | Resident of Samish Neighborhood |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | <p>The proposed CityView apartment complex at 4413 Consolidation Avenue can & would have many deleterious effects on the Puget Neighborhood and the adjacent Samish Neighborhood. Aside from its negative impact on the peace & tranquility of neighbors in nearby single-family homes, it will bring a stream of automobiles to & from this complex through a neighborhood of families with elderly citizens and young children.</p> <p>Given the design features of these apartments (3 bedrooms each with a private bath) and the anticipated rental costs (\$700 x 3), this complex is clearly targeting temporary college students who desire an off-campus living arrangement. The entire rationale for such a sizable project (318 individual rental "units") likely assumes a continuing trend of an ever-increasing student population at WWU. The onset of COVID-19 and other societal pressures is causing a huge disruption to such assumptions that underlie the enrollment trends for all colleges & universities. This entire undertaking seems like a poor use of this otherwise peaceful neighborhood site</p> |

that may not even prove out to be a successful
venture for its developers / owners.

EMAIL

tokadohma@gmail.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 2:07 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Stacie Erfle
Attachments: Public Comment - 171.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| NAME | Stacie Erfle |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | <p>I live on South 42nd Street, right off consolidation. I feel that a five-story, 300 plus apartment complex at the top of consolidation is a complete mismatch for the area and the neighborhood. I am greatly concerned at what it will do for the safety of consolidation street, with so many additional cars traveling on it. Because of the way the streets are aligned, my daughter has to go on consolidation street to get to her bus stop. I would not feel safe having her do this with so much additional traffic. There is also the significant issue of noise in what is, and should remain, a quiet residential area. outside of financial gain, I see no positive or benefit to adding a monstrosity such as this. We live in Bellingham to obtain a certain quality of life and maintaining neighborhood integrity and feel is a big portion of that.</p> |
| EMAIL | stacie.erfle@gmail.com |

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 6:16 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Andy & Pety Yan
Attachments: Public Comment - 172.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| NAME | Andy & Pety Yan |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | <p>To Whom It May Concern Regarding the CityView Apartment Project,</p> <p>I would like to add my comment to the growing number of people concerned that the approval of the CityView Apartment project will be a grave mistake. Please deny the application and do not build this complex.</p> <p>As was the case in 2013 when Ambling University Development tried to permit the University Ridge development in this location, this large development is out of character for this location. The controversy remains: it would destroy our quiet, peaceful neighborhood, that the surrounding homeowners have spent their lives to maintain. There are some provisions in the development to abate a few of the concerns from the University Ridge fiasco, such as additional parking spots and "the building design plans would minimize noise impacts and car headlights." However, the fact of the matter remains that if more people and cars are added to the area, there is more of everything, including: (most</p> |

importantly) crime, noise, accidents, disturbances, calls to police and emergency personnel, the list goes on and on. Roads in the area will need more maintenance due to increased traffic, and there may need to be other infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate such a large and domineering building and it's residents. Who pays for that? My guess is the homeowners in the area, that did not want this in the first place, which is not equitable to the homeowners in the area, myself included. This is all after a long and laborious destruction of the natural ecosystem in this location. The construction alone will be a huge disruption, and the disruptions continue indefinitely.

I sincerely hope the city will follow the precedent set by the variance request denied by the Whatcom County Hearing Examiner in late 2013 for the University Ridge project and not allow the dormitory complex to be built in our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration,

EMAIL

petcyyan@yahoo.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 7:55 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -MARIA Nardella
Attachments: Public Comment - 173.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| NAME | MARIA Nardella |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | I'm so disappointed that this absurd proposal has continued to advance. Why should this neighborhood have to tolerate the addition of a university dormitory so distant to the WWU campus? Why should they have to absorb the impact of 249 parking spaces and so much new traffic through the neighborhood? Why is the city so willingly giving up such a beautiful city forest and the connections to trails? The common thread is unleashed capitalism and greed. |
| EMAIL | mnards@comcast.net |

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 8:05 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Naomi Bormuth
Attachments: Public Comment - 174.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| NAME | Naomi Bormuth |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | <p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>I want to express my extreme hope that the proposed development does not happen. My family of 5 (2 adults, three kids ages 7, 5 and 4) live at 825 Nevada St., Bellingham, WA 98229, across the street from the proposed development.</p> <p>This development would not be an appropriate location to build 106 three-bedroom units in a neighborhood filled with families. This development would wreck our neighborhood, the sense of safety and camaraderie that is currently enjoyed. We know each other, feel comfortable having our young kids cross the street to say hi to neighbors on the other side, ride bikes, tricycles and scooters up and down the sidewalks, shoot water guns across the street, etc.</p> <p>We also have a nice mixture of retired senior citizens who live in the neighborhood. For me and my family in particular, the neighbor to our south is a sweet, single, retired lady who's like a second grandmother</p> |

to my children. The family directly north of us is a family with two parents, and two young kids. Directly across the street is a family with one small child, and next to them is a kind, retired couple. This is an accurate picture of our neighborhood.

I know I speak for all of us when I say that this proposed development is very scary for us. We fear for the breaking up of relationships as the traffic becomes MUCH busier down Nevada, Consolidation and Byron Streets. I won't be able to allow my kids the same freedom to ride their bikes and scooters up and down the street or to be able to safely cross the street to greet their neighbors coming home from work. Bellingham is a city committed to building and fostering authentic relationships, and this development would strike at the heart of this.

My three kids LOVE walking up the trail into the woods (the exact area of the proposed development), pretending they're hunting for pirate treasure, looking for good sticks to roast marshmallows, searching for different kinds of animal droppings on the trail, or looking for interesting bugs. Even though we live in the city limits, these woods have become a sacred area to our family, as well as to others in our neighborhood. It gives us a chance to slow down from the hustle and bustle, breathe deeply and truly notice the unique treasures to be found in the woods. When my children heard that the woods might be taken down for apartment buildings, they were appalled and couldn't understand how anyone would do that. Please, listen to our children. They ARE our future. Show them we care about them and their development.

Visitors to our home often comment how nice of a neighborhood we live in, and it can be all too easy to take that for granted. We are fighting now for the chance to keep our neighborhood as it is, as a safe, trusting, life-giving space for families to thrive and for senior citizens to enjoy the quiet mornings and days, punctuated only by the happy shrieks of children playing tag or hide and seek. We beg you to reconsider your proposed development.

We bought our home in 2009 and have lived here for almost 11 years. We have truly enjoyed being part of this community.

Thank you for taking the time to hear our concerns.

With great appreciation,

Cody and Naomi Bormuth

EMAIL

naomijkooi@yahoo.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 8:08 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Jacqueline Barnett
Attachments: Public Comment - 175.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| NAME | Jacqueline Barnett |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | <p>I am writing as a very concerned citizen that will be directly impacted by the inappropriate proposal for the City View apartment complex in the Puget Neighborhood. We bought our house 4.5 years ago at 802 Nevada Street, right below the south end of the proposed project. I have two young children and my greatest concern is for the safety of my own family as well as the safety of others regarding this project. Currently, the intersection of Nevada and Consolidation streets is dangerous. I have been nearly hit in my car and while walking by motorists that fail to stop or even yield at posted stop signs. Just the other day one of the stop signs was hit as people use the intersection improperly. I greatly fear that the massive increase in traffic will certainly result in accidents and I fear for the safety of my own children and that of others that live and play along Nevada Street. If this project is to go through something major would need to be done to address the safety of this intersection. Furthermore, I worry that the connecting streets cannot handle the increased traffic and further safety issues will ensue. People already illegally park on Consolidation</p> |

Avenue often causing dangerous conditions where visibility is limited and there is not enough room for cars to safely pass by. With increased use the dangers of this street and others will only be increased.

My next concern is that this project is not consistent with the neighborhood and the density of the project is inappropriate given the single-family nature of the neighborhood currently. It is my understanding that compatibility with surrounding property is outlined in the city's codes, this in no way is compatible with the way the Puget neighborhood, Nevada Street in particular, was developed. The housing options outlined in the city's infill toolkit would be much more appropriate development of this land. As it would maintain the feel of the neighborhood and would not overwhelm already troubled streets. The proposed dormitory style units would house over 300 individuals overwhelming our neighborhood and drastically changing the culture of the place we call home. I also feel that the need in Bellingham is for affordable family housing to ensure Bellingham remains a family friendly community as currently the housing market continues to price out families of low or median income. I want to live in a community where everyone can be successful and can afford to live. I want to live in a place that celebrates equity and does not promote capitalistic endeavors to benefit wealthy investors.

My final concern is the environmental impacts this project may have including hydrology and the impact that may have on surrounding habitat as well as current drainage systems. While I have limited experience with the hydrology, I do have an environmental studies degree and know that an impact to one aspect of an environment can have profound impacts to the rest of an ecosystem. I worry that the proposed project will affect groundwater flows and will in turn affect the trees that will be left standing as can be seen with another development just down the road. Some of the trees that could be affected are very large and should they become weakened or die could fall on our house harming my family. This is a genuine fear I have after seeing the tree die-off at the bottom of Consolidation Avenue in relation to the new apartment complex on Ashley Street, a complex that is much smaller than the proposal for City View.

I beg of you to not approve this proposal. We love our

home and our neighborhood and want to provide a place where our children can feel safe growing up. We were barely able to afford our home when we purchased it and would not be able to afford another home in Bellingham given current market prices. I love Bellingham, my husband grew up here and we would be devastated if we were no longer felt safe or comfortable in our home due to an inappropriate development. Please understand and hear our voices and do whatever you can to maintain the culture of our neighborhood, we are a diverse group of people that care deeply about where we live.

Thank you.

EMAIL

jraff@uw.edu

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 9:25 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Tim C Erfle
Attachments: Public Comment - 176.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| NAME | Tim C Erfle |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | <p>I have lived in this neighborhood for 10 years, right off of consolidation street on South 42nd. I do not believe that consolidation can safely accommodate so much additional traffic as would be generated by a huge apartment complex. my daughter has to walk on consolidation to get to her bus stop, and I do not feel that it would be safe for her to do this with the additional traffic. we have occasional prowls in our vehicle in stolen property and feel like this apartment complex would not help with that issue. A development of this size, in this area, provides no positive aspects or benefits the neighborhood in any way.</p> <p>Please reconsider this development.</p> |
| EMAIL | tim.erfle@gmail.com |

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:03 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Deborah Hernandez
Attachments: Public Comment - 177.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| NAME | Deborah Hernandez |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | We just moved into the neighborhood on 42st. I think this new development will cause a lot of traffic and make it unsafe for myself and my children for going on walks. It will also increase the noise in the neighborhood. The development will also impact geology removing mature trees om the hill. I strongly believe this will impact the overall character, and our quality of life. |
| EMAIL | ddalvarez2@gmail.com |

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:17 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Kristen Behrends
Attachments: Public Comment - 178.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| NAME | Kristen Behrends |
| CHOOSE TOPIC | CityView Project |
| COMMENT | Concerned about the impact this will have on my neighborhood. Many families in this neighborhood and with two young children I am concerned about traffic, safety, noise and overall character and quality of life to the neighborhood. |
| EMAIL | kristen.behrends@gmail.com |