

**Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 12:39 AM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Subject:** Public Comment -Murray Cunniff  
**Attachments:** Public Comment - 179.pdf



# City of Bellingham

## Public Comment

### Entry Details

<b>NAME</b>	Murray Cunniff
<b>CHOOSE TOPIC</b>	CityView Project
<b>COMMENT</b>	<p>Hello- I am writing in opposition to the CityView project. As a Nevada Street resident, I believe CityView will cause irreparable harm to me and my family, and to all those who call the Nevada Street neighborhood home. I am not against new development. On the contrary I support new homes and complexes which fit the character, proportions and aesthetics of the neighborhood, ones that IMPROVE our neighborhood. The problem is, CityView does not meet this criteria in the least. Six story buildings towering over 2 story single family homes with a few trees acting as a barrier... Who sees that as an improvement? According to the Bellingham Comprehensive Plan, new development should improve the existing neighborhood. We would not even be discussing such a massive complex in our neighborhood if it wasn't for the DENSITY being allowed by the city of Bellingham for the property. My question is, HOW, WHEN and WHY was the density determined ? WHAT was the basis for that determination? There are serious questions that must be answered about the historical record when it comes to density. If the City of Bellingham cannot</p>

produce the historical record and validate the density, then a new density study MUST be done. The addition of CityView will DOUBLE the number of residents in the neighborhood. Double, overnight. Is that a reasonable rate of growth for one neighborhood? Does that fit the Bellingham Comprehensive Plan? I do not believe that one complex should be allowed to impact the size and character of a neighborhood in such a radical and sudden way. The quality of life for those who already live there should be seriously taken into account. The current proposal by the developer does not include adequate planning for the cars that will be going in and out of the neighborhood, and for the parking for all the residents. NO parking is provided on site for visitors and party-goers who will be coming by. What is CityView and the City of Bellingham planning to do to mitigate the neighborhood impacts to parking, traffic levels, street capacity, noise, light pollution, and crime? The current plans are inadequate at best and nonexistent at worst. My last point has to do with the supposed purpose of CityView as a multifamily housing complex. Let's be honest. CityView units will not be rented to Bellingham families. It will not be helping to ease the affordable housing shortage in town. Few to no families will ever live there. CityView's business model shows what it really is- a college dormitory, rented BY THE BEDROOM, and the target residents will all be college students. It is disingenuous to call these "multifamily residences." I respectfully ask that the City of Bellingham Planning Department deny the CityView proposal and perform a new density study for that area, so that appropriate development can be planned for the future, development which will enhance and improve the neighborhood. Thank you! Sincerely, Murray Cunniff

---

EMAIL

cmcunniff@yahoo.com

## **Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** Clara Kelly <clarahkelly@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:57 AM  
**To:** Bell, Kathy M.  
**Cc:** rmsetler@cob.org; bchammill@cob.org; Huthman, Hollie A.  
**Subject:** CityView

Last minute views accepted.

We have come this far in the whole discussion of yet another horrendous, unnecessary building becoming an eye sore in this beautiful city of Bellingham without any one, it seems, even worrying or looking into the question of water. Not drinking water, but water running out of the ground under the basements of single family homes. Some requiring sump pumps. Water saturating the woods behind my home on Marionberry Court, and flowing like small waterfalls into the ditch dug for the purpose of keeping the water away from my home. We had to have special pipes inserted under our house and into our back lawn so it wouldn't become yet another wet lands.

There are cracks in the road in front of our house from which water regularly seeps onto the road . These puddles freeze in the winter.

Where is this water coming from? This water comes from the hill where the new buildings hope to be built. How safe is that? Any chance of a land slide do you think?

Do you even know?

For give me if I sound upset about the possibility of City View being built up there. Yes, I am very upset.

Two major undreamed of nightmares are disturbing our lives these days.

The Coronavirus and the plans to build these monstrous buildings in our peaceful neighbourhood.

There is definitely hope and a possibility that the Corona virus can be cured. Unfortunately, once City View is built it will be there for ever.

Please, please consider carefully.

Thank you.

Clara Kelly.

## Aven, Heather M.

---

**From:** Jim Le Galley <bikelegend58@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 10:34 AM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View; Ron Merlina; tom\_legalley@yahoo.com; Lani Gabriel  
**Subject:** Fwd: City View Opposition Letter

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Legalley, Jim E (LNI)** <[LEGJ235@lni.wa.gov](mailto:LEGJ235@lni.wa.gov)>  
Date: Thu, May 7, 2020, 10:31 AM  
Subject: City View Opposition Letter  
To: [bikelegend58@gmail.com](mailto:bikelegend58@gmail.com) <[bikelegend58@gmail.com](mailto:bikelegend58@gmail.com)>

May 7, 2020

To whom it may concern:

The concept of urban planning places entities of similar interests together so as to avoid conflict. The concept of the proposed City View apartment that will be built/placed into the Puget/Samish neighborhood without issues is beyond me. A layperson could tell you there would be plenty of problems.

It is my basis, having lived in area for over 24 yrs., that I oppose City View development for this and the following below listed reasons:

1. **Increased Traffic** The residential streets of Byron/44th St/Consolidation cannot handle additional load of more traffic. Already cars are sometimes parked on both sides of street restricting traffic flow. Adding more cars creates a public safety and health hazard to both pedestrians/bicyclists.
2. **Speeding traffic/Noise** This has been occurring for years now where culprits are students who have no regard for traffic laws or public safety. Speed bumps should be installed to calm traffic. There has not been any COB police enforcement to my knowledge.
3. **Narrow residential streets** 44th St. has no curb/gutter and is very narrow with no sidewalks. As such, cars park on-street where both pedestrians, bicyclists and other cars have to navigate creating a public safety and health hazard. Pulling out of driveway, either by bicycle or car, on these narrow streets with high traffic load will present a challenges that will lead to increased risk for collisions. This city street will carry a high load of cars to City View. It's current condition is substandard until either COB or developer upgrades this street making it both wider with curb/gutter.

4. **Car Creep** Since East Ridge apartment complex was built in 2019, there has been an immediate car parking on residential Byron because car parking was inadequately underestimated by COB planning. If City View is built, I guarantee you there will be car creep onto Consolidation, 44th St and also Nevada.
5. **Increased Frequency Student Parties** Students do not share the same values as surrounding persons who work, own and maintain their properties. Not invested into the community, they do whatever they want in a careless/reckless manner. Many times in my 24 yrs. living here I have had to call COB police to break up all-night parties. Check the record yourself! Many students were cited by police for underage drinking. Trying to break up a party myself almost resulted in a fistfight with a drunken student. I am tired of this!!!
6. **Neighborhood demise** if City View is built, there will be long term residents like myself that will just leave. Given that neighborhood is dominated by a massive apartment complex, only investors will buy the single family homes turning them into college rentals. With lack of care, the neighborhood will become blighted and ghettoed-guaranteed!!!
7. **Loss of property values** See above. Our collective home values will be destroyed by our new neighbor City View as most single family buyers will not want to locate near a large college dorm as they do not share the same values. This is a no brainer!!!
8. **Byron/44th bicycle side street** COB has a designated these streets as a low trafficked route for cyclists and as such, been marked with bicycle sharrows. This designation will be meaningless once City View has been built due to increased traffic. I bicycle about 3200-3400 miles/year here in Bellingham and about 1200-1500 miles/year on tour. The loss of easy cycling access will frustrate me forcing me to move.
9. **Increased crime** With an increase in student population, there will be a subsequent increase in crime. Case in point, about/around 2005, I had to call police about somebody trying to break into my home while I was sleeping. It was a drunk student who could not figure out where he lived. In my 24 yrs. here, I had students fire a pellet gun to my front window causing a crack and then with various incidents of urination and throwing beer bottles and cat litter onto my driveway/yard for being angry with me reporting them to either local police or public health.
10. **Too many apartments in area** No matter where I go in this area, there are apartments. I'm literally surrounded by them!!! Its high time developers start looking into Edgemore or consider Marine drive and west Bellingham. Because of historic COB poor planning, it could not decide whether this area should be apartments or single family houses. Just how could you not expect pushback from home owners about these intrusions?
11. **Lack of homeowner knowledge** If homeowners had knowledge of the Harley Parcel that was COB historically planned for students as multifamily apartments, they would have not purchased their single family homes. I for one, would not have purchased my house 24 yrs. ago. In my view, COB failed to communicate this information/intention to all parties at/or before time of home purchase. When I bought my home, the internet was just developing. On this basis, I believe COB could be negligent/liable for any/all homeowner damages including pain and suffering from moving/buying into a new area if City View is built. The COB has a responsibility here and failed to share its intention with all prospective home buyers. This could be pursued by either individual or class action law suits.

If City View is built, I will dread it along with other homeowners. I will tolerate this until my wife retires. During this time, I will be contact local police, COB neighborhood compliance for any deficits I notice. If intolerable, I will most likely move out of Bellingham feeling betrayed by the city, out of state to a nearby state or even out of the country. I believe the COB, as mentioned above, could be liable for any financial damages/pain suffering as a result my move associated with their decision to approve/allow City View apartments to be built.

Again, it is with this and other things that I cannot even yet imagine, that I am opposed to this City View apartment project.

If you have questions, please contact me at 360/421-6909.

Jim E. Le Galley

124 S. 44th St.

Bellingham, WA 98229

## **Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** Gaythia Weis <gaythia@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 10:50 AM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Subject:** Comment on new development where University Ridge was once proposed

Dear City of Bellingham Planning Department,

As the former president of the Puget Neighborhood association at the time of the previous University Ridge proposal I strongly feel that relying now on the geohazard study done in 2013 is a big mistake.

My opinion at that time was that the geohazard study prepared for University Ridge seemed inadequate. It is my understanding that the neighboring property, Hawley Open Space was set aside because it contains wetlands. In other words, highly likely to be undevelopable. These wet areas, obviously on the side of a ridge, may exist because of springs originating from aquifer containing rock layers that become exposed to the surface there. There is a seasonal stream that runs down through the property proposed for development. All this moisture seems to be making the large trees, with underlying ferns and other moisture requiring vegetation, on these properties very happy, and they, in turn slow and absorb some of this water that would otherwise continue to flow down towards Lincoln Creek. Lincoln Creek already has flooding issues. So large scale development here has the potential to affect areas downstream from the Puget neighborhood.

These same rock layers and their associated groundwater aquifers seem to me to be highly likely to extend beneath the property proposed for development. It was my concern back then that the soil depth sampling done seemed to me to be designed to stop just as or just before that aquifer layer was unequivocally detected. And, as I recall, the depth sampling did not even extend to the depth of some of the proposed footings for the buildings and associated retaining walls. Thus I was concerned that the developer was avoiding finding out much about the stability of the ground beneath the proposed buildings. On a steep slope, that might even include potential for landslides. This new developer ought to be required to do a new and very complete geohazard survey.

(While I do have an undergraduate degree in geology, I am not a geohazards expert, which is exactly why I believe that the developer should hire someone with that recognized expertise, and that City officials charged with evaluating reports from those with such expertise ought to do so carefully and completely.)

I think that the City of Bellingham could also do a better job at functioning as an overall community. It does students no favors to have the housing designed for them to be so far from campus and related services and activities. It defeats important aspects of the college experience, making after class and evening campus activities much more difficult. These sorts of activities could be as important for their social and intellectual development as attending classes.

High density is appropriate and makes for desirable living space if done as part of an overall urban plan that encompasses daily life needs and activities. But not if it is plopped willy nilly here and there at the whims of a developer who has managed to pick up property at a lower price than would be the case if it were more reasonable to develop. Outlets at such an urbanized location could include a vibrant commercial district that could absorb the energy otherwise expended on loud parties at distant housing locations. Thus making Bellingham a more vibrant community for all. (Once the virus issue is over, obviously).

I believe that there are some obvious conclusions that ought to be drawn from the fact that this property has remained undeveloped for so long, that lead directly to the conclusion that it ought to remain that way. Or at the very least, be developed at very low density.

Sincerely,  
Gaythia Weis

I have fond memories of Bellingham, and hope to return someday. I now reside in Longmont, CO, a City with city owned electric and fiber optic internet!!! <https://www.longmontcolorado.gov/departments/departments-e-m/longmont-power-communications> Huge for software development businesses.

However, Longmont did suffer a flash flood back in 2013, from which they are still working on recovery efforts. <https://www.longmontcolorado.gov/departments/departments-n-z/public-information/flood-information/recovery-updates>. At a total cost that may reach \$150 million. <https://www.timescall.com/2017/12/05/longmont-officials-estimate-2018-opening-of-2-resilient-st-vrain-projects/> and <https://www.longmontcolorado.gov/departments/departments-n-z/water/stormwater-drainage/resilient-st-vrain/resilient-st-vrain-project-goals>

Prevention, by careful evaluation of natural hazards and zoning accordingly is the much better course of action.

**Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 7:59 AM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Subject:** Public Comment -Bill Green  
**Attachments:** Public Comment - 181.pdf



# City of Bellingham

## Public Comment

### Entry Details

<b>NAME</b>	Bill Green
<b>CHOOSE TOPIC</b>	CityView Project
<b>COMMENT</b>	This project will destroy a neighborhood. It should not be approved. The city should not be considering this now, and should especially not be trying to rush this through without a public meeting.
<b>EMAIL</b>	wdkg@wdkg.org

**Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** Fritz Brune <marmot1995@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 1:04 PM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Subject:** Cityview apartments

Dear Planners -

I am writing in opposition to the proposed City View apartment complex on Consolidation Avenue. I would be happy to see this project built, as proposed, in the appropriate location - which is smack-dab in the middle of the WWU campus. It is plainly apparent that this will be yet another hideous, colossal dormitory for Western students, built at the expense of a private contractor for the benefit of the landlord, and at the tangible inconvenience of residents of the neighborhood in which it lands, uninvited. And it doesn't even address the issue of affordable housing. I'd gladly support a high rise apartment building on campus; Western can pay it's own way for future dormitories instead of transforming Bellingham into Smokey Point or Tacoma.

Thanks.

Fritz Brune  
859 Democrat St.  
Bellingham

**Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** Hernandez, Hector <HHernandez2@peacehealth.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 1:13 PM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Cc:** Debbie Alvarez  
**Subject:** Community Development proposal

In response to PDP2019-0015/DR2019-0036/CAP2019-0037/SEP2019-0039 I am not in favor in the development of this multifamily project for the following reasons:

- I believe we should conserve the current living condition in our neighborhood including forestry and wildlife
- increasing traffic will potentially endanger road conditions for our friends and families, especially under extreme weather conditions
- Increase in noise will make environment unfavorable
- I believe we need to preserve the privacy of our homes
- we would be depreciated from having direct sunlight
- I strongly believe that such a project would affect our community as a whole, as an essential healthcare provider, I believe we need to come together as a community and look at things from a holistic perspective.

Thank you for considering our opinions

The Hernandez Family  
138S 42nd st

---

This message is intended solely for the use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable state and federal laws. If you are not the addressee, or are not authorized to receive for the intended addressee, you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, distribute, or disclose to anyone this message or the information contained herein. If you have received this message in error, immediately advise the sender by reply email and destroy this message.

---

## **Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** Liz Marshall <lizardmarsh@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 2:27 PM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Subject:** Comment

The property seems to have many unique geologic, groundwater, and arboreal aspects to it. It would be good to preserve it something like the Sehome Arboretum. While at it, more wildlife corridors and stream restorations should be promoted. The rush to haphazardly plopp dormitories around town as fast as possible seems unwise for a host of reasons. It is environmentally destructive. The buildings are ugly. They are highly inconsistent with neighborhood character. Such large populations of student tenants have the potential to create undue noise, litter, vehicular problems and other questionable activities. Enabling developers and the University seem to be misguided purposes; serving the entire public without bias would be more equitable. Leaving a legacy of moral caretaking of durable land and life would impress ethical young people and grandchildren more than buildings of time-limited value and lacking in aesthetics. The president of WWU said on tape in a City Hall meeting that 25% of the students have mental health problems. The student population should be decreased by that much if applications cannot be better screened. Because of the pandemic and economic depression, many students will not return to campus. If the university endures, there may be social density provisions that do not align with such unpleasant buildings. Was it Aldo Leopold and Theodore Roosevelt who conveyed such thoughts as: One shouldn't tinker with nature without saving all the parts? I saw an interview with a microbiologist who said Covid-19 is a dress rehearsal for bigger pandemics. So besides the imperative to not obliterate every existence of nature in the urban environment, I would think pandemics and other emergency preparedness should dominate planning thinking rather than bowing to WWU and developers. Posterity matters, if it happens. I thought this BBC article is on point:

<http://www.bbc.com/travel/story/20200503-the-indigenous-communities-that-predicted-covid-19?ocid>

Best wishes,

Liz Marshall  
98225

## Aven, Heather M.

---

**From:** Lani Gabriel <lanirg28@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 2:51 PM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Subject:** CityView comments email 1 of 3 Lani Gabriel

CityView will provide a tremendous influx of traffic and decrease safety in our neighborhood. CityView will pose environmental impacts, provide additional noise and light pollution, and illegal dumping of unwanted and broken furniture in our neighborhood.

1. Increased traffic and overflow off-site street parking, decreased safety. Overflow street parking due to CityView will reduce the visibility of crossing pedestrians and drivers accessing their parked vehicles. This is especially of concern at the narrow, hilled, curved portions of the roadways traversing our neighborhood where vehicles are already parked on one or both sides of the street and/or where sidewalks are unavailable. The narrow roadways and roadways with street parked cars forces drivers to travel in the center of the roadway. With the added traffic and street parking due to CityView, an increase in vehicular accidents is definite. In addition, overflow street parking from CityView will create undue burden on the nearby households with multiple drivers utilizing street parking.
2. Environmental impacts. Loss of wildlife habitat. Loss of trees and the addition of impermeable surfaces pose water runoff and soil erosion hazards. The development of CityView may cause structural and drainage problems to the surrounding homes. A number of Nevada Street residents already have at least one sump pump in their crawlspace and yard drainage issues. The City of Bellingham prides itself on being an environmentally conscious city. 3 bathrooms in a 3 bedroom unit is unnecessary, contributes to our city's carbon footprint, and most importantly, the space used to provide an excessive number of bathrooms could have been used for additional bedrooms. The 3 bedroom and 3 bathroom design of CityView exacerbates our city's crisis for affordable housing. This "multi-family apartment" is in no sense affordable for a middle income family or a single parent. Basic math indicates a monthly mortgage for a no-frills home would cost less than the monthly rent for a unit at CityView. Student housing needs to be placed along an arterial roadway, which will promote the use of the bus system, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes. Proper placement of student housing will reduce vehicle dependency, congestion, and our city's carbon footprint.
3. Increased noise and light pollution. Additional vehicles, parties, security lights.
4. Increased litter and illegal dumping. Beverage containers, food wrappers, etc. Unwanted, worn out, broken sofas, mattresses, tables, lamps, chairs, shopping carts, etc. This is already a problem in the neighborhood, particularly around the apartments and rental houses.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lani Gabriel

-drainage, runoff, and lack of sidewalks on S 44th St and east end of Byron Ave (photo 1 and 2).

-drainage, runoff on Consolidation Ave (photo 3).

-318 units, 249 on-site parking spaces. A number of tenants will double up per room to save money, there will be live-in boyfriends/girlfriends/partners, and regular overnight guests. Overflow street parking will increase the areas and frequency of driving in the center of the road (photo 4).

-poor visibility due to street parked cars, illegally parked cars, intersection design, and vegetation. 2-way stop intersection, vegetation, illegally parked cars at Byron Ave and Ashley Ave (photo 5, 6, 7); narrowing corner and street parked cars: Byron Ave and S 44th St (photo 4); blindspot from the hill, illegally parked cars, street

parked cars narrow Consolidation Ave and block the visibility of people at mailboxes: Consolidation Ave and Ashley St (see phone 8), Consolidation Ave and 43rd St, Consolidation Ave and S 42nd St/Blueberry Ln; blindspot from the hill, street parked cars narrow Byron Ave and block visibility of people at mailboxes: Byron Ave and Milton Street, Byron Ave and Jerome St. See photos. CityView will increase traffic and street parking, reducing visibility and safety.

-one of several dump sites in the neighborhood. (photo 9)

Photo 1

















NO  
PARKING  
ANY  
TIME  
→

DODGE

CHARGER



## Aven, Heather M.

---

**From:** Christopher Jensen <chrisoramy@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 4:16 PM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Subject:** Impending Disaster at 4413 Consolidation Ave. PDP2019-0015

Dear Planning and Community Development Department,

I write to appeal to you to stop this latest proposed threat to the well being of the citizens of the Puget and Samish neighborhoods. While it is obvious to anyone possessing both honesty and intelligence that the project proposed by the applicant, Morgan Bartlett, is not at all suitable for the proposed location, we live in uncertain times in which government officials sometimes permit immoral and unjust acts. It doesn't matter how some group of idiots (or crooks) may have zoned the parcel, to build 106 three bedroom units of STUDENT HOUSING right in a family neighborhood would be an unconscionable act. My neighbors and I would welcome more houses and duplexes on the land, in accordance with the character of the neighborhood, but please forgive us for not wanting our well-being and property values destroyed. Despite what April Barker would have you believe, ownership of a single family dwelling is not a crime (yet) nor is it racist. Our neighborhood of families is amazingly racially diverse - as I look out my window I see families of European, African, Asian, and East Indian descent - all living in single family dwellings.

Now, aside from the moral and ethical objections alluded to above, there are practical reasons for not approving this behemoth. 249 parking spaces for 318 bedrooms is not nearly enough, no matter what your little slide rule might tell you. Every one of those bedrooms will house a driver and they will have visitors. The parking is already a nightmare along Consolidation and Ashley Streets. Much of the time traffic can only be one way on Consolidation due to cars parked on both sides. The amount of traffic this will add will be enormous. Also, **Don't accept any traffic impact study conducted while school is not in session or during the Corona outbreak** - it will give an inaccurate picture of what is normal in the area. If you do accept such a study, we will know that this entire process is a dishonest sham. The added noise from these apartments will make living in the homes nearby almost unbearable. Loss to property values will be severe. It just seems wrong to punish innocent citizens this way when it can easily be avoided.

I am hopeful that this letter reaches someone in the planning department who stills cares at least a little about the quality of life of the citizens of Bellingham - someone who will help us fend off this latest assault.

Sincerely,  
Christopher Jensen  
4204 Honeysuckle Place  
Bellingham, WA 98229

## Aven, Heather M.

---

**From:** Jared Havens <jaredbhavens@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:49 PM  
**To:** G.Proj.City View  
**Subject:** CityView Proposal Comments  
**Attachments:** Ashley-1 (2).jpg; Ashley-2 (2).jpg; Consolidation-2 (2).jpg; Consolidation-3 (2).jpg; Consolidation-6 (2).jpg; Byron-2 (2).jpg; Mattress by road 1 (2).jpg

Dear Planning and Community Development Department,

My wife and I are writing to you in opposition of the CityView (CV) development proposal. Following are reasons why we are against the project.

During a Q&A session with Morgan Bartlett Jr. in the summer of 2019, he stated that he wanted to create the development to add more affordable housing in Bellingham. When asked what he would charge for rent, he said that at the current time in 2019, the approximate rent would be \$700 per bedroom, or \$2,100 per unit, and that it would probably be more by the time the project was done. This is more than the mortgage payment for our house. According to the US Census Bureau, the median household income in Bellingham is \$50,844, based on 2018 estimates. Paying \$2,100 for rent over 12 months would equal \$25,200 per year in rent – **almost 50%** of the median income! How is this affordable housing? Clearly, this is catered to individuals who will pay rent separately for each room, and not families, which Mr. Bartlett would not admit.

Regardless of who these apartments are meant for, the development is not the right fit for this neighborhood. Destroying a nice greenbelt that is home to local wildlife and putting a large apartment complex in the middle of a housing development will hurt the character of the neighborhood, and the apartment complex will look out of place. We purchased our home because it was the right house, in the right neighborhood, and we love where we live. Many of our neighbors love where they live, too, but the neighborhood dynamic will change if CV is built in the proposed location. This, among other factors which I mention below, will contribute to a decrease in our property values. It is not fair to those of us that have invested in our homes, and in our neighborhood. The home values of my neighbors whose homes back up to the greenbelt that will be eradicated, and that will have apartment residents with a clear view looking into their back yards and windows, will be hurt the most.

The Maple Park Apartments (MPA) at the corner of Ashley Ave. and Lincoln St. are located nearby. According to apartments.com, there are one, two, and three-bedroom units, totaling 184 units, with two parking spots per unit, for a total of 368 parking spots at MPA. However, the streets near the apartment complex are still lined with cars (see attached photos **Ashley-1** and **Ashley-2**). While Maple Park has more units than the proposed 106 three-bedroom units for the CV project, there are only 249 parking spots at CV. Not everyone will have a car, obviously, but there will be some renters that will average more than one car per room, and the residents will have guests over that will take up parking spots, leading to more people parking on Consolidation Ave.

At times, there have been cars parked on both sides of Consolidation Ave., even on parts of the hill with No Parking signs. When this occurs as cars are going in opposite directions, cars have to go up and down the hill one at a time. This is dangerous and should not be allowed, but this will become a regular occurrence if the CV project is constructed (see attached **Consolidation** pictures). This even occurs on the other road leading up the hill from Lincoln St., Byron Ave. (see attached **Byron** picture).

There is often junk and old furniture dropped off across the street from MPA – instead of disposing of it properly by selling it, donating it, or taking it to the garbage dump, items remain there until they are finally picked up, which can take weeks. This is unpleasant to look at and reflects poorly on the neighborhood. This is occurring because the renters

lack the ‘pride of ownership’ that exists in people who own homes in this neighborhood. This has also happened on Byron Ave. (see **Mattress by road** picture), and is likely to happen on Consolidation Ave. if this project is approved.

Consolidation Ave., Nevada St., the other nearby neighborhood roads, and the intersections with Lakeway St. and Lincoln St. are not equipped for this. Have you ever tried to take a left onto Lakeway from Nevada around 5 p.m. during the work week? With all the traffic on Lakeway, it could easily take over 10 minutes. How do I know? I used to drive on Nevada St. on my way home from work, and many times it took over five minutes to turn left from Lakeway onto Nevada, which forced the cars waiting to take a left from Nevada onto Lakeway to have to wait for me. This causes drivers to get frustrated and take risks to merge into traffic – I have seen many near-miss collisions there. I have also made the mistake of trying to take a left from Nevada onto Lakeway around 2:00 p.m. during the work week, and it has taken me over five minutes – I don’t take lefts there anymore.

Instead, I drive to Lincoln St. On a normal weekday during the academic school year, if you try to turn left onto Lincoln St. at around 7:45 a.m., you may have to wait for multiple minutes. Additionally, traffic backs up at times from the stop light at Lincoln St. and Samish Way – making the wait even longer. This will get worse, even if only a small percentage of the 249 CV cars commute at that time. Speaking of Samish Way, it gets backed up on the overpass and when taking a left onto Bill McDonald Parkway in the mornings, but it is even worse in the evenings. From roughly 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. (sometimes earlier and later), I’ve seen Bill McDonald back up to Sehome High School, and if you try to head towards I-5 from Samish Way, it can take multiple stop light cycles to get through the Samish Way and Bill McDonald intersection – I’ve sat there for three light cycles before I was able to make it through the light. This is because the traffic is backed up from motorists waiting to head north on I-5.

Are there any plans to address the traffic issues on Samish? I’ve heard that a “road diet” is planned, where a lane will be removed to add a bike lane – this isn’t working on other streets it has already been tried on, and it won’t work on Samish, so I hope this is a false rumor. Please do not try that. The already-bad traffic will only get worse if the CV project is approved. People are not going to stop driving their cars. There are a lot of hills in Bellingham, and many folks do not want to ride bikes to work and get so sweaty that they need to take a shower.

I understand that the owner of the land where CV is proposed wants to cash-in and make a profit. While I do not want to see the greenbelt go, I would be much more open to a new housing development. This would be a smaller overall footprint, less traffic, less people, and less likely to hurt our property values than the apartment complex.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. Please feel free to reach out to us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jared and Megan Havens





Astoria Ave

COMMUNITY HOTLINE  
1-800-272-2722









43rd St

WASHINGTON  
BHP8897

AXT0308





41st a

NO PARKING  
ANY TIME