

Nancy Dearborn
145 43rd St.
Bellingham
WA 98229

RE: City View Dormitory

I am a new resident to Bellingham and to the Samish neighborhood, and very very close to where the City View Dormitory is being proposed to be built. I've been terrorized by the prospect ever since when I heard about it. I asked my realtors point blank, "Are there any plans for anything being built up these slopes?" And they reassured me that the 'City of Bellingham' has ownership or co-ownership with no intent to build. Apparently, that's wrong.

I moved from Issaquah, WA, for several reasons. But the one that convinced me to leave sooner was the abominable traffic because the developers had over built and they hadn't even opened up the Projects (multiple 5 story apartments complexes all in a heap together) right on I-90 in Issaquah before I left.

Developers are not taking the time to find appropriate building spaces to honor their agreements to the community and the ecosystem and the existing residents.

City View looks like one more of those abominations. It's way too outsized for the property. It's on a serious slope. Don't developers care if their building becomes unstable and slides down destroying so much in its path. This very thing happened at Talus in Issaquah. We are in a huge Climate Warming crisis and there are going to be more huge flooding problems and oversaturated hillsides that are going to destroy the properties and risk peoples lives.

OK, you say, we got that handled. We got the best engineers on this..Right. And where are you when the damage is done?

Aside from the ecological hazard, the quality of life for us single resident homes is already challenged with the students in the rental homes on Nevada St. The noise, the racing cars, the uncared for properties, the transitional nature of students, is not creating a residential quality of life and a neighborhood that stays intact and disturbed.

City View is monstrous, HUGE. I can't begin to think, oh, horrors, what kind of traffic and noise and destabilization it is going to bring. It is fine that the students have apartments below these neighborhoods where they aren't (mostly) living

in our backyards, but they would with this monstrous development. And the numbers. How this has even been allowed to be considered is shocking. Where are the urban planners/lawyers to challenge and veto this unhealthy plan?

Please find another place to build. I guarantee you will be happier not to have our wrath and disgust. I am sure you can find another property that will ruin the extant neighborhood.

Respeccrully,
Nancy Dearborn

Aven, Heather M.

From: S J <businesscalls@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 4:16 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Concern about vehicles and traffic

Concern about vehicles and traffic.

The proposed enormous structures will increase the number of vehicles and the amount of traffic in the neighborhood many times over. Three hundred rooms should not be taken as an indication that there would be 300 additional people. Anyone who has spent time on college campuses knows to expect many more. And the lack of nearby amenities of any kind (including a university) should lead a rational observer to expect that most of the students will have cars.

Where are they supposed to park? The neighborhood streets already support only one lane of traffic when cars are parked on both sides of the street. And I'm sure I'm not the only person who has experienced total blockage if cars are not snuggled up to the curbs.

- We all have to back out our driveways. How will we do that with a wall of parked cars on both sides of the street and greatly increased traffic in the remaining lane?
- Because we have small lots, our driveways are short. Where do delivery vehicles, UPS, FedEx, plumbers, electricians, landscapers, etc. park without completely blocking the road? Will you provide for permit-controlled parking in front of our houses, including signage, penalties, and enforcement?
- Traffic in this area is already difficult in some areas. Consolidation, of course. And people who live at the Lakeway end of Nevada typically wind through the Whole Foods/Mudbay parking lot to get to Lincoln and from there to Lakeway. That parking lot is already quite full most of the time. How many more people will be using the lot as a side street?

Please drive along Nevada just south of Lakeway, and 44th Street south of Consolidation. You will see the increased parking demands when, in these cases, only some of the normal-sized homes are rented to multiple tenants. I've counted as many as nine cars at a single (small) address. Then imagine the toll of hundreds of such houses in a giant heap, which is what is being proposed here.

You are proposing to triple or quadruple the population of the neighborhood, and changing the character of the neighborhood completely. All for no reason beyond putting more money in already monied pockets. Please consider that you would be taking that money from us.

Aven, Heather M.

From: S J <businesscalls@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 4:18 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Concern about flooding and runoff

Concern about flooding and runoff.

There is already a lot of water coming off that hill between Nevada and Puget.

- Anyone who walks along Nevada knows that water runs down the hill for a week after it rains, and gushes through the ditches.
- Many neighbors already have water problems in their yards and crawl spaces. How much worse will that be? Why aren't you demanding studies? Where is the "required" stormwater report?

You should expect claims and exceedingly bad PR if you greenlight this damage. The developer will just say, well, the city said it was OK if I went ahead without doing my due diligence. As Mayor Linville said, it's your fault.

Aven, Heather M.

From: S J <businesscalls@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 4:19 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Concern about density

Concern about density.

None of us chose to live here because we were pining for life in a college dorm with five or six hundred transient neighbors. Sound ricochets around in the neighborhood already, probably because of our small lots. We don't need massive parties and constant traffic added to that.

Why are you making density decisions based on a number scribbled ambiguously on a map sometime by someone, and never approved? I think the city has been aware of the problem for a long time. Why haven't you addressed it? Why haven't you responded to citizen concerns about what appears to be a preposterous density allowance (albeit in a scribble)? You knew about this problem since at least the University Ridge days. Why didn't you deal with it?

We shelled out our savings to live in a family neighborhood. The Infill Development Toolkit and the Comprehensive Plan both tell us that we should be able to count on that – that the city would take care to maintain the character of our neighborhood when considering any proposed development. Why aren't you doing that? Could it be that the rules here, as in so much of the country, apply only to us regular folk, not to the wealthy?

Our neighborhood is stable, well maintained, harmonious, and diverse. Our houses and lots are modest, making good use of the land. Why would you want to destroy that?

Aven, Heather M.

From: S J <businesscalls@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 4:19 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Concern about landslides

Concern about landslides.

Most of us have vivid memories of the horror that was visited upon Oso not that long ago. As I recall, there were issues at that time about insufficient study being given to whether that was a safe place to live, and to changes that had been made in the hill that collapsed.

You seem to have forgotten.

What happened to the requested core samples? Where is the geohydrologic report?

And now massive retaining walls. Are you kidding me?

Why are you basing wetland impact on what the developer chooses to tell you instead of the city's own maps? The developer has shown us that his claims cannot be relied on, and he will not be here to shoulder the blame if the worst (or even the bad) happens.

Blame goes to the city.

Aven, Heather M.

From: S J <businesscalls@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 4:20 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Concern about loss of property value

Concern over loss of property value.

Please look on Zillow at the chart in the Home Value information for 820 Nevada. You will see a sharp dip in value at the time the city began consideration of this scheme to feed us to an out-of-state developer.

Sadly for the owner, he chose to put the house on the market at about the same time. They marketed the house heavily, with lots of open houses. The owner came down one day when I was in the yard to ask me if I knew whether we had been sold off to the developer or not. He was in despair. He told me that they could not get anyone to even come look at the property. It wasn't that he was unhappy with what potential buyers were willing to pay. No one would look at it. Nobody wanted to live there.

Finally he managed to sell it for \$50k less than the estimate.

Before this nutty proposal was announced, houses in the neighborhood sold quickly. Is your plan to relieve housing pressure by making this city a lousy place to live?

If you approve this, you are stealing from us.

Aven, Heather M.

From: S J <businesscalls@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 4:31 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Opposition to CityView

So, here we are, fighting for our lives against the destructive impulses of the White House and at the same time fighting for our livelihoods against the government of our city. Certainly we value life over livelihood, but the two struggles are similar in their effect on us in that we pay both governing bodies to take care of us, and we need their help in times of trouble. Instead, they are working to harm us for reasons that I cannot fathom.

Yes, I am opposed to the CityView tenement for all the reasons that were expressed at the public meeting last summer and that have been effectively presented to you by experts in the various areas of harm inherent in the proposal.

- Swamping a successful, established neighborhood of modest family homes on small lots with 500 or more students (300 bedrooms does not equal 300 tenants).
- Filling our streets with probably hundreds of cars for which insufficient onsite parking is provided. Do you have a plan for permit-based street parking?
- Risking increased flooding in surrounding streets and homes. Where are the required reports?
- Risking an Oso event in our city. Where is the required geohydrologic report?
- Reducing the value of our properties, purchased in good faith with no knowledge that you had plans to destroy the neighborhood.

Fundamentally, this proposal is totally out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. What happened to the Comprehensive Plan, which says you can't do that? What happened to the Infill Development Toolkit, which says the same? Are you trying to deal with the housing needs of Bellingham by making it a terrible place to live? I hope you will read carefully the thoughtful and informative letter from Professor Nabil Kamel. Why aren't we using expertise like his in making decisions for our city? Should we rely on developers to have the interests of the public at heart?

We all heard what Mayor Linville said at the public meeting last summer, speaking to the Council and, especially, our Planning Director: "This situation is our fault. We let it happen and didn't do anything about it." If you allow the Planning Director, or whoever is pushing this thing, to destroy our neighborhood, the responsibility lies with you.

Aven, Heather M.

From: WENDY HARRIS <w.harris2007@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 5:00 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: City View Development

Please do not approve this aesthetically jarring, inappropriate project. It does not protect public health and safety. Where is the consideration of on-going air quality impacts once a building of this size is constructed? This matters to me because I developed an environmental pulmonary disease after living in Bellingham for three or four years. It has created a life and death illness that I struggle with every day. I would not wish this on anyone and I hope the city does not either. When I review this and other SEPA applications, I see air quality treated as a construction issue. That is not the primary problem. It is what happens after people move in and bring their cars and trucks, light recreational fires and gas powered lawn and maintenance equipment is used. There have been situations where tobacco smoke in one apartment or condo wafts into nearby residences exposing people to second hand smoke.

Air quality remains the No. 1 environmental health risk for city and county residents and the applicant has provided no information or assurance that there is adequate mitigation standards in place. For large projects like this, a higher standard of building construction, while not required, may be necessary for health and safety, which should always be placed first. Please make the applicant complete this analysis at a minimum.

Wendy Harris
Former city resident of 7 years.

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 9:19 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Alan Hui & Angela Chen
Attachments: Public Comment - 190.pdf; DJI_0010-23.jpg



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Alan Hui & Angela Chen
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>Attached photo shows Nevada Street, heading south, extended into S 44th Street. The cross road is Consolidation Ave. Notice how narrow Consolidation Ave. It is narrower than Nevada Street. The wooded area on the lower left of this photo is the proposed development. On the east end of Consolidation is where the proposed CityView has its only entrance and exit for upwards of 318 renters.</p> <p>With its intended clientele--WWU students, CityView will generate traffic, exiting out of the complex on Consolidation, turn left onto S 44th Street, turn right onto Bryon then Samish to the University. The traffic on S 44th will be greatly increased. I believe the TIA has under-counted this route of traffic.</p> <p>Why? Because CityView does not want to pay for the road improvement on S 44th. But CityView should. Note how narrow S 44th Street is compares with Nevada Street. This section of S 44th does not have sidewalk, no lighting. The stormwater is an open gully on the east side of the street.</p>

The City should require the CityView developer to pay for the required improvement on the S 44th as according to the City's ordinance about improvement of abutting streets. Furthermore the Transportation Planning should reassess and properly assess the TIA generated by the addition of 300 vehicles.

FILES

DJI_0010-23.jpg

EMAIL

alanhui@yahoo.com



Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 10:03 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Alan Hui & Angela Chen
Attachments: Public Comment - 191.pdf; DJI_0019-26.jpg



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Alan Hui & Angela Chen
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>Attached photo shows this proposed development site on the wooded area. Puget Street and its homes perch on the top left. On the right is a the part of our neighborhood. This area is being directly assaulted by the proposed landing of the alien dormitory complex named CityView. There is no 3-story homes here, not to say a 5.5 story apartment building.</p> <p>While we applauded the City's effort to increase affordable housing and limiting urban sprawl. As proposed, CityView does not increase affordable housing for the middle-class. In fact, it takes away such housing opportunity in a serene Puget Neighborhood. We urge the City to deny the CityView application. Instead act on designating this area as for in-fill development only.</p>
FILES	DJI_0019-26.jpg
EMAIL	alanhui@yahoo.com



Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 10:24 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Courtney Kiehn
Attachments: Public Comment - 192.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Courtney Kiehn
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	Affordable housing? For what demographic? Not realistic for the people who work in Bellingham. Please rethink!
EMAIL	coawtnee@gmail.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 10:51 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Erin Kommer
Attachments: Public Comment - 193.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Erin Kommer
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>900/mo is not affordable. The economy I'm Bellingham does not support that and simply relies on Tennant's to have help with income or high paying jobs compared to whatcom counties median income. Tear down culdesacs and single family homes instead of trees down. Especially in the Covid19 reality, how easily with high density living be filled? Stop spreading housing and build up near the campus. Not the arboretum. Not block and blocks away. Pay people for their homes and build up.</p>
EMAIL	erinkommer@gmail.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 11:00 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Michael Richardson
Attachments: Public Comment - 194.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Michael Richardson
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>The current shelter-in-place order has brought out all the neighborhood children to play in the adjacent cul-de-sacs. I've counted 9 children approximately 2-12 years old riding bikes and playing supervised. It would be a real shame to increase traffic on Nevada St to a point where my infant son will never be able to play on the street or even in a cul-de-sac. I also am extremely worried what the deforestation will do in terms of rainwater drainage. I have a city rainwater drain running directly through my back yard with a man hole access back there. If it were to get backed up and flood that man hole access will flood directly into my crawl space. I would very much like to have an engineer from the city assess whether that access should be permanently capped to prevent this. Also it would drive down my real estate price. There are a lot of neighbors with the same concerns as myself.</p>
EMAIL	michaelrichardson1988@gmail.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 11:01 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Alec Howard
Attachments: Public Comment - 195.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Alec Howard
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>Hello, I am writing you in support of the CityView Project. As a renter and a student, I understand the reality of struggling to find a place to live. I have resorted to having to live in more distant parts of the City just to be able to afford rent. Commuting is a huge hassle and really reduces my quality of life. It makes sense to build more housing and build it near the University. Please do not let the loudest people scare you into denying this project. These people will react to any project you have, anywhere in our city. Our residents deserve housing, and this can help address that problem.</p> <p>Thank you for approving this project.</p>
EMAIL	alecinbellingham@gmail.com

May 8, 2020

To Whom It May Concern,

Having moved to the Puget Neighborhood four years ago to be closer to my family, I was thrilled to retire in a neighborhood where fellow university professors lived alongside students. Driving daily both in the early morning and afterschool down Blueberry Lane to help my family with childcare has changed radically during this time:

- Blueberry Lane is currently overrun by vehicles on both sides of the street, making it a one lane road which is so tight that vehicles often need to back up to clear the single lane left for one car to drive through. This is dangerous!
- The speed that young students drive around the cul-de-sac is also extremely dangerous.

The CityView Project's damage to an established family neighborhood where homes are maintained and even the lawns reflect the commitment of these Bellingham residents would be detrimentally impacted.

Please consider the impact that will fall on a lovely neighborhood with many older residents who have lived in a community they take pride in and consider home.

Sondra Kelley

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 11:59 AM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Naomi Bunis
Attachments: Public Comment - 197.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Naomi Bunis
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>My major concern, first of many, is traffic. When the new apartments behind Fred Meyer opened, the amount of traffic exploded. Getting to and from the Freeway caused huge slowdowns on Lakeway and, sometimes, on Ellis. This is definitely NOT multi-family and will be a huge disruption to the single family neighborhood. Having a 3 story 'apartment' building towering over our peaceful low traffic community will intrude on our quality of life. The recent traffic 'calming' installations on Nevada has not slowed down the speed of cars except at the immediate points. I live on a corner of Nevada and one of the cul-de-sacs and I hear the speeding cars all day and evening. There are already many students living in duplexes and triplexes and adding over 300 more will be totally unacceptable to those of us in single family homes all along Nevada and the cut-de-sacs. Many of the homes in the neighborhood have small children and they are at risk!!!! Please, PLEASE deny this permit forever.</p>
EMAIL	naomibunis@comcast.net

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 12:03 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Greg Halleen
Attachments: Public Comment - 198.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Greg Halleen
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>I have serious concerns about the CityView project in the Puget neighborhood. I moved to Bellingham about one year ago. I attended the meeting with the developer Morgan Bartlett in July of 2019. I was new to the area, went with an open mind and spoke with him before the meeting. While listening to his presentation, one thing became very clear. This was not what I would call a typical multi-family apartment complex. The design was clearly set up to draw college students. Each unit would have 3 bedrooms with individual bathrooms. Rents could be charged by the room—potentially \$700-\$900 per month per room. The proposed complex was huge—right in the middle of a 1 and 2 story home residential neighborhood. It sure looked and felt like student housing/dormitory.</p> <p>I think it's great Mr. Bartlett wants to provide both low middle income housing and responsible higher-density housing in Bellingham. The city needs it. This isn't that.</p> <p>My concerns with the CityView project:</p>

1) Whether this is a multi family apartment building or most likely student housing, it absolutely does not fit into the surrounding neighborhood. The neighborhood surrounding the proposed building site is all 1 and 2 story family homes. The proposed buildings, even in the revised documents will TOWER over the existing homes. Building C will be 5.5 stories and built on an area of the site where the elevation is higher. The unit density of the proposed development is completely out of proportion to the neighborhood. The buffers suggested don't come close to addressing all of the issues that will be created—noise, traffic, parking, site lines, etc.

The CityView development fails to adhere to the Comprehensive Plan and Puget Neighborhood 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.” (Policy CD-7 - Community and Character) and (Goal CD-3 - District and Neighborhood Identity) of the City of Bellingham Comprehensive Plan.

There are more responsible and respectful ways to develop this property. I would support Mr. Bartlett building a development in character with the rest of the neighborhood which would still allow for higher density—for instance, a mix of duplexes, cottage homes and/or townhouses.

2) The property includes wetlands and unstable soil conditions. Over the years, there has been much water run off that has flooded basements on the lower part of Nevada Street. A new geohazard study was supposed to be submitted with the revised proposal. This didn't happen. A cover letter was attached to a previous 2013 study. This does not adequately address the many unique and significant geohazard issues related to this property. It seems it would be helpful to require a new survey with several additional drill-tests to deeper depths to ensure proper measures are taken to deal with slope, soil stability and drainage issues. It seems critical that if this property is developed by Morgan Bartlett or anyone else—a serious updated geohazard is done.

3) Traffic/parking is another serious concern. The streets coming into and out of the neighborhood are not adequate to service the increase in traffic related to such a huge complex. The revised proposal does not adequately address this. Nevada Street is treated as if it won't be used by the tenants of the CityView complex. It will. Children will be out playing in the neighborhood and there is potential for serious accidents. The number of suggested increase in trips per day in Mr. Bartlett's application is significantly lower than what the reality will probably be. He estimates many of the 318 tenants and guests will walk the 1 mile 15-20 minute trek to services in rainy and snowy weather rather than drive. The complex is just too large and there will be a significant increase in traffic. The neighborhood is not designed for this.

Parking also doesn't seem adequate for the size of the complex. This will create further neighborhood issues and strain relationships as CityView residents and guests will end up parking on neighborhood streets which again, are not designed for that kind of load.

4) Potential noise at all times of the day and night is another issue not addressed adequately. Noise easily travels. A 20 foot buffer area on the Western border is very minimal and the height of the buildings will still allow significant noise to the the existing neighborhoods below and above. The constant traffic and gatherings in parking lots will also contribute to increased noise levels. The buffer areas really need to be tripled and building heights and number of units reduced to address this.

In Mr. Bartlett's application, there is no plan for mitigation efforts to keep the noise down during construction except a tight schedule to minimize the duration—so, significant noise from 7:30 AM until 6:00 PM every day during construction.

5) The area has a large number of wildlife living within and moving through it—I did not see how protection for this is addressed in the proposal.

These are all serious concerns. If there is a need for more student housing in the city, there are many other more appropriate sites available in areas that are not surrounded by 1 and 2 story residential homes and which do not have the drainage and soil issues of this property as well as the traffic issues.

If Mr. Bartlett wants to develop this property—he should do it properly—working to build within the character of the current setting and directed by the Comprehensive and Puget Neighborhood Plans as well as doing the necessary geohazard studies.

Thank you for considering and taking seriously these concerns.

EMAIL

ghalleen19@gmail.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 12:58 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Sandra [REDACTED]
Attachments: Public Comment - 199.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME

Sandra [REDACTED]

CHOOSE TOPIC

CityView Project

COMMENT

My husband and I purchased a single family home to raise our three year old daughter. Up and down and across our street live several families with young children. A few houses down from us, a school bus drops off school children, who then walk independently to their homes. CityView will be built directly behind our houses, and we are worried about the influx of traffic that CityView will bring to the neighborhood. CityView will have 318 bedrooms, each with a private bath, and with its proximity to the University, it is clear these apartments will function as a dormitory for college students. Thus, the proposed 249 on-site parking spaces will likely not be sufficient for its 318+ inhabitants and visitors, and there will likely be an overflow of dozens of cars into neighborhood streets. This not only poses the likelihood of noise disturbances, property damage, and obstruction of vehicles, but the very real risk of automobile accidents and danger to our children, who walk on neighborhood streets. These streets are not designed to handle such a load, and I believe it would pose a hazard to residents of both neighborhood streets and CityView.

EMAIL



Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 12:59 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Sandra [REDACTED]
Attachments: Public Comment - 200.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Sandra [REDACTED]
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>CityView is being proposed as affordable housing, however, CityView's layout is much more in line with a college dormitory for students of means than with multi-family housing. A three-bedroom apartment at CityView will rent from \$2,700 a month, or \$900 a bedroom, while two-bedroom apartments in the Puget neighborhood currently rent from \$1,200 a month. All of CityView's bedrooms will have a seperate bath--not a common feature for multi-family dwelling units. This is a feature for dormitories, and we believe CityView hopes to appeal to college students and operate as such. CityView's spaces for recreation, inappropriately placed along the border of single-family homes, will likely create long term noise issues, while CityView's parking structure, backing up against single family homes, will likely create constant traffic noise for surrounding residents. The area CityView hopes to build is not an appropriate space for a college dormitory, and CityView has not sufficiently addressed these noise concerns, which will create a constant disturbance for Puget residents.</p>

EMAIL



Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 1:00 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Sandra [REDACTED]
Attachments: Public Comment - 201.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Sandra [REDACTED]
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>CityView is disproportionately large and out of scale with the Puget neighborhood it will build in. It will dwarf surrounding residences, decreasing the property value of neighboring homes. The height of the largest building is 65 feet and only 200 feet from the one and two story homes on Nevada St., and clearly out of proportion to the one- and two-story homes that will surround it. A new geohazard study, requested by the city to be submitted with the revised proposal, has also not been met. Instead, a former study from 2013 is being used. Wetlands with unstable soil can create enough runoff to flood basements on Nevada St, a situation that will be exacerbated by CityView. Flooding can endanger residents and their property, and possibly lead to increased automobile accidents, as runoff in the winter months is often enough to resemble rushing water several inches deep. Such risks need to be adequately measured and mitigated, and the new proposal fails to address these concerns.</p>
EMAIL	[REDACTED]

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 1:58 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Frank [REDACTED]
Attachments: Public Comment - 202.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Frank [REDACTED]
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>A new geohazard study, as requested by the city, was not submitted with the revised proposal. The submitted copy of the "new" geohazard study was an old one conducted in 2013 with a new cover letter attached. The soil on the north end is unstable and has a lot of trees leaning downhill. Run off from the project will be an issue, as during the last large rainfall, streams of water were running into our yard. A new geohazard study NEEDS to be done. The one submitted from 7 years ago is not up to date and can not be trusted to ensure the safety of homes and residents.</p>
EMAIL	[REDACTED]

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 2:01 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Kathleen Taylor
Attachments: Public Comment - 203.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Kathleen Taylor
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>I live at 814 Nevada St. That is on the East side of Nevada St. The CityView Project will literally be directly behind my back yard on a steep hillside, with an estimated 300* tenants peering into our backyards and homes. This complex is way out of proportion for this area of the Puget neighborhood. On all four sides of the proposed CityView project are single-family one and two-story homes. This project does not meet the parameters of our neighborhood comprehensive plan.</p> <p>PUGET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: CityView does not adhere to Puget Neighborhood's Comprehensive Plan which directs development to be of a type, SCALE, and design that maintains or improves character, aesthetics, and LIVABILITY of the neighborhood.</p> <p>City Council members, could you for a moment imagine that you live in one of our single-family homes, and imagine the impact this project will have on your quiet lifestyle and home value. Because CityView would be built on a steep hillside behind our</p>

homes, it will appear much, much taller than 110 feet to all the homes below. We will literally have up to 300 students looking down into our back yards and homes. I say 300 students because each unit is 3 bedrooms WITH one bathroom for each bedroom. To me that definitely describes "Dormitory". Also, a dormitory will not address the current short supply of multi-family housing in Bellingham. If I remember correctly this configuration of student dormitory-style housing proposed by University Ridge, was denied. Also with the uncertainty of when and how students will return to WWU because of the ongoing pandemic, it certainly does not seem like it is the right time to build dormitory-style housing.

NOISE MITIGATION: There is little ability to mitigate noise on a hillside. As it is, when Puget Street neighbors are in their back yards, and I am outside, I can hear their conversations, even though there is a forest between us. Now imagine 300 students and cars between Puget Street and Nevada Street with the forest gone.

CityView states that onsite open space is located in the southwest corner of the site. That is directly behind my backyard. If this project goes forward, the Nevada St neighbors (on the east side of Nevada Street) need to have input into what will be used to separate our property from theirs to give us the most privacy and separation possible, both visually and noisewise.

GEOHAZARD STUDY: I am extremely concerned that a new Geohazard Study was not completed since the University Ridge application. This study should be done during the rainy fall, winter or early spring when the ground is OVER saturated. There has been a change in the hillside behind my house and property over the last 4 or 5 years. Each year I have more and more standing and RUNNING water in my back yard. Because I have a video and photo to share I will submit a separate letter to: cityview@cob.org.

Thank you City Council for honestly considering the impact this project will have on my beloved section of Puget Neighborhood.

Kathy Taylor
814 Nevada St.

EMAIL

kataylor.alaska@gmail.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 2:06 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Frank [REDACTED]
Attachments: Public Comment - 204.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Frank [REDACTED]
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>It is mentioned in the proposal that the housing units are meant to serve as affordable housing. Based on layout, amenities, and pricing, these housing units are meant and designed to suit the style of a dormitory. It is clear CityView is intended to be housing for college students of means.</p> <p>In the SEPA Environment Checklist, section 7b only addressed noise during the construction period. It did not address the long-term additional noise and traffic that will be added to the streets of Consolidation Ave, Nevada St., S. 44th St., Byron Ave, Ashley Ave, Lincoln St. and Lakeway. The streets are not wide enough to accommodate two cars passing by at the same time with NO other cars parked on the side of the streets. The proposed development will vastly increase traffic and the amount of cars that will be parked along side of the streets, which will also increase the noise level. Such issues have not been properly taken into account in the proposal.</p>
EMAIL	[REDACTED]

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 2:31 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Andrea Lubeck
Attachments: Public Comment - 205.pdf; 4DB3C16A-A7B5-487D-B136-2C0385C301BF.jpeg



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Andrea Lubeck
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	This proposed development does not fit and has no place in this residential neighborhood. It will generate too much noise, too much traffic, environmental disruption, and is not consistent with the surrounding developments. I implore you to be reasonable and keep this monstrosity out of this neighborhood.
FILES	4DB3C16A-A7B5-487D-B136-2C0385C301BF.jpeg
EMAIL	andrea_linus@yahoo.com



Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 2:56 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Erik Bernhoft
Attachments: Public Comment - 206.pdf; CityView Dormitory Complex.jpg



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Erik Bernhoft
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>I'd like to renew my opposition to the Cityview Project proposed to be constructed on the Hawley Tract of the Puget neighborhood.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Inappropriately placed, towering over the homes of Nevada St. only ~100ft away at times.2) Out of character of the Upper Puget Neighborhood.3) Is disproportionately dense dormitory style apartment, suited for a college campus, not a neighborhood of small apartments and family homes.4) Would overly strain fragile neighborhood roadways.5) is out of proportion.6) has little to no no Hillside Forest Transition and is over baring in the small neighborhood it would consume.

7) is simply out of scale for the neighborhood it is proposed in.

I challenge you to look at the attached rendering of this proposed CityView monster and tell the community you serve that this represents a reasonable, appropriately stair-stepped, properly scaled, proportional project for the neighborhood.

Do not let Morgan Bartlett, a wealthy profit-hungry developer, and his Madrona Bay Realty Company destroy the sanctity of the Puget and Samish Neighborhoods in the name of special interest profiteering!

I implore you to stand up for the average people of the Puget and Samish neighborhoods and deny this profit-centric proposal.

-Erik Bernhoft

FILES

CityView Dormitory Complex.jpg

EMAIL

ebernhoft@hotmail.com



Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 3:02 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Julie LaVergne
Attachments: Public Comment - 207.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Julie LaVergne
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>Good Afternoon, Thank you for taking our comments in regards to the CityView Project. As a homeowner and resident of 808 Nevada Street (butting up to said proposed project), the following are just some of the items that will need to be addressed and remedied by the Developer and the City in order for this project to proceed to minimize any fallout:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Sufficient storm and water drainage installed on the resident properties that are on the west side of proposed project property to prevent flooding.2) Roundabout installed at intersection of Consolidation and Nevada Street.3) Roads, sidewalks, and drainage on Consolidation street and Nevada Street, re-constructed to be able to handle 250+ more cars and people, in addition to its current load.4) "No public parking signs" installed on Nevada Street and Consolidation street sidewalks.5) Traffic light installed at end of Nevada Street and Lakeway, as well Lincoln Street access intersections to minimize accidents.5) Noise barrier / and privacy: greenery / shrubbery /

trees installed between proposed project property and southwest residence properties.

6) Current expert comprehensive density and drainage study of subject property performed and then reviewed by and agreed to by the City and experts as "ok to proceed", prior to beginning any construction on said proposed project.

7) Safe removal of any trees appearing on proposed subject property that appear to be leaning, to avoid any accidents.

Thank you for listening to this and the voices of other citizens who will be deeply impacted by this project if it proceeds.

Sincerely,
Julie LaVergne

EMAIL

jlavergne532@msn.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 3:12 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Kerry Helm Follis Realty
Attachments: Public Comment - 208.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Kerry Helm Follis Realty
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>To Who It May Concern:</p> <p>I moved into the Puget Neighborhood this past January. I had occasion to spend a lot of evenings--both weekdays and weekends--at my fiancé's home on Nevada Street, located down the hill from where this CityView apartment complex is envisioned. Frankly I was surprised to learn that this huge complex was even being considered for this location in what is decidedly a Single Family Home neighborhood. Just because you can do something hardly means you should do it and just because of some oversight in this area's zoning, should not mean that a complex of this size should be built where the developer plans.</p> <p>It is completely out of character in a single family home neighborhood. Furthermore, I have seen firsthand the high volume of very fast--does everyone speed on neighborhood streets--traffic on Nevada Street, and I can see very clearly, whether the Council can or not--the huge increase in traffic volume that will go with this project on all the streets accessible below this complex. There is enough--too much--traffic already in this neighborhood which can't</p>

even get speed bumps placed on streets to slow the speed, if not the volume, of the traffic.

Nobody can argue this huge rental complex housing three tenants in each unit, almost all of whom will have cars, is not going to have a serious negative effect on the Puget Neighborhood. No families are going to rent there. At the cost of renting three bedrooms separately, families will rent homes elsewhere.

This property should be developed as single family homes in character with the rest of the neighborhood. There is no reason that this huge complex should be located where proposed except greed. That hardly makes it right.

I would ask the Council to consider the homeowners in the Puget Neighborhood and reject this proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

Kerry Helm
Follis Realty
Bellingham

EMAIL

kerryA8@msn.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 3:59 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Sara Johnson
Attachments: Public Comment - 209.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Sara Johnson
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>This proposed project is way oversized for the immediate neighborhood where it is planned and would scar the landscape forever as it starkly towers above the surrounding houses.</p> <p>CityView 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.” CityView fails these requirements (Policy CD-7 - Community and Character) and (Goal CD-3 - District and Neighborhood Identity) of the City of Bellingham Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>There is no way CityView meets these qualifications, and it should not be allowed to be built!</p>

EMAIL

sarajashland@gmail.com

Planning and Community Development Department
City of Bellingham (COB)

Dear Madam/Sir:

I am a Bellingham resident and homeowner providing feedback in response to the new residential multi-family building proposed for 4413 Consolidation Avenue/Area 17 in the Puget neighborhood of Bellingham. While I do not reside in the Puget neighborhood, I care deeply about the unique character and livability of all Bellingham neighborhoods, and about our interconnected natural environment. Moreover, my home is in a neighborhood (Happy Valley) with extensive integration of single-family homes (like mine) and multi-family/multi-unit dwellings. The issues raised by the proposed project at 4413 Consolidation Ave. resonate profoundly with me.

In my experience, it is deceptively easy for multi-unit projects to change the character of neighborhoods in ways that reduce livability and quality of life for all neighborhood residents. For that reason, I think it is imperative that any large multi-family/multi-unit project be planned with the utmost care, common sense, transparency, and scrupulous adherence to COB planning requirements.

I am very concerned that the size and scale of this proposed project is so out of line with the prevailing and long-standing character of the surrounding neighborhood (which continues to be mostly single-family homes) that the likely negative impacts are fundamentally unmitigatable and the project should not proceed. Specifically, my leading concerns are as follows:

1) The surrounding neighborhood consists overwhelmingly of one- and two-story homes. This project proposes a 5.5 story building (Building C) that would be utterly out of place and thus out of compliance with the requirement to reflect the existing neighborhood. This is twice the height of City Hall. Would you like that building arising in your home's immediate viewshed? I sure wouldn't. I don't even want to see it dominating the neighborhood as I drive by on I-5. It would remind me of the sacrifice that neighboring long-time homeowners have had to make to accommodate a building that should never have been permitted. This project will neither enhance nor preserve neighborhood character, a requirement as per Policy LU-4 of the COB Comprehensive Plan.

2) The allowable buildable density claimed by the project applicant (176 units) is not sufficiently documented nor justifiable for proceeding with a proposal of this magnitude and potential neighborhood impact. A much more reasonable baseline for this project would be the documented and definable density of 8.7 units per buildable acre (it is clear that a significant portion of this site cannot be considered buildable due to the presence of wetlands). This latter density (8.7 units) is much more in line with the historical and current residential density of the surrounding neighborhood. I am requesting that you please use this standard for formal review of the project proposal.

3) Given the proximity of the Puget neighborhood to Western Washington University's main campus, it is very likely that the primary market for the apartments proposed in the project will

be WWU students. It is disingenuous for the project applicant to suggest otherwise, and it would be irresponsible for COB to accept this claim absent credible supporting data. With students as the primary market, it is highly unlikely that this project would make a major contribution to meeting the existing city-wide need for low-income family housing options. Would you want to raise your children in a college student dormitory? I wouldn't, and would not ask other families to do so.

4) As a resident of a neighborhood (Happy Valley) in close proximity to the WWU campus and thus home to a substantial student population, I am well aware of the neighborhood impacts that students generate (e.g. noise, excessive curbside trash, vehicles occupying all available streetside parking). This project does not adequately address or account for these kinds of impacts on the surrounding Puget neighborhood. Light and noise pollution from the buildings (students stay up late!) is not adequately addressed in the proposal. The claim that most student residents of the project will walk/ride public transit to campus is a blithe, unfounded assumption that needs to be supported by actual data (my blithe observation in response is that students are no different from most city residents--some take public transit, but plenty of them prefer to drive, and assuming otherwise is fantastical thinking).

5) As a sloping hillside site, it is essential that this proposal carry out a full assessment of potential geohazards, hydrological dynamics, and vegetation management. I am concerned that the project proposal is cutting corners in these areas with incomplete or less than thorough analysis of site conditions. The geohazard study was originally done for a different development proposed at 4413 Consolidation Avenue, and has not been completely updated. Potential runoff/drainage issues at the north end of the property are not fully addressed in the current application, nor are concerns about the long-term stability of trees on sloping areas of the site. Will the applicant be responsible for monitoring and inspection of trees left standing in the vicinity of the construction site? This should be a responsibility borne by the developer, not by the City. The lack of attention to these sorts of details suggests to me that the applicant really does not care about the natural qualities and environmental conditions of this property. Well I do care. Please hold the applicant to the highest possible standards in terms of COB's environmental review and mitigation requirements. I and many other Bellingham residents are reliant upon you to protect our city's natural environment that we cherish and care for every single day.

6) The applicant proposes to remove extant coniferous trees along the Nevada St. border of the site and replace them with deciduous trees. This dubious landscaping decision will increase the impacts of the project (noise, light pollution) experienced by neighboring Nevada St. residences. While a relatively small issue, it is symptomatic of an unacceptable lack of concern on the part of the applicant for overall neighborhood impacts.

Given all of the above concerns, I do not believe that this project proposal should be approved for 4413 Consolidation Avenue. It essentially proposes to build a large student dormitory in the middle of a primarily single-family residential neighborhood. This particular pattern is demonstrably toxic for the social fabric of our city and community. The proposal is clearly not in the best interests of the Puget neighborhood, nor does it reflect the priorities, cares or concerns of most Bellingham citizens. Please either send this proposal back again to the drawing board, or

straight to the (regrettably large) trash heap of bad, self-serving developer concepts. But do not let it go forward as is. Thank you sincerely for your service to all Bellingham residents, and stay safe.

Kind regards,

John Tuxill
1604 20th St.
Bellingham
(360) 441-1392

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 4:22 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Sara Johnson
Attachments: Public Comment - 211.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Sara Johnson
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>I am concerned about traffic on Nevada Street which would affect me everyday should this huge project somehow be approved. The 318 rental bedrooms would be occupied by many more students than that as they double up, and most of them would have cars. How can Nevada Street and Consolidation handle all that additional traffic (not to mention the parking issue)?</p> <p>I live on Whatcom just off Nevada. Nevada is a narrow street not designed for heavy traffic. Already it is hazardous getting from Whatcom St. onto Nevada where there is an odd oval-shaped roundabout and a blind corner to the north. Then making a left turn from Nevada onto Lakeway is another challenge, so much that often it is safer and faster to drive slowly through the Whole Foods parking lot to get to Lincoln. The additional traffic that this project would create would exacerbate the problem and undoubtedly result in more traffic accidents.</p>
EMAIL	sarajashland@gmail.com

Aven, Heather M.

From: noreply@cob.org on behalf of City of Bellingham <noreply@cob.org>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 4:57 PM
To: G.Proj.City View
Subject: Public Comment -Alan Hui
Attachments: Public Comment - 212.pdf



City of Bellingham

Public Comment

Entry Details

NAME	Alan Hui
CHOOSE TOPIC	CityView Project
COMMENT	<p>The City has recently passed an Emergency Moratorium to deny single family homes construction in a RM zone site. This emergency moratorium (EM) is the City's effort to mitigated a problem of accepting single-family homes development on RM zoned area. In a way, this is the City's admission of a negligence and mistake on the part of the City. Now using this EM to right a wrong.</p> <p>The City's had wronged us by allowing single-family homes to be built in Area 17. Furthermore the City should not punish us now, causing us great harm and injustice, by allowing CityView to be built here. The way to mitigate this wrong by the City is to designate the remaining Hawley Tract to be developed based on the in-fill toolkit.</p> <p>Conversely, the City could not use this EM or RM zoning to justify CityView development, as one councilman nonchalantly stated, that it was the single-family homeowners' wrong to have bought these homes without due diligence. By accepting our property tax, which increased every year, the City</p>

should protect our property value, safety and security. Not to destroy them.

EMAIL

alanhui@yahoo.com