

## Appendix A. Comments written on 2007 Fairhaven Neighborhood Questionnaire

### Comment written on Front page

Thank you for your effort. I would appreciate a report of the findings to the Neighborhood before any integration in the Plan.

### What I consider most important to preserve about Fairhaven is:

Other – Ability to use land efficiently and improve availability of housing by allowing 4- and 5-story buildings.  
Other – I think unless people are seniors or disabled or helping out such, they should not be in cars at all! More public housing on a sliding income scale.  
Other – Building height...It allows the winter sun in.  
Thriving businesses – small

### The areas I would most like changed or improved in Fairhaven are:

Other – Fair/consistently applied zoning rules for every property owner.  
Other – Growth limitations, particularly high-rise buildings.  
Affordable housing – Sliding scale public housing.  
Available housing – Too many condos. We are poor.  
Other – Better crosswalks. People at Chuckanut Square are in danger. Also that banner across the road in front of Chuckanut Square is an assault on the residents when the wind whips it into a flapping fury.  
Other – No more 35+ ft. buildings.  
Other – Lower height limit of new buildings.  
Thriving businesses – small  
Other – Police Patrol  
Access to Bay – larger and more beaches available to public.  
Other – Buildings only below 4 stories tall. No high rises. Blocks views for all, living or walking.  
Other – Good “healthy” restaurants  
Other – Star viewing, organic community gardens and healthy sustainability.  
Other – Building height limits to 3 to 4 stories only.  
Other – Views are increasingly compromised.  
Other – High rollover of small businesses.  
Other – Less than 5 stories height.  
Other – 100 Acre Woods and trail system.  
Roads able to hold fire trucks and cars.

### Question #1. In general, how do you rate the quality of existing parks, trails, and greenways on the south side?

Good – Create permanent access of South Bay Trail, Village Green to Taylor Dock.  
Good – Getting better.  
We have one of the best park systems in the nation.

Parks dept. not well run.  
Trail between Fairhaven business district and Taylor Ave. Dock needs to be completed off road.  
Let’s keep them our most important asset.  
Bus noise.  
Bus noise.  
Please, let’s continue to improve this.

### Question #2. In general, how satisfied are you with the size, extent and number of parks, trails and greenways on the south side?

Neither – We need to extend Fairhaven Park.  
Neither – No Chuckanut Ridge Development!  
Satisfied – Can always use more! Can never have too much.  
Wish that a large forested area could be kept natural and not built on.  
So far good but too many cars coming in.  
Need more parks and trails.  
Chuckanut Mountain must be preserved. Whose Fairhaven? I’m ok. No side needs help.  
Chuckanut Mountain must be preserved and not developed.  
Even more would be better.  
Bus noise.  
Reduce traffic noise.  
That means for the rich.  
Please, let’s continue to improve this.  
Satisfied – Could designate more.  
Always benefit from more.

### Question #3. In general, how satisfied are you with public access to Bellingham Bay and the waterfront in the Fairhaven area?

Dissatisfied – Need more and larger beaches.  
Dissatisfied – Controlled by the Port.  
Expansion would be good.  
Expand public boat launch at Marine Park.  
Satisfied – But I’m worried about future access.  
Love the parks.  
Larger public beach.  
Satisfied – Few access areas.  
Too much industry/pollution.

### Question #3a. Do you agree that improved and direct access from the Village Green to the Bay, as proposed by the Waterfront Futures Group, is important?

Strongly agree – Great idea!  
Neutral – I don’t know what this entails.  
Neutral – Important to what?  
Neutral – Who?  
Unknown.

Don't know about proposal.  
Not familiar with the plan but it sounds nice.  
I only agree if it will incorporate a parking garage over the bank along the now-unimproved 10<sup>th</sup> St. Some merchants and employees continue to park on the streets. Ken's lot at 11<sup>th</sup> and Mill has helped, but again a parking structure over the bank along 10<sup>th</sup> would really help. As a condo owner one block away with only one parking space I would pay a monthly rate to have a spot, as would others. The port and city really need to work on this, not just talk about it.

**Question #4. In general, how satisfied are you with the city's recreational programs, such as community centers, public spaces, art museums, recreational sports programs, etc.?**

Neither – Always good, not too aware  
Neither – Need better senior center.  
Not familiar with this.  
Teens are without much support. So are ... on social fringe.  
Neither – Need more appropriate space for elderly.

**Question #5. In general, how do you rate the quality of traffic management and parking facilities in the residential areas of Fairhaven?**

No answer – There needs to be a better bike lane from town so that I can use the road and not the trail. The bike lane is nonexistent heading to Fairhaven.  
Neither good nor bad – Too many streets are narrow and have parking on one side only.  
Neither good nor bad – Residents should provide their own off-street parking.  
They have done a great job considering the preset parameters they were faced with—need more with safe ingress/egress.  
We can reduce the number of cars – park, sell, share. Close Wilson Ave. except to bikes and emergency vehicles.  
Take out landfill and open creek at 10<sup>th</sup> and Donovan.  
Good – but threatened in future.  
Ridiculously crowded.  
Trucks should be off Harris.  
Bus noise.  
Speeding problems.  
Poor quality traffic management with the recent construction.

**Question #6. In general, how do you rate the quality of traffic management and parking facilities in the commercial core of historic Fairhaven?**

Bad – meters needed  
Bad – Congested!  
Good – Obviously, future growth would benefit from a parking structure, which would require parking meters on streets.

Neither good nor bad – I've been living in Henderson, NV w/mother and have been living in Blaine, until I could get my favorite neighborhood in Bellingham, Old Town, Arts, etc. I'm finally here ☺, pushed myself more I should have and ended up in the hospital – I will be home to my apt. Chuck Sq.  
Bad – Too many cars. 80% are not really needed. Too many parking lots. If they must have parking, make those automated stacked-up lots like they have in Japan. People should have an incentive to lose their cars. I also find it possible to live without a cell phone, computer, or trips to Europe.

Good – Can always use more parking.  
Very bad – Big problem.  
Worsening.  
Commercial and residential are overlapping now, so hard to separate management of traffic—needs integration.  
Must be improved in both size and safety.  
Too much parking – need better pedestrian environment and protection. No enforcement of stop signs and red light running.  
No parking meters.  
Need more parking.  
WTA and Greyhound buses make too much noise  
Will get worse.  
Should be a pedestrian district.

**Question #7. In general, how do you rate the condition of the streets, street lights, and pedestrian facilities in the Fairhaven neighborhood and business area?**

No answer – I know you must be working on this.  
Bad – Bad crosswalk at Chuckanut Square. No bike lane from town. Too many cars.  
No answer – Ok, but construction blocks traffic and parking.  
Residential – VERY BAD. Commercial – GOOD.  
No more banners across 12<sup>th</sup>. Need more lights.  
Pedestrians shouldn't have to push buttons to walk at intersection.  
11<sup>th</sup> and Mill by the toy store needs the crosswalk painted in.  
No sidewalks in lower Fairhaven.  
Don't want more light poles in residential neighborhood.  
What's up with the barricades in the middle of the sidewalk between Eclipse and Fairhaven Bike?  
Good, but the bargain rate sale by the city of street right of way in Fairhaven is very poor.  
We need more emphasis on business.  
Some streets too narrow.  
Neither good nor bad – Need improvement.  
Need new bulb at 8<sup>th</sup> and Donovan.

**Question #8 . In general for all of Bellingham, in such matters as enforcing land use laws and building codes, granting of building permits, and neighborhood planning, do you think that the city's Planning Department is too lenient, too strict, or about right?**

A bit too strict – Inconsistent.

A bit too strict – and inconsistent.

No answer – I don't know, but those big square drainage ponds on McLeod Rd. and by "Darby Estates" are downright ugly and offensive!

Much too lenient – Harris Square and McKenzie Square? They're Big and Vacant!

A bit too strict – Arbitrary – They don't apply to laws fairly and equally to all developers.

None – Just too subjective.

No answer – Strict isn't right word. Incompetent is.

Much too strict – They're idiots!

No familiar with enforcement.

Stupid.

Some seem to be treated more equal than other equals, but have come a long way from Kenny H(ertz) in Dave S(yre)'s watch pocket.

Depends on who has the money.

They let money talk and don't keep commitments to neighborhoods or enforce environmental protection—i.e., drain runoff into Padden Creek lagoon.

Inconsistent – responsive to big projects but not small infill and homeowner projects.

About right – Currently/incompetent and unprogressive/Don't know, but no enforcement of zoning in neighborhood of single-family homes.

It's not about strict or lenient but capable or not.

A bit too lenient – Too many buildings, condos.

**Question #9. Do you think that the city's planning and permitting process for Fairhaven in particular is too lenient, too strict, or about right?**

A bit too strict – & inconsistent

No answer – Too lenient for some...view-blocking condos south of 10<sup>th</sup> Street. Also the fumes from the boat building businesses are way too intense. It smells like an acrylic hail parlor on the trail.

A bit too lenient – Allow too many high-rises in Fairhaven.

About right – Except for parking problems.

None of these – Just too subjective.

Lenience as long as historic appearance is why Fairhaven is what it is—all people residents to "customers."

Depends on how many cars live here.

Caters to commercialism over ecology and quality of life.

Caters to consumerism and developers over ecology and quality of life.

No clear vision for future, and how building affects neighborhood and infrastructure.

About right currently. Much too lenient in commercial/A bit too strict in residential. Incompetent and unprogressive.

Too lenient for commercial/condo but too strict for residential.

**Question #10 . How would you rate the overall impact on the neighborhood of a 10-story tall building on or near MacKenzie Ave. and 9<sup>th</sup> Street in Fairhaven, such as has been proposed for the "Fairhaven Harbor" project?**

Good – brings neighborhood closer to bay without more parking on streets.

Very bad – Destructive

Very bad – Blocks views and light.

Very bad – An awful precedent!

Good – I prefer density over sprawl into Chuckanut. Disgusting.

I think it is a great project, which has continued to evolve. From what I've seen of the building due to the slope will not be much taller than the already completed Harris Square. Once the project is done, more street parking will be available and all the residents will have underground parking.

Height reduction needed.

Finally something interesting.

Will block views for all.

Noisy to build, too high and too much density.

Very bad – Not enough space for all cars/people "needs."

**Question #11. How would you rate the impact of a 10-story building, on or near Mackenzie Ave. and 9<sup>th</sup> Street in Fairhaven, on local parking and traffic?**

Very bad – Destructive

No answer – not enough research?

Bad – Available parking will not meet needs unless underground.

Very good – If they are building what the city requires for parking. If parking is not enough, city should change rules for new developments, not ones already permitted.

Traffic – neither good nor bad. Parking – good.

Very bad – An awful precedent!

As with all things if well thought out it will be very well thought of.

Too many cars and lights and noise and pollution into creek.

Only ones to park their project.

Construction would be horrendous on Harris.

Don't change a thing!

**Question #12. How would you rate the impact of a 10-story building, on or near Mackenzie Ave. and 9<sup>th</sup> Street in Fairhaven, on neighborhood character, appeal, and community?**

Very bad – Destructive

Very bad – My patients who used to come to my office were excited about being in Fairhaven and shopping here – they tell me now that they hate it here.

Very bad – Ugly, blocks light and views, does not fit neighborhood.

Very good – If people keep having babies, we need to provide places to live. Better this than miles of county sprawl and added pollution and costs of service development.

Depends on which plan is implemented. I prefer the scaled-back version—less bulky.

I'm no fit judge.

Current proposal looks like Marriot on Waikiki Beach.

Sets a pattern for tall buildings, which belong downtown, not in an historic neighborhood where we need to maintain building designs, views and access to the waterfront.

Finally somewhere people can live rather than rent/invest. The other projects nearby are junk.

It would destroy the historic district.

**Question #13. How would you rate the impact of a 10-story building on or near Mackenzie Ave. and 9<sup>th</sup> Street in Fairhaven on economic and commercial prosperity in Fairhaven?**

No answer – Shorter building will also be prosperous!

Very bad – Due to parking and congestion. Why does Fairhaven need another big, expensive, vacant building with inadequate parking and traffic flow?!

Fine as long as any landowner is compensated for economic loss over lost view—whatever, as deemed using average of 3 real real estate evaluators.

Move to large urban area like Seattle.

People may actually live there.

Only prosperous for the building owner.

Older businesses may not survive.

New stores will detract from old stores.

More people and more commercial competition.

**Question #14. Do you agree or disagree that there should be a 35-foot height limit in all of the Fairhaven commercial core area (most of the Fairhaven core already has a 35-foot limit)?**

Strongly disagree – Should have 4- and 5-story buildings.

Strongly agree – with no exceptions, such as were given to Village Books owners!

But the Fairhaven Harbor project, for example, is not considered to be in the core nor in the parking district.

Neutral – What about Village Books/condo and other buildings like it. Aren't they over 35'?

Less than 35' if possible.

**Question #15. Do you agree or disagree that should be a 54-foot height limit in the Fairhaven commercial core area (except in areas where the current height limit is already 35 feet)?**

Strongly agree – All historic! Look at the Waldron, Sycamore Square – 54' or more!!!

Strongly agree – At the minimum and eliminate 35' restriction.

Strongly disagree – Keep buildings low!

No answer – See above #14. How about going subterranean?

Should be 35 ft. as in other areas.

I would want to see a plan before answering this in order to see exactly what areas would be covered by the 54-foot limit.

Strongly disagree – As long as the building is for low income or physically disabled, provided underground parking, then I'd say Strongly Agree.

Too high – mid-40s ok.

Strongly agree – Keep height limit at 35'.

Too high already.

10-story building should not be built.

31' or less.

35' everywhere is better by far.

Strongly agree – or less – 35' best.

Strongly agree – if we can't get a universal 35' limit.

Strongly disagree – if we can get a 35' limit.

**Question #16. Do you agree or disagree that current city practices, policies and municipal codes adequately protect views in Bellingham?**

Agree – To benefit all.

Neutral – If you didn't buy the air space, your view is not protected.

Neutral – Nor should they.

One cannot “protect” views, only “change” views.

Who says what “view” is worthy of “protection?”

Uneducated about the issue but to take someone's view is lower than a snake's belly.

Property rights need precedence.

Height should be limited to protect access to sunlight, regulate density, and other planning goals – not just “view.”

Protect public views, not private ones

Disagree – in commercial areas. Agree – in commercial areas (typed as written).

Our ward rep. is a disgrace.

Disagree – Roof utility items block view.

**Question #17. Do you agree or disagree that current city practices, policies and municipal codes adequately protect neighborhood character in Bellingham?**

Disagree – More needs to be done.

Neutral – Are you talking commercial or residential?  
No answer – Are you going to tell me how to design my house? If so—there is little in the way of any “Fairhaven neighborhood character.”

None – Too subjective.

I don’t know what these are.

We need to protect the character of Bellingham.

All I can say is talk to people and I mean talk. You don’t need a 2 or 3 million dollar big city planning firm. Hire some temps, call people that would be effected, go to their homes, talk them face to face.

Poor question: some neighborhood character stinks.

Rules don’t make character necessarily.

Disagree – Need more stringency.

**Question #18. Do you agree or disagree that the city should plan for Fairhaven to accommodate more residential infill and multifamily residences (e.g. condominiums), to meet growth projections?**

Agree – Yes to single-family or two-family. No to condominiums!

Strongly agree – But must meet height requirements.

Include a % of low-income, disabled people—not make a “project”—good people not prison violent convicts.

Infill is good but there are both bad, cheap designs and sustainable, low-impact designs.

Neutral – Only if height limits are set and enforced.

Too many apts. and condos proposed.

**Question #19. Do you agree or disagree that the city should set maximum residential density goals for each neighborhood (rules to limit infill beyond a certain level)?**

Strongly agree – Set limits on lot sizes and number of condos per square foot.

Density not bad if well planned.

**Question #20. In general, how do you rate the quality of the city’s fire department and emergency medical services?**

Very good – At Chuckanut Square is all I know about.

Very bad – They send 2 fire trucks to a home who has dialed for an ambulance.

Very good -- Thank God, have never had to use them.

Good – Not adequate road-space.

**Question #21. In general, how do rate the quality of the city’s police services?**

Good – They should crack down on bikes on the sidewalk, except for walking it, bikes going the wrong way on the road, and other ways that make it bad for us law-abiding bicyclists to be grouped with them.

Very good – Thank God, have never had to use them.

Bad – for discrimination.

Would like to see more police presence in Fairhaven, even a patrol car once in a while.

I like the bike police, which seem to come through in summer.

Need to deal with noise of kids and buses, especially at night.

Need to police racing cars on Fri. and Sat. on Harris.

**Question #22. In general, how safe or unsafe do you feel walking alone at night in the Fairhaven neighborhood and commercial core area?**

Unsafe – The commercial core is really bad. Drunks, aggressive gangs of people who need counseling. Scary!

Need more lighting on 11<sup>th</sup> (south).

Feel safe save for the rare bad occurrence.

Unsafe – Trails not so safe even in day. Movie nights, teens on corners, parking lots overwhelmed, trash next morning worse than I’ve ever seen, too many vehicle break-ins. People living across Cascade Joinery (it is not a campground). We just talked to police officers down by the trail off 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. The RV parked for months across from Cascade Joinery had sex offender living in it. Community not informed. RV stayed too long.

Neither safe nor unsafe – Not as safe as I used to.

**No Question #23**

**Question #24. In general, how do you rate the quality of the city’s recycling programs?**

Good – It would be better if I could recycle my yogurt containers.

In most cities you also get compensation or monetary ... at a central branch.

Noisy and complicated.

**Question #25. Do you agree that protecting salmon creeks and estuaries such as Padden Creek and the Padden Creek lagoon should be a high priority for the City?**

Strongly agree – Put up the \$ to get the 1 mile pipe out of the creek.

Strongly agree – Of course! Clean water is top priority. High compared to what? Police or “Public Access Channel?”

Which they have been doing!

More should be addressed upstream of I-5.

Take Padden Creek out of all the culverts the city put in.

**Question #26. Do you agree that the City does an adequate job minimizing the amount of untreated stormwater from roads and adjacent areas that enters Padden Lagoon?**

Neutral – I don't know. But I wonder about all the pet waste going into Lake Padden. I used to swim there, but I'm afraid I'll get worms or something. Also, is it safe to swim in the bay, yet?

Neutral – Don't know.

Disagree – What they are doing is unclear. I haven't seen anything different done, even with the construction.

Need fewer vehicles, less impervious surface.

**Question #27. In general, how satisfied are you with Whatcom Transit Authority, the city's bus system, for its service to the Fairhaven Neighborhood?**

Satisfied – improved recently

Satisfied – Later night service, until 2:00 am. Also, the connections from downtown at night are scary. No one wants to go through that!

Satisfied – More nighttime service.

Very satisfied – Do not use it, but others say it is good.

Neither – Don't use it. Don't know.

The only improvement I would like to see is a 2-4/hour service to Samish/32<sup>nd</sup> St. where I work. Service to downtown and WWU is very good.

Satisfied – I like the new schedule.

We have never used WTA.

WTA should be electric.

Noisy and polluting.

Adequate schedule and electric buses.

**OPTIONAL AND EXTRA NOTES**

Thank you for asking.

Where have all the Laundromats gone? We need a nice, clean new one in Fairhaven!

We need secure places to lock up bikes, cameras, etc.

Bikes get stolen at the south side library rack, in front

of Fred Meyers, etc. Stores should allow people to walk their bikes inside, or provide secure facilities, security cameras, stronger racks.

I gave up driving, by choice, 11 years ago. It takes 1\_ hours to walk to the mall. People don't realize how small Bellingham is. If you walk and bus you can get around real fast. Don't sit around at the bus stop, keep walkin' & bussin', & walkin' & bussin'.

Thank you for asking. This was fun to fill out.

Thank you!

Fairhaven has already lost a great deal of its historic quality.

Economic pressures are driving out culturally mixed middle class in favor of a monolithic gentry.

Should close commercial core to cars.

More small craft and recreational boat launch areas.

10-story at MacKenzie and 9<sup>th</sup> good except for parking.

Municipal view protection is inconsistent.

Should do infill in commercial areas only.

Thank you!

Many thanks for your time and effort!

Thank you for doing this!

Less neighborhood involvement!

Thank you!

I've lived here, within the commercial area, for over 60 years. The real "Historic Fairhaven" has been long gone. It's sad for me to see the change. I neither visit nor purchase items there anymore.

TO ALL FAIRHAVEN NEIGHBORS – Very deepest thanks for all your work and accomplishments!

## Appendix B. Fairhaven Neighborhood Questionnaire Response Rate

1,079 Questionnaires were mailed out, in late February and Early March, 2007. Of these questionnaires, over half of them (571, or 53%) were mailed to the Fairhaven core area (commercial zoning Areas 2A, 2B, and 14, and Public Areas 12 & 13). This area contains the greatest number of commercial enterprises in Fairhaven, as well as all of the buildings of the Fairhaven Historic District.

A total of 390 questionnaires were returned, for an overall response rate of 36%. The rate of response was high in all geographic areas.

### Response Rate by Geographic Area

Areas 1, 1A, 1B, 4, 10 and 15	27%
Areas 2A, 2B, 2C, 12, 13, and 14	33%
Area 5	42%
Areas 9, 9A, 9B, and 11	34%
Area 8	31%
Areas 7 and 11	38%
Area 6A and 6B	60%
Area 3	50%

