

Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village Master Plan

Public Input Report: May 10, 2011 through August 5, 2011

CONTENTS

- I. PURPOSE
- II. BACKGROUND
- III. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
- IV. NEXT STEPS
- V. EXHIBITS & APPENDICES

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to summarize the public comments received during the initial public meetings regarding the Fairhaven Neighborhood & Urban Village planning project, and to describe the next steps in the planning process.

Many written comments touched on the years of financial ups and downs that Fairhaven has experienced, and the years of devotion of property and business owners to renovate and improve the district. Common themes included the long history of the area's urban use, and the need in Bellingham for areas with existing infrastructure, transportation connections and zoning to allow urban development that accommodates growth and prevent sprawl. Additionally, common themes about preserving and maintaining the historic character and preventing unsightly new development that detracts and undermines the district character was also repeatedly raised.

One written comment seemed to get at the heart of the matter:

"With its diversity – the commercial core, working waterfront and residential areas, Fairhaven is the urban village that other Bellingham business districts aspire to be. We care very much about Fairhaven and its future and hope that the new Neighborhood and Urban Village Plan will be written in a way that will allow businesses in Fairhaven to continue to prosper, and will help to encourage continued investment and improvement of Fairhaven for the benefit of all."
Brad Imus, Jacaranda Land & Development Corp.

The complete written comments are posted on www.cob.org/fairhaven as **Appendix A**.

II. BACKGROUND

The public was invited to attend two listening sessions in December of 2010 following the release of a "Blue-lined version" of the original Fairhaven Neighbors plan update proposal. 47 people participated in the listening sessions and notes were taken. All public feedback was posted on the project website.

Following those sessions, the City Council directed staff to reorganize and consolidate the project into one larger planning project that would include the Urban Village plan elements. A revised Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village Plan Project Charter was approved in May of 2011.

A series of five public meetings to provide input to the Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village master planning process. Public notification included the following efforts:

- 1) A public meeting series invitation was distributed to Fairhaven stakeholders and a press release issued detailing the public meeting series. **(EXHIBIT A)**

- 2) Email addresses were collected from residents, businesses, and commercial property owners, and prior to each meeting a reminder was distributed to the project email list. The list current contains 103 individuals.
- 3) Notice of the Public Meeting Series was sent to Neighborhood Associations for email distribution and publication in their newsletters, as well as posted on the City website and calendar of meetings and events.

The five meetings were each held from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. in either the Fairhaven Middle School or the Fairhaven Library. The meetings focused on the following subjects:

Meeting #1: May 10, 2011	Introduction, Character & Boundaries
Meeting #2: May 17, 2011	Natural Environment, Parks & Recreation
Meeting #3: May 25, 2011	Fairhaven Design Review District and Historic Resources
Meeting #4: June 8, 2011	Public Realm - Transportation & Streetscapes
Meeting #5: June 22, 2011	Development Character - Height, Design, Views and Uses

Each session was well attended (between 35 and 43 at each) and included neighbors, business owners, property owners, developers, nonprofit organizations, elected officials and other interested parties. A complete list of attendees is available from City staff.

III. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Meeting #1, May 10th: Introduction, Character, and Boundaries (40 attendees)

The purpose of the first meeting was to introduce the project, provide an overview of the planning process and timeline, and to make the public aware of opportunities to provide input. Staff presented an overview of the process and the project, as well as how it fits into the wider Urban Village planning subtext. Staff reviewed the many elements of an urban village, and how Fairhaven is a “model” urban village in need of a refined and updated plan and regulations to guide it into the future.

Staff also presented information about the ten elements of successful urban village design, and explained how the preliminary urban village study area boundaries had been drawn based on a comparison of the existing zoning with the actual current uses, as well as from neighborhood association representatives’ input. As part of the workshop exercises, participants were asked to identify the area’s strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats. They were also asked to provide input on the district planning area boundaries and to identify which areas should be included in the study area. Comments are summarized below, with the full SWOT analysis attached as **Exhibit B**.

SWOT Analysis

Top **strengths** included the variety and mix of uses existing in this one compact area, especially the fact that the area has been in urban use for over 100 years. The vibrant business core, and different transportation modes and corridors (bus, train, ferry, foot, bike, car) make for easy access. The historic character and buildings were noted as a great strength for the area, as well as its waterfront location with beautiful views and natural scenery.

Top responses regarding **weaknesses** included parking limitations, the fact arterials “bisected” the area, and the underutilized waterfront. The limited access from the core to the Bay, especially limited by the BNSF tracks, was a key weakness.

Opportunities for the future included creating direct waterfront access from the core, and continuing to restore Padden Creek and Estuary. Vacant property, the opportunity for short-term moorage and tourism were also popular.

Threats were dominated by lack of height limits and the potential for view blockage, and the current concern for potential coal trains associated with a new terminal at Cherry Point. Additional threats were a lack of long-term parking, increasing traffic, “Disneyfication,” NIMBYism, and urban village sprawl into adjacent areas.

Project Study Area Boundaries

Following an overview of key urban village planning principles as well as current zoning, land use, and special boundaries that exist in Fairhaven, on a black & white aerial map, participants were asked to draw where they thought the urban village boundary should be. Of the 38 responses submitted, 22 thought the planning area should include the entire neighborhood or greater, 26 thought it should extend northwards to include all or some of the Port's property to create a transition/approach zone, 15 specifically noted that the village "core" should extend down Harris Avenue, and some concern was noted about including the single-family residential within the urban village boundary. Generally, participants felt more information was needed about what each area would include before boundaries could be clearly defined.

A submittal from the Old Fairhaven Association included the entire neighborhood in the Urban Village boundary. Submitted boundary comments are posted under **Appendix B**.

Meeting #2, June 17th: Natural Environment, Parks and Recreation (43 attendees)

The second meeting focused on the materials contained in the working draft plan, and provided updated information pertaining to the shoreline history and current regulations that apply to the entire shoreline, Port of Bellingham property, critical areas including Padden Creek, Estuary and Post Point, and current and future efforts regarding parks and trails. Multiple city staff from these areas led the presentations and discussions. Participants engaged with the presenters, and were asked whether any key issues relating to parks, trails, open space or the natural environment were missing from the current working draft.

Comments received throughout this phase of the project stressed the importance of continued enhancement and protection of the vital natural environment assets within Fairhaven using buffers, stormwater improvements, and height and light limits. Creating direct pedestrian access to the waterfront from the core was a key concept, as well as adding small boat moorage facilities. Fairhaven is well-served by an existing trail network that is unsurpassed, however, public comment did stress that additional trails, especially along the waterfront, would be desirable.

The Port staff stated that creating public access to the waterfront would be more likely to happen sooner via property north of the Fairhaven neighborhood boundary rather than around the east side of Padden Estuary. This was due to environmental constraints, as well as the Port's desire to continue the current marine industrial uses at the Fairhaven Marine Park for another 20 years or so. A recap of the meeting and comments on the Parks chapter are attached as **Exhibit C**.

Meeting #3, June 24th: Fairhaven Design Review and Historic Resources (35 attendees)

The third meeting successfully tapped into many layers of opinion, feedback and nuanced thoughts from participants regarding the various elements of design as it pertains to Fairhaven. This topic was of huge interest to participants, and staff provided a special exercise that provoked extensive, personal responses from the participants. This meeting was one night after a similar overview staff provided to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). A lively discussion regarding this planning effort occurred at the HPC, and written comments were submitted following that meeting and are included in the posted written comments under **Appendix A**.

Staff provided an overview of Fairhaven's development history, including the creation of a National Historic District in 1977 which formed the basis for a design review and parking district. Staff highlighted the "primary" and "secondary" historic buildings within the area, that are looked to for compatibility when

conducting design review. Staff noted how design review elements focus on building height, bulk, orientation, materials, architectural features, parking, and other elements. Design review areas include Approach, Influence and Core, and three stations were provided that illustrated buildings both new and old within these three areas. Participants were asked to comment on what worked best, what has not worked, and how design review should work within the three areas.

Extensive comment was received, and a complete version of the original comments are posted as **Appendix C**. The compiled version of the comments, as well as the three posters, is attached as **Exhibit D** and has been provided to the consultants hired to help with the Historic Survey and Inventory, as well as assist regarding the formation of new Fairhaven Design Guidelines. It was interesting to see the diversity of responses to the mostly open-ended questions contained in the exercise. Capturing the essence of Fairhaven included terms such as preserving harmony of scale, integrity without monoculture, human-scale, welcoming, textural and engaging. There was clear consensus in the group regarding what materials and features really made the buildings in the core of Fairhaven special, including arched narrow windows, cornices, brick and stone, awnings, historic paint colors, zero setbacks, short blocks, obvious entries, large front store windows, diversity of textures and sizes within each block, and other points. What folks did not care for were buildings that were “out of scale,” square windows, turrets, blank walls, buildings taller than historic buildings, and other points. Concern about angled parking, parking access, height limits, view protection, and pedestrian safety were also raised.

A robust discussion followed this exercise, especially in regards to how design review should be applied in the three areas. The group was clearly split on how design review should be applied in the Core versus the lower area (Approach) below the bluff that extends down Harris Avenue. Half felt it should apply, while the other half did not. However, they both felt design review should apply to both Influence and the Core. Many felt that the Approach area should draw design cues from the historic working waterfront, and incorporate materials from the Core area. Participants engaged fully in this exercise and provided very useful and detailed feedback that will be integral to the creation of new design rules for the district.

Meeting #4, June 8th: Public Realm: Transportation & Streetscape (40 attendees)

The main goals of this meeting were to help participants understand the general parameters guiding the improvement of public spaces; to have them identify existing and potential pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections; and to brainstorm and prioritize features that could be incorporated into the overall streetscape design. Staff gave an overview of the multi-modal connections that currently exist within the study area, and guest speakers emphasized the importance of coordination between the sometime conflicting purposes of bike, pedestrian and automotive (including transit) vehicles that frequently use the arterials. The elements of the parking study were provided for comment, and several comments were received, forwarded to the Parking study consultants, and posted as part of the written comment in **Appendix A**.

The exercise provided additional areas for improvement that had yet to be identified in the draft plan. The following missing links were already identified:

TRAILS: Missing trail system links may require private property acquisition, redevelopment, or rezoning of particular areas. These identified missing links include:

- a beach/shore trail connection between the Taylor Avenue Dock and the South Bay Trail at Douglas Avenue;
- a trail from that point running down to the Bay and then along the shoreline to Marine Park, with a branch along the east side of the Padden Lagoon to meet the trail that runs along Padden Creek to the Off-leash Dog Park;
- and a trail directly connecting the Fairhaven Village Green and the Bay.

CROSSWALKS: The Fairhaven neighborhood has identified the following locations to study for additional crosswalks as growth and new development may warrant:

- Crosswalks at Knox Avenue at the 11th Street/Finnegan Way and 12th Street.
- Crosswalks at Harris Avenue at 8th and 6th Streets
- Intersection of 10th Street and Mill Avenue, connecting Fairhaven Village Green with the South Bay Trail.

The results of the exercise are attached as **Exhibit E**, and there was clear consensus that the items above were needed, as well as the other connections noted in the feedback. Additionally, participants were asked to comment about areas that felt unsafe for any form of travel, as well as streetscape preferences. The comments obtained will help support plan content in regards to multi-modal improvements and streetscape amenities.

At the end of the meeting, participants were provided with a homework assignment, including a large 3D map depicting the current building heights in Fairhaven. Participants were asked to identify key public view corridors, as well as observe how heights and building design, both of historic and modern buildings, influenced how the buildings felt from the street. The final meeting would start with a discussion of the height and views.

Meeting #5, June 22nd: Development Character: Height, UV Design Guidelines, and Permitted Uses

This fifth and final meeting of the series began with an historical retrospective by Jackie Lynch using photos to show how the Fairhaven District has changed over time.

Public Views

Jeff Thomas led a discussion compiling participants findings from the homework exercise. Those findings are summarized in **Exhibit F**. An extensive discussion about public view corridors took place, specifically the charming mid-block pedestrian connections that are so “Fairhavenesque” and the views to the water through every street corridor. Views from Village Green were noted as important, both towards the bay and to the surrounding buildings. The fact that the Port property on the water had no height limits was a strong concern. There was clearly difference of opinion regarding the ability and the appropriateness of regulating view protection on private property. The financial realities of building on high-priced land was duly noted, as well as the ability to finance underground parking for residential uses or buildings outside the existing Fairhaven Parking District. Also expressed was the unique short blocks and lack of alleys that made the district very different than other areas.

Height and Design

Planning GIS analyst, Chris Behee, provided an overview of the 3D modeling that provided a visual context of what the building envelopes looked like at 35’, 55’, and 75’ height limits, from three main viewpoints in Fairhaven. He showed the building envelopes both with and without urban village design guidelines. Opportunity sites, including undeveloped property and private parking lots, were included in the modeling. Chris Koch provided an overview of the key elements of Bellingham’s adopted Urban Village Design Guidelines, which can be pulled from when drafting Fairhaven’s new design guidelines.

Comments received regarding height were varied, and included many recommendations supporting the current 35’ – 55’ height limits. A few wanted to go up to 75’ or generally in keeping with Samish Way Urban Village and Old Town Urban Village. Most height comments received were more general, noting the desire to not have buildings taller than the historic buildings, to prevent shadowing, and to preserve the human-scale environment, charm, and existing public view corridors. Also, a clear need was noted to establish compatible height limits in the areas that do not currently have height limits. The lack of height limits in industrial areas down Harris and along the shoreline were noted as a concern, but also noted was that height limits would depend on any future change in use to the property. Shoreline Master Plan height limits were news to many participants. The fiscal realities of being able to design and build a new structure under too tight of regulations was also clearly noted by participants, as well as the pervasive notion about preserving the integrity and current vibrancy of the district into the future.

IV. NEXT STEPS

Over the summer, staff will work to complete a technical study of existing on-street parking capacity and deficiencies, and survey the historic resources. City staff will complete a traffic analysis about future capacity of the existing street network, as well as a survey of residential property owners regarding their interest in pursuing additional *Infill Housing Toolkit* forms for Area 7.

The parking study will provide baseline information about the existing public and private parking capacity within the district, as well as usage and recommendations for future management strategies. Information gathered in the historic resource survey will be used, along with the public input, to inform the creation of new Fairhaven design guidelines in the areas identified as having high historic integrity, character and public value.

Allowable heights, design standards and parking requirements in the commercial core zone will also be studied further and draft concepts on key plan elements will be launched in early October.

V. EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT A: Press Release
- EXHIBIT B: Meeting #1 SWOT Analysis Results
- EXHIBIT C: Meeting #2 Natural Environment, Parks and Recreation recap
- EXHIBIT D: Meeting #3 Fairhaven Design – Compiled Comments
- EXHIBIT E: Meeting #4 Transportation & Streetscapes – Compiled Comments
- EXHIBIT F: Meeting #5 Public View Corridors, Height and Bulk – Compiled Comments

Posted on www.cob.org/fairhaven:

- Appendix A: Written comments
- Appendix B: Boundary Exercise results
- Appendix C: Design Review complete comments
- Appendix D: Transportation & Streetscapes complete comments
- Appendix E: Public View Corridors, Height and Bulk complete comments

Additional written submittals including a PhD thesis, white papers, surveys and other documents may be viewed at City Hall by contacting Nicole Oliver, noliver@cob.org.

EXHIBIT A

City hosts public meeting series on Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village

Posted: May 5, 2011 12:06:22 PM PDT

The City of Bellingham is launching the Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village planning process with a series of topic-specific public meetings scheduled in May and June, 2011. Meetings take place at Fairhaven Middle School, 110 Park Ridge Road, and Fairhaven Library, 1117 12th Street.

"These public meetings are designed to gain insight and clarification from all Fairhaven stakeholders and interested community members regarding the development of a Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village Plan," said Jeff Thomas, Planning & Community Development Director.

City staff from multiple departments will attend the meetings. Content from these sessions will be used by staff and consultants to create complete planning documents that will be reviewed at later public meetings. The current project timeline anticipates submitting the plan and regulations for legislative review by January 2012.

The meetings are scheduled as follows:

- **Meeting #1: Tuesday, May 10**, Fairhaven Middle School, 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Review project scope, approach and resources. Identify boundaries, planning framework and regulatory structure, and key elements of planning effort.
- **Meeting #2: Tuesday, May 17**, Fairhaven Middle School, 6:30 to 8:30 p.m., Parks, Trails and Natural Environment.
- **Meeting #3: Wednesday, May 25**, Fairhaven Middle School, 6:30 to 8:30 p.m., Fairhaven Design Review District and historic resources. In addition, staff will be discussing Fairhaven Design Review Code with the Historic Preservation Committee at their meeting on Tuesday, May 24th, 7 p.m., City Council Chambers.
- **Meeting #4: Wednesday, June 8**, Fairhaven Library Auditorium, 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Village Core regulations including current regulations and area special conditions, height, bulk, parking, transportation, streetscape and design review.
- **Meeting #5: Wednesday, June 22**, Fairhaven Library Auditorium, 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Second meeting on Village Core regulations including current regulations and area special conditions, height, bulk, parking, transportation, streetscape and design review.

All meeting materials will be posted in advance on project website, and comments and feedback will be posted within 7 days following each meeting. For complete project details, see the project website at www.cob.org/fairhaven or contact Nicole Oliver, Project Manager, at (360) 778-8353, noliver@cob.org

###

EXHIBIT B

**SWOT Analysis Results, Public Meeting #1
Fairhaven Urban Village Planning, City of Bellingham**

STRENGTHS	
Good variety and mix of uses, multi-use/types of land use (residential, commercial, industrial, marine industrial, jobs)	••••••••••
Different transportation modes/corridors/connections - bike, walkable, trails, bus, Amtrak, ferry	••••••••••
100+ years of urban use; Central Business Core; strong core; shops; viable, vibrant businesses; regional center of tourism and commercial activities; commercial services for surrounding neighborhoods	••••••••
Historic character; design standards; existing turn-of-the-century buildings	••••••
Waterfront; waterfront recreation; Bay views; working waterfront	••••••
An organic, authentic urban village with existing infrastructure; Urban Village designation; dense residential uses	••••••
Neighborhood continuity in residential area along Donovan, Wilson, etc.; familiar faces; stable population	•••
Community involvement; committed people	•••
Viable salmon habitat	••
Topography; sloping hill in core; two-level ambiance	•••
Village Green	•
Proximity to schools	
Location	
Size	
Trolley tracks up Harris	
Fairhaven activities	

WEAKNESSES	
Parking District dysfunctional; limited parking; infrastructure or facility needed; too much on-street parking in core	••••••••••
Bisected by arterials	•••
Underutilized waterfront	•••
BNSF railway; the railroad tracks along the edge of the shoreline; limited Bay access.	•••
Lack of residential; already met infill projections; population too small in existing village boundaries	••
Not enough parks	••
Waterfront enhancements: restaurant, walk/ped connections, trail connections; missing trail links	••
Empty storefronts	•
Market cycles	•
Sewage plant	•
Vacant lots	
Connection to neighborhoods	
Cars have priority over pedestrians	
Lack of business diversity	
Lack of ethnic and racial diversity	
Lack of affordable housing	
Lack of recreational opportunities for youth.	
Not pedestrian friendly in core	
Complicated zoning	
Ownership of downtown is highly concentrated	
Haphazard development historically	
Boardwalk ends at dock	
Greedy development	
Traffic limits North/South	
Loud NIMBY sentiment	
Some areas without height limits	
Inflexibility of points of view	

OPPORTUNITIES	
Waterfront access; direct access to waterfront between Port and Taylor Dock; trail from Boulevard Park to Marine Park; access to water from core	••••••••••
Padden Creek & Estuary - a functioning, natural ecosystem/habitat within an urban area; wildlife corridor; salmon habitat	••••••••
Vacant/undeveloped lots; Haskell property	•••••••
Short term moorage; public access boat moorage; additional marine activities: row boats, tour boats, temp daily moorage; separate docking for motorized boats	••••••
Increase visitation by working with tourism industry (cruise companies, etc.); Alaska ferry tourists; walking tours for tourists; regional destination; Granville Island opportunities; marine commerce	•••••
Port's undeveloped land on waterfront; Port's property if used for public use, not housing; Port involvement	••••
Connect walking/bike routes to WWU and downtown; more parks/trails; strengthen bike facilities and network	••••
Increase tax base	•••
TOD (Transit-oriented development), integrating with mass transit; transit	•••
Car-free blocks/areas; reduced car usage	••
Integrated residents with business to lessen need to leave	••
Improved pedestrian safety and connectivity	••
Adaptive reuse; more mixed use	•
Regulations to permit Fairhaven's development at "human scale"; Limit heights of building to 54 feet and lower	•
Build trolley line from Ferry terminal to 21st Street	•
BNSF quiet zones along shoreline; rerouting freight traffic from shoreline	•
Housing for people working in industry; industrial jobs	•
Village-scale government; enhanced opportunities for citizen participation in planning	•
Hardware store/garden center	
Infill to accept growth	
Design standards in single family zone	
Community power	
Carousel	
Covered meeting pavilion	

Sports field	
Creation of stormwater treatment areas	
THREATS	
Lack of height limits, view blockage, "Manhattanization", relaxing height limits; keeping and reusing old buildings; modern architecture; loss of character; inappropriate development regulations	••••••••••
Coal trains, noise from trains, coal dust; increased rail traffic	••••••••••
Potential loss of existing parking with future development; no long-term parking; accommodating parking for business expansion	••••
Auto-centric, too many cars, traffic	•••
Tacky commercial look; "Baby Gap" development, Disneyfication; too much high-rise	•••
NIMBYism; opinion that Fairhaven should "stop" or that it is a "rural" area	•••
Urban village sprawl; Maintaining quality fo life in residential area; Inter-neighborhood contention; commercial uses along 14th butting up to Happy Valley housing land use	•••
Perceived as a retirement community; could turn into "rich person" enclave; property values become too high for local workers	••
Unclear definition of Urban Village	••
Stormwater runoff; development at 9th and Harris/impact to Padden Creek	••
Underfunded library	•
Sea level rise	•
Aging infrastructure; degradation, entropy	•
Available land supply; encroachment into right-of-ways	•
Poor economy hurting businesses; destruction of quality of business environment	•
Unscrupulous developers; banks without conscience	•
Port property; Port not cooperating	•
Lack of certainty through building process	
Not producing a plan that complies with Comp Plan and GMA	
Light and noise pollution	
Trail around S side of sewage treatment plan while protecting heron habitat	
Construction of infrastructure that prevents infill	
Limited number of major property owners	

EXHIBIT C

Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village Master Plan

Recap of Public Meeting #2 Natural Environment, Parks & Recreation

Materials: Powerpoint presentation

Various maps of parks and open space were provided

City Parks map of Fairhaven and Larrabee area trails and parks

Approximately 35 people in attendance.

Meeting opened with Jeff Thomas – introductions and review of the project scope.

Nicole Oliver provided a recap of the SWOT analysis and boundary exercise (see PowerPoint for highlights). Noted staff had been invited to Fairhaven Neighbors June 1st meeting to discuss residential transition zones.

Steve Sundin, Environmental Planner – Reviewed the Shoreline Master Program, noting that DOE was holding a hearing next Wednesday, May 25th to review comments before they make a decision on our plan. Reviewed the Waterfront Futures Group vision for Fairhaven that involved mixed uses east of the lagoon and north along the shoreline (Reid Boilerworks area). The proposed SMP designations for Fairhaven are Urban Maritime around the ferry terminal and boatyard, then change to Urban Conservancy around Padden Lagoon and northwards towards the Chrysalis. Urban Conservancy allows for 100 foot buffers and mixed use. He explained the rich aquatic system and marine life that exists just north of the lagoon opening. This is an area that is targeted in the SMP for enhancement.

Urban Maritime designations are for water-dependent uses and do not require buffers or height limits. They are rare and used for areas that are well-developed and well-used such as the ferry terminal and shipyard areas.

In urban conservancy zones, there are requirements for public access and environmental enhancements that much go along with any development proposal. Steve explained the difference between SMP jurisdiction (200 feet from marine shorelines) and buffers (required in certain zones). The SMP is an overlay that applies to anything within 200 feet of shore. The SMP jurisdiction extends to McKenzie up Padden Creek (intertidal zone), and where the SMP leaves off, the CAO starts. Some discussion ensued regarding flows in Padden Creek as they are nearly enough to warrant designation under the SMP, but so far have not been adequate for DOE to designate them.

Greg McHenry, Port of Bellingham Planning Department – Explained the Port of Bellingham's fairly recent update to the Fairhaven Scheme of Harbor Improvements, which he led, and the input from neighbors that they considered during this process. Specifically Greg referred to the future use of the Fairhaven Marine Industrial Park east of the lagoon. The Port considered continuing with industrial as well as rezoning to mixed use, however the Port Commission felt it was essential to continue with marine industrial to ensure the continuation of the industrial jobs and potential for future marine industrial tenants in that area. The size of the property was one of the few that allowed for a larger potential tenant. Greg noted that the Port felt the life of the buildings in that location would be at least another 20 years. They anticipated that future mixed

use was more possible north of the developed and leased areas, and that discussions about future pedestrian access have been ongoing, including establishing connections to the south bay trail.

Greg went on to note that the Port is a part of the Bellingham Bay Pilot, and that the area occupied by the Fairhaven Marine Industrial Park is a contaminated area. Testing done at the shore have come up clean, likely because the asphalt of the area has kept the contaminants contained. The cleanup of this area is not slated for another 5-10 years (via RIFS) because it is a lower priority than other shoreline cleanup sites that are not contained. Exploring the feasibility of expanding the estuary or pulling back the edge to the east of the lagoon is something referred to in the Scheme of Harbor Improvements, but is not something that is likely to happen any time soon.

Kim Weil, Environmental Planner for the City, detailed the Critical Areas located in Fairhaven, including the wildlife, wetlands and especially the Great Blue Heron colony at Post Point. She explained how the Critical Areas ordinance regulates Padden Creek, and how upstream day lighting projects are coming to fruition after years of planning. Kim spoke about the water quality and temperature in Padden Creek, and how forest canopy has been very helpful in keeping the water cool for the different species that inhabit the creek.

Tim Wahl, Greenways Program Coordinator for the Parks Department, talked about the history and acquisition of parks and trails in and around Fairhaven. He noted that the estuary is 21 years old, and is man-made. He commented on the extensive ownership of open space by the Larrabee family, and how the lower interurban trail system is an asset and focus for Parks. No major capital improvements are planned for the area, as it is well served compared to other parts of the city, and very well-connected by trails. Parks is looking at acquiring a last piece of property right around Padden Creek. He spoke about the quality of habitat within the estuary, and how it has been re-evaluated over time. He reiterated the high value ecosystem located just north of the mouth of the estuary as a wonderful area for foraging fish. Some discussion ensued regarding stormwater and the volume of untreated stormwater that enters the creek at Harris Avenue.

Following the presentations, participants spent about 20 minutes discussing questions with staff and examining maps around the room. The meeting reconvened to take any input or provide comments on the draft chapter pertaining to Natural Environment, Parks and Recreation.

Matt Christman suggested creating a green zone around commercial to protect residential east and north of core. Want to “containerize” commercial core and avoid encroachment.

Bill Geyer noted that a key part of urban village planning involves bringing more people closer to the urban core, while stabilizing the “zone of investment.” A green buffer would work against that principle. The Padden Creek area already buffers the residential areas to the south and west of the core.

Christman noted the potential land swap on 14th with Haggen as part of their rezone and street vacation to continue that green, open space buffer along 14th.

Michael Lillilquist stated he appreciates this discussion and noted it is a conversation about transition zones, which is critical and has been the focus in past urban village planning projects.

David Moody – commented re type of street tree – important to keep in mind for view protection and root impacts.

Wendy Scherrer – wants to incorporate the urban forestry policies in Happy Valley Neighborhood Plan into the Fairhaven plan. Nicole added there may be some other stormwater policies that could be applicable as well.

Paul James asked the plan language regarding future trail connections (last page). Suggested adding a policy to create a short term connection along 10th street as a near-term improved waterfront access rather than long-term, given what we heard tonight from the Port.

Paul Schissler noted that 14th is a transition zone. Make a definite boundary and don't let the area sprawl.

Dave Moody – look at all the other urban villages – height is staggered from the center extending outwards. Don't plan for lots of parking. 200' blocks are small compared to 1000' blocks in other areas.

Bill Geyer – noted environmental resource and waterfront connections suggestions from OFA. Daily public moorage to bring in day-use boaters – dinghies dock to access passengers (aka Friday Harbor). Dock access could be at Douglas – make a policy to tie moorage into shore. John Servais added that this is a huge potential new tourism draw, bigger than I-5, that has not been realized.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

EXHIBIT D: Design Review Exercise (compiled comments)

Core Area – Including National Historic District

1. What features, forms and materials do you think work best for new construction in the “Core” and National Historic District area?

- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **features** for this area include:
 - Arched windows and doorways (tall and narrow)
 - Canopies over sidewalks
 - Cornices
 - Decorative facing
 - Defined entries (covered)
 - Details that add charm (ornate twists)
 - Punch windows on 2nd story
 - Roof-slopes (similar to variety of existing buildings)
 - Sashed windows
 - Store-front windows (non-square and tall)
 - Transom lights / glass above sidewalk canopy
 - Use of lines or window lines to separate stories
 - White accents on brick
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **forms** for this area include:
 - Human-scale first floor and entries
 - Large first floor, clear commercial window
 - Parapets
 - Proportions of storefront to 2nd story
 - Small residential / office space above
 - Structures similar to Ken Imus’ and Ebenal buildings
 - Tall street level floor with canopy
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **materials** for this area include:
 - Any materials that mimic the existing structures or do not contrast too badly
 - Brick (craftsman style ok)
 - Crown Molding (Clapboard)
 - Masonry (Chuckanut Sandstone foundation)
 - Paint (in historical colors – brick/earth tones)
 - Sandstone
 - Stone
 - Stucco
 - Wood
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Articulation (building plane)
 - Buildings should front the sidewalk
 - Flexibility and common sense
 - Height – keep under 50 feet / 4 stories (no taller than existing historic buildings)
 - Height – should be 3 stories max (not 2 stories)
 - Include more variety of historical forms (too “Disneyland” perfect)
 - Keep compatible with existing historic buildings (style / feel should agree)
 - Street grid should be short square blocks

- Utilize Victorian / Arts & Crafts features and elements
- Window height and rhythm
- Additional comments:
 - One story for the Eclipse seemed like a missed opportunity
 - Village Books is a nice building
 - Acceptable Pictures: #1-7, 9 (materials add to charm), 13-17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27
 - #10 – yellow color is not good
 - #19 – could be darker / more historic color

2. What has not worked in the “Core” and National Historic District area?

- Respondents felt that the following things have not worked in this area:
 - Angled parking
 - Concrete
 - Efforts to break up building bulk
 - Large glass / steel window fields on upper levels
 - Large / massive building footprints (cover too much area)
 - Large signs
 - Lighting that is direct and glaring on pedestrians
 - Linear “boxie” / modern look
 - One-story square buildings
 - Paint (instead of brick)
 - Parking District
 - Pop-outs and turrets
 - Sealed 2nd-story windows
 - Solid blocks of building (eliminates off-street parking)
 - Stucco that blocks view corridors
 - Chuckanut Square, Eclipse Bookstore (large sign) Garden Plaza (cinder block) Harris Square (dark courtyard), Joinery (not well-matched to historic buildings), Key Bank (no street presence / garish external lights), McKenzie Square (upper floors don’t work), Muljat buildings (blocking view corridors), Public Housing Authority tower renovation (needs depth / texture to façade and roof line), WECU / Fairhaven Pizza Building, Winn’s Drive-In
- Additional comments:
 - Apparent requirement that commercial space at street level seems squashed at Fairhaven Gardens
 - Economics drives growth
 - Lack of parking on Finnegan side makes finding tenants difficult
 - Making everything look the same
 - Materials / architecture features should be left to the architect
 - The façade of historic on new buildings is not attractive
 - The Planning Department does not work for this area
 - Vague language / lack of code (“harmony of scale”)
 - Picture #29 is a good source for corner design
 - Unacceptable Pictures: #2, 8-12
 - #5 – ugly
 - #8 – signs (bold color)
 - #13a – Rounded top

- #14 – balcony railings
- #16 – corner turret (rounded), rounded window on 2nd / 3rd stories, top of bay
- #17 – bump-out, flat aspect from lack of detail
- #18 – New Orleans style
- #19 – construction is weak
- #24 – shape of windows
- #26 – too massive / not compatible
- #30 - ugly

3. Do you think the “Core” and National Historic District should be subject to design review?

- The majority of the respondents felt that this area **should be** subject to design review.

Influence Area

1. What features, forms and materials do you think work best for new construction in the “Influence” area?

- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **features** for this area include:
 - Angled entrances
 - Arched windows (lots of them)
 - Decorative cornices
 - Historic design (using features like the Village Books building)
 - Large window along street level (tall - not square)
 - Window framing / curves (not just vinyl inserts)
 - Window proportions
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **forms** for this area include:
 - 1st –story retail / street level commercial
 - Cornices
 - Height
 - Less bulk and height to reflect core
 - Maximum of 3 stories
 - Pillars
 - Roof edges
 - Roof slopes / lines that are interesting
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **materials** for this area include:
 - Brick
 - Brick / Concrete combination... Brick / Wood combination
 - Lapsiding (horizontal)

- Paint (in earth tones)
- Stone
- Wood
- Wood / Concrete combination
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - 12th Street Village corner buildings
 - Buildings should be consistent and close to core
 - Buildings setback from sidewalk
 - Compatibility with the Core area
 - Integrity without monoculture
 - Street grid
 - Variety and similar colors
- Additional comments:
 - City should supply specific guidelines
 - Future development / redevelopment should be compatible with existing structures
 - If designed to meet the guidelines, permits should be issued without over-reaching by staff
 - Acceptable Pictures: #1(brick), 3-7
 - #6 – Great textures, cornices, roof and balcony
 - Unacceptable Pictures:
 - #2 – does not look like it belongs
 - #2-6, 8-9, 11 – too linear / modern
 - #4 – too plain / not welcoming
 - #30 – blocks water views from visitor first entering town

2. What has not worked in the “Influence” area?

- Respondents felt that the following things have not worked in this area:
 - 1-story buildings next to taller structures
 - 5-story buildings or any buildings over 3-stories
 - Blank walls
 - Buildings that are not pedestrian-scale
 - Bulky buildings / Massive building footprint
 - Cinder-block
 - Concrete
 - Fake muntins on windows
 - Lack of graceful lines
 - Large, outward-sticking cornices on Harris Square
 - No historical feature represented
 - Pop-outs and turrets
 - Railings on decks – too modern
 - Weird, modern shapes
 - Windows that are too modern or small and square
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Buildings like Banner Bank, Chuckanut Square Building and Haggens do not work
 - Not splitting the blocks between the Core and Influence areas
 - City Planning Department has not established guidelines to build by

- Design features are inferred and not in code
- Individual planners influence developers & the public as to their own opinions (which are often absurd)
- Height limits should be imposed towards the water
- Parking in front of building
- Stanello's could have used a few windows on the south side
- Vague language does not work
- Additional comments:
 - Unacceptable Pictures:
 - #2 – square blocks, too modern
 - #3 – balconies, windows / finishes look cheap and dated, too tall, block shaped
 - #4 – parapets, roof-line too soft
 - #5 – windows / finishes look cheap and dated, not historic, too tall, block shaped
 - #7 – poor adaptation of craftsman
 - #8 – too tall, block shaped, blank wall, bulk and height
 - #9 – needs historical character, large exposed parking lots, reflects a mausoleum
 - #10 – boring, reflects a mausoleum
 - #11 – no windows, not welcoming, tomb-like, does not represent Fairhaven, reflects a mausoleum

3. If the “Commercial Core” was extended down Harris Ave, what visual design cues should be drawn upon for new construction?

- Respondents felt that the following things should be considered
 - A warehouse design that mimics piers and historic warehouses
 - A welcoming gate
 - Brick buildings of varied bulk fronting the sidewalk
 - Brick / Wood
 - Build right up to the sidewalk
 - Consider using characteristics from the “core area”
 - Good sidewalk interface
 - Historical buildings in the core area
 - Lots of textures with varied features / provide a historic feel
 - Maximum of 3-stories with reasonable height and bulk
 - Nothing higher than 5-stories
 - Pedestrian friendly
 - Under-ground power lines
 - Wide sidewalks with tree-lines forming a canopy over Harris
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Impose height limits to preserve views / preserve water view corridors
 - Keep the essence of a town that is on the water
 - Maintain the topography going down the hill
 - Provide a range of permitted choices and alternative receiving discretionary review by DRB

- Thematic unity along Harris – significant extension of the historic district
- Views from the water and the boardwalk
- Additional comments:
 - #1, 4, and 7 are good examples

4. Do you think the “Influence” area should be subject to design review?

- The majority of the respondents felt that this area **should be** subject to design review.
 - For major features – entries, primary pedestrian locations, signage, roof lines, access points, and windows
 - Need criteria that addresses location / heights adjusted to fit hills

5. Do you think the “Influence” area should have a different type of review than the “Core Historic District”?

- The majority of the respondents felt that this area **should not** have a different type of review.
- Some respondents felt the review process should be the same, but maybe less stringent in what is allowed, less overall design control
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Allow mid-century modern designs
 - Create a unified development ordinance for the entire UVP boundary
 - Divide “influence” area between urban section near the “core” and the working section – consider appropriate design and scale
 - Expand the “core” and “influence” areas around the center
 - Keep attractive, safe and accessible
 - Keep with the design of the “core” area
 - Make a pleasant transition from the Core Historic District
 - Make it human-scale, bike-friendly and encouraging to the community
 - Maintain waterfront view
 - Retain some structure from the 40’s and 50’s era

Approach Area

1. What features, forms and materials do you think work best for new construction in the “Approach” area?

- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **features** for this area include:
 - Good landscaping – more trees / plantings
 - Large open spaces
 - Window proportions on 1st-story retail
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **forms** for this area include:
 - Industrial designs
 - Let industrial buildings appear as such
 - Long warehouses on fish processing piers
 - Shabby old buildings (VW Mechanic’s shop)
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **materials** for this area include:
 - Brick / Historic look
 - Brick / Masonry
 - Historical materials that work well with type of industry at the Port

- Metal
- Wood
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - All areas should have same features, forms, and materials
 - Create pathways for pedestrians through nature areas
 - Figure out the use of “approach” area – industrial / light-manufacturing
 - Keep a working waterfront area
 - Off-site parking with weekend shuttle to “core”
 - Use all features of the “core”
- Additional comments:
 - Bus / Amtrak Station and the Ferry Cruise Terminal are good examples of what is wanted
 - Good public transport
 - Transition to more “white collar” buildings
 - Acceptable Pictures: #1-2, 7-8
 - #2 - Arches
 - #10 – Industrial roofs
 - Unacceptable Pictures:
 - #1 – “rustic” kind of marine feel does not work
 - #7 – “rustic” kind of marine feel does not work

2. What has not worked in the “Influence” area?

- Respondents felt that the following things have not worked in this area:
 - Blocking Harris view corridor at end (west)
 - Buildings that are taller than 5-stories
 - Chainlink fence
 - Lack of character and well-kept marine area
 - Lack of value along Harris
 - Large bulk buildings and warehouses
 - Most of the buildings in this area
 - No trees or foliage
 - No unification
 - Poor maintenance / no paint
 - Skateboard shop
 - Squared brick of the train station
 - Vacant lots
 - Wood-frame industrial buildings – reaching end of useful life
- Additional comments:
 - Design Review should follow
 - Encourage investments (south of McKenzie)
 - Impose height limits towards the waterfront
 - Keep light-industrial options open
 - Planning Department does not work
 - Prime location for redevelopment
 - Unacceptable Pictures:
 - #2 – windowless, decaying

- #3-6 – decaying
- #8 – needs landscaping, shed roof, overly modern
- #9-11
- #11 – metal warehouse, overly modern

3. Do you think the “Approach” area should be subject to design review?

- The majority of the respondents felt that this area **should be** subject to design review.
- Some respondents felt that it was necessary but would like the following considered:
 - Design standards should be somewhat relaxed
 - Not too strict
 - Only to provide suggestions for compatibility / articulation
 - Only for major elements – entries and pedestrian interface
 - Waterfront should have same regulations of the “core”

4. Should the review be different from the Core and National Historic District or “Influence” areas?

- Some respondents felt that this area **should not have** a different type of review.
 - The review criteria for the core should extend to the waterfront and include the docks.
 - Should not be as stringent.
- Some respondents felt that this area **should have** a different type of review.
 - Provide list of permitted palette and advise on all other components
 - Assure similarity of scale and use – not materials or looks
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Allow less historical influence – but keep in character with “core” and “influence” areas
 - Do not allow City Planner opinions
 - Emphasize pedestrian, bike and public-friendly transportation / mobility
 - Establish design guidelines – grant approval if they are met
 - Encourage dock and pier type development in industrial areas – mechanical and arch features
 - Encourage view toward the historical setting – DO NOT require it
 - Landscaping should be attractive
 - Most historical uses were oriented towards the waterfront industry – this should be maintained through code guidelines governing buildings
 - No neon signs, chain shops, or tacky stuff
 - Preserve the Native American historical uses focused on water access to “core” through beach access
 - Signage
 - Significant development should be added to “core” or subject to historic review
 - Under-ground power lines
 - View corridors down Harris should extend to water
 - Waterfront should include historical regulations related to water views and waterfront access

Comments

- A local historic district, if possible, would be a good step
- All three areas should have a historical area design code – the code must be clear and enforceable

- Angled parking does not work
- Avoid overcrowding (use setbacks) and monotony of street scape – work to achieve human-scale
- Buildings with brick and wood facades should be encouraged (concrete and stucco looks out of place)
- Consider building height minimums and maximums – also FAR
- Do not let parking / auto-centrism impinge on historic character
- Downtown Fairhaven has become a successful business area because of the core historic buildings
- Effort should be made to preserve the historic buildings
- Historical buildings and design review is what has made Fairhaven a commercial success for tourists
- “Influence” and “Approach” areas should be combined and have the same code
- Keep out cheap looking materials and franchise-based designs
- Maintain on-street parking – perhaps add adjacent parking outside the “core” area
- Maintaining the atmosphere is key to the continued prosperity of that area
- Need Design Review Board – maybe same one that does downtown
- Preserve current views and view corridors
- Possibly a point system to earn design requirements, like Santa Fe
- Sign regulations are good – nothing lighted or flashy / no electronic or moving signs
- The zoning should be divided:
 - One for the "core" – strict design review should be established
 - One for the “influence” area
 - One for multi-family and single-family

Fairhaven Design Review District Station 1: CORE HISTORIC DISTRICT AREA



"PRIMARY" HISTORIC BUILDINGS



"SECONDARY" HISTORIC BUILDINGS



RECENT CONSTRUCTION (design review by Historic Preservation Commission)



HISTORICAL REFERENCE (NO LONGER EXTANT)



RECENT CONSTRUCTION AND REMODELS (design review by Historic Preservation Commission)



Fairhaven Design Review District

Station 3: APPROACH AREA



EXISTING HISTORIC BUILDINGS



EXISTING AND RECENT CONSTRUCTION



HISTORICAL REFERENCE (MANY NO LONGER EXTANT)



Late 1890s: BIG Industry on north side of Harris, buildings on south side of Harris



Prime view by Sandison from the tower of the Fairhaven Hotel at 12th & Harris, circa 1918

EXHIBIT E

Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village Plan

Meeting #4: Public Realm – Transportation and Streetscapes

Exercise #1: Neighborhood Connections* Use maps and other resources to identify:

1. Identify the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections and crossings that are missing. Do you agree that the missing links below are the most important, or are there others? Consider the key pedestrian and bike routes to popular destinations (i.e. schools, grocery store, bus stop, etc.)

CROSSWALKS:

- Access to busiest spots (i.e. Haggens, Win's) should have more signage/control
- 10th and Mill by Village Green – very dangerous u turns on the curve; bikes blast through.
- Trail crossings at 4th and 6th Streets
- 4th Street at Donovan and Wilson to trail & 25 mph signing on 4th and traffic calming devices.
- Crosswalk at 10th and McKenzie across truck route (note: opposed by Public Works as would create unsafe condition due to curve and downhill speeds)
- Crosswalk at 12th and McKenzie not painted in.
- Improve cross-walk markings along 12th between Donovan and Mill
- Crosswalk 9th and Harris.
- Finnegan & Mill – need flashing pedestrian crossing – Alternative: Only 230 ft from 11th and Finnegan to Harris – don't need a pedestrian crossing there.

SIDEWALKS:

- Sidewalks on 11th between Douglas and Knox, 10th between Douglas and Taylor Dock, 11th & Finnegan intersection
- Sidewalk W side of 11th N of Mill
- Sidewalks needed south side of Harris from 4th to 9th
- Sidewalks down Harris too narrow – should be wide enough for couples to pass. Also no bikes on sidewalk.
- Sidewalk down south side of Harris between 9th and RR tracks
- Prefer no sidewalks on Wilson & Donovan and Cowgill
- Most sidewalks work well, but many are unlevel.
- Perhaps add sidewalks leaving town going north at least to Taylor Dock

TRAILS:

- More direct pedestrian path from 11th, across the dirt parking to 10th.
- Water Treatment plan lagoon trail – connecting across RR tracks to Marine Park. No safe way to cross.
- Establish walk/bike trail from 10th and Douglas (west of existing trail) to join Harris below 10th St.
- Trail from 4th to 10th too narrow for bikes & walkers to share comfortably and

safely (Noted multiple times)

BICYCLES:

- No good route northbound from the S. State/Boulevard fork to the bike/walk bridge at Wharf St. Bike ramp to the trail north of steps would do it.
- Bike lane N side of Harris from 10th to Marine Park – Alternative: Concern about eliminating parking on Harris for bike lanes
- Skateboard/bike lane down Harris

SIGNAGE:

- 25 mph signage and traffic calming devices along Cowgill Ave.

OTHER:

- Could better serve pedestrians with closed off streets – discussion of concerns re parking overflow – distance to walk compared to Bellis Fair Mall
- ROW between 12th and 13th on McKenzie should be returned (formerly vacated)
- Perfect: great suggestions
- ADA ramp from Harris to Village Green at A Lot of Flowers

2. Identify areas that feel safe or unsafe, and describe why. Consider lighting, crossings, blind spots, crime, loitering, graffiti, littering, lack of eyes on street, visibility, etc.

- 10th and Mill by Village Green – high car, bike and ped traffic circulate here. U-turns frequent - need lighting, signage and barriers. (Noted multiple times)
- Intersection of Finnegan, 12th and Mill- especially turning onto Mill from the North. Confusing and unsafe. (Noted multiple times)
- Ped safety issue at SW corner of 12th and Donovan – new curb needs yellow paint – trip hazard.
- Berm at Donovan and 10th is unsafe due to loitering and littering by transients/homeless. Widen path, increase police patrol and lighting.
- Unsafe bathrooms next to Village Green – too dark.
- Unsafe behind Morgan Blk east of Skylark's – street people hang out.
- Unsafe blind crossing at corner of north west side of Village Green and 10th.
- From 9th East on Harris – well lit and populated at night – lots of kids.
- Drinkers, smokers outside Fairhaven Martini Bar feels unsafe.
- Curve to 10th on Donovan – lighting not adequate for night walking.
- No continuous sidewalk between Larrabee and 11th.
- Harris between 12th and 10th is unsafe for bikes – angled parking, rough street surface. Possible solution: reopen 9th Street – Port staff disagrees
- McKenzie W. of 10th – solid wall – no eyes on street
- Crosswalk at Win's – poorly lit at night
- 6th and Harris, McKenzie W of 4th – problems with long-term overnight parking, no sanitary service, crime
- Larrabee E of 10th – jumble of street improvements
- Mid-block Harris between 10th and 11th – unsafe crossing

- Graffiti becoming a small issue – any city-wide effort to find the offenders or increase the penalty?
 - Future bus shelters could use a bit more thought about wet weather – visibility can be a conflict.
 - Cars speed down Harris – Flashing light? Slow sign?
3. Identify streetscape amenities that work and don't work and describe why. Consider signage, sidewalk/trail size, accessibility, furniture, street trees, bike racks, sandwich boards, lighting, etc.
- View corridors – require 100' ROW on McKenzie between 8th and 9th (formerly vacated)
 - Low lighting around lagoon for wildlife
 - Dark sky ordinance
 - Curb on Harris is 90 degrees – perhaps sloped would work better?
 - Banners – help ID the district
 - More trees – not too tall or too big of roots (urban species)
 - Hanging baskets, cobblestone alleys
 - Discussion of ped-only streets/malls – costs, parking, Granville Island, costs to business, one-way streets w/wider sidewalks? Monterey, Boulder both have examples of big investment and land cost to enable ped-only malls.
 - Allow sidewalk dining with clear passage on sidewalk
 - Cherry trees on 10th need to be trimmed
 - Outside seating area at Mill & Finnegan blocks driver's view of Finnegan – busy intersection
 - Sandwich boards blow around in big wind gusts
 - Signage to stop skateboards on sidewalks and down streets late at night
 - Clean sidewalks and maintain plantings where trees are located
 - Bike racks are best covered (like Tony's)
 - Provision for recyclables at garbage cans
 - Historic streetlamps do introduce glare because of low height (conflict with inadequate illumination of pavements)
 - Do not limit amenities to one type – variety makes Fairhaven unique.
 - Variety of design: it is great to have a variety of benches representing many eras. Do not need one uniform design.
 - Lighting, signs, etc. should respect the historic context, but should not imitate historic style. We should celebrate the historic resources we have and preserve them. But we should let new, exciting and creative amenities into the neighborhood to reside among the old.
 - More garbage cans – especially where leaving the District.
 - Sandwich boards take up space but appropriate to ambiance.

EXHIBIT F

FAIRHAVEN NEIGHBORHOOD AND URBAN VILLAGE PLAN

Meeting #5 – June 22, 2011

Exercise #2 - Homework: Public view corridors, height and bulk

Take the 3D Fairhaven Map on a walking field trip to understand the existing built environment in advance of the next session.

1. Identify key public view corridors on the map and describe them below.

- Harris Avenue looking west to the bay
- 12th & Mill to the bay over top of Village Inn (diagonal view)
- NW corner of Village Inn between Village Inn and parking lot (no height limits on Port property down below)
- Looking south down 11th can see activity in core
- From 6th looking north to mountains
- Village Green to Taylor Dock
- West on McKenzie looking down 100' ROW
- Village Green framed by taller buildings and 10th St. buildings
- Continuity from Mill to Larrabee of roof heights – creates a sense of place
- Old Fairhaven Parkway light at 12th towards the bay
- Trek Video sunsets
- Library sunsets
- View corridors through Port property
- Ever street along 12th looking west
- Step down buildings to preserve water views from above
- Some corridors go both ways – up from water and down to water.
- Views from S. Hill, Bayside, Edgemoor
- Residential area of Donovan and 8th, 9th, and 10th, over Tennis Courts to Harris.
- Entry points including 12th St. Bridge looking north, Firehall Performing Arts Center at Harris, Condos at Larrabee and 11th
- Douglas & 11th
- View preservation vs. private property
- View of working waterfront and railroad
- Views of buildings
- From transportation terminal east to Chuckanut Mt.
- From water (ferry, boat, train) to Fairhaven
- Mid-block view corridor north of Fairhaven Pharmacy – see the top of Pythias Building.
- Harris to the west – step down to enticing commercial/retail – possibly town houses behind to south of Harris.
- Mill out to water and Lummi Island, also down Mill across industrial to water.
- Views from water east/up.
- From “crest” at 12 and 13th out.
- Donovan west.

- Harris down to water.
- McKenzie Avenue
- 6th north to water.

2. Look at the building heights as marked on the map and notice how the heights change from block to block, and how the topography works with the buildings. Notice building bulk, setbacks, entry accessibility, and how the buildings relate to the street.

- Harris Square is not a nice gradual step down to water.
- Natural relief drops 25'+, natural step down of buildings as move down the street.
- Underground parking and new residents add to vibrancy
- Most buildings not set back, entries accessible
- Buildings to sidewalk give urban feel, welcoming streetscape
- Mid-block breaks, 12th and 13th at Mill and Harris – great idea to plan development together of this area. Building to Sycamore Square height would provide an entryway to Fairhaven
- Harris Square – if it bumped back at 35' wouldn't look so massive.
- Windows that are arched and narrow make a huge difference in building appearance (Harris Square windows are like postage stamps)
- Form-based development can require buildings be set back at certain heights
- Current plan calls for step down to waterfront
- Ensure setbacks are adequate for sidewalk use
- Sidewalks need to be created for ped access to parking lots
- Mid block view corridor should be added at Mill between 10th and 11th – Jacaranda site. If Harris Sq. had allowed a view corridor...
- Cost of a million views and great architecture? Where units to go if units can't be built here? Urban space is for urban uses. Think about what is lost to create view corridors.
- Fairhaven has small blocks 200'X200' plus 80' ROW. Mid-block view corridors don't make sense. City ROW enough for big wide sidewalks. Unrealistic and unfair to require them as the area is already very limited.
- No land or money for massive parking structures.
- Fairhaven is an urban village, not a downtown. Draws tourists – that is the village quality. Hills, water, curved windows, ambiance. They won't come to see buildings, they come for the feeling we have here, a feeling we need to maintain.
- Harris Square and building south – accommodate a lot of house – do we want to do that? Fairhaven's identity crisis is a struggle between village ambiance and accommodating housing units.
- 84' Chuckanut Square building – creates shade and has setback for open space.
- Key is sustainable development, not maximum profit.
- Urban special analysis includes paths, nodes, landmarks, entry corridors, edges, and texture – as well as views. Plan and guidelines should reflect what is desired for all these elements.
- Blocks platted without alleys was a mistake of history.

- Vision of Fairhaven down to the sea – no height limits in industrial area – needs more comprehensive thinking.
- Mid-block corridors are not just for views – they are very attractive, popular spaces (i.e. Skylark’s cobblestone alley).
- Noted the evolution and economic vitality it took to get here. Tenants and property owners need to make a living – price of development plus land cost. Must ask does the plan and standards make economic sense? They must to succeed.
- Live in White Rock, save \$30 on gas, spend it on dinner. Keep this idea!
- North, east and west from Trek Video – 55 ft with articulation
- Haskell property – expand to include commercial/retail/residential – add tourist draw to that area.
- Harris Square clearly creates shadow, wind tunnels – too bulky, high and no “thru” visual to west or south.
- Stair step on Fairhaven Gardens at Mill and 12th works well.
- Whole “blocks” w/o green or visual is less good.
- Maintain stair step down to water.
- What has “worked” in Fairhaven is some sense of variation, areas can wander thru. Very popular walkway thru Skylark’s.
- Evening on the Harris Ave profile what a mistake it was for the City to allow the height of Harris Sq. and McKenzie Sq. Height does not flow down the hill, and bulk and lack of design is an anathema to the beauty of the village.
- Likes buildings set close to sidewalk.
- Chuckanut Square: too tall, ugly, incompatible style (i.e. “communist bloc.” Does have attractive landscape and entrance is well setback from the street.
- Waldron Bldg: Good maximum height. Good maximum bulk – does not dominate block.
- Sycamore Square: Like this building height and bulk – adequate sidewalks and trees.
- Key Bank – poor style, sits in a hole. Poor landscaping and accessibility.
- Condo at Mill & 13th – good height and bulk for its location at the top of the hill.
- Fairhaven Gardens – building conforms well to the site in that it steps down from high to lower location.