City of Bellingham
Committee Of The Whole Agenda
May 7, 2018, 2:00 PM

Mayor Kelli Linville
Council Members April Barker, Gene Knutson, Daniel Hammill, Pinky Vargas, Terry Bornemann, Michael Lilliquist and Roxanne Murphy

Contact: (360) 778-8200, ccmail@cob.org
www.cob.org/council

All meetings are held in the City Hall Council Chambers at 210 Lottie Street, Bellingham, WA, unless otherwise noted.

Call to Order

Council Standing Committee Meetings:
Open to the public to attend. Note: there is generally no public comment period for Committee sessions. Standing Committee Members receive reports and information, ask questions and, when appropriate, vote on a recommended action for consideration by the full Council at the Regular Meeting. The notice of Committee Meetings identified below also serves as notice of Special Meetings of the City Council at the times identified as Council Members who are not members of the committee routinely attend and participate in the Committee Meetings. Committee Chairs give a report of the Committee Meeting at the Regular Meeting in the evening prior to deliberation and formal vote in the order shown below:

Committee Of The Whole
Roxanne Murphy, Chair
April Barker; Gene Knutson; Daniel Hammill; Pinky Vargas; Terry Bornemann; Michael Lilliquist

21946 1. 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan Adoption  p. 3

21947 2. Bellingham Home Fund Levy  p. 94

21905 3. A Resolution to Implement the Climate Protection Action Plan 2017 Update, Aim for 100% Renewable Energy Goals, and Create a Climate Action Plan Task Force  p. 106

21922 4. Consideration of Revisions to Bellingham’s Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations  p. 122

5. Approval of City Council Committee and/or Special Meeting Minutes

6. Old/New Business

Adjournment

Agenda Information:
Council Committee and Regular Meeting agendas and agenda packets, which contain the supporting documentation for agenda items, are available to the public Wednesday afternoon prior to the meeting. They are posted at https://meetings.cob.org/. Meetings are streamed live on the internet as they occur.

Accessibility:
The Council Chambers is fully accessible. Elevator access to the second floor is available at City Hall’s west entrance. Hearing assistance is available and a receiver may be checked out through the clerk prior to the evening session. For additional accommodations, contact the Legislative Assistant at 778-8200 in advance of the meeting. Thank you.

Next City Council Committee Meetings
Monday, May 21, 2018

Deadline to submit material for any public hearing for inclusion in the published agenda packet is 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday prior to the meeting.
Subject: 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan Adoption

Summary Statement: The Consolidated Plan is required by HUD to guide the planning of projects and programs funded by the federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME). Planning for allocation of current and future Housing Levy-funded and General Fund projects and programs is integrated into the process. Staff will present public comments received on the draft plan and the proposed plan for HUD submittal.


Fiscal Impact: Assumptions for 5 year period of Consolidated Plan: CDBG: $ 4,455,900 ; HOME: $ 2,498,790; General Fund: $ 2,500,000 ; Levy: $ 18,600,000

Funding Source: Federal HOME and CDBG; Local General Fund and Home Fund (Housing Levy)

Attachments: 1. STAFF MEMO
2. CON PLAN RESOLUTION
3. CONSOLIDATED PLAN

Meeting Activity | Meeting Date | Recommendation | Presented By | Time
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Committee Briefing - Vote Requested | 05/07/2018 | Pass Resolution | Samya Lutz, Planning and Community Development | 15 minutes

Recommended Motion: 

Council Committee: Committee Of The Whole

Agenda Bill Contact: Samya Lutz, Planning and Community Development, 360-778-8300

Reviewed By | Department | Date
--- | --- | ---
Rick M. Sepker | Planning & Community Development | 04/30/2018

Council Action:

Alan A. Marriner | Legal | 04/30/2018
Kelli J. Linville | Executive | 05/01/2018
MEMORANDUM

TO: CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
   MAYOR KELLI LINVILLE
FROM: SAMYA LUTZ, HOUSING AND SERVICES PROGRAM MANAGER
SUBJECT: CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADOPTION
DATE: APRIL 20, 2018

On March 26th, staff presented and discussed with Council the Community Solutions Workgroup – Continuum of Housing recommendations, and the Consolidated Plan strategies and process. Since that time, the public has submitted comments on the draft Consolidated Plan, an Open House was held for discussion of the plan with the public, and the draft plan has been amended accordingly.

As a reminder, every five years, as a condition of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funding from the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the City must develop and adopt a Consolidated Plan. The last plan was adopted in 2012 and covers the period through June 30, 2018. The next plan must be adopted in May of 2018 for the period of July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2023 (the 2018 through 2022 Action Plan years).

The Consolidated Plan has been drafted by staff, incorporating substantial public input in accordance with the Community Participation Plan (available on the City’s website here: https://www.cob.org/Documents/planning/community-development/consolidated-plan/consolidated-plan-ppp.pdf). The Community Development Advisory Board (CDAB) has assisted with the development and review of the Consolidated Plan, and recommended approval of the plan by the Council and Mayor at their April 19 meeting. The plan can be found on the City website here: www.cob.org/cpupdate and is included in your packet. It contains an appendix with public comments received.

A draft resolution accompanies this packet, and staff seeks a recommendation of approval. Please contact me with any questions or concerns at 360-778-8385.
RESOLUTION NO. __________


WHEREAS, the City of Bellingham receives annual block grants from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for community development and affordable housing needs;

WHEREAS, every five years, as a condition of receiving this federal financial assistance, HUD requires the City to prepare a "Consolidated Plan" following HUD's required elements and template;

WHEREAS, each year, as a condition of receiving this federal financial assistance, HUD requires the City to prepare an annual "Action Plan" following HUD's required elements and template;

WHEREAS, the City's Housing and Services program includes additional funding dedicated to low-income housing approved by voters, known as the "2012 Housing Levy" or "Home Fund";

WHEREAS, the City also contributes other City general funds for services and activities that benefit low-income persons;

WHEREAS, the Consolidated Plan and annual Action Plan is the community's choice, within the parameters of these various programs, for how the funds will be used in the community;

WHEREAS, the Consolidated Plan and annual Action Plan incorporate information gathered through the Assessment of Fair Housing process;

WHEREAS, preparation of the Consolidated Plan and annual Action Plan requires citizen involvement prior to action, and the City undertook extensive outreach to agencies and the public, including surveys, stakeholder group discussions, Community Development Advisory Board meetings, an open house,
and a public hearing, all in accordance with the “City of Bellingham 2018-2023 Consolidated Plan and Assessment of Fair Housing Community Participation Plan”;

WHEREAS, after holding a public hearing on March 8, 2018, and considering comments from a comment period open through April 10, 2018, the Community Development Advisory Board recommended on April 19, 2018, that the Mayor and City Council adopt the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan, including the 2018 Action Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the best interests of the citizens of Bellingham will be served by submitting the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan, including the 2018 Action Plan, to HUD.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM:

THAT the Mayor is authorized to submit the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan, including the 2018 Action Plan, to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and to commit the City of Bellingham to all certifications and assurances contained therein; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor is authorized to contract with agencies to carry out the activities to low income residents of Bellingham as set forth in the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan, including the 2018 Action Plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the 2018 Action Plan component of the Consolidated Plan shall be substantially consistent with the funding distribution shown in Exhibit A, 2018 Action Plan Budget Summary, attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the 2018 Rental Assistance and Services allocation, which is a component of the 2018 Action Plan Budget Summary, shall be substantially consistent with the funding distribution shown in Exhibit B, attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that upon acceptance of this plan and budget by HUD, the Mayor is hereby designated as the representative of the City who is authorized to enter into grant agreements for financial assistance from HUD; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Mayor is authorized to perform all duties and execute all documents and do all other things required to be done in order to obtain payment of the grants authorized herein.
PASSED by the COUNCIL this _______day of ________________2018:

_____________________
Council President

APPROVED by me this _______day of ________________2018:

_____________________
Mayor

Attest: ______________________
Finance Director

Approved as to Form:

___________________________
Office of City Attorney
### RESOURCES ANTICIPATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Grant/Allocation</td>
<td>$785,545</td>
<td>$537,364</td>
<td>$342,486</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,665,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income (Loan Paybacks)</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 FY Program Income Anticipated</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 FY Program Income Unspent</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Uncommitted/Deobligated Funds</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING COMMITMENTS (AWARDS)</td>
<td>$385,747</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$181,274</td>
<td>$1,429,852</td>
<td>$2,291,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 HOUSING LEVY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levy Production &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,210,006</td>
<td>$1,210,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy RASS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$207,768</td>
<td>$207,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy Homebuyer</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy A &amp; O Fund</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy Admin</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$165,268</td>
<td>$165,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 FY Program Income Anticipated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Income Anticipated</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Council/NWYS - 22 North</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$193,383</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Place Gladstone - predevelopment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Promise Village - predevelopment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 Allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC Promise Village</td>
<td>$368,523</td>
<td>$1,035,006</td>
<td>$1,403,529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Housing Repair</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19 Emergency Repair</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHDO Set Aside (min. 15% of HOME Grant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC Promise Village</td>
<td>$80,605</td>
<td>$80,605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Production Program

**Previous (Unspent) Commitments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 City Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Manufactured Housing Repair</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 DVSA5 Baker Place Shelter Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$254,084</td>
<td>$254,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Opportunity Council G St Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>$417,950</td>
<td>$417,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Housing Repair</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19 Emergency Repair</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acquisition and Opportunity Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition and Opportunity Fund</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rental Assistance, Housing & Human Service Program

**Previous Commitments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 FY Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Based Rental Assistance (OC) - new contract</td>
<td>$142,500</td>
<td>$142,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Service Center Admin</td>
<td>$39,274</td>
<td>$46,533</td>
<td>$85,807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Homeless Connect</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Outreach Team</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Case Management</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter NOFA</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Project-Based Services (see Ex. B)</td>
<td>$397,832</td>
<td>$397,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Services (see Ex. B)</td>
<td>$119,895</td>
<td>$119,895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human &amp; Social Services (see Ex. B)</td>
<td>$454,255</td>
<td>$454,255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Facility Program

**Previous Commitments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Opportunity Council Cornwall Phase II</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Road Infrastructure (see homebuyer project below)</td>
<td>$315,747</td>
<td>$315,747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for the Challenged - DD Housing</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 Competitive NOFA Allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public/Special Needs/Community facilities</td>
<td>$463,337</td>
<td>$463,337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Homebuyer Program

**Previous Commitments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Finance Commission</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$259,767</td>
<td>$554,767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLCT Telegraph Rd (see public facilities above)</td>
<td>$4,253</td>
<td>$4,253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contingency Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOME - WSHFC, TBRA, Multifamily housing, CHDO operating</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG- Rehab program, Public Facilities</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Expenses</td>
<td>$199,109</td>
<td>$53,236</td>
<td>$165,268</td>
<td>$417,613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBRA Administration (contract)</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Assistance, Housing &amp; Human Service Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXHIBIT A

2018 ACTION PLAN SUMMARY
### 2018 RENTAL ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES

#### EXHIBIT B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commitments:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$181,274</td>
<td>$656,365</td>
<td>$837,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Services</td>
<td>$119,895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$191,268</td>
<td>$311,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human and Social Services</td>
<td>$45,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$312,486</td>
<td>$357,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-Based Rental Services</td>
<td>$142,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based Rent and Services</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

$165,149 $142,500 $23,760 $864,133 $1,695,542

#### 2018 PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>HOUSING LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rental Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commitments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 FY Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Program:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$142,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Housing Services** | | | | | |
| Existing Commitments: |  | | | | |
| Homeless Service Center Admin | | | $39,274 | $46,533 | $85,807 |
| **2017-18 Competitive NOFA Allocations (year 2):** | | | | | |
| Lydia Place - Ending Family Homelessness | | $22,095 | | $25,905 | $48,000 |
| Lydia Place - Transitional Housing | | | | $25,063 | $25,063 |
| OC - Housing Services | | $49,600 | | | $49,600 |
| CCS - Anti-victimization Re-housing Program | | | $49,600 | | $49,600 |
| NWYS - PAD Program | | $48,200 | | $0 | $48,200 |
| DVSAS - Safe Shelter | | | $29,700 | | $29,700 |
| NWYS - Transitional Living Program | | | $36,000 | | $36,000 |
| YWCA - Larrabee Residence | | | $25,000 | | $25,000 |
| Held for Emergency Shelter NOFA | | | $30,000 | | $30,000 |
| Homeless Outreach Team | | | $210,000 | | $210,000 |

| **Project-Based Rental Assistance & Housing Services** | | | | | |
| Existing Commitments: |  | | | | |
| 2013-18 Francis Place Housing Services | | | $187,918 | | $187,918 |
| 2013-18 Greggie's House Housing Services | | | $67,914 | | $67,914 |
| Opportunity Council / NWYS 22 North Housing Services (begins 2018) | | | $142,000 | | $142,000 |

| **Human & Social Services** | | | | | |
| Existing Commitments: |  | | | | |
| Intensive Case Management / GRACE | | | $140,000 | | $140,000 |
| 2018 Project Homeless Connect | | | $2,000 | | $2,000 |
| **2017-18 Competitive NOFA Allocations (year 2):** | | | | | |
| Lydia - Mental Health Counseling | | | $20,000 | | $20,000 |
| DVSAS - Help & Healing to Children of DV Victims | | | $21,350 | | $21,350 |
| BCEL - Childcare & Early Learning Services | | | $29,900 | | $29,900 |
| WCOA - Meals on Wheels Bellingham | | $30,000 | | $0 | $30,000 |
| OC - Volunteer Chore Program | | | $29,600 | | $29,600 |
| WLC - Gaining Jobs & Improving Self-Sufficiency Through Literacy | | | $12,490 | | $12,490 |
| BCFSC - Target Intensive Case Management | | $15,254 | | $14,746 | $30,000 |
| Rebound Roots | | | $30,000 | | $30,000 |
| BFB - Free Grocery Program | | | $26,800 | | $26,800 |
| MNW - Farm Worker & Senior Support Services | | | $19,300 | | $19,300 |
| OC - Maple Alley Inn | | | $22,100 | | $22,100 |
| NWYS - Teen Court | | | $24,300 | | $24,300 |
| WDRS - Parent / Teen Mediation | | | $15,000 | | $15,000 |
| NWYS - Vocational Readiness Program | | $25,900 | | | $25,900 |
| SHH - Residential Services for Adults Living with AIDS | | | $13,000 | | $13,000 |
| LAW - Residential Disability Benefits Project | | | $8,000 | | $8,000 |

**TOTAL ALLOCATIONS**

$165,149 $142,500 $23,760 $864,133 $1,695,542

**BALANCE:**

- $ - $ - $ - $ - $ -
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This is a public summary version of the Bellingham Consolidated Plan for review and comment. The full version of the Consolidated Plan that will be submitted to HUD is available in the same locations as this version, mirroring as closely as possible what would be submitted digitally to HUD through their IDIS. Please contact Kate Bartholomew, Department of Planning & Community Development, at kebartholomew@cob.org with any questions or comments, or visit www.cob.org/cpupdate.
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A Note about Data Sources

The City of Bellingham receives federal funds through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD provides a certain amount of default data for use in the development of the Consolidated Plan. Most of the data tables supplied by HUD are from the 2009-2013 American Community Survey (ACS). Wherever possible the data from these tables was updated or supplemented to reflect the most accurate and timely data available, which includes the following sources:

- **US Census**: The Census is the most statistically accurate source of data for the jurisdiction, but as we approach the end of a decade, most of the 2010 Census data is now outdated. 2000 and 2010 data are used throughout this report as a benchmark to compare changes and analyze longer term trends. All Census data is available to the public at: [https://factfinder.census.gov](https://factfinder.census.gov).

- **American Community Survey (ACS)**: This survey is a sample meant to provide more timely estimates between decennial Censuses. The ACS is available in 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year averages. Because the 1- and 3-year estimates have a high margin of error, the most recent 5-year estimates are used as a default for all calculations, unless otherwise specified. The most recent 5-year ACS available is the 2012-2016 estimate. All ACS data is available to the public at: [https://factfinder.census.gov](https://factfinder.census.gov).

- **Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)**: HUD commissioned the Census Bureau for special data tabulations that address housing and community development needs for low income households. CHAS data is based on the 2010-2014 ACS 5-year estimate, and can be accessed at: [https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html#2006-2014](https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html#2006-2014).

- **Enterprise Community Partners – Opportunity360 Reports**: Enterprise Community Partners is a non-profit housing and community development organization, which also engages in policy and advocacy to benefit low-income communities. They developed the Opportunity360 tool to help inform local decision-making by providing an analysis of “opportunity indicators” at the Census Tract level. Having scores on a variety of indicators that affect opportunity is a helpful way to make comparisons within the jurisdiction and region. Their reports were used to analyze differences between neighborhoods within Bellingham. More information is available at: [https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/opportunity360](https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/opportunity360).

- **Housing and Service Providers**: The City of Bellingham works with and provides funding to many community partners that provide affordable housing and critical human services. Housing inventory information was compiled from various sources, and is only accurate as of the date the information was provided. Statistics, analyses, and anecdotal evidence about trends and needs was also solicited from knowledgeable partners, especially the Bellingham/Whatcom County Housing Authority, the Opportunity Council/Homeless Service Center, Catholic Housing Services, and the Northwest Regional Council.
Executive Summary

Bellingham, like the entire Western Washington region, has seen population growth and increased housing costs over the past five years. As a result, there are not enough affordable rental units or homes to purchase for low- and moderate-income residents. This is primarily a function of the fact that rents and home values have risen much faster than wages in recent years, and new construction has not caught up with population growth. As a result, almost 43% of households in Bellingham pay more than 30% of their income for housing. This rate is higher than both the state and US averages for cost burden.

Affordable housing and human services are broadly needed. Certain groups are especially underserved at this time, including:

- People who are dealing with disability, mental health, or addiction issues
- Homeless single adults
- Single-parent households
- Elderly homeowners

A lack of affordable housing contributes to the rise in homelessness because it makes it even more difficult for low-income residents to save enough money to avoid eviction or foreclosure in the event of unforeseen expenses. Bellingham’s homeless population has increased by 50% over the last five years to a total of 742 homeless individuals on a given night in 2017. Approximately 40% of this population is unsheltered at a point in time.

Family poverty has remained steady since the previous Consolidated Plan. Our analysis reveals that poverty is especially concentrated in a handful of neighborhoods, which also generally correspond to those with the highest minority (non-white) populations. We also see that minority households at some income levels are disproportionately cost burdened when compared to the general population.

The population of Bellingham is young and well-educated, but the senior population is growing and is expected to become a higher proportion of the population over time. This will present challenges for meeting housing and care needs for the elderly in the future, but will also present new economic opportunities.

The community has many diverse needs, and the City cannot address all of them with our limited resources. After a robust community participation process, the City has selected the following goals:

- Increase affordable housing supply
- Address and prevent homelessness
- Preserve existing housing
- Promote neighborhood equity
- Coordinate effective delivery of services

The City has prioritized actions accordingly to meet each of the above goals, which are detailed in the Strategic Plan section. While all actions are priorities over the next five years, the City has developed a tiered system to highlight the most urgent needs within the community, as well as a way to depict those priority
actions in which our partners take a lead role (with the City playing a strategic supporting role). This is done also due to the uncertainty of funding over this five-year period, as a way to simply depict how the City will handle various funding scenarios. The Tier 1, 2, and priorities with the city’s partners as the lead are shown in the chart that follows.
Figure 1. 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan Priorities

**CITY AS LEAD**

**Tier 1**

- Support the acquisition and development of additional housing units affordable for low-income residents.
- Increase the City’s proactive role in affordable housing development.
- Support the development of emergency shelter in a safe, permanent location.
- Offer rental assistance for vulnerable households, prioritizing homeless families and adults, elderly, and severely cost burdened families with young children.
- Support programs to prevent chronic homelessness through intervention services like diversion and light-touch case management.
- Offer home rehabilitation loans with favorable terms for low income homeowners – especially for those who are elderly & disabled, or for those who will offer elderly or disabled care in adult family homes.
- Allow for infill, multifamily, and group housing in more neighborhoods.

**Tier 2**

- Conduct a housing equity audit by neighborhood.
- Address community and public infrastructure needs in underserved neighborhoods, and/or for the benefit of special needs populations.
- Involve partner agencies, tenants, landlords, and the broader community in education and advocacy efforts involving homelessness, fair housing, cost burdened households, and neighborhood equity. Coordinate local strategies to assist those experiencing and at risk of homelessness.
- Raise awareness with upstream funding and finance agencies about local needs and priorities.
- Support owners of rental housing that offer units to residents who pay some or all of their rent with a voucher/subsidy by pursuing a rehabilitation loan program that offers favorable terms or a damage mitigation fund for owners who rent to these households.
- Improve disaster preparedness and response efforts, particularly for special needs populations.
- Support homeownership and down payment assistance for low to moderate income households, especially for minority households and households with young children.

**PARTNERS AS LEAD**

- Support intensive case management for those experiencing chronic homelessness.
- Support social inclusion programs for those reentering housing from homelessness.
- Support additional services for those experiencing unsheltered homelessness like storage and sanitation facilities.
- Support the expansion of affordable childcare opportunities.
- Support the coordination and expansion of mobile health and peer health services that serve special needs populations.
- Address the “benefits cliff”: pursue opportunities to ease the transition off housing assistance to encourage more households using assistance to embrace upward mobility.
- Prioritize housing and services to special needs populations: elderly, families with young children, developmentally disabled, victims of DV, homeless, or with behavioral or physical health issues.
- Support local economic development: especially job training for those who are exiting homelessness, and microenterprise development.
Public Participation

City staff engaged in a robust public participation preprocess beginning in spring 2017, and which included the Assessment of Fair Housing that was accepted by HUD in December 2017. The complete Community Participation Plan is available at: https://www.cob.org/Documents/planning/community-development/consolidated-plan/consolidated-plan-ppp.pdf. The main components of the community participation process were:

- Consultation with the Community Development Advisory Board
- Regular email communication with a stakeholder list of 170 community organizations
- Online and printed surveys targeting the general public, low-income residents, and local service agencies
- A Community Solutions Workgroup on the continuum of housing
- A service provider workgroup focused on homeless housing and service needs
- An interactive exhibit during Bellingham Housing Week (Nov 6-9, 2017)
- Social media posts
- In-person meetings with community groups, committees, and commissions upon request
- Public hearing on March 8, 2018
- A 30-day public comment period (from March 9-April 10, 2018)
- An open house to present the draft plan to the public on March 26, 2018
- City Council updates and deliberations

Every effort was made to solicit public feedback from the greatest diversity of community members possible through a variety of different strategies. This included translation of surveys and promotional materials into Spanish, targeting disabled residents, coordinating with public housing resident councils, and hand delivering printed surveys, postcards and fliers to places that provide services to low-income residents, such as Unity Care Northwest, Walton Place, Goodwill, Opportunity Council, and Francis Place. Every neighborhood was contacted by email and through the Mayor’s Neighborhood Advisory Commission. Throughout the process, public comments were received in the form of survey responses, letters, emails, verbal comments in public hearings and meetings, and social media posts. All public comments were compiled, summarized, and reported to City Council and the Community Development Advisory Board. See Appendix 1 for all written comments submitted during the formal comment period. Several citizens wrote to express their general support for the Consolidated Plan as written, and appreciation for the community engagement process. The other main themes of comments and suggestions received were:

Housing affordability and zoning:

- The need for more housing units in general, and support for the City taking a more active role in the development of affordable multi-family housing.
- Both support for and opposition to more density and infill development in single-family neighborhoods, including accessory dwelling units.
• The difficulty of finding affordable housing in general, and concern with elderly residents being “priced out” of their homes through high property taxes.
• Expansion of the Urban Growth Area, while protecting sensitive environmental areas and greenspace within city limits.
• The need for building capacity of Community Housing Development Organizations through operational support.

Homelessness and human services:
• The need for more low-barrier housing and services for those experiencing homelessness (shelter, transitional, and permanent housing with supportive services), especially for single adults without children.
• Support for programs that build self-sufficiency and self-respect, including providing jobs for people experiencing homelessness.

Neighborhood equity and public facilities:
• Insuring equal access to parks and greenways throughout the City.
• The need for more specific goals to promote racial equality, including equity training for all employees who deal with housing.
• The need for additional day facilities for special needs populations such as those with developmental disabilities, seniors with dementia, and those experiencing homelessness.
• The need for community gathering spaces and an affordable grocery store in the Birchwood neighborhood.
• The need for facility improvements and additional funding to cover operating costs at the Bellingham Senior Activity Center.

Community Solutions Workgroup
A major contribution to the priorities reflected within our Strategic Plan came from the formal recommendations of the Community Solutions Workgroup. Mayor Kelli Linville, Councilmember April Barker, and Councilmember Dan Hammill convened a Workgroup on the “Continuum of Housing and Service Needs” beginning in July 2017 and meeting monthly through October 2017. Community members on the board represented the following local stakeholder agencies:
• Bellingham/Whatcom County Housing Authority
• Community Development Advisory Board members
• Domestic Violence Sexual Assault Services
• Downtown Bellingham Partnership
• Lighthouse Mission Ministries
• Lydia Place
• Northwest Youth Services
• Opportunity Council
• PeaceHealth
• Philanthropic community: Chuckanut Health Foundation
• Pioneer Human Services
• Public housing resident/Housing advocate
• Whatcom County Health Department

The group was asked to identify key issues, and recommend strategies, actions, and solutions to address homelessness and the continuum of housing and service needs in Bellingham. Over the course of four meetings, the group identified a number of gaps and prioritized strategies to address them. All Workgroup materials, including meeting agendas, presentations, and the final Report of Recommendations can be found at: https://www.cob.org/gov/public/bc/Pages/Community-Solutions-Workgroups.aspx.

Consolidated Plan survey results

In addition to the Community Solutions Workgroup and Assessment of Fair Housing survey, the City launched a Consolidated Plan survey. The survey was designed to gather information about priorities from low-income residents who receive housing assistance, staff working at agencies that provide housing or other services to low-income residents, and the general public. The survey was open from November 5, 2017 until February 5, 2018, and there were a total of 865 participants. Figure 2 shows the distribution of survey responses by group. A detailed summary of the survey results can be found online at: https://www.cob.org/Documents/planning/community-development/consolidated-plan/consolidated-plan-survey.pdf.

![Figure 2. Consolidated Plan survey respondents](image)

*Note that those who did not answer demographics questions were included in the “general public” group.

The survey asked participants to rank issues related to affordable housing, homelessness, human services, and community development from highest to lowest by priority, and to select their top two or three priorities from a range of options which are permissible under HUD and local funding guidelines.

The top three problems related to affordable housing identified by all three groups were:
• Rents have increased too much (38%)
• Most of the jobs here don’t pay enough to afford housing costs (38%)
• Low-income and working families can no longer afford to live here (37%)

Many aspects of the Consolidated Plan survey reflect the priorities that were recommended by the Community Solutions Workgroup. The top solution that the general public, agency staff, and low-income residents thought the City should prioritize is to build or purchase more housing to be reserved for low- or mixed-income residents (prioritized by 51% of all respondents). The second highest priority given by the general public and low-income residents was to recruit companies that will bring higher wage jobs to town (40% and 42%, respectively). Among agency staff, the second highest priority was to change zoning to allow multi-family buildings in more neighborhoods (36%).

There was significant variation in opinions about homeless housing programs. The top program selected by the general public was transitional housing (46%) followed by emergency shelter (32%) and single-room occupancy housing (28%). Meanwhile, among staff who work for a human service or housing agency, the top priority by far was permanent supportive housing (53%), followed by transitional housing (29%) and single-room occupancy housing (26%). About 4% of respondents said the City should not provide any homeless housing programs or services.

There was much greater agreement among the community about what types human services the City should prioritize. The top service need chosen by each group was mental and behavioral health services, followed by housing support services and affordable childcare. There were some minor differences between groups: a greater proportion of low-income residents prioritized legal and/or mediation assistance compared to the general public, while the general public prioritized job training more highly than both other groups.

![Figure 3: What type of services should the City prioritize for funding?](image)

Participants were also asked to select three special needs populations which they think should receive more help. The top three populations prioritized by all groups were people with mental illness (49%), families with
children or single parents (48%), and people experiencing homelessness (43%). These special needs populations align closely with the human services that survey respondents prioritized.
Community Profile

Demographics

The population of Bellingham estimate was 86,720 as of April 1, 2017. The entire Western Washington region has been experiencing steady population and economic growth since the previous Consolidated Plan period. Both Whatcom County and Bellingham’s populations have grown, but at a rate that is slightly below the state’s average. Since 2010 the population of Washington State has grown by 8.7%. Of the 39 counties in the state Whatcom County was 11th in terms of population growth, with its population growing by 7.5% since 2010. Compared to both the state and the county, Bellingham as a city has seen slightly lower than average population growth, for a total increase of 7.2%. As Figure 4 shows, the annual growth rate jumped above state average in 2013 and 2017, and was below state average in all other years. Smaller cities in Whatcom County have seen much faster growth in recent years compared to Bellingham. Lynden has grown by 14% since 2010, and nearby Ferndale has grown by 18%.

Bellingham’s housing shortage is sometimes attributed to a high number of students and retirees. In fact, Bellingham has a college-age population that is larger than average, but has an average-sized senior population. In both Washington State and the US as a whole, people age 20-24 make up about 7% of the population. As a college town, 18% of Bellingham’s population is 20-24 years of age. However, the student-age population has not risen significantly in recent years. This portion of the population has remained consistently around 18% since 2000, before housing prices began to climb dramatically.

1 Washington Office of Financial Management. Available at: https://ofm.wa.gov/washington-data-research/population-demographics/population-estimates/april-1-official-population-estimates. Note that other total population estimates are used throughout this report, depending on the year of the data source in use.

2 Of course, not everyone age 20-24 is a college student, and some undergraduate and graduate students fall outside that age range. Academic year 2016-17 average enrollment at Western Washington University was 12,795 full-time students (or about 15% of the population). Enrollment varies quarter by quarter for all institutions, but we estimate around 21,000 people (or about 24% of the population) attend a community college, technical college, or university in Bellingham during the year – this includes part-time students and professional or continuing education students.
On the other hand, the senior population in the city has risen since the last Census—but it is still not above the national or state average. People age 65+ make up 14% of Bellingham’s population, the same as Washington State as a whole. This is just slightly lower than the US average of 14.5%. However, there are significantly fewer people in the 45 to 64 age group. Figure 5 shows how Bellingham’s population by age group compares to the US population.

![Figure 5. Population by age group in United States and Bellingham](image)

Bellingham also differs from the state and nation in that our non-White population is lower than average. Although the city is gradually becoming more diverse, Table 1 shows that Bellingham remains a majority White community with the following racial and ethnic composition:

**Table 1. Bellingham’s population by race and ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Percent of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic and no other race)</td>
<td>69,938</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>6,912</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2012-2016 ACS

3 2012-2016 American Community Survey (ACS)
Population growth and housing demand

The composition of Bellingham’s population today is not well matched to our existing housing stock. Of all the housing units in Bellingham, 46% have three or more bedrooms, while the average number of people per housing unit is 2.17. The average family size and number of persons per household has steadily declined over time⁴, and therefore has increased demand for smaller units like one-bedroom and studio apartments. Today only 16% of housing units have one bedroom. Coupled with the slowdown in housing production that has not kept pace with population growth in general, this has resulted in a very low rental vacancy rate (estimated at 1.79%) and rapidly rising rents.

![Figure 6. New residential units permitted and population growth in Bellingham](image)

Data source: City of Bellingham (residential permits); WA Department of Commerce, April 1 population estimates

Even as population growth continued, the development of new housing units slowed significantly between 2007 and 2013 during the Great Recession, as shown in Figure 6. While the production of new units has accelerated since 2013, this has not yet alleviated preexisting demand or affordability challenges. For example, the population has risen by 3,140 since 2015 to a total of 86,720 residents. Meanwhile, there were 1,267 new units permitted in 2015 and 2016 combined. As Table 2 shows, using the average persons per household for multifamily and single family units, we can estimate there are enough housing units available to accommodate 2,633 new residents, a shortage of 507 housing units. This estimate does not take into consideration any preexisting housing shortage and reflects only the shortage for that two-year period.

---

Table 2. Population growth and new housing units from 2015 to 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 2015 population estimate</td>
<td>83,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 2017 population estimate</td>
<td>86,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Population change (b - a)</td>
<td>+3,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Total multifamily residential units permitted in 2015-2016</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Total single family residential units permitted in 2015-2016</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Average persons per multifamily unit</td>
<td>1.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Average persons per single family unit</td>
<td>2.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Estimated # of people housed in new multifamily units (d x f)</td>
<td>1,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Estimated # of people housed in new single family units (e x g)</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Total estimated number of additional people housed (h + i)</td>
<td>2,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Estimated 2-year housing shortage (j - c)</td>
<td>-507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response, this demand has encouraged developers to build more units. Much of Bellingham’s total land area (42%) is zoned as single-family residential, compared to 14% that is zoned as multi-family residential. This puts constraints on what types of housing developments can be sited in which neighborhoods, concentrating lower-income families in neighborhoods with multi-family zoning where housing is more affordable. As demographics change, there is demand for a greater variety of housing options in more neighborhoods.

Incomes

In Bellingham, the median household income is $44,441, compared to $54,207 in Whatcom County. Both lag behind the state’s median household income of $62,848. Even so, Whatcom County and Bellingham have seen housing costs grow faster than incomes. According to the 2016 1-year ACS, the median household income in Bellingham has risen 46% from 2000 to 2016, while the median rent has risen 59%, and the median home value has risen 137%. Increases in Whatcom County have followed a similar trend, but are a bit less dramatic.

---

5 2012-2016 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates. Available at: https://factfinder.census.gov
6 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Whatcom County.
7 2000 Census (Base Year), 2016 ACS 1-year estimate (Most recent year).
Bellingham also has very high rates of poverty. Over 22% of individuals live below the Federal Poverty Level. This is almost ten percentage points higher than the Washington State poverty rate of 12.7%. It is important to note that the poverty rate is not equal across all racial or ethnic groups. For example, 44.9% of Native American or Alaska Natives in Bellingham live in poverty. This percentage is above the City’s average for all non-white groups. Non-married families with children are also more likely to live in poverty. Over 50% of single female households with children live below the poverty level. All of the poverty measurements described here are slightly higher than during the last Consolidated Plan period, showing that there has been no significant reduction in poverty in recent years.
Housing Market Assessment

Analysis of housing stock

As of January 2018, there were 38,228 housing units within Bellingham’s city limits. Roughly half were single-family or manufactured homes, and half were multi-family homes, such as apartments, townhomes, or condominiums.

Although multifamily housing is being added to the overall housing stock at a faster rate than single-family detached units, the largest proportion of housing units (49%) are still single-unit detached homes, according to Table 3. Altogether, multi-family units of all sizes make up 46% of housing units. Mobile homes, boats, RVs, and attached one-unit structures, such as mother-in-law units, make up the remaining units.

There are about 3,400 more renter-occupied than owner-occupied housing units in Bellingham. From 2012-2016, on average 45% of housing units were owned and 55% were rented. Compared to the last Consolidated Plan period, these percentages have changed very little. Smaller units such as studios and 1-bedrooms are more likely to be renter-occupied, whereas larger units (3 or more bedrooms) are more likely to be owner-occupied. Two-bedroom units are 40% renter-occupied and 28% owner-occupied.

Table 3. All residential properties by number of units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit detached structure</td>
<td>17,930</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached structure</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 units</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19 units</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,564</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2012-2016 ACS

Compare this housing stock to the average household size. In Bellingham, nearly 70% of residents are part of a one- or two-person household (each make up roughly 35% of all households). And while 69% of owner-occupied homes have three or more bedrooms, only 30% of all households have three or more people. Although the number of occupants per housing unit is slightly higher for owner-occupied households (2.44) than renter-occupied households (2.25), the fact that people today are not as likely to share housing with large families also helps explain the strong demand for smaller housing units.

---

8 Source: City of Bellingham Estimated Population and Housing Unit Model. Updated January 2018. Available at: www.cob.org/housingstats. Note that City of Bellingham estimates are slightly higher than the 2012-2016 ACS, because they represent a more recent count.

9 2016 ACS 5-year estimates. Tenure by Household Size (B25009).
### Condition of housing

Overall, the condition of most housing units in Bellingham is good. Because of the steadily increasing property values and high demand for housing, Bellingham has very few blighted or abandoned properties – so few that there is no database for tracking such properties. According to USPS data, the number of vacant residential units in the first quarter of 2017 was 961 (about 2.5% of all housing units).10

### Age of housing

As the production of new housing picks up, the percentage of older homes within the City declines gradually. As of the latest ACS estimate, about 8,216 units (or 24% of all housing units) were built before 1950. A higher proportion of older units are owner-occupied, which reflects the fact that many older homes are in Bellingham’s historic, mostly single-family neighborhoods.

### Lead-based paint

Lead-based paint is more common in houses built before 1980, and presents more of a health hazard when young children are present. The 2010-2014 ACS data indicates that 56% of owner-occupied households and 47% of renter-occupied households were built before 1980. Of those, there were 1,060 owner-occupied households and 915 renter-occupied households with children under six years of age.

---

Table 6. Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Units Built Before 1980</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units built before 1980 with children under 6 years old present</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011-2014 CHAS tabulations

Regardless of the year the home was built, low- and moderate-income households may have less ability to remove or stabilize lead-based paint, a process which can be quite expensive. A more accurate estimate might be done by subtracting those households earning over 80% of the area median income (AMI). In that case, the risk of lead based paint hazard is most likely to be highest in the 470 owner-occupied houses and 740 renter-occupied houses where moderate or low income households with young children reside (a total of 1,210 households).

Cost of housing

Since 2000, the median home value in Bellingham has increased by 137% and the median rent has increased by 59%. In comparison, the median income in Bellingham increased by 46% over this same time period. Predictably many families are now paying more than they can afford for housing.

Table 7. Change in median home value and contract rent from 2000 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year: 2000</th>
<th>Most Recent Year: 2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
<td>$148,900</td>
<td>$352,700</td>
<td>137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Contract Rent</td>
<td>$559</td>
<td>$887</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2016 ACS 1-year estimate (Most Recent Year)

An “affordable” home is considered to be one priced so that the mortgage payment or rent plus utilities would cost no more than 30% of household income. Lack of homes affordable to low- and moderate-income families (those earning below 50% and 80% of median, respectively) has made it increasingly difficult for potential homebuyers to find houses in their price range. In the five years since the last Consolidated Plan, the median home price in Bellingham has increased by almost 27%, while the median family income (MFI) has increased by 3%. In 2016, less than 18% of all houses sold in Bellingham were affordable to a household at 80% MFI making $55,920 per year.
Table 8. Affordable home sales: 2012 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% Bellingham MFI</td>
<td>$54,240</td>
<td>$55,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable mortgage for 80% MFI¹¹</td>
<td>$238,018</td>
<td>$246,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable home purchase price</td>
<td>$261,819</td>
<td>$270,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of homes sold affordable to 80% MFI</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: City of Bellingham Single Family (2 bedroom or larger) Median Sales Price: 2005-2016

Whatcom County is well below the State average for homes affordable to a household earning median income (100% MFI), at just 34% of homes compared to 54% of homes statewide.¹² About 25,000 homes in Whatcom County are affordable to median-income earners, and there are about 40,000 households earning less than 100% of the county’s median income. In the Puget Sound region, Whatcom County has the second lowest percentage of homes that are affordable to median-income earners.

Figure 8. Percent of homes affordable to a median-income household in Puget Sound by county

Cost burden

The four housing problems monitored by HUD are complete plumbing, complete kitchen, overcrowding, and cost burden. Cost burden is by far the most prevalent issue in Bellingham. For example, only 0.4% and 1.5% of units lack complete plumbing and complete kitchens, respectively. Meanwhile 19% of all households in Bellingham are cost-burdened and 24% are severely cost-burdened. That means 43% of households overall are paying too much of their income for housing.

¹¹ This assumes 4.5% fixed interest rate and 10% down payment on a 30-year mortgage, minus $150 per month for utilities. Calculation does not include property taxes or insurance.

¹² Department of Commerce. 2015 Washington State Housing Needs Assessment. Available at www.commerce.wa.gov/housingneeds
Cost burden is defined as paying more than 30% of household income for housing (rent or mortgage, plus utilities). Severe cost-burden is defined as paying more than 50% of household income for housing.

- <30% of income going to housing: Not cost burdened
- 30%-50% of income going to housing: Cost burdened
- >50% of income going to housing: Severely cost burdened

The percentage of Bellingham residents who are either cost-burdened or severely cost burdened is higher than both the Washington State and the National average, indicating that a large portion of residents cannot find a home that is within their budget. Housing affordability affects people at all income levels, as Figure 9 below shows. Even among those households making above 100% of the area median income (AMI), 11% are cost burdened or severely cost burdened.

For those with less income the situation is worse. Among households making less than 30% of AMI, a full 83% are cost burdened or severely cost burdened, for a total of 6,055 cost-burdened households. This indicates a severe shortage of homes which are affordable to low income households. Cost burden also differs among renters and homeowners. Among renter-occupied households, 55% are cost burdened or severely cost burdened, compared to 28% of owner-occupied households. The fact that Bellingham has a large population of college students may increase the number of cost burdened households, since many full-time students have no income. An analysis of only family and elderly households revealed that 37% of these households are cost burdened, and 51% of family and elderly households who rent are cost burdened. This indicates that, even excluding students, Bellingham has a high proportion of cost burdened households.

---

Programs and services

The City of Bellingham administers a Rental Registration and Safety Inspection Program. Property owners are required to register their rental properties with the City and undergo a health and safety inspection every three years. This inspection includes a wide range of standards. A property may fail an inspection for major issues or may pass with conditions if issues are minor, such as the need to install the appropriate amount of smoke detectors, and would not require a second inspection. The City has approximately 19,000 rental units registered. Of the units that have been inspected so far, 54.6% passed the first inspection without any issues, and 22.7% passed with minor conditions. The remaining 22.8% failed the first inspection. However, all but three of those passed final re-inspection. While not all rental properties in the City have undergone inspection, preliminary results indicate that very few rental properties in Bellingham are in need of major rehabilitation.

There are several ways the City helps low-income homeowners make health and safety repairs, including stabilization of lead paint. Since 2001, 236 homes in Bellingham have been rehabilitated through the Home Rehabilitation Loan Program. Low-income homeowners who qualify can receive zero-interest loans for necessary repairs, which keep owner-occupied properties from becoming blighted or condemned. Homes that test positive for lead paint-based receive assistance with lead stabilization in addition to other health and safety repairs. The Rental Registration and Safety Inspection Program helps ensure that rental properties are meeting local health and safety codes, and that property owners are making necessary ongoing repairs.

Public and assisted housing

For households that are struggling to find or maintain their housing, there is a continuum of housing programs run by the City of Bellingham and our partner organizations. Table 9 is a summary of the total number of units by type of housing program, as of January 2018. This chart includes all types of housing programs for low-income residents – from those facing homelessness to home owners. Depending on the type of housing program, a housing “unit” could be a single-family house, an apartment, a motel room, or a bed/cot. Therefore, the total units below should be considered roughly equivalent to the number of households that are being served by each program, not the number of individuals.

Table 9. Total number of units by housing program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of housing program</th>
<th>Total units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership or repair</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public or nonprofit housing (permanent)</td>
<td>2,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported housing (permanent)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-based rental vouchers*</td>
<td>1,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,801</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that there is significant overlap between vouchers and public or nonprofit housing units, since low-income voucher holders may use their vouchers in the nonprofit housing as opposed to on the private market. Vouchers administered by BHA can be used anywhere within Whatcom County.
Public housing programs

Most public housing units and voucher programs in Bellingham are administered by the Bellingham/Whatcom County Housing Authority (BHA). The BHA administers “public housing” that they own, and HUD vouchers that assist low-income households with the cost of housing and utilities in various buildings – many of which have been developed by the BHA in partnership with tax credit entities. Table 10 depicts the number of units and vouchers in use as of January 2018, based on a 99% unit occupancy rate in their housing and a 98% lease rate for rental vouchers.

Table 10. Number of BHA managed units/vouchers in use by program type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers Total</th>
<th>Vouchers Project-based</th>
<th>Vouchers Tenant-based</th>
<th>Vouchers Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Affairs Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Unification Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Bellingham Housing Authority. January 2018. Includes all units/vouchers in Whatcom County.
*Includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition programs

Housing needs

The information presented previously in this section explains why the housing cost burden in Bellingham is above average. Put simply, there are not enough housing units available for all income levels of the population. That means lower income residents are in tight competition for the units that are affordable to them. This is even true for households who receive market-based rental assistance vouchers because some property owners and managers will not accept them.14 Housing prices continue to rise at a much faster rate than earnings, which is unlikely to change in the near future. This trend not only puts strain on household finances, it also puts more households at risk of homelessness because it’s nearly impossible to save up enough money to cover unexpected expenses. In this way, cost burden, supply of subsidized housing, homelessness, and housing problems such as overcrowding are interrelated issues.

There is no exact estimate of the total number of people who need access to affordable housing. Table 11 shows several different ways to estimate the number of households in Bellingham who are most likely to be in need of assistance. The four categories represent different types of measures that could be used to approximate the need among populations who are especially vulnerable to increases in housing costs. These cannot be totaled because there is duplication between several of the categories. Keep in mind that these estimates represent households that may be comprised of multiple individuals, and therefore the total number of people in need would be greater.

---

14 In response to this issue, Bellingham City Council approved Agenda Bill 21778, amending the Bellingham Municipal code by prohibiting source of income discrimination. At the time that Consolidated Plan was drafted and the public participation was taking place, this source of income discrimination was legal in Bellingham.
Table 11. Different estimates of housing need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households in need</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Number of very low income households who are paying over 50% of income for housing</td>
<td>6,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Number of households on Housing Authority waiting lists as of January 2018 (added before waitlists were closed)</td>
<td>3,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Number of families (related households) living below the Federal poverty level</td>
<td>2,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Number of low-income senior households that are paying over 50% of income for housing</td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: A. 2010-2014 CHAS tabulations, “very low income” is below 50% of the area median income; B. Bellingham Housing Authority (list not unduplicated); C. 2012-2016 ACS; D. 2009-2013 ACS, “low income” is below 80% of the area median income, “senior” is age 65+.

Among all income levels, those making below 30% AMI have the highest rates of severe cost burden, regardless of household type. Seniors, single-parent families, and students are populations that have a particularly high need for affordable housing. Many retired seniors live on a fixed income and cannot afford rental costs or property tax increases. In fact, senior households make up the majority of owner-occupied households that are cost burdened. This may force low-income seniors to move away from family, community, and services if they cannot find housing within their budget, which can be particularly detrimental if a senior does not drive and has no easy access to transit.

Single parent families in Bellingham also have especially high needs. Over 50% of single mothers with children live in poverty. Working families with children in general report that it is a struggle to find affordable housing in the city with adequate space for themselves and their children.

The housing provided by local colleges and universities houses a portion of the student population, leaving a significant gap in student housing supply. While students are not a population for which the City offers housing or services, the lack of adequate student housing impacts the city’s housing needs and must be acknowledged. Full-time college students are limited in the number of hours they can work, and the wages they can earn. Increasing housing costs often translate to an increased student debt burden after graduation.

There are currently 3,666 on-campus student housing beds at Western Washington University. In the 2016-2017 academic year, there were an average of 12,795 full-time students enrolled. Therefore, the on-campus housing can accommodate about 29% of the student body. This does not include the nearby private off-campus housing that is marketed to students, which adds another 1,065 beds. There are currently plans under consideration to develop an additional 980 beds of on- and off-campus student housing in the city.

Disproportionate housing problems

Analysis of HUD-provided data also indicates that there are disproportionately high needs among particular racial and ethnic groups in Bellingham, when compared to the city’s population as a whole. HUD’s definition

---

15 Western Washington University. Office of Institutional Research. WWU Total Enrollment, 2016-17 Academic Year Average for State-Funded students (i.e., not continuing education or professional development), not including Everett.
of disproportionately greater need is defined as “when the members of a racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole.”

Table 12 below shows the percentage of households at each income level who have housing problems in Bellingham as a whole compared to the percentage of households of each race/ethnicity who have housing problems. The chart indicates there are several groups who have disproportionately greater needs related to housing problems. As mentioned earlier, it is important to remember that the primary “housing problem” experienced in Bellingham is cost burden.

Table 12. Rate of housing problems by race/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or ethnicity</th>
<th>Has one or more housing problems</th>
<th>Total households at income level</th>
<th>Percent with housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,215</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race or ethnicity | Has one or more housing problems | Total households at income level | Percent with housing problems
---|---|---|---
Asian | 35 | 75 | 46.7%
American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 60 | 0.0%
Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0.0%
Hispanic | 75 | 160 | 46.9%

No groups in the 0-30% AMI level have disproportionately greater housing needs, even though that category has the highest level of housing problems. We see disproportionately greater needs in all other income categories. In the 30-50% AMI level, Black/African American and Hispanic households have housing problems at a rate greater than 10 percentage points above the jurisdiction’s average – with 100% of Black/African American households at that level having housing problems compared to 80% for the income category as a whole. At the 50-80% AMI income level, 57% of all households have housing problems; meanwhile, 78% of Black/African American households and 86% of American Indian or Alaska Native households have housing problems. Both of these groups have a disproportionate need over 20 percentage points higher than the income level. At the 80-100% AMI income level, we see only 34% of all households have housing problems. However, among this group, 47% of both Asian and Hispanic households have one or more housing problems.

**Disproportionate severe housing problems**

The designation of “severe” housing problems means that there is severe cost burden, more than 1.5 persons per room (severe overcrowding), or lack of complete plumbing or kitchen facilities. Similar to the other housing problems, we also see disproportionate representation of particular racial or ethnic groups who experience severe housing problems in Bellingham. The table below shows all households with one or more severe housing problems.

**Table 13. Rate of severe housing problems by race/ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or ethnicity</th>
<th>Has one or more severe housing problems</th>
<th>Total households at income level</th>
<th>Percent with severe housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnicity</td>
<td>Has one or more severe housing problems</td>
<td>Total households at income level</td>
<td>Percent with severe housing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jurisdiction as a whole</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,215</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>5,695</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80-100% AMI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the previous analysis of housing problems, there are no disproportionate needs by race/ethnicity among households in the 0-30% AMI group. At the 30-50% AMI level, Asian and Hispanic households have severe housing problems at a significantly greater frequency compared to the jurisdiction as a whole – both are more than 20 percentage points above average. At the 50-80% AMI level, Hispanic households have disproportionately more severe housing problems. At the 80-100% AMI level, Asian households do.

While there has been some improvement for other racial/ethnic groups since the last Consolidated Plan period, low-income Hispanic households are still disproportionately experiencing severe housing problems, as they were in the last Consolidated Plan.
Homelessness Assessment

Homeless facilities and services

Bellingham’s homeless housing and service organizations participate in Whatcom County’s coordinated entry system, and a database called the Homeless Management Intake System (HMIS). Whatcom County was an early adopter of this system, which is now recognized as a best-practice for housing people effectively across multiple organizations. In addition, the County and the City are committed to a Housing-First model and prevention-based strategies. That means the same coordinated-entry system serves people who are at-risk of homelessness, currently homeless, and re-entering society from institutional settings.

The Opportunity Council’s Homeless Service Center, located in Bellingham, is the agency responsible for managing the coordinated entry system and rental assistance distribution in coordination with Whatcom County Health Department. All agencies that provide housing perform a standardized housing assessment that is administered at the point of entry. A standardized intake and vulnerability assessment is administered at entry and households are then referred to openings with the following partners:

- Bellingham/Whatcom County Housing Authority
- Catholic Housing Services*
- Lighthouse Mission Ministries
- Lydia Place*
- Interfaith Coalition
- Northwest Youth Services*
- Opportunity Council*
- Pioneer Human Services
- Sun Community Services
- YWCA

*These partners receive County-funded rental assistance through the coordinated entry system.

Other community partners that provide support to homeless households include:

- Compass Health
- Catholic Community Services
- Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services
- Lake Whatcom Treatment Center
- Unity Care NW
- SeaMar
- Northwest Regional Council
- Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS)
- Whatcom Alliance for Health Advancement
The Homeless Service Center supports key staff responsible for managing and coordinating across the partner agencies listed above. These are:

- HMIS Database Manager
- Housing Retention Manager
- Leasing Specialist
- Landlord Liaison
- Housing Referral Specialist
- Program Assistant
- Homeless Outreach Specialists
- Homeless Outreach Coordinator

### Homeless housing needs

As a jurisdiction, there are three main sources of data on the homeless population: The 2017 Point-in-Time Count, the Homeless Service Center and the Homeless Outreach Team (both operated by the Opportunity Council). This data, other than the Homeless Outreach Team, includes all of Whatcom County. That said, Bellingham is by far the largest City in Whatcom County and most of the services and facilities for people experiencing homelessness are located here.

Over the past five years since the previous Consolidated Plan, the homeless population has grown steadily, from an estimated homeless population of 493 to 742 (a 49% increase). The Whatcom County Point-in-Time count shows that the percentage of homeless individuals who are unsheltered increased each year, then returned to the 2012 level (40%) after Lighthouse Mission’s interim low-barrier shelter opened its doors in Fall 2016, providing 80 additional beds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals sheltered</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals unsheltered</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent unsheltered</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of people who are homeless over the course of any given year is much larger than those who are experiencing homelessness on a single night. The Homeless Service Center reports that there were 2,399 people in Whatcom County who were homeless at some point during 2017. This number represents all households that were active at some point on the Housing Pool (a housing list for people experiencing homelessness) during a 365 day period. Of those, 989 were people in families with children, 1,410 were people in adult-only families, and 119 were veterans. Table 15 compares a 365-day period in 2012 with a 365-day period in 2017, which shows significant increases in both the number of people becoming homeless and the number of people exiting homelessness into stable housing.
Table 15. Changes in Housing Pool from 2012 to 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th># becoming homeless/yr</th>
<th>% chg.</th>
<th># exiting homelessness to stable housing/yr</th>
<th>% chg.</th>
<th>Avg # of days experiencing homelessness</th>
<th>% chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in families with adults &amp; children</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in families with adults only</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>149%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>148%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically homeless individuals</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically homeless families</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>176%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Since 2012, there has been an increase in all types of populations experiencing homelessness in Whatcom County. The largest percentage point increases are among the number of chronically homeless families, both those experiencing homelessness in a given year and becoming homeless in a year. The largest group experiencing homelessness by far is individuals in families with adults only (i.e., single adults or couples with no children). The 2017 Point-in-Time Count documented 287 individuals in families with adults and children, and 448 individuals in families with adults only who were homeless on a given night. The same count found 52 veterans on a given night.

Despite the increased need, there have also been some positive changes. We see the number of days that families with children and chronically homeless families experience homelessness has decreased by 48% and 39%, respectively. However, the results for individuals and families without children have not been positive. We also see a substantial increase in the numbers of all populations who are exiting homelessness into stable housing among all groups except Veterans. Another way to compare the needs and outcomes of homelessness programs in the community is to look at the number of individuals exiting homelessness into stable housing as a percentage of the individuals becoming homeless in a given year. The higher the percentage of a group that exits homelessness compared to the percentage that enters homelessness in a year, the better. This indicates that the group is being helped to access housing. Figure 10 below compares this percentage for 2012 and 2017.

Note that this is a proportion and does not indicate that the same individuals who are entering homelessness are necessarily the same as those exiting homelessness in a given year. The specific individuals on the Housing Pool are always in flux, and may drop off for a variety of reasons.
Even though the number of people needing help has increased substantially since 2012 (as shown in Table 15), there has been an improvement in the percentage of chronically homeless individuals and families who are exiting homelessness compared to the proportion of the number becoming homeless in a year. At the same time, there has been very little improvement for persons in families with children, and no change for adults with no children. There has been a significant decline in the percentage of veterans who are exiting homelessness compared to the number becoming homeless. While the number of homeless veterans doubled from 2012 to 2017, the proportion who exited into stable housing dropped from 98% to 31%. Overall, these figures speak to a considerable effort to provide housing and services, but which is still not adequate to address all needs – especially of adults without children and veterans.
Community Development Assessment

Job market analysis

The major employment sectors in Bellingham are Education and Health Care Services (9,352 jobs), Retail Trade (6,796 jobs) and Arts, Entertainment, and Accommodation (6,117 jobs). Altogether these three sectors make up 51% of the share of all workers. The next biggest employment sector is Manufacturing, which has 2,880 jobs. These numbers indicate that Bellingham’s economy is predominantly a service economy.

Table 16. Bellingham employment by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business by Sector</th>
<th>Number of Workers</th>
<th>Number of Jobs</th>
<th>Share of Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Care Services</td>
<td>5,253</td>
<td>9,352</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>6,796</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>6,117</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Management Services</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Mining, Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,789</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,392</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date source: 2009-2013 ACS (Workers), 2013 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

Labor force assets

Home to a state university, community college, and a technical college, Bellingham has a highly educated workforce. Of adults age 25 and over, 51% have obtained a college degree (either an Associate’s, Bachelor’s, or Master’s degree) and 26% of this population has no college education. Compare this with the US average, in which 39% of adults age 25 and over have a college degree, and 40% have no college education. Table 17 compares the educational attainment of Bellingham residents with the county, state, and nation.
Table 17. Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 9th Grade</th>
<th>No High School Diploma</th>
<th>High School Diploma / GED</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Associate's Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>Master's or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA State</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2011-2015 ACS

Workforce and infrastructure needs

In Whatcom County, Construction will be the industry with the highest expected annual job growth rate over the next five years and the occupation with the greatest number of new jobs in the short term. This is due to the high demand for new development discussed earlier. At present, a shortage of skilled construction labor is the result of an industry that scaled down during the Recession, and is still struggling to rebuild its workforce. Natural Resources and Mining is the only industry sector expected to lose jobs in the near-term. Jobs in Professional and Business Services, Leisure and Hospitality, and Education and Health Services are expected to see healthy increases annually for the next five years and will remain a major portion of the employment market.

Table 18. Whatcom County industry employment projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated employment 2015</th>
<th>Estimated employment 2020</th>
<th>Average annual growth rate 2015-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-farm jobs</td>
<td>158,300</td>
<td>171,600</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health services</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business services</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, warehousing and utilities</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resource and Mining</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-3.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


18 See section on Population Growth and Housing Demand.
One factor that will influence future workforce needs will be the age of the population. As Figure 11 shows, the youth population (age 0 to 29) in Whatcom County is expected to decrease as a percentage of the overall population, and the elderly population (age 70 and above) is expected to increase even more significantly. This will have implications for the economy and types of jobs available. An aging population in Whatcom County is a factor in the high projected growth for the healthcare industry.

Figure 11. Current and projected population in Whatcom County: 2016 and 2040

- Utilities
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- Transportation and warehousing
- Government

Poverty by neighborhood

There are areas in Bellingham where both racial/ethnic minorities and low-income families are concentrated. According to school district enrollment data and Census tract level data, there are certain neighborhoods that have a high concentration of both racial/ethnic minorities and low-income families – and in most cases these overlap (see Figure 12 below). Areas of concentration are defined as neighborhoods where the average is at least one standard deviation above the city’s average.

The percent of children enrolled in elementary school who qualify for free or reduced meals (FRM) is one way to measure the number of low-income families in an area. Looking at school district data, the average percentage of children in Bellingham who receive FRM is 41%, but the range by elementary school varies substantially, from 16% to 81%. Alderwood Elementary school is the highest, with 81% of students receiving...
FRM. Although the Alderwood neighborhood is not currently within the Bellingham city limits, it is included in this data set because it is part of the Bellingham School District and may be annexed into the city during the next Consolidated Plan period. Birchwood and Cordata neighborhood schools also meet the criteria for high concentration of low-income families, with 65% and 64% respectively.

Another way to measure the concentration of low-income families is to look at the percent of families below the Federal Poverty Level by Census tract. There are 17 Census tracts in the city, and not all of them correspond exactly with just one neighborhood, although several do. Some neighborhoods are spread across two or more Census tracts, or combined. The city average rate of family poverty is 12.4%. Looking at Census tract data, the area corresponding to the City Center has the highest rate of family poverty, at 58.5%. Happy Valley also meets the criteria for a concentrated area of poverty at 31.4%. The family poverty rate for the Census tracts corresponding to Roosevelt (20%), Birchwood and Meridian (22.1%) don’t meet the threshold of being one standard deviation higher than the city average, but still have rates that are well above average.

Using the same data sets, we can see that high-poverty neighborhoods also correspond to areas where minority families are concentrated. The average percentage of non-white, non-Hispanic students is 25% per elementary school. Birchwood (49%), Alderwood (45%), and Cordata (44%) have the highest percentages of

*Irene Reither School is in the Meridian School District, but enrolls students that live in north Bellingham city limits.

---

20 See section NA-50: Non-housing Community Development Needs in the full version of the Consolidated Plan.
minority students, and all meet the criteria for an area of high concentration of minority families with children. Figure 13 is a map of Bellingham that shows the percentage of 2016-17 enrolled public elementary students who identified as non-white/non-Hispanic or more than one race in each attendance area.

Figure 13. City of Bellingham racial diversity of elementary school students by neighborhood

Data source: WA State Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction, Report Card for Bellingham & Meridian

According to Census tract data, the percentage of minority population in Roosevelt (38.7%), Birchwood/Meridian (31.7%), and City Center (24.3%) neighborhoods all meet the criteria for concentrated areas of minority families when compared to the city average of 17.2% non-white, non-Hispanic.

The same neighborhoods with the highest percentage of family poverty and minority populations generally correspond to those with the most multi-family housing. The four neighborhoods with the highest number of multi-family units are Cordata, Birchwood, Happy Valley, and Roosevelt. Together, these four neighborhoods make up 42% of the city’s total multi-family housing units. Including Puget and Meridian neighborhoods would account for 57% of all the city’s multi-family housing. As such, these neighborhoods also have among the highest population density in the city.  

---

21 City of Bellingham, WA. Bellingham Housing Statistics page. Available at [www.cob.org/housingstats](http://www.cob.org/housingstats)
Community development needs

Public facility needs

The City of Bellingham aims to remain responsive to the needs of local agencies as new priorities and opportunities arise. In the past, we have responded by supporting community groups who identified a need for facilities in their service area, and the City will continue to do so in the future for agencies serving low income residents – especially prioritizing neighborhoods that lack opportunities for local residents and services for special needs groups.

One present example is Bellingham’s Senior Activity Center. With the population of Bellingham continuing to age, the center has increased its programming and outgrown the current building, which is 40 years old. There is need for increased program funding, safety and security improvements, lighting and acoustic improvements, parking, and increased space for large group classes. Health and wellness programs for seniors – including socialization, meals and exercise programs – have been proven to save money in the long-term by preventing or delaying stays skilled nursing facilities or hospital visits.

Meanwhile, residents of the Birchwood neighborhood lack access to fresh and nutritious food after a major grocer closed its location there in 2016. The nearest grocery stores are more than a mile away, which is especially difficult for low-income families who rely on public transportation. Birchwood has some of the highest concentrations of both poverty and minority households, and the loss of a local grocery store within walking distance has represented a significant hardship for this community.

Other public comment indicated a desire for microenterprise development, especially related to food production. Microenterprise operations related to food production could be permissible in some areas, while others may require special zoning. Innovative responses to the needs of urban food production and local jobs could be mutually beneficial, as they could boost both jobs and health outcomes in some of the lowest-income neighborhoods, where both economic and health disparities exist.

Within the next five-year period, it is also possible that the City will annex low-income areas within the City’s urban growth area. The Alderwood neighborhood is one of these areas, with higher rates of poverty than the city as a whole and which lacks urban levels of service. We anticipate the highest public investment needs would be in the form of:

- Housing rehabilitation (both for multifamily rental and owner-occupied properties);
- Facilities (neighborhood center or other);
- Services (mobility and transportation, nonprofit services, policing); and
- Infrastructure (sidewalks, street lighting, parks and public spaces).
Public service needs

The main non-housing public service needs in Bellingham are treatment for mental health and addiction, peer support and community inclusion for the formerly homeless population, and disaster preparedness.

Mental health treatment & support services

For both mental health and addiction treatment services, the Whatcom County Health Department is the lead agency. The county has its own set of existing plans to increase availability of mental health facilities and services, expand treatment for opioid addiction, and increase coordination between agencies for patients with the highest service needs, among other strategies.\(^{22,23,24}\) The City of Bellingham recognizes the immense need for these services. Beyond medical treatment, the community needs resources for emotional and social support of our most vulnerable populations – especially those exiting homelessness or treatment. The desire to belong and to be accepted is a fundamental human need. City workgroup discussions and survey of service providers revealed that a lack of social inclusion is a significant barrier to successful housing and recovery for the homeless population, and no current programs explicitly target this gap. Such programs might rely on volunteers and community organizations, with City support.

The need for mental health and addiction treatment were prioritized among the service gaps by the Community Solutions Workgroup, and also prioritized as the top service needs by survey participants. Many members of the public and stakeholders expressed that mental health and addiction treatment are a foundation for stability (including employment and housing). The Community Solutions Workgroup and service provider sub-group also identified social inclusion and job training as a gap for the homeless. Providers reported that clients who received stable housing were still going to the drop-in center to fulfill their social needs. This was mainly due to feeling as if they did not belong anywhere in the broader community and/or lacking the skills to develop new social networks.

Disaster preparedness

Disaster preparedness efforts have taken place through citizen groups and countywide planning. The need for preparedness can come suddenly in the event that a disaster threatens or strikes. Natural disasters elsewhere in the country have showcased how the effects of a natural disaster can be especially devastating for low-income residents and neighborhoods. Bellingham, like all of the Puget Sound region, lies along the Cascadia Subduction Zone, making it vulnerable to a high magnitude earthquake. Other hazards include flooding, tsunami, volcanic eruption, wind storms, and wildfires.\(^{25}\) It is prudent that the City remain flexible and receptive to any emergency response, public safety, and infrastructure needs which may prevent injury, reduce


hardship, or avoid damages in the event of such a disaster, with particular attention to the special needs populations.

The City’s Legacy and Strategic Commitments include increasing community readiness and resilience.26 As such, the City of Bellingham needs to be prepared for natural disasters, including proper infrastructure, planning, and response. A community’s resiliency in the event of a natural disaster is in large part dependent on thoughtful planning and training for a worse-case scenario. Preparedness has taken place with leadership from public safety experts, volunteer organizations, and countywide efforts. The City is a supportive partner and resource in these preparedness and response efforts as needs arise.

26 See City Legacies and Strategic Commitments in the Strategic Plan section.
Special Needs Assessment

Elderly population
While age 62 and above is commonly considered to be a senior, we will use age 65 and above to define the “elderly” population. There are estimated to be 11,315 residents aged 65 and above in Bellingham (13.6% of the population). Of these residents, 18% have some kind of disability, and 1,884 have an independent living difficulty. The total elderly population has increased by 1,371 since the last Consolidated Plan, and the proportion that have disabilities has increased by 2.4 percentage points. Though these changes are moderate, the proportion of the population aged 75+ years with disabilities jumps to 51.1%, and so the care needs of the elderly population are likely to increase in coming years as the larger 65+ population continues to age.

Assets
Altogether, there are 29 Skilled Nursing Facilities, Adult Family Homes, and Assisted Living facilities in Bellingham, with a total capacity of 1,454 beds. This does not include Senior Living or Retirement communities, which may provide meals and some services, but whose residents are capable of living independently and could live elsewhere in the community if they chose to. Table 19 below shows the breakdown of long-term care facilities by type and number of beds available to residents who are paying with Medicaid.

Table 19. Long-term care facilities in Bellingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Total number of beds (capacity)</th>
<th># of Medicaid clients as of January 2018</th>
<th># of Medicaid clients not required to pay privately before residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Family Homes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living Facilities</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources: Northwest Regional Council, January 2018.

Skilled nursing facilities are medical care institutions rather than a long-term housing option. However, they cannot legally discharge patients who no longer require medical care unless they have safe and appropriate housing to go to, and therefore may end up providing long-term housing and care if there are no other housing options available. As of February 26, 2018 there were 594 beds in skilled nursing facilities in Bellingham, and 318 residents using a skilled nursing facility for long-term care, without a discharge plan.

In addition to housing for seniors, there are several programs in the community which help enable seniors to continue to live independently in their own homes. Programs such as the Volunteer Chore Program provide

---

27 The reason is simply because most ACS and Census data is grouped by age in this way.
28 2012-2016 ACS estimate.
29 Calculated using Bellingham’s 2017 Housing Unit & Population Estimate Report and DSHS’s Assisted Living Facilities locator.
free access to light housework. The Home Rehab Program offers loans for low-income seniors to make needed health and safety repairs which do not have to be repaid until the house is sold. The Whatcom County Council on Aging (WCCOA) manages the Meals on Wheels program and the Bellingham Senior Activity Center. Through the Center, WCCOA runs a variety of evidence-programs to promote seniors’ health and well-being.

The Northwest Regional Council, in association with county governments, implements state and federal programs for seniors and people with long-term care needs in Whatcom County. The goal of community-based care is to help seniors and adults with disabilities live in their homes and communities for as long as possible, postponing or eliminating the need for residential or institutional care, such as nursing homes. Some of the community-based care programs they participate in are Senior Information & Assistance, Congregate Meals, Respite Care, Adult Day Services, Case Management and Family Caregiver Support.31

Needs

Among the elderly population, the most common disability is ambulatory difficulty, followed by hearing difficulty. Although many seniors may continue to live independently or with assistance from family members, 1,884 people in this group have an independent living difficulty, and 2,093 have two or more types of disability. These numbers exceed the 1,454 long-term care beds available in the community, indicating that many residents rely on in-home care or lack appropriate care.

Table 20. Population age 65+ with disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranked in order of prevalence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% with disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population 65 years and older</td>
<td>11,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With any difficulty/diability</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an ambulatory difficulty</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a hearing difficulty</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an independent living difficulty</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a self-care difficulty</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a cognitive difficulty</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a vision difficulty</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2012-2016 ACS

A challenge facing the elderly and disabled community is that oftentimes neither traditional health insurance nor Medicare pay for long-term care facilities, and in many cases residents must pay 2-3 years of private pay32 before Medicaid is accepted. This reality is especially problematic for low-income elderly and disabled residents who need daily care. While there are 868 beds available in Adult Family Homes (AFH) and Assisted Living Facilities (ALF) together, only 23% of these accept Medicaid clients (a total of 201 beds). As the population ages and demand for AFHs and ALFs increases, Medicaid beds decline as many facilities generally

---

32 Median private pay cost for an Adult Family Home or Assisted Living Facility is $55,920 per year, and $102,936 per year in a Skilled Nursing Facility (Nursing Home).
only choose to accept Medicaid clients when they are not able to reach capacity with private pay clients. The Northwest Regional Council estimates that there are 485 people in Bellingham (and a total of 891 people in Whatcom County) who are currently receiving Medicaid long-term care at home but are eligible to move to an AFH or ALF, and will likely need AFH or ALF care in the future. They estimate this number will increase from 891 to 1,266 within five years.33

Even for those who do not have regular care needs, it is difficult for seniors on a fixed income to find housing they can afford. As of January 2018, the BHA had 278 people on their project-based voucher waitlist for senior housing, and 1,005 people on their public housing waitlist for senior and/or disabled housing.

**Disabled population**

Assuming that most disabled children will be cared for by their parents or guardians as would any minor, and elderly care needs are discussed above, the disabled population included below are adults between the ages of 18 and 65. Among these adults, 17% (10,059 people) have a disability – although not all are necessarily in need of assistance. Only 3.8% have an independent living difficulty, and 1.5% have a self-care difficulty. While the percentages are relatively small, the total number of non-elderly disabled adults is greater than for elderly adults for all types of disabilities except self-care.

**Table 21. Disability by type for population aged 18-64 years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranked in order of prevalence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% with disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population aged 18-64 years</td>
<td>57,667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with any difficulty/disability</td>
<td>10,059</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a cognitive difficulty</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an ambulatory difficulty</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an independent living difficulty</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a hearing difficulty</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a vision difficulty</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a self-care difficulty</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2011-2015 ACS

Compared to the number in Table 21, far fewer adults with cognitive difficulty have a developmental disability which is severe enough to qualify for paid services. The Washington State Developmental Disability Administration reports that there are 1,259 eligible clients in Whatcom County as of July 1, 2017. Of those, 637 are adults between the ages of 18 and 62.34

**Assets**

The majority of the 523 public housing units managed by the BHA are for either seniors or people with disabilities. Throughout the community, there are also a handful of organizations that offer in-home care,

33 Data provided by Northwest Regional Council, January 2018.
permanent supportive housing, transitional housing, and emergency shelter to adults with developmental disabilities and other needs.

- Lighthouse Mission Ministries’ Special Needs dorm: 16 emergency shelter beds
- Opportunity Council’s Evergreen House: 3 permanent supported housing units
- Sun Community Services: 11 permanent supportive housing units and 9 transitional housing beds
- Access Living: provides in-home care to over 40 adults with developmental disabilities

Of the 1,259 developmentally disabled clients in Whatcom County, 172 adults live in a DDA residential setting. These include:

- 139 clients have Supported Living services
- 11 clients live in Group Homes
- 4 clients live in Companion Homes
- 24 clients live in Adult Family Homes

The Arc of Whatcom County also provides family support, advocacy, training, and serves as a resource for individuals with developmental disabilities and their caregivers. In 2015, the Arc provided:

- Family support events for 710 individuals
- Information and educational newsletters to over 1,637 individuals
- Information and education in response to 450 requests for problems solving assistance and support
- Technical assistance, resources, and support to 314 educators regarding inclusion and self-determination

**Needs**

As of January 2018, there were 500 people on the BHA’s waiting list for disabled or supportive housing, and the estimated wait time was five years. The BHA also manages the Section 8 voucher program. The waitlist for Section 8 assistance is currently closed, with 1,193 households on the waitlist, 448 of which have a member of the household with a disability. Compared to the non-elderly adult population at large, we see that the proportion on the waiting list with a disability is more than twice as high (38% compared to 17% of the general adult population). This backlog indicates there is significant unmet need for disability housing in Bellingham, and a disproportionately high amount of low-income residents in need of housing who are disabled.

The types of disability most common among the non-elderly adult population is very different from disabilities common among elderly adults. As Table 21 shows, the most common disability type among non-elderly adults in Bellingham is cognitive difficulty, which includes having difficulty remembering, concentrating, or making decisions because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem. Mental health

---


36 Bellingham Housing Authority, January 2018.
disability is possibly the biggest non-homeless special needs group in the jurisdiction, and also significantly impacts the homeless population.37

Safe, independent, accessible, and affordable housing provides individuals with freedom and self-sufficiency as well as offering the opportunity to achieve independence and become part of a community. Lack of affordable and accessible housing is the most significant barrier to community integration for people with developmental disabilities. High unemployment rates for persons with significant disabilities (typically 60% to 90%) engender continued reliance on public benefits. People with disabilities who receive SSI often cannot afford housing at market rates. In fact, they constitute the low-income group with the highest level of unmet need for housing assistance (as evidenced by the number of disabled individuals on the waitlist for subsidized housing). According to the Arc of Whatcom County, a considerable number of individuals with developmental disabilities live in substandard or unsafe housing which constitutes a significant risk to health and safety. There are also community facility needs for safe and engaging day services for adults with disabilities who are unable to function independently.

Victims of domestic violence

**Assets**

In 2014, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services (DVSAS) took over the services for victims in Whatcom County that were formerly provided by Womencare. DVSAS provides safe emergency shelter, advocacy counseling, legal assistance, referrals, and a 24-hour helpline for victims of domestic violence. In addition, the Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence provides outreach, awareness building, and trainings to the community.

Currently there are 166 beds in the city available to victims of domestic violence and their children. Not all of these beds are exclusively designated for those fleeing domestic violence. Some are available for women and children who are facing homelessness for other reasons, and often have domestic violence in their backgrounds.

- DVSAS Safe Shelter: 21 beds; Baker Place Shelter: 4 beds (with an additional 8 beds under construction, to be open in 2018)
- Dorothy Place: 35 beds (25 beds are in permanent supportive housing; 10 beds are transitional housing)
- Lydia Place: 20 beds (8 transitional beds; 5 permanent supportive units)
- YWCA’s Larabee Residence: 36 beds (9 emergency shelter and 27 transitional beds for single women)
- Lighthouse Mission Ministries’ Agape Home: 50 beds (transitional housing for women and children)

---

37 As of December 2017, 50% of the households on the Housing Pool identified as having a mental health disability. The proportion of homeless households with a mental health disability consistently hovers around 50% on both the Housing Pool and annual Point-in-Time count.
Needs

Over the past five years, there has been continuous demand for DVSAS's services. Fewer protection orders were filed in 2016, but even more victims are reaching out for help. The number of calls, unique victims receiving services, and domestic violence offenses remains constant or has increased slightly since the previous Consolidated Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of:</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence offenses reported by Bellingham Police</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>564*</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence protection orders filed in Whatcom County</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls to Womencare/DVSAS helpline</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique victims who received support services from DVSAS</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults and children who stayed in emergency shelter**</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources: Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence and DVSAS
*This number is from 2015. The 2016 figure has not been released.
**In 2011, stays were limited to 30 nights. They are now limited to 90 nights, and the average stay is 45 nights. The decline in clients staying in shelter can be attributed to the increased length of stay for the average client.

At the time of the previous Consolidated Plan there were 115 beds available for single women and women with children in need of emergency or transitional shelter. By the end of 2015, there was capacity for 162 women and children, a 41% increase. Nevertheless, the need remains high. DVSAS reports that they are usually at capacity every night.

Persons with behavioral health needs

This section covers behavioral health needs such as mental health, addiction, and substance abuse. Available data is for Whatcom County and approximately 40% of the residents of Whatcom County reside in Bellingham.

In addition to the need for direct treatment for mental health and drug addiction, the City of Bellingham is aware that oftentimes such needs are the result of adverse childhood experiences and trauma. Throughout Whatcom County, many agencies and organization are reviewing their internal polices to ensure that their interactions with the community are trauma-informed, and working to reduce childhood traumas which can lead to a lifetime of struggles. The Bellingham Public Library has taken an especially pro-active role in adopting a trauma-informed approach when dealing with and welcoming people experiencing homelessness into the library, and who are using it as a safe space to shelter.

38 Verified by Lydia Place and DVSAS, as of July 2017.
39 Whatcom County Health Department. Whatcom Communities Addressing ACEs & Adopting Trauma Informed Approaches. August 10, 2017.
Assets

In 2011, the Whatcom County Health Department (WCHD) convened multiple key stakeholders and drafted a Community Health Needs Assessment Report. This report was the starting place for prioritizing the health needs of Whatcom County and developing strategies to address them. Among the top of those community priorities were substance abuse and mental health challenges. Metrics for measuring progress toward improved mental health in the community were adopted. Since that time, additional planning has taken place with strategies to address the needs of those with serious mental illness, opioid addiction (and other substance use disorders), complicated physical health issues, or criminogenic and antisocial attitudes and behaviors. WCHD works closely with the North Sound Behavioral Health Organization, which serves a five-county region, administering a coordinated system of care, and together they are moving toward meeting the needs of those with behavioral health challenges.

The City also supports these efforts, and has partnered with the Whatcom Alliance for Health Advancement (WAHA) to serve those with behavioral health challenges that highly impact the City’s emergency medical, police, and jail resources. The Community Paramedic Program, together with professional case managers from WAHA have a mobile program serving this population, about a quarter of whom are also homeless. WAHA observed a 69% reduction in hospital and emergency department charges, along with a decrease in incarceration in the population served through this program. The county has recently joined this partnership, with the intention of expanding it into the Ground-level Response and Coordinated Engagement (GRACE) program that is countywide with additional support from regional partner agencies.

Needs

Although there has been progress, as of 2014 (the most recent available data) none of the mental health targets had yet been met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Metric</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suicide death rate (per 100,000)</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 10th grade students reporting depressive feelings</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of adults with frequent mental stress</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Whatcom County Health Department

As with mental health, the data for substance abuse is only available at the county level. In the 2016-2019 Health Needs Assessment Plan, PeaceHealth St. Joseph Medical Center reported that Whatcom County has among the highest rates of opiate addiction compared to the State as a whole.

---


• **Opioid use in Whatcom County:**
  - Ranks 3rd of 39 counties in Washington for overall negative impacts from heroin abuse.
  - Ranks 6th of 39 counties in Washington for overall negative impacts from prescription opiates.
  - Deaths attributed to any opiate: 8.2 per 100,000 population (about equal to state average of 8.6 per 100,000 population).
  - Some of the highest rates of Buprenorphine prescription for Suboxone treatment for opiate addiction in all of Washington counties.

• **Excessive drinking:**
  - 22% among adults (higher than state average of 19%)

• **Smoking:**
  - 14% among adults (slightly lower than state average of 15%)
  - 10th graders smoking cigarettes in past 30 days: 8.7% (slightly higher than state average of 7.9%)

For both mental health and addiction treatment services, the WCHD is the lead. The county has its own set of existing plans to increase availability of mental health services, expand treatment for opioid addiction, and increase coordination between agencies for patients with the highest service needs, among other tactics. The City of Bellingham recognizes the significant need for these services, and will continue to be an active partner, with the focus on implementing and expanding the GRACE program.
Strategic Plan

The City of Bellingham's Strategic Plan outlines the housing and community development goals and strategies to meet the priority needs with available resources. This plan covers the period from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2023.

The City anticipates receiving continued federal entitlement grants through HUD in the next five years. The two entitlement grants include Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME). The City also anticipates continuing to receive funding from the local housing levy. The existing levy is in place through 2019, and the City will seek a replacement levy prior to its expiration.

HUD and Levy Goals

This Strategic Plan is written to meet the requirements of HUD. It is also written to be consistent with the 2012 Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan, which governs the use of local housing levy dollars, and the City of Bellingham Council's Legacies and Strategic Commitments, which is the framework the City uses to align City commitments with needs. These guiding frameworks align well with one another.

HUD funding sources must primarily benefit low- and moderate-income persons in accordance with three goals:

- **Provide decent housing**, for example, assisting homeless persons obtain affordable housing; assisting persons at risk of becoming homeless; retaining the affordable housing stock; increasing the availability of affordable permanent housing, particularly to members of disadvantaged minorities; increasing the supply of supportive housing; and providing affordable housing that is accessible to job opportunities.

- **Provide a suitable living environment**, for example, improving the safety and livability of neighborhoods; eliminating blighting influences and the deterioration of property and facilities; increasing access to quality public and private facilities and services; reducing the isolation of income groups within areas through spatial de-concentration of housing opportunities for lower income persons; and conserving energy resources and use of renewable energy resources.

- **Expand economic opportunities**, for example, job creation and retention; establishment, stabilization and expansion of small businesses (including micro-businesses); the provision of public services concerned with employment; the provision of jobs to low-income persons living in areas affected by those programs and activities; availability of mortgage financing for low-income persons at reasonable rates using non-discriminatory lending practices; and empowerment and self-sufficiency for low-income persons to reduce generational poverty.

The city's housing levy goals mirror both the HUD goals above, and the specifically aligned City Legacies and Strategic Commitments below. While the emphasis changes in response to community needs, any new housing levy framework is anticipated to be substantially similar to the existing one.
City Legacies and Strategic Commitments

The Bellingham City Council has adopted Legacies and Strategic Commitments. Bellingham’s Community Development Advisory Board (CDAB) aligned the following City legacies and strategic commitments to HUD’s three program goals.

**Equity & Social Justice**
- Provide access to problem-solving resources
- Support safe, affordable housing
- Increase living wage employment
- Support services for lower-income residents
- Cultivate respect & appreciation for diversity

**Vibrant Sustainable Economy**
- Support a thriving local economy across all sectors
- Promote inter-dependence of environmental, economic & social interests
- Create conditions that encourage public & private investment
- Foster vibrant downtown & other commercial centers

**Sense of Place**
- Support sense of place in neighborhoods
- Encourage development within existing infrastructure

**Safe & Prepared Community**
- Prevent and respond to crime
- Increase community readiness and resilience

**Mobility & Connectivity Options**
- Provide safe, well-connected mobility options for all users
- Limit sprawl

**Access to Quality of Life Amenities**
- Provide recreation & enrichment opportunities for all ages & abilities

**Quality, Responsive City Services**
- Deliver efficient, effective & accountable municipal services

**Geographic Priorities**

The City does not propose geographic priorities in this planning period. The areas in which to focus are different for different priority activities. New development of affordable multifamily housing is prioritized within urban villages (especially those currently lacking in that type of housing), which are examined to ensure they have adequate capacity and an appropriate regulatory framework to accommodate the needed development. Existing single family neighborhoods are looked to for providing appropriate housing choices and increasing diversity, with affordable housing opportunities in these areas especially needed for households with young children. Rehabilitation and investment in community and public facilities is targeted in neighborhoods with higher rates of poverty and minority populations. The intent of prioritizing certain activities in different areas is to promote equity of services and opportunities, and fair distribution of
affordable housing across the city. It also aligns with the goals set forth in the City’s Assessment of Fair Housing.

**Consolidated Plan goals and priorities**

The level of need in Bellingham is greater than the limited resources available to help meet those needs. In previous chapters of this Consolidated Plan, information has been presented that compares the types and levels of need to the existing assets within our community to inform setting priorities, goals and strategies.

The City uses these priorities to form the basis for determining what types of housing and community development programs the City will fund over the next five years. The City has identified the following general priorities amongst different activities and needs. They are categorized into “Tier 1,” “Partners as Lead,” and “Tier 2” priorities. The most pressing needs that the City feels compelled to move forward proactively with are listed as Tier 1; those needs which are also pressing, but for which the City plays a supporting role to other local agencies, are listed as Partners as Lead; and those which are also important are listed as Tier 2. Our priorities are aligned with the contributing factors and issues identified during the Assessment of Fair Housing process, and respond to all of these identified factors:

- Lack of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes
- Low vacancy rate
- Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities
- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures
- Access to publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities
- Lack of affordable in-home or community-based supportive services
- Lack of assistance for housing accessibility modifications
- Lack of assistance for transitioning from institutional settings to integrated housing
- Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement
- Private discrimination
- Occupancy codes and restrictions
- Land use zoning laws
- Community opposition
- Impediments to mobility

The Fair Housing issues that are also addressed through these priorities are:

- Disparities in access to opportunity
- Disproportionate housing needs

During the community process, the following populations were identified as having the highest needs: those with behavioral health issues, seniors, families with young children, and victims of domestic violence. The City also prioritizes youth and young adults as a special needs population needing unique, targeted supports. These special needs populations will be given specific consideration as part of the following goals.
Increase Affordable Housing Supply

The greatest need in our community is to assist those with the lowest incomes obtain stable and secure housing. At least 63% of all households earning less than 50% AMI are paying more than half their income towards housing. With the ability to pay between $0 and $641 per month for a 1-bedroom unit, the private market is unable to meet this demand without assistance. The rise in housing costs, together with historically low vacancy rates and stagnant wages, makes it very difficult to find affordable housing.

The majority of the city’s land is currently zoned for single-family development, which is the most expensive type of housing. Allowing more forms of housing that meets the community’s needs is one way to boost supply. In addition to adding new affordable housing stock, it will also be important to look for opportunities to acquire ‘naturally occurring’ affordable rental units that already exist in lower-income neighborhoods. This strategy can prevent displacement that comes with gentrification, and is less expensive than new construction.

Tier 1 priorities:
- Support the acquisition and development of housing units affordable for low-income residents.
- Allow for infill, multifamily, and group housing in more neighborhoods.
- Increase the City’s proactive role in affordable housing development.

Tier 2 priorities:
- Support homeownership development and down payment assistance for low to moderate income households, especially for minority households and households with young children.

Address & Prevent Homelessness

Many people in Bellingham, and throughout Whatcom County, experience homelessness or face the prospect of losing their homes. The increasing cost of housing has placed new hardships on some families, while others face loss of their homes for reasons including chemical dependency, mental health, and domestic violence.

Tier 1 priorities:
- Support the development of emergency shelter in a safe, permanent location, and
- Support programs to prevent chronic homelessness through intervention services like diversion (from housing waiting lists) and light touch case management.
- Offer rental assistance for vulnerable households, prioritizing homeless families and adults, seniors, and severely cost burdened families with young children.

Partners as lead:
- Support intensive case management for those experiencing chronic homelessness.
- Support social inclusion programs for those reentering housing from homelessness.

42 2010-2014 CHAS tabulations.
• Support additional services to those experiencing unsheltered homelessness like storage and sanitation facilities.

**Preserve Existing Housing**

Bellingham's housing stock is aging. Older buildings requires costly maintenance – such as roofs, electrical, plumbing, weatherization, and lead-based paint stabilization – in order to preserve the unit for continued use.

The owners of the non-profit affordable housing inventory have been successful in attracting private tax credit financing to undertake significant rehabilitation work of their properties, but some financial assistance from the City has been needed. The City should ensure that new projects include strategies to address funding repair and maintenance needs.

Owner-occupied housing is also aging and in need of rehabilitation. Lower interest rates in recent years have allowed more homeowners to refinance existing mortgages to complete needed repairs, which lessened the demand for financial assistance from the City – although this is beginning to change. Senior households can benefit from the assistance the City provides in project scoping, contractor oversight, and deferred loan repayment.

Private rental housing in Bellingham provides non-subsidized housing options. The City should look at opportunities to assist, if possible, private multi-family rental projects that need assistance to meet minimum housing standards, as well as the increased standards required to house those with TBRA or other vouchers. The number of rental properties is significant to meeting the affordable housing needs of the community, and the City should ensure its continued viability.

Mobile or manufactured housing accounts for 5% of the city's owner-occupied housing stock, the majority of which are occupied by low-income households. Older homes require repair, which is difficult to obtain when occupying leased ground in a park.

The City should continue to offer rehabilitation assistance to low-income owner-occupied housing. Preference should be given to the following populations: seniors, disabled, single-parent households, very low-income, and veterans.

**Tier 1 priorities:**

• Offer home rehabilitation loans with favorable terms for low income homeowners – especially for those who are elderly or disabled, or for those who will offer elderly or disabled care in adult family homes.

**Tier 2 priorities:**

• Support owners of rental housing that offer units to residence who pay some or all of their rent with a voucher or subsidy by pursuing a rehabilitation loan program that offers favorable terms to owners or a damage mitigation fund for owners who rent to these households.
Promote Neighborhood Equity

Concentrating any single type of housing in a neighborhood limits economic diversity and housing choice. For families to achieve financial stability and economic independence, they need to have access to good schools and affordable housing, located near their place of work or convenient transportation corridors. In keeping with HUD’s goal to provide affordable housing that is accessible to job opportunities and the City’s strategic commitment to equity and social justice, the City should look for ways to promote affordable housing options within all neighborhoods. This would help disburse low-income and minority populations proportionately throughout the City, and help avoid problems that can come with high concentrations of poverty. We will also look for opportunities to serve priority special needs populations through community facilities.

Tier 2 priorities:

- Address community and public infrastructure needs in underserved neighborhoods, and/or for special needs populations.
- Conduct a housing equity audit by neighborhood.
- Diversify urban villages and higher income neighborhoods by adding affordable housing for low income residents in areas where it is lacking.

Coordinate Effective Delivery of Services

Numerous public, non-profit and private agencies provide housing and other services to low-income persons and households. Applicants, funding agencies and the recipients of housing and services would benefit from greater coordination. The City should work with other agencies and providers to coordinate the funding and delivery of services in order to be more effective and efficient, and work together to foster greater understanding among the public about housing and related issues, and the programs in place to address them.

Tier 1 priorities:

- Involve partner agencies, tenants, landlords, and the broader community in education and advocacy efforts involving homelessness, fair housing, cost burdened households, and neighborhood equity.
- Coordinate local strategies with partners to assist those experiencing and at risk of homelessness.
- Raise awareness with upstream funding and finance agencies about local needs and priorities.

Partners as lead:

- Support the coordination and expansion of mobile health and peer health services that serve special needs populations.
- Address the “benefits cliff”: pursue opportunities to ease the transition off housing assistance to encourage more households using assistance to embrace upward mobility.
- Support local economic development: especially job training for those who are exiting homelessness, and microenterprise development.
Tier 2 priorities:

- Improve disaster preparedness and response efforts, particularly for special needs populations.

Resources and contingencies

The tables that follow summarize the anticipated resources according to source of funding, and estimate the allocation of those resources by goal. Funding levels are estimations, and the community participation plan and community discussions mention that actual funding levels could be greater or less than those estimated in the plan. Goal and activity funding may be adjusted among discussed goals and activities. Contingency funding is also specifically proposed for the following activities:

Goal: Increase Affordable Housing Supply - Rental

- Multifamily rental housing development (HOME, Levy)
- CHDO projects and operating (HOME)

Goal: Address and Prevent Homelessness

- Tenant Based Rental Assistance (HOME, Levy)
- Supportive Services, including Case Management (Levy)

Goal: Preserve Existing Housing

- Housing Rehabilitation (CDBG)

Goal: Increase Affordable Housing Supply – Homeownership

- Housing Finance Commission Homebuyer (HOME, Levy)

Goals: Promote Neighborhood Equity, and Coordinate and Improve Delivery of Services

- Public/Community Facilities (CDBG)
- Administration and proactive involvement in securing sites and undertaking predevelopment activities to prepare for nonprofit housing development (Levy)

Resources allocations and estimated numbers to be served for goals and activities are based on both the current needs and historic information. They are also estimated based on HUD guidelines for maximum subsidies and regional information about the cost to develop and operate housing. Bellingham has conducted its own market analysis on both homes for sale, and market rents for apartments, and these point to a need for differentiation from the HUD standards for certain values. Those market studies are included as attachments in the HUD plan.
## Anticipated resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Year 1</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Allocation:</td>
<td>Program Income:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Acquisition; Admin and Planning; Housing; Public Improvements; Public Services</td>
<td>$681,180</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>Acquisition; Homebuyer assistance; Homeowner rehab; Multifamily rental new construction; TBRA</td>
<td>$379,758</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Gen Fund</td>
<td>Public Services; TBRA</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Housing Levy</td>
<td>Acquisition; Admin and Planning; Homebuyer assistance; Homeowner rehab; Housing; Multifamily rental new construction; Multifamily rental rehab; New construction for ownership; Public Services; TBRA</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$1,174,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals summary information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Goal(s)</th>
<th>Sort Order</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Funding 41</th>
<th>Goal Outcome Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Supply of Affordable Rental Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Build or acquire rental housing; includes acquisition and opportunity fund dollars</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$13,680,000</td>
<td>Rental units constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address &amp; Prevent Homelessness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support low barrier shelter, rental assistance, case management and diversion programs, and services that fill the gap in basic needs</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$6,796,000</td>
<td>Homeless person overnight shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant based rental assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public service activities for low/moderate income housing benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public service activities other than low/moderate income housing benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve Existing Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rehabilitate housing</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$3,628,500</td>
<td>Homeowner housing rehabilitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rental units rehabilitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Affordable Homeowner Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support down-payment assistance and new homeownership opportunities</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
<td>Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Neighborhood Equity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improve infrastructure and connectivity, and invest in facilities in low-income neighborhoods</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1,269,750</td>
<td>Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate &amp; Improve Effective Delivery of Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Education and administration funding</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1,420,440</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 Includes year one anticipated annual allocation + program income, and remainder of 5-year period anticipated allocations
Barriers to affordable housing

In 2017, a workgroup convened to address the gaps and barriers to housing and services delivery, and suggest strategies to ameliorate those barriers. The Community Solutions Workgroup convened selected community stakeholders and city staff to identify and prioritize needs along the continuum of housing, including issues of homelessness, and the various housing options available.

Specifically, the Workgroup was asked to:

1) Review the most recent Point-in-Time count and American Community Survey/Census data;
2) Review the inventory of emergency, transitional, supportive, and subsidized housing;
3) Identify the needs and gaps within the community; and
4) Recommend strategies and actions.

Over the course of four working meetings, the group was presented with data about the existing needs and resources within the community, and was asked to address a series of questions, and identify gaps and barriers. For the purposes of this workgroup, gaps were defined as deficits in any kind of resource required to meet the housing needs of our community (including funding, infrastructure, services, planning, coordination, or capacity). Barriers were defined as systematic issues, policies, or norms that prohibit the reaching of goals or operating at full potential.

Gaps for low-income renters

The workgroup was asked to start by identifying all gaps and barriers that make it difficult for low-income renters to find permanent, suitable housing. An extensive list of gaps and barriers was identified. These were compiled and summarized by City staff into the four broad categories below, keeping in mind that these categories have substantial overlap with the gaps that also affect the homeless population.

- **Inventory gaps**: An existing shortage of at least 500 rental units for low-income households, and an additional predicted shortage of 900-1,000 units over the next 5 years.
- **Service gaps**: Funding for 2.5 to 3 additional housing case managers needed immediately to fill available units and/or utilize available resources (rental vouchers).
- **Cultural gaps**: A climate in the general public that is conducive to addressing the identified barriers.
- **Coordination gaps**: A clear, comprehensive plan, backed by public/private partnerships; transparency among partners in order to understand the need for resources in real time; and access to good data about needs.

Additional gaps for the homeless population

They key barriers/areas of highest need identified by the service provider sub-group, the City, and Community Solutions Workgroup were:

- Services to promote social inclusion, community building, and independent living skills;
- Light-touch services available for those who could be housed stably with a little assistance;
- Job training and supported employment;
- Intensive, coordinated medical and behavioral health interventions; and
- Safe place(s) for people who are homeless to have shelter while the community works on other strategies.
Another effort to convene stakeholders took place in 2007, when Whatcom County and the City of Bellingham appointed sixteen community members to a Countywide Housing Affordability Task Force (CHAT). The purpose of CHAT was to review and develop policies and strategies to meet countywide affordable housing goals. Three of CHAT’s six goals addressed strategies to remove barriers to affordable housing: 1) Create a housing trust fund; 2) Strive to reduce land and building costs; and 3) Provide incentives for the creation of affordable housing.

The primary strategies that CHAT recommended to implement these goals are:

- Create an affordable housing investment fund
- Adopt measures that reduce land costs
- Adopt measures that reduce labor and material costs
- Adopt measures that reduce infrastructure development costs
- Adopt affordable housing incentives

Most of these measures have been implemented, though the City annually reviews what is still needed to be done.

**Actions planned to remove barriers**

The Community Solutions Workgroup identified strategies, defined as possible solutions that may help either fill an identified gap or overcome an identified barrier. After a thoughtful analysis of the existing gaps and barriers in housing and services, the group identified and then prioritized a list of top strategies that could help to address those gaps and/or overcome the barriers. Those were:

- Acquire, preserve, and improve existing affordable apartment blocks in the city (purchase units in gentrifying areas);
- Change zoning to support a greater diversity of housing products in the market;
- Access & provide more funding for expanded case managers / landlord liaisons;
- Construct new housing units;
- Create an insurance or damage mitigation fund to minimize the risks to landlords renting to tenants with no/poor rental history;
- Expand mobile health services;
- Study options for general transportation services and decide if appropriate to integrate into other strategies (or keep as a standalone strategy);
- Create additional staffing to leverage resources, funding, and housing development deals more strategically and proactively; utilize innovative new funding models which are already being implemented elsewhere to build new housing;
- Create a rental rehab program that makes funding available to landlords who rent to low-income tenants who utilize vouchers for upgrades required to pass more stringent inspections;
- Conduct a housing equity audit by neighborhood;
- Increase programs that enable and empower tenants receiving subsidized housing to transition out and become integrated w/in the community;
- Check-in regularly between local funders and service providers to adapt to changing needs and trends;
- Develop a community liaison or trained peer health worker program to help keep people in housing and integrate with the broader community;
- Coordinate among services and programs to promote social inclusion and community building for those exiting homelessness;
- Light-touch case management services available for those experiencing homelessness who have lower vulnerability scores to get them housed quickly;
- Assess existing workforce development programs, and cultivate relationships with employers and/or develop linkages among programs to better serve the needs of those experiencing or recently leaving homelessness; and
- Develop and offer training community-wide about how to connect with and include those experiencing homelessness.

These strategies are reflected in the priorities and goals outlined in the Consolidated Plan.

In terms of the CHAT recommendations, the City reviews them annually on land use and other limitations or policies that affect affordable housing supply in the City. Most of this effort is now integrated with other city planning efforts that encourage infill opportunities within the City. The City has accomplished most of these earlier-identified barriers, including developing a local source of funding and offering reductions in fees for low-income housing.

Discussion

The City remains committed to removing or ameliorating the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing. As described in the HUD version, section MA-40-91.210 (e), the major barriers to affordable housing in the jurisdiction are driven by market forces: demand for housing exceeds supply, there is a shortage of low-income housing as rents and property values rise, and wages are not increasing proportionate to housing costs. Additionally, minorities are less likely to apply to home ownership programs, meaning that low-income homeowners are disproportionately White (even after taking into account the fact that Bellingham has a majority White population).

Since 2012, there has been an increase in all types of populations experiencing homelessness in Whatcom County. The largest percentage point increases are among the number of chronically homeless families, both those experiencing homelessness in a given year and becoming homeless in a year. The largest group experiencing homelessness by far is individuals in families with only adults.

Whatcom County is designated as the Lead Agency to address homelessness in the county and the city. Funds are collected by the county from document recording fees locally to support local strategies to prevent or reduce homelessness. The City works in close partnership with the county to address gaps in services when possible.

As part of the outreach efforts described earlier, a subgroup of the Community Solutions Workgroup developed a survey to be taken by caseworkers and other direct service providers to assess the needs of households currently on the Housing Pool. The results were combined and analyzed anonymously as a way to quantify the needed housing types and services estimated for this group of individuals and families. In total,
the survey was conducted on behalf of 327 unique households by case managers and the Homeless Outreach Team.

Many of the strategies to address the severe housing shortage will also impact the availability of units and impact the speed at which households are able to reenter housing from homelessness. In addition, the City has put forward the following priorities specific to homelessness:

- Support the development of emergency shelter in a safe, permanent location, and
- Support programs to prevent chronic homelessness through intervention services like diversion and light touch case management.
- Support intensive case management for those experiencing chronic homelessness.
- Support job training and social inclusion programs for those reentering housing from homelessness.
- Support additional services to those experiencing unsheltered homelessness like storage and sanitation facilities.
The 2018 Action Plan is the first year of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan. The Action Plan addresses the proposed programs, projects, and activities that will be undertaken in the 2018 Action Plan year (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019) with the resources anticipated to be available in the proposed budget. Funding sources include the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME), as well as local City Housing Levy and General Fund support for specific activities.

In the event that HUD appropriations are greater or less than anticipated, or project activities come in less than funding allocated, the following activities are proposed as contingencies: Multifamily rental housing development (HOME), Tenant Based Rental Assistance (HOME), Housing Finance Commission Homebuyer (HOME), CHDO projects and operating (HOME), Housing Rehabilitation (CDBG), and Public Facilities (CDBG).
**Expected Resources**

HUD's 2018 allocation to the City of Bellingham is anticipated as 95% of the 2017 allocation for the public comment period, and will be adjusted when the actual allocation is released. Adjustments will be made in accordance with the Community Participation Plan.

**Anticipated Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Year 1</th>
<th>Expected Amt Available Reminder of ConPlan $</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Allocation:</td>
<td>Program Income:</td>
<td>Prior Year Resources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Public - Federal</td>
<td>Acquisition; Admin and Planning; Housing; Public Improvements; Public Services</td>
<td>$681,180</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$385,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>Public - Federal</td>
<td>Acquisition; Homebuyer assistance; Homeowner rehab; Multifamily rental new construction; TBRA</td>
<td>$379,758</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Gen Fund</td>
<td>Public - Local</td>
<td>Public Services; TBRA</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$23,760</td>
<td>$523,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Housing Levy | Public - Local | Acquisition; Admin and Planning; Homebuyer assistance; Homeowner rehab; Housing; Multifamily rental new construction; Multifamily rental rehab; New construction for ownership; Public Services; TBRA | $3,000,000 | $1,174,699 | $4,174,699 | $15,600,000

The City of Bellingham has a voter-approved housing levy that supports development and preservation of housing, as well as rental assistance and housing services.
## 2018 Projects Summary

### 2018 Action Plan Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Anticipated</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>Housing LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Grant/Allocation</td>
<td>$681,180</td>
<td>$379,758</td>
<td>$342,486</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,403,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income (Loan Paybacks)</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 FY Program Income Anticipated</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 FY Program Income Unspent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Uncommitted/Deobligated Funds</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commitments (AWARDS)</td>
<td>$385,747</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$181,274</td>
<td>$1,429,852</td>
<td>$2,921,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012 Housing LEVY:
- Levy Production & Preservation: $- $- $- $1,176,851 $1,176,851
- Levy AASS: $- $- $- $398,423 $398,423
- Levy Homebuyer: $- $- $- $- $-
- Levy A & O Fund: $- $- $- $875,000 $875,000
- Levy Admin: $- $- $- $165,268 $165,268

**Total:**
$1,526,937 | $794,758 | $523,760 | $4,045,394 | $6,890,859

### Activities

#### Production Program

**Previous (Unspent) Commitments**
- Opportunity Council/WAYA - 22 North: $0 | $193,383 | $193,383
- Lytle Place Jailstorm - predevelopment: $39,000 | $39,000
- OC Promise Village - predevelopment: $2,000 | $2,000

**2018 Allocations**
- OC Promise Village: $250,319 | $1,176,851 | $1,427,170

**CHDO Set Aside (min. 15% of HOME Grant)**
- OC Promise Village: $56,964 | $56,964

#### Preservation Program

**Previous Commitments**
- 2017 City Rehabilitation Program: $15,000 | $15,000
- 2017 Manufactured Housing Repair: $10,000 | $10,000
- 2016 OYASAS Baker Place Shelter Rehabilitation: $254,084 | $254,084
- 2016 Opportunity Council G St Rehabilitation: $12,000 | $12,000

**2018 Program**
- City Rehabilitation Program: $417,930 | $417,930
- Manufactured Housing Repair: $125,000 | $125,000
- 2018-19 Emergency Repairs: $50,000 | $50,000

#### Acquisition and Opportunity Program
- Acquisition and Opportunity Fund: $875,000 | $875,000

#### Rental Assistance, Housing & Human Service Program

**Previous Commitments**
- 2017 FY Tenant Based Rental Assistance: $2,000 | $2,000

**2018 Program**
- Tenant Based Rental Assistance (OC): $142,500 | $16,500 | $159,000
- Homeless Service Center Admin: $39,724 | $46,533 | $86,257
- Project Homeless Connect: $2,000 | $2,000
- Homeless Outreach Team: $210,000 | $210,000
- Intensive Case Management: $140,000 | $140,000
- Emergency Shelter NOFA: $30,000 | $30,000
- Housing Projects Based Services (see Ex. B): $397,832 | $397,832
- Housing Services (see Ex. B): $104,240 | $0 | $204,240 | $311,603
- Human & Social Services (see Ex. B): $45,254 | $312,486 | $0 | $357,740

#### Public Facility Program

**Previous Commitments**
- 2016 Opportunity Council Cornwall Phase II: $0 | $0
- Telegraph Road Infrastructure (see homebuyer project below): $315,747 | $315,747
- Foundation for the Challenged - DD Housing: $55,000 | $55,000

**2018 Competitive NOFA Allocations**
- Public/Special Needs/Community Facilities: $395,500 | $395,500

#### Homebuyer Program

**Previous Commitments**
- Housing Finance Commission: $255,000 | $259,767 | $554,767
- KCLT Telegraph Rd (see public facilities above): $4,253 | $4,253

#### Contingency Projects

- HOME - WSHPC, TBRA, Multifamily housing, CHDO operating
- CDBG: Rebuild program, Public Facilities
- Administration

**Total**
$1,326,927 | $794,758 | $523,760 | $4,045,394 | $6,890,859

**Balance**
$- | $- | $- | $- | $-
### 2018 RENTAL ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CITY GF</th>
<th>LEVY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Commitments:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$181,274</td>
<td>$656,365</td>
<td>$837,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,240</td>
<td>$206,923</td>
<td>$311,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human and Social Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,254</td>
<td>$312,486</td>
<td>$357,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-Based Rental Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$142,500</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based Rent and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$181,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$149,494</td>
<td>$142,500</td>
<td>$523,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 PROGRAM

#### Rental Assistance

**Existing Commitments:**
- 2017 FY Tenant Based Rental Assistance
- 2018 Program:
  - Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program: $142,500

**Housing Services**

**Existing Commitments:**
- Homeless Service Center Admin: $39,274

**2017-18 Competitive NOFA Allocations (year 2):**
- Lydell Place - Ending Family Homelessness: $6,440
- Lydell Place - Transitional Housing
- OC - Housing Services: $49,600
- CCS - Anti-victimization Re-housing Program: $49,600
- NWYS - PAD Program: $48,200
- DVSAS - Safe Shelter: $29,700
- NWYS - Transitional Living Program: $36,000
- YWCA - Larrabee Residence: $25,000
- Held for Emergency Shelter NOFA: $30,000
- Homeless Outreach Team: $210,000

**Project-Based Rental Assistance & Housing Services**

**Existing Commitments:**
- 2013-18 Franks Place Housing Services: $187,918
- 2013-18 Gregg's House Housing Services: $56,914
- Opportunity Council / NWYS 22 North Housing Services (begins 2018): $142,000

#### Human & Social Services

**Existing Commitments:**
- Intensive Case Management / GRACE: $140,000
- 2018 Project Homeless Connect: $2,000

**2017-18 Competitive NOFA Allocations (year 2):**
- Lydell - Mental Health Counseling: $20,000
- DVSAS - Help & Healing to Children of DV Victims: $21,350
- BCFLC - Childcare & Early Learning Services: $29,900
- WCOA - Meals on Wheels Bellingham: $30,000
- OC - Volunteer Chore Program: $29,600
- WLC - Gaining Jobs & Improving Self-Sufficiency Through Literacy: $12,490
- BCFSC - Target Intensive Case Management: $15,254
- Rebound Roots: $30,000
- B&W - Free Grocery Program: $26,800
- MNW - Farm Worker & Senior Support Services: $26,800
- OC - Maple Alley Inn: $22,100
- NWYS - Teen Court: $24,300
- WOHC - Parent / Teen Mediation: $15,000
- NWYS - Vocational Readiness Program: $25,900
- SHH - Residential Services for Adults Living with AIDS: $13,000
- LAW - Homeless Disability Benefits Project: $8,000

**TOTAL ALLOCATIONS:**
- $149,494
- $142,500
- $523,760
- $679,788
- $1,695,542

**BALANCE:**
- $149,494
- $142,500
- $523,760
- $679,788
- $1,695,542
Consolidated Plan Open House
March 26, 2018, 6-7:30 PM
Bellingham Central Library Conference Room

Summary of Feedback:

There were a total of 37 attendees at the Open House, as well as three City Staff and two volunteers from the Community Development Advisory Board, and one community volunteer. The event was divided among four tables according to the following topics. A volunteer or staff member manned each table to facilitate the activity, answer questions, and record comments or questions.

Market analysis & needs assessment:

- The following comments and suggestions came up during discussions with participants:
  - How can we better use data and population projections by neighborhood to accommodate growth?
  - I thought I had planned adequately for my retirement, and my house is paid off. I always believed in contributing my fair share of taxes, but as property values continue to go up, my property taxes have increased so much. It’s scary.
  - Re: homelessness, we should foster family involvement and reconnection, make it easier for the family to get involved.
  - When people think about zoning changes, most people are scared of the design standards, or “form” the new buildings will take. We should have more conversations with the public about “form-based codes” (see strongtowns.org, for example).
  - Is rent data collected as part of the Rental Safety Inspection Program? It should be. Then you can track how much rents are going up by neighborhood, and if landlords are raising rent more than 10%.

Goals and priorities:

- 19 participants did the goal sorting exercise. The two priorities ranked first most often among this group were “Address & Prevent Homelessness” (8) and “Increase Affordable Housing Supply” (7). These match the top two priorities in the Consolidated Plan.
- Written comments on goals and priorities were:
  - Help by giving jobs and self-respect to those who are homeless/elderly (from cleaning to education) and vouchers for work completed.
  - Promote walkability and bicycling – these should be prioritized in neighborhoods over autos.
  - Move “conduct a housing equity audit by neighborhood” (Unsure if this means remove it, or move it elsewhere. This participant ranked “Promote Neighborhood Equity” as the top priority).
- The following comments were also collected by City staff:
  - Homebuyer assistance drives the economy and creates wealth.
  - It doesn’t make sense to fund low-income buyers who can’t afford maintenance and repairs.
  - Need to have rent control. My rent is about to go up $150/month due to “market value.”
Need to provide safe spaces for homeless population. This includes listening to what the homeless want, not what we think they want.

Housing crisis due to college/university students taking over and driving prices up out of sight! Not keeping up with local incomes either.

Convert empty retail spaces just to get/increase shelter for those in transition! (Especially in this horrible weather)

Wouldn’t it be cheaper to buy apartments to serve poor people with subsidized housing and more environmentally responsible than building new buildings?

Need to have simple support systems to employ/keep busy and show respect to homeless. Example: cleaning streets, weeding, and washing public areas.

- In addition, there were two questions asked:
  - What percent of vote is needed to pass the levy?
  - Does 5-year consolidated plan assume next levy passes?

Community engagement:

- We asked participants to complete a quick survey with 3 questions which we could use to better plan and advertise future community engagement events:
  - How did you hear about this open house?
  - Did you participate in any of our online surveys?
  - What’s the best way to get your attention about important issues?

  - 17 participants completed the survey.
  - As expected, most of the participants (7) had heard about the open house via the email distribution list. A quarter of the participants (4) heard about the event through Facebook. Three participants just happened to walk by, and two heard about it by word of mouth. This indicates that the City’s Facebook events calendar is a good way to advertise events, and that good signage and event location are important factors in attracting more participants on the day of.
  - About half the participants had taken one of our online surveys (53%) and about half had not (47%).
  - Participants were asked to circle all the methods that are good ways to get their attention about important issues. The top method was social media (10), followed by print media (i.e., notices in Cascade Weekly or the Herald) and presentations to community groups (both 8). This was somewhat contradictory because “Newspaper” was an option for Question 1, “How did you hear about this open house?”, and no one selected it. The next most popular method was online surveys (7).

- Discussion question: Who’s missing from this conversation? How could we better reach them?
  - Homeless; non-English speaker and low-income families; Western students; high school classrooms
  - Over half of us who are tenants (renters) don't get heard enough
  - Homeless people?
  - Marginalized community members; Do specific outreach
  - Families of the homeless
  - More low-income residents; More Spanish speakers

APPENDIX 1
Since the colleges/university demand for housing (students) is so high, I think they need to come to the table!!! They are driving housing prices up and taking up space from others!

The following verbal comments were also written down by the volunteer:
- A homeless person said none of the strategies listed will work (people will find a way to discriminate against low-income despite new protections).
- Attorney retired from NW Justice Project wanted to know when we were going to do more testing.
- Most people thought we were doing a fantastic job.
- One person asked why they didn’t know about the Fair Housing survey. Suggested they should follow the City of Bellingham on Facebook.
- One lady who works for Skookum House felt that the problems start very early and our focus should be earlier, toddlers taken from parents.
- One man who said he is very involved but did not hear about either of the surveys. Suggested to check the City’s web page.

Budget & Funding:

Participants were shown a pie chart of the 2012-2017 Consolidated Plan budget allocation, and a pie chart of the proposed 2017-2022 allocation. They were each given $460 in fake bills (in denominations of $100’s, $50’s, and $20’s), representing a $4.6M annual budget, and asked to allocate the money between the categories as they see fit. The following pie chart is the accumulative budget allocation of 18 participants’ budgets.

Compared to the City’s proposed 2017-2022 allocation, this “participant budget” is much more evenly distributed. While the City’s proposed budget allocates 44% to rental housing construction, the
participant budget allocates just 20%. This is the only category that receives significantly less in the participant budget than in the City’s budget.

Public and community facilities comparatively received the biggest increase, at 14% of the budget (compared to 4% in the City’s budget). Strategic acquisition of sites also received significantly more in the participant budget – at 14% compared to 5% in the City’s budget. Some of this may be due to the fact that participants only received large denominations for this exercise, which made allocating small amounts a bit more of a challenge.

Rental assistance and support services receive exactly the same allocation (24%) in both budgets, and housing preservation receives nearly the same allocation (12% versus 13% in the City’s budget).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House - Budget Exercise</th>
<th>Participant budget</th>
<th>Proposed City budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental housing construction</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental assistance &amp; support services</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing preservation</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebuyer assistance</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic acquisition of sites</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; community facilities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; contingency</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED & RESPONSE (Reported in HUD’S IDIS)

There were a wide variety of comments and questions during this event. The comments recorded in relation to the City’s proposed Goals & Priorities were:

- *Homebuyer assistance drives the economy and creates wealth* (Yes, this is why we continue to fund homebuyer assistance)

- *Need to provide safe spaces for homeless population. This includes listening to what the homeless wants, not what we think they want.* (We have made a great effort to survey case managers and low-income residents. The low-barrier homeless shelter is a top priority in the near-term. As an emergency measure, the City has made dumpsters and toilets available to those who are homeless, and works to make public places welcoming and safe for the homeless population.)

- *Wouldn’t it be cheaper to buy apartments to serve poor people with subsidized housing and more environmentally responsible than building new buildings?* (Yes! That is why we have prioritized acquisition of existing buildings and strategic acquisition of sites, along with new construction.)

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS NOT ACCEPTED AND REASONS

- *It doesn’t make sense to fund low-income buyers who can’t afford maintenance and repairs.* (Our homeownership assistance programs provide training for homebuyers, and also ensure that the buyer has adequate income for routine maintenance and upkeep of the property.)
- Need to have rent control. My rent is about to go up $150/month due to “market value.” (Under State law, the City cannot enact rent control measures. This is an issue to bring up with your elected State representative.)

- Housing crisis due to college/university students taking over and driving prices up out of sight! Not keeping up with local incomes either. (It is true that housing costs are not keeping up with local incomes, however we do not attribute this or the high cost of housing to the student population. Bellingham has long been an affordable college town, and has only seen sharp housing increases in recent years as the region has experienced significant economic and population growth. Meanwhile, the student population has remained relatively constant, and therefore we cannot reasonably attribute the rise in housing costs to the student population alone.)

- Convert empty retail spaces just to get/increase shelter for those in transition! Especially in this horrible weather. (The City is actively working with property owners and developers to redevelop and repurpose vacant properties in our Downtown core. However, this is dependent on private owners’ willingness to sell and/or redevelop their properties. The City cannot legally force them to do so. This is also why building a new low-barrier shelter is a top priority.)

- Need to have simple support systems to employ/keep busy and show respect to homeless. Example: cleaning streets, weeding, and washing public areas. (There is no such City-run program planned, however, we do have ample job-training opportunities in the community through Goodwill and Worksource. Our partner-led priorities include more supported job training and placement for those who are currently or formerly homeless.)
Consolidated Plan: Written comments received
Submitted December 21, 2017 – April 10, 2018
(Does not include Assessment of Fair Housing comment period)

Housing Affordability and Zoning

Email received: March 28, 2018
From: Kornelis, Jon S Jon.Kornelis@bp.com
Subject: RE: Remind: Consolidated Plan Open House - Today!

Thank you for the invite to the Open house on Monday. It was very informative and I learned a lot about what the city was doing, and about their future plans. It was also nice to talk with a few of the city staff and to talk with April Barker from the City council. One of the questions I was asked by staff was what did I think the city should be doing about housing. I did have some feedback with a few of the staff that where there but here are some of my responses.

1. Continue to build the big apartment complexes. A lot of people don’t like them but they are the answer to cheaper housing. If done right they work.
2. Expand the UGA’s. There may be some land left in the City limits to develop but it seems to be something that either drives the price up, or environmental constraints on it. (a lot of wetlands/hard to build on lots) A lot of this land may be better off left as green spaces. There is a lot of land to the north and south of the city that would be easy to develop.
3. Allow building on the empty lots in the UGA. There is already Urban density here and lots that would be available if they had water and sewer. Most of these lots have the water and sewer going to them and people could and would build but the city won’t allow hookups (the city already allows hookups for some big business and developers but not for small property owners-example, the new Holiday Inn Hotel at the airport).
4. Encourage the ADU’s where they in neighborhoods that will except them.
5. Try to develop some type of development plan to connect and work with the city of Ferndale. The I5 corridor is already being built out commercially but not a lot of residential being mixed in with it. (trying to think of homes that are close to business making for short commutes—similar to the Haskell business park or Iron gate)
6. Keep up the good work with the Green ways and parks. Bellingham is doing a great job with this. Make sure to secure park land and trails as the city grows. Make sure the trails coming out of the North end of Bellingham connect up with the South end of Ferndale.
7. Be thoughtful of future road connections and traffic plans. It currently is quite hard to get around Bellingham due to its general layout. Need to look into improving various connectors. An example would be the lack of east and west connectors between Smith road and Bakerview road.

Thank you for giving the community an opportunity to give input. I know that community development is a very difficult thing and making everyone happy is quite impossible.

Thanks again for your hard work!
Jon Kornelis
Submitter: Patricia Leja  
Address: 4396 Saddlestone Dr  
City: Bellingham  
State: WA  
Zip: 98226  
Comments:  
We would like to see more 55+ Active Retirement Community Single Family Homes in Bellingham. With the rapidly growing number of retirees settling in Bellingham, this is something that is desperately needed. Are there any plans in the works?

Submitter: Izaac Post  
Address: 2105 Knox Ave Apt. 3  
City: Bellingham  
State: WA  
Zip: 98225  
Comments:  
The City has excellent guidelines for infill housing, but they are not allowed to be applied to single family zones. Please encourage infill housing types to be built in single family zones. Infill housing supplies more houses inside our existing city limits, reducing sprawl and the negative side-effects of sprawl such as increased pollution, increased vehicle miles, and increased storm water runoff. Increasing our density will provide more diversity of housing types and more affordable housing types near where people already live, work, and play—and reduces the need for new or expanded infrastructure that greenfield development requires. Lastly, parking is an amenity, not a right—and our laws should reflect that. Remove parking minimums, at least from neighborhoods served by bus service. Bus riders shouldn’t be forced to pay for a parking spot with their apartment or house if they don’t own a car.

In summary, please adopt the infill toolkit for use in all single-family zones to create more diversity and affordability in our housing supply. Remove barriers to increased density such as parking minimums.

Thank you!

Submitter: ERIC RODRICK  
Address: 3219 Pinewood Avenue, apt C4  
City: Bellingham  
State: WA  
Zip: 98225  
Comments:  
I am very concerned about converting all single-family zoning in the city to multi-family zoning (in all but name) by allowing second residences up to 90% of the size of the original.

There is no evidence this will generate equality.

There is no evidence it will achieve its stated goals.

There is plentiful evidence that its advocates have vested interest, as most are landlords and developers seeking to profit in a changed real estate market.

Just the disingenuous and dishonest arguments of the proponents should be cause enough not to move forward with that aspect of the plan, but if that is not enough then retaining the respect of the people
(and possible their votes) surely is. Seattle attempted a similar change recently, and was forcibly restrained because though they have (dishonestly and disingenuously) maintained that the measure would not require an environmental impact study, in fact it did. Should the council pass a similar measure here, it will certainly also be frozen pending environmental impact study and the people of this city will come to understand how little respect their council has for environmental concerns and how deeply they are in the pockets of developers and small, minority groups of wealthy land-owners.

That is what the people will see if this measure is passed and restrained only by appeal, essentially confirming that it was deficient and known to be from the beginning.

Submitter: Natalia Robinson
Address: 1401 James St
City: Bellingham
State: WA
Zip: 98225
Comments:
It is vital to this community to focus on affordable housing. Alternative housing such as ADUs, low income hud housing and section 8 homes help address this concern. Currently the available housing in Bellingham is so costly that the majority of Bellingham housing is inaccessible to Bellingham citizens. We desperately need a shift in priorities. If it were not for disabled income based apartments, I would be homeless.

Email received: April 10, 2018
From: Paul Klein royenorth@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Last chance to submit your written comments!

Dear Department members:

First of all, thank you for the important and monumental effort of producing the City of Bellingham 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan draft for public comment. I can only imagine the amount of work that went into it, and you deserve real kudos.

Overall, I concur with the Strategic Plan described in pages 45 through 56, and have fundamentally just one objection, two concerns related to that objection, and one suggestion.

1. My objection
I disagree with the notion, expressed within the pages of the Strategic Plan and elsewhere in the draft, that infill in neighborhoods currently zoned single family residential will assist those among us with the lowest incomes.

Page 48 states in its first paragraph: "The greatest need in our community is to assist those with the lowest incomes." I agree unequivocally. In furtherance of doing so, the "Tier I priorities" are stated as: "support the acquisition and development of housing units affordable for low-income residents," "allow for infill, multifamily, and group housing in more neighborhoods," and "increase the City's proactive role in affordable housing development."
I agree overall with those priorities except, as I've already stated, the "infill." Would it increase the housing supply? Yes, obviously. Would it directly or even indirectly increase a housing supply specifically targeted to assist those most in need? I doubt it, and I know of no reputable studies to assuage that doubt.

2. My concerns

Like many others in our community, I am concerned that infill in at least some neighborhoods currently zoned single family residential will result in a degradation in its residents' quality of life, and even in degradation in the quality of life in Bellingham as a whole.

Additionally, like many seniors on modest, fixed pensions, I am concerned about the potential tax consequences of infill. Page 23 of the Consolidated Plan draft states: "Many retired seniors live on a fixed income and cannot afford rental costs or property tax increases. In fact, senior households make up the majority of owner-occupied households that are cost burdened." That's my wife, Emily, and me.

I searched throughout the Consolidated Plan draft to see a discussion of whether infill might have the effect of raising our property taxes, and found nothing on the topic. Did I miss it? Whether I did or not, isn't there credible evidence that infill does in fact routinely have that result? If so, there's an important "disconnect" between the facts about seniors stated on page 23 and the claimed benefits of infill.

3. My suggestion

Already quoted above, the Consolidated Plan draft states there should be "an increase in the City's proactive role in affordable housing development." On that point, I have long wondered why the City apparently does not routinely require a percentage of new construction of various housing types be produced for low-income residents. Am I correct in that observation? I did not see it addressed at all in the Consolidated Plan draft. As you no doubt know, permits for new construction of various types of housing are routinely conditioned to produce that result elsewhere in the US. I suggest it should become a high priority for the City.

In closing, again, thank you for your efforts!

Sincerely,
Paul Klein
3205 Alderwood Avenue

Addendum:

Dear Department of Planning and Community Development members:

I did not see a discussion, in the Consolidated Plan draft, of the effects of "Airbnb" and similar vacation rental arrangements. It seems to me this might be an important omission when undertaking the task of planning Bellingham's housing future.
For example, if we promote DADUs, isn't it just as likely or even more likely that a person would build one to rent to vacationers, rather than long term residents, much less low to moderate income residents? I honestly have no objection to it, but nearby in my neighborhood, I know two households that rent rooms to vacationers, one households that rents an attached ADU to vacationers, and one household that rents a DADU to vacationers. Those are just the folks I know, within a handful of blocks!

My very basic understanding is that the "Airbnb" and similar vacation rental markets might be difficult to quantify, much less regulate. I don't envy you or anyone else the task. Still, I think it merits a good deal of thought if we are to have faith in the claimed outcomes of planning.

Sincerely,
Paul Klein
3205 Alderwood Avenue

Homelessness

Submitter: Cari Duffy
Address: 3214 Cherrywood Ave
City: Bellingham
State: WA
Zip: 98225
Comments:
I do not agree with increasing taxes in any way to compensate for homeless issues or affordability. I also do not agree that we need to do anything about affordability. This is what happens in a town that is growing bigger and more expensive. People move into smaller communities when they cannot afford to be in Bellingham anymore. This is life. Stop allowing the homeless to ruin our city!

Submitter: Schyler Duryee
Address: 1200 N. Garden St.
City: Bellingham
State: WA
Zip: 98225
Comments:
I think that this is a good start to getting people housed but I think there should also be a focus on giving support to people who have or are facing homelessness or those with lower incomes struggling with the costs of housing as well as other necessities for living. I think that there are a lot of rules and regulations that come along with subsidized housing and I think if the city will work with those who are struggling with housing we can focus on an even bigger problem of what comes with having low income. These support services should work with individuals with issues involving financing, mental health, substance abuse, etc. I think that too often policies expect those who are marginalized by income are put under a microscope to be absolutely perfect when nobody perfect no matter what income bracket they fall in. I think that if that is considered then this could be a successful plan in elevating the number of people who have to face homelessness and helping a bigger problem from continuing its cycle.
Whatcom County needs to provide, or allow, more support for transitional housing for individuals...both male and female. The new approach by the United Way to focus support on agencies with children, of course a high priority, leaves the single, needy population at risk. Mental problems, drug or alcohol addiction make placement difficult but progress can be attained.

No population center should look like the streets of so many US cities....disenfranchised people, all ages, pushing carts with all their belongings, rain or shine, no place to go. We did better in the Depression....at least many showed human kindness to their fellow man and shared what little they had.

**Neighborhood Equity/Equality**

**Submitter:** Brian Estes  
**Address:** 4720 Spring Vista Way  
**City:** Bellingham  
**State:** WA  
**Zip:** 98226  
**Comments:**  
I highly endorse this latest section of the consolidated plan. Lack of fair housing opportunities is a very important issue in Bellingham and the solutions listed below are a great first step towards addressing them. We need the infill toolkit implemented city-wide ASAP. While Bellingham prides itself on being a welcoming, liberal city, for too long our housing and zoning policies reinforce racial and income segregation by neighborhood. More publicity and education of the public about the results of the resent 2018-2022 Fair Housing Assessment report would greatly aid this effort as well.

**Promote Neighborhood Equity**

Concentrating any single type of housing in a neighborhood limits economic diversity and housing choice. For families to achieve financial stability and economic independence, they need to all have access to good schools and affordable housing which is located near their place of work. In keeping with HUD’s goal to provide affordable housing that is accessible to job opportunities and the City’s strategic commitment to equity and social justice, the City should promote affordable housing options within all neighborhoods. This would help disburse low-income and minority populations proportionately throughout the City and help avoid problems that can come with high concentrations of poverty.

**Tier 1 priorities:**  
• Support the acquisition of existing ‘naturally occurring’ rental units in higher poverty neighborhoods as a strategy to prevent displacement with gentrification.

**Tier 2 priorities:**  
• Address infrastructure needs in underserved neighborhoods.  
• Conduct a housing equity audit by neighborhood.
• Diversify urban villages and higher income neighborhoods by adding affordable housing for low income residents in areas where it is lacking.

Submitter: Shovia Muchirawehondo  
Address: 2551 Donovan Avenue  
City: Bellingham  
State: WA  
Zip: 98225  
Comments:
In the Plan as well as the assessment there is ample evidence that race and the practice of racism is a factor in the housing issues of Bellingham. We must address equality in housing and income in Bellingham in some way to ensure that there is a move toward a more equitable housing situation for communities of color in Bellingham. While mentioned in the assessment, there is not reference to the fact that a barrier that exists is that "they felt unwelcome somewhere because of their race, or because they are “not white". This coupled with the disparity issues reflected in the plan should lead to a goal that reduces this fear through the city taking a hard stance against any discrimination based upon race. In this plan, there should be the inclusion of specific goals and actions that promote equality to affirm equity. The city should require diversity training for all city employees that deal with any issues but particularly deal with housing issues. Any plan associated with ensuring that a move away from housing inequalities based upon race should include and have as primary stakeholders those from communities of color. Equality promotes equity.

Submitter: Tina McKim  
Address: 2333 Humboldt St  
City: Bellingham  
State: WA  
Zip: 98225  
Comments:
Birchwood needs an accessible, affordable, culturally diverse and appropriate grocery store to provide fresh, healthy food. It is important that this grocery does not contribute to the gentrification of the neighborhood, as residents are already being forced out by higher rents. It is important that any planning in the Birchwood neighborhood be based on the needs and desires of those most affected in the neighborhood; in the case of the grocery, those who have lost their place to get groceries (in particular the disabled, poor, people of color and the elderly)should have their voices at the forefront of any decision. Outreach must be extensive and accessible to the disabled, those who speak various languages and those who work multiple jobs. Surveyed neighbors also note the lack of community center/social meeting spaces in the neighborhood, which would have a positive impact on the health and spirit of the neighborhood. The issue of non-compete clauses in the city in the case of essential needs such as groceries must also be urgently addressed. These clauses must be prohibited in COB. No neighborhood should have to go hungry because some corporation decides it wants to make more money somewhere else, chasing after a different income/demographic bracket. The city missed a real opportunity to purchase the Albertsons building and lease it out to essential services needed in the area.
General comments

Email received: March 13, 2018
From: Katherine Freimund director@whatcomliteracy.org
Subject: Re: Consolidated Plan: public comment period is open
Regarding the Consolidated Plan, a note: In Figure 12. Bellingham School District: % minority and free/reduced meals by elementary school on page 31 it includes Irene Reither. The last time I checked Irene Reither was in the Meridian School District.

Thank you for all of your good work on this project.

Best,
Katherine

Email received: March 22, 2018
From: Ivana Grace ivanamazingrace@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Consolidated Plan Open House - Monday
THAN YOU! This is very thoughtful, and I appreciate the 'transparency' in this public/civic action, reminding us that THIS IS OUR CITY, after all, blessed to be a DEMOCRACY!!! Looking forward, Ivana Grace

Email received: April 10, 2018
From: Mike and Kristina Heintz <mikeheintz@msn.com>
Subject: 2018-2023 Consolidated Plan Public Comment
Good Afternoon, Kate,

I want to provide comment on the City Council's Consolidated Plan for 2018-2023.

This updated Consolidated Plan is stellar! It is amazingly well-written, concise, evidence-based, data-driven & compassionate policy proposal that strives for and will create a more inclusive & socially-equitable community!

I support it completely and urge its adoption as written.

I also want to thank the Council members who authored it for their dedication, hard thoughtful work and insight! It eloquently articulates our shared community goals to create an inclusive city where all can thrive and provides the guidance & policy to achieve those goals. The tiered approach is wonderful!

Good Afternoon, again, Kate,

As part of the input for the Consolidated Plan public comment, I would like to add the following links for inspiration & guidance for policy implementation & success of the plan.
https://www.huduser.gov/portal/casestudies/study-030718.html
Inspirational project to create low to mid-income housing & commitment to healthy living & local sustainable food systems, Portland, Maine
https://www.huduser.gov/portal/casestudies/study_08312015_1.html
Homelessness Project, Quixote Village, Olympia, WA
https://www.huduser.gov/portal/pdredge/pdr-edge-featd-article-072417.html

Filling in Housing Gaps

https://www.shareable.net/blog/11-affordable-housing-alternatives-for-city-dwellers

Alternative urban affordable housing options.

https://www.citylab.com/design/2018/01/the-granny-flats-are-coming/550388/

accessorydwellingunits.org

A great resource on ongoing ADU policy & development.

https://www.shareable.net/blog/austin-to-shelter-homeless-in-a-tiny-house-village

https://www.shareable.net/blog/11-tiny-house-villages-redefining-home

Again, I support it completely and ask Council to adopt the updated Consolidated Plan as proposed and written.

Thank you for your time, consideration & service,

Sincerely,
Kristina Heintz
Birchwood
Community Development Advisory Board  
City of Bellingham  
Bellingham City Hall  
201 Lottie Street  
Bellingham, WA  98225  

Dear CDAB Members:

On behalf of the Board of the Whatcom Council on Aging, I am responding to the City of Bellingham’s 2018-2022 Consolidated Draft Plan. I appreciate the extensive information in the draft plan on population patterns and trends. However, because of the increasing number of seniors and anticipated continuing increase in the percentage of seniors in Bellingham over the next decade, we recommend the Plan include additional priorities regarding programs (operations and facilities) that will support this growing aging population.

**Basic Needs**

- Rental Assistance  
  Specifically, we propose that the elderly be identified as a special-needs population in the priority for rental assistance. With the rapidly increasing cost of housing in Bellingham, the elderly that are on a limited and fixed income will be especially in need of rental assistance to avoid becoming homeless. This priority would assist those elderly who do not own their own home. (The City has identified a priority of home rehabilitation loans for low-income elderly.)

- Basic Food and Nutrition  
  Our Meals on Wheels and More program has experienced a 40% increase in the last three years for home-delivered meals to homebound seniors. Year-to-date, we have delivered 16% more nutritious meals to local homebound seniors. We receive new requests for meals nearly every day. This past year, 2017, we operated at a $40,000
loss even though we generated revenues above that of 2016. The loss is due to the increasing cost of providing additional meals. As our reserves cannot continue to address this need, it is likely that Meals on Wheels will establish a wait list, even though the last thing we want to do when someone calls hungry for a meal, is inform them they need to wait until their number comes up.

While meeting basic needs such as hunger allows seniors to maintain their quality of life, it also reduces further costs to society. There are studies that demonstrate that states that spend more on meals on wheels have fewer hospital admissions and shorter hospital stays, which in turn is less costly to the community.

Meals on Wheels and More typically provides one nutritionally-balanced meal per day. Our recent client surveys indicate that many of the Whatcom County seniors receiving Meals on Wheels remain food insecure even with our services. We hear of seniors in Whatcom County who receive Meals on Wheels and are making decisions of whether to purchase additional meals or needed medical prescriptions. Additional support through delivered food from the Foodbank, food assistance programs such as SNAP, or additional meals through Meals on Wheels and More are needed to meet the basic nutrition needs for the population we serve.

**Bellingham Senior Activity Center**

We advocate for the Consolidated Plan to address the priorities that will focus on an improved quality of life for the elderly. This includes programs that will offer improved health and wellness. This includes the facility at the Bellingham Senior Activity Center and appropriate operating costs. As with the Meals on Wheels and More program, the current demand for services cannot be met with our anticipated revenue, nonprofits, but will need community support.

We understand the City has a number of issues before them and we request the City consider the current and anticipated growth in the number of seniors and increase priorities that will improve the quality of life for the elderly. It is time for the City to include these seniors in their planning as it will not only improve the quality of life, but will decrease future costs for medical and housing expenses for our aging population.

- Space for Programs
  The Bellingham Senior Activity Center is an important gathering place for seniors in Bellingham. It offers a variety of programs that support and sustain our aging population. There are activities to address a variety of physical needs – ranging form group walks, hikes, and a range of fitness classes designed for older adults – from chair yoga and dancing to strength training and Zumba. The Senior Center is a
vital location providing a noon meal (through Meals on Wheels and More) for seniors who are not homebound, a place for creativity though craft projects and educational presentations, along with programs to stimulate their brains, and for social interactions so important to minimize the isolation and depression that can be found among the elderly.

The current Senior Center facility is provided by the County, and the current programs have outgrown this space. While we are very appreciative of the Senior Center, plans are needed to replace the existing facility to accommodate the increasing senior population. The Senior Center is juggling room assignments to maximize space and cannot accommodate all programming requests. Frequently, larger rooms are needed as the demand has increased. There is no elevator although the Meals on Wheels and More offices are located downstairs in the partial basement. Seniors sometimes have difficulty with the stairs, and must then wait for staff to come upstairs, or go outside in the weather and use the steep ramp before coming back in.

- **Building Design for Senior Health**
  The Senior Center building was built about 40 years ago, and much has been learned since then to accommodate the needs of aging adults. This includes the important need to have improved acoustics in the building with carpeting or sound-absorbing panels, or rooms with a hearing loop built in to the flooring of large rooms to improve the ability of one to hear using hearing aids. In addition, lighting needs to be brighter and focused to accommodate failing eyesight, along with equipment and space for the equipment to allow magnification of documents and books.

- **Building Security**
  Lastly, the Senior Center building was not designed with security needed in today’s society - there are over a dozen doors providing access into the building. Since we are responsible for the safety of all who visit the Senior Center, we need to know who is in the building.

- **Parking**
  Parking is also an issue for the Bellingham Senior Activity Center. When the Senior Center building was constructed in the seventies the thinking then was that seniors don’t drive, so parking was not included as a necessary adjunct for the building. Currently, we lease parking across the street (the City does pay for a majority of the parking lease), and should the property owner decide to sell the parking or include it in the lease of the building tenants, we would be hard pressed to find alternate parking.
Funding for Senior Center Operations
Apart from the building, the Bellingham Senior Activity Center is rethinking how to fund operations. The County supports one position for each of the four larger Senior Centers (Blaine, Bellingham, Lynden and Ferndale). Even with the use of volunteers, this is not sufficient for the level of programs offered at the Bellingham Senior Activity Center. With 1,700 members, the Senior Center currently relies on membership dues for $75,000 of its operating budget. We are reluctant to increase dues and, if anything, would like to reduce or eliminate membership fees to encourage all persons to be active in the Center. The balance of operating costs come from class fees, support drives to the senior center members and fundraising.

Many senior centers in the state receive substantial operating funds from local governments, either City or County (i.e., Kent, Issaquah, Lynnwood, Ellensburg, and Vancouver senior centers.) We request the City prioritize operating support for the Bellingham Senior Activity Center.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment of the Consolidated Plan Draft,

Mary Carlson
Executive Director
Subject: **Bellingham Home Fund Levy**

Summary Statement: Mayor Kelli Linville and staff will present information on the renewal of the low-income housing levy, including the option to place a ballot item on the November 2018 ballot. The proposed levy would replace the existing housing levy with a levy to raise property taxes for ten years to provide for implementation of programs with funds raised by the authorized property tax increase. The existing levy passed in 2012, and increased the regular property tax levy by $.12 per $1,000 of assessed valuation (AV), and authorized the levying of $.24 per $1,000 AV for very low-income housing as allowed by RCW 84.52.105. The draft resolution includes the proposed ballot title as well as an exhibit on the proposed uses: production and preservation of homes, rental assistance and support services, low-income homebuyer assistance, acquisition and opportunity loans, and program administration.

Previous Council Action: **Ordinance 2012-06-033 (existing Home Fund/Housing Levy)**

Fiscal Impact: **Existing levy was proposed at $.36 per $1,000 AV, and raises $21M over a seven year period, or $3M annually. The proposed levy is $.36 per $1,000 AV for a ten year period, raising up to $40M, or $4M annually.**

Funding Source: **Property tax**

Attachments: 1. STAFF MEMO  
                2. DRAFT RESOLUTION

**Meeting Activity**  
Committee Briefing - Direction Requested  
**Meeting Date** 05/07/2018  
**Recommendation** Provide Direction  
**Presented By** Mayor Kelli Linville  
**Time** 10 minutes

**Recommended Motion:** Direct the Mayor to schedule the resolution for a vote of the Council at its June 4th meeting.

**Council Committee:**  
Committee Of The Whole

**Agenda Bill Contact:**  
Brian Heinrich, Exec, x8117

**Reviewed By**  
Brian M. Heinrich

**Department**  
Executive

**Date**  
04/26/2018

**Council Action:**  
Forrest W. Longman  
Finance  
04/26/2018

Peter M. Ruffatto  
Legal  
04/30/2018

Kelli J. Linville  
Executive  
05/01/2018
TO: BELLINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
FROM: MAYOR KELLI LINVILLE
SUBJECT: MAY 7, 2018
DATE: RENEWAL OF THE BELLINGHAM HOME FUND

Following this memorandum, please find a draft resolution to renew the Bellingham Home Fund. I will be requesting that this item be placed on the November 6, 2018 general election ballot to replace the existing levy with a new one, and to enhance the current housing levies at your June 4, 2018 meeting. These funds are referred to as our Bellingham Home Fund ("Home Fund"), which was first passed in 2012. The draft resolution in the packet is subject to Legal and staff review and modification.

The proposition would:

- Permit the City to continue its regular property tax collection by up to $0.12 per $1,000 of assessed valuation. The 2013 rate was set at $.12 per $1,000 of assessed valuation;

- Authorize the City to continue to impose regular property tax levy of up to $0.24 per $1,000 of assessed valuation for very low-income housing pursuant to RCW 84.52.105. The 2013 rate was set at .24 per $1,000 of assessed valuation;

- Based on the same rate, generate up to $4M annually because of increased property tax valuation. The current levies generate $3M annually; and

- Provide for a term of 10 years.

Voters passed levies to provide revenue for the Bellingham Home Fund in 2012, resulting in $3M raised annually for affordable housing and services. The Bellingham Home Fund is on track to meet or exceed all goals adopted as part of the administrative and financing plan for the levy revenue, including supporting the addition of 405 completed housing units and another 183 units that are under contract to be built.

For every $1 raised by the Home Fund, an average of over $8 of other private and public funding is leveraged for housing affordability initiatives.
While we are meeting and exceeding our goals, the need for additional affordable housing supply and services continues. As indicated in our community survey, creating more affordable housing options and addressing the homelessness crisis remains a top priority to our community.

U.S. Census data has estimated that there are 7,680 low-income households in Bellingham that face a severe housing cost burden by having to pay more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs. And, over 1,000 low-income seniors in Bellingham pay more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs and face challenges in repairing their homes without financial assistance.

At any point in time, over 700 people are homeless in Whatcom County, according to the annual Point-in-Time Count, and 15 percent of all people experiencing homelessness in Bellingham are children under 10 years of age, with adverse childhood experiences that have profound and long-lasting negative consequences.

A continuation and enhancement of the housing levies will enable the City to provide for the housing needs of low-income and very low-income households by:

- Producing and preserving another 580 homes;
- Providing 3000 households with rental assistance or other support services needed to preserve their housing;
- Supporting additional services for project-based supportive housing, such as Francis Place and 22 North;
- Taking a more proactive in working with our partners to secure property and assist in packaging development projects; and
- Assist 55 low-income homebuyers.

I look forward to discussing this proposal with you on May 7, 2018.
A RESOLUTION RELATING TO LOW-INCOME HOUSING; REQUESTING THAT A SPECIAL ELECTION BE HELD CONCURRENT WITH THE NOVEMBER 6, 2018 GENERAL ELECTION FOR SUBMISSION TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY OF A PROPOSITION TO LIFT THE LIMIT ON REGULAR PROPERTY TAXES UNDER CHAPTER 84.55 RCW FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING; DECLARING THE EXISTENCE OF AN EMERGENCY UNDER CHAPTER 84.52.105 AND REQUESTING VOTER APPROVAL OF AN ADDITIONAL PROPERTY TAX FOR VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING; PROVIDING FOR THE EXPIRATION OF THE ADDITIONAL LEVIES AT THE END OF TEN YEARS; SETTING FORTH THE BALLOT PROPOSITION; DESIGNATING A CITIZEN LEVY ADVISORY COMMITTEE; AND PROVIDING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS WITH FUNDS DERIVED FROM THE TAXES AUTHORIZED.

WHEREAS, City Council has adopted equity and social justice as legacies for the City of Bellingham;

WHEREAS, the City Council is committed to supporting safe, affordable housing and services for lower-income residents in order to promote equity and social justice;

WHEREAS, a healthy community is one in which all members have access to basic needs such as safe, secure, and affordable homes, yet homes remain unaffordable for a significant percentage of Bellingham residents;

WHEREAS, households face a severe burden when housing costs (including utilities) exceed 50 percent of household income;

WHEREAS, U.S. Census data has estimated that there are 7,680 low-income households in Bellingham that face a severe housing cost burden by having to pay more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs;

WHEREAS, over 1,000 low-income seniors in Bellingham pay more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs and face challenges in repairing their homes without financial assistance;

WHEREAS, at any point in time, over 700 people are homeless in Whatcom County, according to the annual Point-in-Time Count, and 15 percent of all people experiencing homelessness in Bellingham are children under 10 years of age, with adverse childhood experiences that have profound and long-lasting negative consequences;

WHEREAS, the Bellingham Housing Authority has closed waiting lists for public housing, with 750 households listed, 93 percent of which earn less than 30% of the Area Median Income and 41 percent are families with disabilities;

WHEREAS, the Bellingham Housing Authority has 1,181 households on the closed
waiting list for rental assistance vouchers, with an average waiting time to receive assistance of nearly a year for those on the waiting list;

WHEREAS, roughly one-third of Bellingham's housing stock is over 50 years old, requiring repair, maintenance and weatherization that is often not affordable to low-income households;

WHEREAS, local wages are not keeping pace with Bellingham's housing costs, with median rent increasing by 72 percent and median wages increasing by 46 percent since 2000;

WHEREAS, according to the U.S. Census, the median value of homes increased 137 percent from 2000 to 2016, while median family income increased 41 percent;

WHEREAS, the creation of more affordable housing options near employment centers is good for the environment, reduces long commutes with associated pollution, lowers commuting expenses, reduces traffic congestion, and avoids road widening costs;

WHEREAS, Bellingham voters passed levies to provide revenue for the Bellingham Home Fund in 2012, resulting in $3,000,000 raised annually for affordable housing and services;

WHEREAS, the Bellingham Home Fund is on track to meet or exceed all goals adopted as part of the administrative and financial plan for the levy revenue, including supporting the addition of 405 completed housing units and another 183 units that are under contract to be built;

WHEREAS, each $1 from the Bellingham Home Fund has been used as matching money to leverage an average of over $8 of other private and public funding for housing affordability;

WHEREAS, as a condition of receiving federal funding for low-income housing, the City of Bellingham administers affordable housing programs with citizen oversight, including preparation of five-year strategic plans, performance measures and outcomes, and annual action plans;

WHEREAS, the City of Bellingham has efficiently administered the Bellingham Home Fund in conjunction with its existing programs that manage federal funding for housing affordability;

WHEREAS, Chapter 84.55 RCW generally limits the dollar amount of regular property taxes that a city may levy in any year, but RCW 84.55.050 allows a city to levy taxes exceeding such limit by majority approval of the voters, allows a city to include in the ballot proposition a limit on the purpose for which the additional taxes levied will be used and allows the proposition to provide for the expiration of the additional taxing authority;

WHEREAS, the proposed additional levy is within the limitations set by RCW 84.52.043;

WHEREAS, RCW 84.52.105 authorizes a city to impose additional regular property tax levies to finance affordable housing for very low-income households when specifically
authorized to do so by a majority of the voters of the taxing district voting on a ballot proposition authorizing the levy;

WHEREAS, RCW 35.21.685 authorizes a city to assist in the development or preservation of publicly or privately owned housing for persons of low income by providing loans or grants of general municipal funds to the owners or developers of the housing, including loans or grants to finance the acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of low-income housing, and to provide rental assistance and other supportive services to low-income persons;

WHEREAS, the Council has determined that it is the best interest of the City to submit to the voters the question of whether to replace and enhance the existing housing levies which are set to expire in 2019 by proposing levies to collect up to $0.36 per $1,000 assessed valuation (both levies combined) over a period of 10 years or less; and

WHEREAS, the City intends that in 2019 it will collect up to $0.36 per $1,000 assessed valuation for the Bellingham Home Fund based on the proposed combined levies if approved, and will collect $.00 per $1,000 of the existing levies so that the total revenue collected in 2019 remains at approximately the same as the level as will be collected in the subsequent 9 years.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Findings. The City Council makes the following findings and declares as follows:

A. The City's Consolidated Plan and Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan identify insufficient safe, sanitary, and decent housing that is affordable to low-income and very low-income households to meet the present and anticipated needs of such households, including homes affordable for local working people, U.S. military veterans, families with children, people with limited or fixed incomes including senior citizens, and people having a disability.

B. Affordable rental housing for low-income households, including the homeless, other persons with special needs, families and seniors, often requires a commitment of City funds for development or preservation, or other forms of assistance.

C. Promoting and preserving home ownership for low-income households contributes to the stability of families and neighborhoods; helps preserve the physical condition of residential properties; and addresses the shortage of safe, sanitary, affordable housing both by maintaining and enhancing the supply of owner-occupied housing.

D. The additional taxes to be levied under this resolution will enable the City to provide for the housing needs of low-income and very low-income households and thereby work to fulfill the purposes of federal, state and City laws and policies, including the federal HOME Investment Partnerships Act, federal Housing and Community Development Act, the State Growth Management Act, and the City's Comprehensive Plan.

E. An emergency exists with respect to the availability of housing that is affordable to very low-income households in the City of Bellingham.
Section 2. Definitions. The following terms used in this resolution shall have the definitions stated below, unless the context otherwise clearly requires:

A. "Affordable housing" means residential housing for rental or private individual ownership which, as long as the same is occupied by low-income households, requires payment of monthly housing costs, including utilities, other than telephone, of no more than 30 percent of the household's income.

B. "Low-income housing" means housing that will serve "low-income households."

C. "Household" means a single person, family or unrelated persons living together.

D. "Low-income household" means a household with income less than or equal to eighty percent (80%) of median income.

E. "Median income" means annual median family income for the statistical area or division thereof including Bellingham for which median family income is published from time to time by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, or successor agency, with adjustments according to household size.

F. "Very low-income household" means a household with income less than or equal to 50 percent of median income as determined by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, with adjustments for household size, for the county where the taxing district is located.

To the extent permitted by applicable State law, income determinations may take into account such exclusions, adjustments and rules of computation as may be prescribed or used under federal housing laws, regulations or policies for purposes of establishing income limits, or as may be established in City housing and community development plan documents consistent with federal laws, regulations or policies.

Section 3. Proposition to Authorize a Replacement Levy to Continue Raising Additional Regular Property Taxes.

The City submits to the qualified electors of the City a proposition as authorized by RCW 84.55.050(1), to exceed the levy limitation on regular property taxes contained in Chapter 84.55 RCW for property taxes levied in 2018 through 2027 for collection in 2019 through 2028, respectively. The proposition would also authorize an additional property tax levy for very low-income housing pursuant to RCW 84.52.105. The proposition would raise $4,000,000 per year totaling $40,000,000 in aggregate over a period of up to ten years.

A. The proposition would permit the City to increase its regular property tax levy by up to $0.12 per $1,000 of assessed valuation, resulting in a regular property tax levy of $2.24 per $1,000 for collection in 2019. All the levy proceeds shall be used for the purposes specified in Section 5 of this resolution.

B. The proposition would also authorize the City to impose an additional regular property tax levy of up to $0.24 per $1,000 of assessed valuation for very low-income housing pursuant to RCW 84.52.105. The limitations in RCW 84.52.043 shall not apply to the tax levy authorized by this part. All the levy proceeds shall be used for the purposes specified in
Section 5 of this resolution.

C. The taxes authorized by this proposition will be in addition to the maximum amount of regular property taxes the City would have been limited to by RCW 84.55.010 in the absence of voter approval under this resolution, plus other authorized lid lifts. Thereafter, such levy amount would be used to compute limitations for subsequent years as allowed by chapter 84.55 RCW. Pursuant to RCW 84.55.050(5), the maximum regular property taxes that may be levied in 2028 for collection in 2029 and in later years shall be computed as if the limit on regular property taxes had not been increased under this resolution.

D. The City intends that in 2019 it will collect up to $0.36 per $1,000 assessed valuation for the Bellingham Home Fund based on the proposed combined levies if approved, and will collect $.00 per $1,000 of the existing levies so that the total revenue collected in 2019 remains at approximately the same as the level as will be collected in the subsequent 9 years.

Section 4. Levy Revenues.

A. Unless otherwise directed by resolution or ordinance of the City Council, all revenues collected from the additional taxes authorized pursuant to this resolution shall be deposited initially in the Low-Income Housing Fund to be used as set forth in Section 5 and as described in the Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan, as may be adopted by the City Council under Sections 5 and 6 of this resolution. The Finance Director is authorized to create other subfunds or accounts within the Low-Income Housing Fund as may be needed or appropriate to implement the purposes of this resolution.

B. Pending expenditure for the purposes authorized in this resolution, amounts deposited in the Low-Income Housing Fund pursuant to this resolution may be invested in any investments permitted by applicable law. All investment earnings on the balances shall be deposited into the Low-Income Housing Fund. Amounts received by the City from payments with respect to loans, recovery of grants, insurance proceeds or proceeds of sale or disposition of property ("program income") shall be deposited into the Low-Income Housing Fund unless otherwise specified by resolution or ordinance. Any investment earnings and program income derived from revenues collected from the additional taxes authorized pursuant to this resolution shall be used for the purposes set forth in this resolution and as authorized by the City Council.

Section 5. Administration; Use of Proceeds.

A. The levy funds shall be used to pay for affordable housing for low-income and very low-income households, pay for affordable housing programs, and otherwise to provide for the housing needs of low-income and very low-income households; provided that all funds raised from the levy authorized by RCW 84.52.105 shall be dedicated to affordable housing for very low-income households.

B. The Planning and Community Development Department, or such other department as may be designated by resolution, shall administer programs funded with the additional taxes
authorized pursuant to this resolution. Any programs adopted by the City Council for use of the funds derived under this resolution shall be referred to as "Housing Levy Programs." Housing Levy Programs shall be implemented consistent with the Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan, as may be adopted by the City Council and as may thereafter be amended from time to time.

C. The Housing Levy Programs, with estimated targets, are shown in Exhibit 1, attached hereto. The City Council, upon recommendation of the Citizen Advisory Committee described in Section 7 of this resolution, or upon recommendation of the Mayor or on its own motion, may review the allocations to particular Housing Levy Programs and make changes to the programs, including additions and deletions of programs and/or in the timing of or amount of funds allocated to any program, consistent with the purposes of this resolution and applicable law. Administration funding shown on Exhibit 1 is intended to be used for administration of the use of levy proceeds for all programs, including but not limited to developing the Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan, preparing and reviewing loan and grant applications, monitoring and auditing performance and compliance with loan, grant and program requirements, and paying for financial accounting, legal, and other administrative services necessary to implement the Housing Levy Programs.

Section 6. Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan.

A. The City has adopted a Housing Levy Administrative & Financial Plan to cover the years 2013-2019 ("Plan") covering all of the Housing Levy Programs. The Director of Planning and Community Development, or other such person as may be designated by the Director or the Mayor, shall prepare updates to the current Plan or a new Plan, as needed. The Plan shall cover the period commencing in 2019 and continue through 2028 (or until the funds are expended); shall identify the intended use of funds raised by the levy authorized by RCW 84.52.105; shall be consistent with either the locally adopted or state-adopted comprehensive housing affordability strategy required under the Cranston-Gonzalez national affordable housing act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12701, et seq.), as amended; and shall be approved by City Council. The Plan will continue to satisfy the requirement set forth in RCW 84.52.105(2)(b).

B. The expenditure of all funds raised pursuant to this resolution shall be as set forth in the Plan adopted by City Council. The City Council reserves the right to amend the Plan as it may in the future be determined as necessary or appropriate. The Plan should be done in coordination with the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans required by HUD for expenditure of HOME and CDBG funds for the benefit of low income housing and community development needs in the City.

C. The City Council shall appropriate from the Low-Income Housing Fund, as part of the City budget, such monies derived from the levies authorized in this resolution as it deems necessary to carry out the Housing Levy Programs.

D. The Mayor, or other such person as may be designated by the Mayor, is authorized, for and on behalf of the City, to select projects for funding and to approve, make and modify loans, grants or other expenditures to carry out the Housing Levy Programs, provided that such authority is subject to the appropriation of sufficient funds and the Plan approved by City Council.
Council pursuant to Sections 5 and 6. The Mayor and his or her designees are further authorized, for and on behalf of the City, to execute and deliver such documents and instruments as he or she may determine to be necessary or appropriate to implement the financing of specific projects or to otherwise carry out the Housing Levy Programs.

Section 7. Citizen Levy Advisory Committee.
The Community Development Advisory Board ("CDAB"), established pursuant to BMC 2.46.010, shall advise the Mayor, City Council, and the Director of Planning and Community Development regarding the Housing Levy Programs authorized by this resolution. CDAB shall advise the Mayor and City Council on the Plan prepared pursuant to Section 6 of this resolution. CDAB shall also assist in monitoring the progress, performance, and accomplishments of Housing Levy Programs, and report such findings to the Mayor and City Council, including any problems and recommendations on actions to be taken so that the Housing Levy Programs are conducted in a timely and efficient manner for the benefit of low-income households.

Section 8. Election - Ballot Title.
The City Council hereby requests that the Whatcom County Auditor, as ex officio supervisor of elections, submit to the qualified electorate of the City for a vote, concurrent with the November 6, 2018 general election, a proposition substantially in the form set forth in this resolution. The City Clerk is directed to certify to the Whatcom County Auditor the ballot proposition to the electorate of the City in the form substantially as follows:

PROPOSITION NO. 1
Low-Income Housing Levy

The City of Bellingham Council adopted Resolution No. 2018--- concerning property taxes for low-income housing assistance.

This proposition would replace and enhance existing levies to fund housing and housing services for people with low or very low incomes by authorizing a (a) property tax increase of $0.12/$1,000 in assessed valuation (to $2.24/$1,000) for collection in 2019 (the 2019 levy amount would be the base for computing the levy for collection in 2020-2028); and (b) regular property tax levy of up to $0.24/$1,000 under RCW 84.52.105, each for ten years, generating $4,000,000 annually. Should this proposition be approved?

Yes? ............................. ☐

No? .............................. ☐

Section 9. Corrections.
The Bellingham City Attorney’s Office or the Auditor or her designee is authorized to make necessary clerical corrections to this resolution including, but not limited to, the correction of scrivener’s or clerical errors, references, resolution numbering, section/subsection numbers and any references thereto.
Section 10. **Severability.**
If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this resolution should be held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section, sentence, clause or phrase of this resolution.

**PASSED** by the Council this ____ day of ______, 2018.

__________________________________
Council President

**APPROVED** by me this ____ day of ______, 2018.

__________________________________
Mayor

Attest: __________________________
Finance Director

Approved as to Form:

__________________________________
Office of City Attorney
## 2019-2028 HOUSING LEVY PROGRAM ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Est. Total Funding (10 Years)</th>
<th>Estimated Housing Produced/Households Assisted</th>
<th>Program Description/Affordability Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Production and Preservation of Homes         | $21,700,000                   | 580 homes                                     | • Homes for people working at minimum wage, veterans, seniors on fixed incomes, and people exiting homelessness (households at or below 30% of median income)  
• Homes for local workers, working families up to 60% of median income  
• Affordable and specialized homes for veterans, people with disabilities, and seniors.  
• Rehabilitation and weatherization to increase affordability and preserve existing affordable homes |
| Rental Assistance and Support Services       | $13,600,000                   | 3,000 households                              | • Supportive services matched to specialized homes for disabled veterans and homeless individuals to help them retain their homes and reduce costly care in hospital emergency department and other inappropriate systems of care  
• Temporary and long-term assistance to families and individuals to help preserve their housing, prevent eviction and homelessness (targeted households at or below 50% of median income)  
• Temporary and long-term assistance to those experiencing homelessness, including emergency shelter options |
| Low-income homebuyer assistance              | $1,800,000                    | 55 homes                                      | • Assistance to low-income homebuyers, including programs that promote long-term affordability of ownership housing (targeted to households at or below 80% of median income) |
| Acquisition and Opportunity Loans           | $500,000                      | 20 homes                                      | • To be added to $750,000 already set aside for short-term loans for strategic purchases of buildings or land for rental or homeownership housing development that will serve low-income households |
| Administration                               | $2,400,000                    | n/a                                           | • 6% of total                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| **TOTAL**                                   | **$40,000,000**               |                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
Subject: A Resolution to Implement the Climate Protection Action Plan 2017 Update, Aim for 100% Renewable Energy Goals, and Create a Climate Action Plan Task Force

Summary Statement: The City of Bellingham adopted a Climate Protection Action Plan in 2007 and City staff have created a 2017 update to that Plan, including revised targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The attached resolution, and options, directs staff to implement the Climate Action Protection Plan and creates a Climate Action Plan Task Force to recommend actions and resources needed to achieve greenhouse gas reductions. The 2017 Climate Protection Action Plan is available at https://www.cob.org/services/environment/climate/Pages/program.aspx.

Previous Council Action: March 12, 2018, bring back revisions to draft resolution; March 26, 2018, adopted the revised Climate Protection Action Plan

Fiscal Impact: $20,000 for consultant services for the updated plan. Additional expenditures to achieve climate action goals will be identified by the Climate Action Plan Task Force

Funding Source: Multiple Sources

Attachments: 1. RESOLUTION CLIMATE CHANGE OPTIONS
   2. COVER SHEET 3-26-18 DRAFT
   3. RESOLUTION MARCH 26 VERSION
   4. COVER SHEET 3-30-18 DRAFT
   5. CLIMATE RESOLUTION MARCH 30 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Activity</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Presented By</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Briefing - Vote</td>
<td>05/07/2018</td>
<td>Consider Resolution</td>
<td>Pinky Vargas</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Motion:

Council Committee: Committee Of The Whole

Agenda Bill Contact: Mark Gardner, 778-8204

Reviewed By Department Date
Mark J. Gardner Council Administration 04/30/2018
Peter M. Ruffatto Legal 05/01/2018
Kelli J. Linville Executive 05/01/2018
Climate Action Resolution - Options for Revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Title</th>
<th>Option 1 (Barker)</th>
<th>Option 2 (Vargas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND DIRECTING THE CITY ADMINISTRATION TO IMPLEMENT THE CLIMATE PROTECTION ACTION PLAN 2017 UPDATE, AND TO CREATE A CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE TO DEVELOP 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGETS FOR THE MUNICIPALITY AND THE BELLINGHAM COMMUNITY.</td>
<td>A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND DIRECTING THE CITY ADMINISTRATION TO IMPLEMENT THE CLIMATE PROTECTION ACTION PLAN 2017 UPDATE, AIM FOR 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY GOALS AND CREATE A CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recitals (Last recital in March 26 version)</th>
<th>Option 1 (Barker)</th>
<th>Option 2 (Lilliquist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHEREAS, The City of Bellingham recognizes that while it is desirable and beneficial to set aggressive targets and transition to 100% renewable energy quickly, there are numerous financial, technological and societal challenges that need to be addressed.</td>
<td>WHEREAS, the City Council believes the ultimate ambition for both municipal operations and the community as a whole should be reduction of greenhouse gas emission to zero or net zero, and a long-term shift to reliance on 100% renewable energy sources for electricity, heating, and transportation. The City Council recognizes that, at this point in time, it is not known what it would take to complete this transformation, and that more information is needed on the scope, nature, and magnitude of the steps that could be taken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 8, Ambitions</th>
<th>Option 1 (Barker)</th>
<th>Option 2 (Vargas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 8. COUNCIL’S AMBITIONS FOR ACCELERATING MUNICIPALITY AND COMMUNITY GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS. The Council identifies the following as greenhouse gas reduction ambitions:</td>
<td>SECTION 8. COUNCIL’S AMBITION IS TO AIM FOR ACCELERATED 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGETS IN MUNICIPAL FACILITIES WHICH WILL BE IDENTIFIED BY THE TASK FORCE OUTLINED IN SECTION 9. THE TASK FORCE WILL ALSO WORK WITH THE COMMUNITY TO IDENTIFY ACHIEVABLE COMMUNITY TARGETS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100% renewable energy for municipal facilities (electricity, heating and transportation) by 2030;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100% renewable energy use for the Bellingham community’s electricity supply by 2030, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100% renewable energy for community heating and transportation by 2035.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 9, Directives for the Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 (Barker)</th>
<th>Option 2 (Liliquist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 9. CREATION OF A COMMUNITY AND STAFF CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE.</strong> A limited-term Community and Staff Climate Action Plan Task Force (“Task Force”) will be formed with the following directives:</td>
<td><strong>SECTION 9. CREATION OF A COMMUNITY AND STAFF CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE.</strong> A limited-term Community and Staff Climate Action Plan Task Force (“Task Force”) will be formed with the following directives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopt a triple bottom line plus technology philosophy; and</td>
<td>• Determine feasibility, costs and impacts of the 100% greenhouse gas reduction and renewable energy ambitions (Section 8); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine feasibility, costs and impacts of the 100% renewable energy ambitions (Section 8); and</td>
<td>• Develop 100% renewable energy targets; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop 100% renewable energy targets; and</td>
<td>• Identify which aspects of a revised plan fall under local control and which aspects involve necessary partnerships with other entities and jurisdictions; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify funding mechanisms and develop a plan to achieve the Task Force’s recommended 100% renewable targets; and</td>
<td>• Identify funding mechanisms and develop a plan to achieve the Task Force’s recommended 100% renewable targets; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop accelerated greenhouse gas emissions targets for the Council to consider for adoption; and</td>
<td>• Develop accelerated greenhouse gas emissions targets for the Council to consider for adoption; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify policy considerations to attain accelerated targets.</td>
<td>• Identify policy considerations to attain accelerated targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 9, Date for Final Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 (Barker)</th>
<th>Option 2 (Vargas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Task Force will deliver a final report to Council by May 2019.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Task Force will deliver a final report to Council by July 2019.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 9, Task Force Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 (Barker)</th>
<th>Option 2 (Vargas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Task Force will consist of no more than 12 members appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. Up to six members of the Task Force will be drawn from the general public and will include individuals with experience in relevant fields such as renewable energy, energy conservation, land use, energy/resource economics, community engagement, transportation, or finance. The Task Force will include one representative from energy utilities and one representative from public transportation. Up to six members of the Task Force will be City staff designated by the Mayor based on subject matter expertise. The Task Force will be supported by Mayor-designated staff and City Council-designated staff.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Task Force members will be appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. The Task Force will be drawn from the general public and will include individuals with experience in relevant fields such as renewable energy, energy conservation, land use, building design, energy/resource economics, community engagement, transportation, or finance. The Task Force will include representation from energy utilities and one representative from public transportation. Up to six members of the Task Force will be City staff designated by the Mayor based on subject matter expertise. The Task Force will be supported by Mayor-designated staff and City Council-designated staff.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate Resolution

Agenda Bill # 21905

- Draft Resolution from March 26, 2018 Council Meeting
RESOLUTION NO. __________

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND DIRECTING THE CITY ADMINISTRATION TO IMPLEMENT THE CLIMATE PROTECTION ACTION PLAN 2017 UPDATE, INCLUDING 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY GOALS, AND TO CREATE A CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE TO DEVELOP 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGETS FOR THE MUNICIPALITY AND THE BELLINGHAM COMMUNITY.

WHEREAS, climate change, if unchecked, will have ever increasing impacts on human health, natural systems, wildlife, and infrastructure, creating mounting costs for individuals, communities, businesses, and local governments; and

WHEREAS, the scientific consensus demands we limit global temperature increases below 1.5 degrees Celsius to avoid the most destructive and dangerous effects of climate change; and

WHEREAS, an important first step toward achieving 100% renewable energy is to set a public long-term renewable energy target to demonstrate political commitment, and to provide both stakeholders and the community people with an understanding of the long-term vision for the City; and

WHEREAS, "renewable energy" is herein defined as energy derived from hydrogen, wind power sited in ecologically responsible ways, solar, existing and low-impact hydroelectric, geothermal, biogas (including biogas produced from biomass), and ocean/wave technology sources. "Renewable energy" specifically excludes energy derived from fossil fuels, nuclear, biomass feedstocks sourced from state and federal lands, hydrogen produced from fossil fuels, and incineration of municipal and medical waste; and

WHEREAS, Washington State has already experienced long-term warming, longer and more intense fire seasons, sea level rising along most of the coast, ocean acidification, and decline in glacial area and spring snowpack; and, the State Department of Ecology has reported that, "human caused climate change poses an immediate and urgent threat"; and

WHEREAS, economists have concluded that Washington’s families and businesses are likely to incur billions of dollars of annual economic costs if communities fail to drive reductions in greenhouse gas pollution. These economic...
impacts include increased energy costs, coastal and storm damage, reduced food production, increased wildland fire, and increased public health costs; and

WHEREAS, The City of Bellingham municipal government is responsible to promote the public health and safety of its residents including access to clean air, clean water, and a livable environment, and

WHEREAS, the entire community will be impacted by climate change, but communities that already face existing socioeconomic and health inequities will be most severely impacted by these risks, These which include youth, elders, people of color, and low-income communities; and, such communities will therefore require an investment in resilience that is proportionate and accountable to these more severe risks; and

WHEREAS, since time immemorial, the Coast Salish People have called home and have been the stewards, whose example we shall all follow, of what we now recognize as the City of Bellingham. The Coast Salish People depend on healthy ecosystems for subsistence and are disproportionately impacted by climate change, which threatens fish, crustacean, and shellfish populations of the Salish Sea, and

WHEREAS, since 2005, the City of Bellingham (the “City”) Mayors and Councils have declared support for local, national and international commitments to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

WHEREAS, in 2007 the Bellingham City Council passed Resolution 2007-10 adopting greenhouse gas reduction targets and a Climate Protection Action Plan to achieve those targets; and

WHEREAS, many of the measures proposed or underway in 2007 have been implemented and the City exceeded the 2012 targets at both the municipal and community levels and is on track to meet the 2020 municipal emissions reduction target; and

WHEREAS, implementation of additional measures included in the Climate Protection Action Plan 2017 Update (the “Update”) will be necessary to meet commitments to further reduce emissions by 2030; and

WHEREAS, the transition to 100% renewable energy will provide a range of benefits, including improved air quality, enhanced public health, increased national and energy security, local jobs, reduced reliance on finite resources, and facilitation
of local control and ownership over energy options, and will bring tangible benefits to low-income residents and others who have historically been disadvantaged by our energy system; and

WHEREAS, On December 5, 2017 the Whatcom County Council approved Ordinance 2017-080 establishing the goal of 100% renewable energy use within County operations and the larger Whatcom County community; and;

WHEREAS, the City of Bellingham aims to become the second city in Washington, and one of the first 75 nationally to commit to 100% renewable energy goals; and

WHEREAS, the City of Bellingham has signaled its commitment to declare ambitious climate action goals commensurate with its obligations as a signatory of multiple international climate agreements, including the We Are Still In Declaration, City’s Climate Action Plan, the Compact of Mayors, 100% Clean Energy, and the ICLEI Cities for Climate Protection; and

WHEREAS, The City of Bellingham recognizes the leadership of the following cities in passing resolutions committing to 100% renewable energy goals, informing both the language and structure of this resolution: Edmonds, WA; Salt Lake City, UT; Hanover, NH; Madison, WI; Cambridge, MA; Rochester, MN; and Portland, OR.

WHEREAS, The City of Bellingham recognizes that while it is desirable and beneficial to set aggressive targets and transition to 100% renewable energy quickly, there are numerous financial, technological and societal challenges that need to be addressed.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM:

SECTION 1. ADOPT THE CLIMATE PROTECTION ACTION PLAN 2017 UPDATE. The Bellingham Climate Protection Action Plan 2017 Update presented to Council on March 12, 2018, is hereby approved and adopted as the basis for continuing to implement actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from municipal and community sources.

SECTION 2. ADOPT REVISED GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION TARGETS. The City hereby adopts the action plan for hitting targets of reducing annual greenhouse gas emissions from City municipal operations by 85 percent below

City of Bellingham
City Attorney
210 Lottie Street
Bellingham, Washington 98225
360-778-8270
2000 levels by 2030 and by 100 percent below 2000 by 2050. The City also adopts the action plan to reach the targets of reducing annual greenhouse gas emissions from the entire Bellingham community by 40 percent below 2000 levels by 2030 and by 85 percent below 2000 levels by 2050.

SECTION 3. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO IMPLEMENT THE ACTION PLAN. The City Council directs City administration to implement, to the greatest extent practicable and achievable, the programs and projects described in the Climate Protection Action Plan 2017 Update.

SECTION 4. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO REVIEW GROWTH, LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TO INSURE ALIGNMENT WITH THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN GOALS. This will include reviewing the Comprehensive Plan policies, and include Parks, Fire current and future land use policies, future development and re-development, and building standards to find options to further reduce the Bellingham community's carbon footprint and accelerate Climate Action Plan targets.

SECTION 5. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO WORK WITH ALL CITY DEPARTMENTS TO INSURE THEIR POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES ARE IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN. This will include all Departments reviewing operations and facilities as well as policies, practices and procedures to determine opportunities to further reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and insure alignment with the Climate Action Plan when developing future policies.

SECTION 5. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO DOCUMENT METHODS THAT WILL BE USED TO ACHIEVE ACTIONABLE PRIORITIES. These will include identification of specific actions to reduce emissions, methods of delivering education and outreach to the public, and efforts to ensure that goals targets are achieved in a socially equitable manner. Activities will include developing metrics for cost effective decisions, guided by a Triple Bottom Line plus Technology approach.

SECTION 6. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO REPORT BACK TO COUNCIL ANNUALLY. The City Council directs City administration to report back to update the City Council during the first quarter of the year on activities, and on progress towards achieving the goals of the Climate Action Plan targets, to be timed early enough in the year to inform budget and planning decisions.
SECTION 78. IDENTIFICATION OF ACCELERATED GOALS COUNCIL’S AMBITIONS FOR ACCELERATING MUNICIPALITY AND COMMUNITY GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS IN THE MUNICIPAL AND COMMUNITY SECTORS. The City Council identifies the following accelerated renewable energy goals as greenhouse gas reduction ambitions: as an

- 100% renewable energy for municipal facilities (electricity, heating and transportation) by 2030;
- 100% renewable energy use for the City’s Bellingham community’s electricity supply by 2030, and
- 100% renewable energy for community heating and transportation by 2035.

SECTION 89. CREATION OF A CITIZEN COMMUNITY AND STAFF CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE. A limited-term Citizen Community and Staff Climate Action Plan Task Force (“Task Force”) will be formed to with the following directives:

- Adopt a triple bottom line plus technology philosophy; and
- Determine feasibility, costs and impacts of the 100% renewable energy ambitions (Section 8); and
- Develop 100% renewable energy targets; and
- Identify funding mechanisms and develop a plan to achieve the Task Force’s recommended 100% renewable targets; and
- Develop accelerated greenhouse gas emissions targets for the Council to consider for adoption; and
- Identify policy considerations to attain accelerated targets.

identify what actions and funding are needed to achieve the 100% renewable goals in Section 7, with a final report to be delivered to the Council by May, 2019. The Task Force will deliver a final report to Council by May 2019.

The Task Force will consist of no more than 12 members appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. Up to six members of the Task Force will be drawn from the general public and will include individuals with experience in relevant fields such as renewable energy, energy conservation, land use, energy/resource economics, community engagement, transportation, or finance. The Task Force will include one representative from energy utilities and one representative from public transportation. Up to six members of the Task Force will be City staff designated by the Mayor based on subject matter expertise. The Task Force will be supported staff designated by the Mayor-designated staff, and City Council-designated staff.
SECTION 910. THE CITY COUNCIL WILL CONSIDER ADDING THE ACCELERATED GOALS ADOPTING THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS BY MAY 2019 AFTER BEING BRIEFED BY THE TASK FORCE. Recommendations will include policies to accelerated climate action plan greenhouse gas reduction targets and 100% renewable energy targets. TO THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN AFTER BEING BRIEFED BY THE TASK FORCE IN MAY 2019.

PASSED by the Council this _____ day of __________________, 2018.

________________________________________
Council President

APPROVED by me this _____ day of _______________, 2018.

________________________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:__________________________
Finance Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________
Office of the City Attorney
Climate Resolution

Agenda Bill # 21905

- Revised Draft Resolution, Councilmember Barker—March 30, 2018
RESOLUTION NO. _________

A RESOLUTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO INSURE DEPARTMENTS AND POLICIES ALIGN WITH THE 2018 CLIMATE ACTION PLAN AND TO DEVELOP A “CLIMATE ACTION TASK FORCE” TO DEVELOP AND RECOMMEND 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGETS AND SUGGEST POLICIES TO ACCELERATE 2018 CLIMATE ACTION PLAN GREEN HOUSE GAS REDUCTION TARGETS.

WHEREAS, climate change, if unchecked, will have ever increasing impacts on human health, natural systems, wildlife, and infrastructure, creating mounting costs for individuals, communities, businesses, and local governments; and

WHEREAS, the scientific consensus demands we limit global temperature increases below 1.5 degrees Celsius to avoid the most destructive and dangerous effects of climate change; and

WHEREAS, an important first step toward achieving 100% renewable energy is to set a public long-term renewable energy target to demonstrate political commitment, and to provide both stakeholders and the community with an understanding of the long-term vision for the City; and

WHEREAS, "renewable energy" is herein defined as energy derived from hydrogen, wind power sited in ecologically responsible ways, solar, existing and low-impact hydroelectric, geothermal, biogas (including biogas produced from biomass), and ocean/wave technology sources. "Renewable energy" specifically excludes energy derived from fossil fuels, nuclear, biomass feedstocks sourced from state and federal lands, hydrogen produced from fossil fuels, and incineration of municipal and medical waste; and

WHEREAS, Washington State has already experienced long-term warming, longer and more intense fire seasons, sea level rising along most of the coast, ocean acidification, and decline in glacial area and spring snowpack; and, the State Department of Ecology has reported that, “human caused climate change poses an immediate and urgent threat”; and

WHEREAS, economists have concluded that Washington’s families and businesses are likely to incur billions of dollars of annual economic costs if communities fail to drive reductions in greenhouse gas pollution. These economic...
impacts include increased energy costs, coastal and storm damage, reduced food production, increased wildland fire, and increased public health costs; and

WHEREAS, The City of Bellingham municipal government is responsible to promote the public health and safety of its residents including access to clean air, clean water, and a livable environment, and

WHEREAS, the entire community will be impacted by climate change. Communities facing socioeconomic and health inequities (such as youth, elders, communities of color, and low-income) will suffer disproportionately, requiring the City to invest in resilience that is proportionate and accountable to these communities, and

WHEREAS, since time immemorial, the Coast Salish People have called home and have been the stewards, whose example we shall all follow, of what is now recognize as the City of Bellingham. The Coast Salish People depend on healthy ecosystems for subsistence, thus are disproportionately impacted by climate change threatening the health of fish, crustacean, and shellfish populations in Salish Sea, and

WHEREAS, since 2005, the City of Bellingham (the “City”) Mayors and Councils have declared support for local, national and international commitments to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

WHEREAS, in 2007 the Bellingham City Council passed Resolution 2007-10 adopting greenhouse gas reduction targets and a Climate Protection Action Plan to achieve those targets; and

WHEREAS, many of the measures proposed or underway in 2007 have been implemented and the City exceeded the 2012 targets at both the municipal and community levels and is on track to meet the 2020 municipal emissions reduction target; and

WHEREAS, the 2018 updated Climate Protection Action Plan implementation of additional measures will be necessary to meet commitments to further reduce emissions by 2030; and

WHEREAS, the transition to 100% renewable energy will provide a range of benefits, including improved air quality, enhanced public health, increased national and energy security, local jobs, reduced reliance on finite resources, and will bring
Resolution Climate Action

WHEREAS, On December 5, 2017 the Whatcom County Council adopted Ordinance 2017-080 establishing the goal of 100% renewable energy use within County operations and the larger Whatcom County community; and.

WHEREAS, the City of Bellingham has shown its commitment declaring ambitious climate action goals commensurate with its obligations as a signatory of multiple international climate agreements, including the We Are Still In Declaration, City’s Climate Action Plan, the Compact of Mayors, 100% Clean Energy, and the ICLEI Cities for Climate Protection; and

WHEREAS, The City of Bellingham recognizes that while it is desirable and beneficial to set aggressive targets and transition to 100% renewable energy quickly, there are numerous financial, technological and societal challenges that need to be addressed.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM:

SECTION 1. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO REVIEW GROWTH, LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TO INSURE ALIGNMENT WITH THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN. This will include reviewing Comprehensive Plan policies, current and future land use policies, future development and re-development, and building standards to find options to further reduce the Bellingham community’s carbon footprint and accelerate Climate Action Plan targets.

SECTION 2. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO WORK WITH ALL CITY DEPARTMENTS TO INSURE THEIR POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES ARE IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN. This will include all Departments reviewing operations and facilities as well as policies, practices and procedures to determine opportunities to further reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and insure alignment with the Climate Action Plan when developing future policies.
SECTION 3. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO DOCUMENT METHODS THAT WILL BE USED TO ACHIEVE ACTIONABLE PRIORITIES. These will include identification of specific actions to reduce emissions, methods of delivering education and outreach to the public, and efforts to ensure that targets are achieved in a socially equitable manner. Activities will include developing metrics for cost effective decisions, guided by a Triple Bottom Line plus Technology approach.

SECTION 4. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION TO REPORT BACK TO COUNCIL ANNUALLY. The City Council directs City administration to update the Council during the first quarter of the year on activities and progress toward 2018 Climate Action Plan targets.

SECTION 5. COUNCIL’S AMBITIONS FOR ACCELERATING MUNICIPALITY AND COMMUNITY GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS. The Council identifies the following as greenhouse gas reduction ambitions:

- 100% renewable energy for municipal facilities (electricity, heating and transportation) by 2030;
- 100% renewable energy use for the Bellingham community’s electricity supply by 2030, and
- 100% renewable energy for community heating and transportation by 2035.

SECTION 6. CREATION OF A COMMUNITY AND STAFF CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE. A limited-term Community and Staff Climate Action Plan Task Force (“Task Force”) will be formed with the following directives:

- Adopt a triple bottom line plus technology philosophy; and
- Determine feasibility, costs and impacts of the 100% renewable energy ambitions (Section 5); and
- Develop 100% renewable energy targets; and
- Identify funding mechanisms and develop a plan to achieve the Task Force’s recommended 100% renewable targets; and
- Develop accelerated greenhouse gas emissions targets for the Council to consider for adoption; and
- Identify policy considerations to attain accelerated targets.

The Task Force will deliver a final report to Council by May 2019.

The Task Force will consist of no more than 12 members appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. Membership will include up to six community members (may include individuals with experience in relevant fields such as...
renewable energy, energy conservation, land use, energy/resource economics, community engagement, transportation, or finance); one member to represent the energy utilities; one member to represent public transportation; up to six members representing City of Bellingham Departments. The Task Force will be supported by Mayor-designated staff and City Council-designated staff.

SECTION 7. THE CITY COUNCIL WILL CONSIDER ADOPTING THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS BY MAY 2019. Recommendations will include policies to accelerate Climate Action Plan greenhouse gas reduction targets and 100% renewable energy targets.

PASSED by the Council this ____ day of ________________, 2018.

________________________________________
Council President

APPROVED by me this _____ day of ________________, 2018.

________________________________________
Mayor

ATTEST: ________________________________
Finance Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________
Office of the City Attorney

Resolution Climate Action (5)
Subject: Consideration of Revisions to Bellingham’s Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations

Summary Statement: In 2017, staff restarted the process to update the City’s Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) regulations. The Planning Commission has completed their review and has recommended a number of changes to the current regulations.

On April 9, 2018 the City Council held a Public Hearing on the proposed amendments. At the conclusion of the hearing the matter was assigned to Committee of the Whole for further evaluation.

Previous Council Action: None

Fiscal Impact: Funding for staff time to process the ADU ordinance update was included in the Planning and Community Development Department’s 2017-2018 Budget.

Funding Source: General Fund

Attachments: 1. STAFF MEMO
2. DRAFT ADU ORDINANCE
3. ADU ORDINANCE EXHIBIT A
4. PUBLIC COMMENT TO COUNCIL OFFICE 4-18-18 TO 5-2-18

Meeting Activity | Meeting Date | Recommendation | Presented By | Time
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Committee Briefing - Vote Requested | 05/07/2018 | Vote to Approve | Rick Sepler, Planning and Community Development Director | 5 minutes

Recommended Motion:

Council Committee: Committee Of The Whole

Agenda Bill Contact: Greg Aucutt, Planning and Community Development, 360-778-8300

Reviewed By | Department | Date
--- | --- | ---
Rick M. Sepler | Planning & Community Development | 05/01/2018
Alan A. Marriner | Legal | 05/01/2018
Kelli J. Linville | Executive | 05/01/2018
The City Council took up the matter of the Planning Commission’s recommended revisions to the City’s ADU regulations at a public hearing on April 9. At the conclusion of the hearing, Council referred the proposal to the Committee of the Whole for additional discussion.

The following is a partial list of the changes to ADU regulations recommended by the Planning Commission:

1. Allow detached ADUs in all single family zoned areas.
2. Reduce the minimum lot size for detached ADUs from 10,000 sq. ft. to 5,000 sq. ft.
3. Change the maximum number of occupants from three to four for all ADUs.
4. Limit the number of bedrooms in detached ADUs to two.
5. Require a minimum of one off-street parking space for each ADU.
6. Eliminate transportation and park impact fees for all ADUs.
7. Reduce the maximum building height for detached ADUs from 25-feet to 20-feet.
8. Include a requirement to review the ordinance when 200 detached ADU permits are issued city-wide; or 25 in any one neighborhood; or by year 2025, whichever occurs first.

Staff will be available to assist the committee with their deliberations.
ORDINANCE NO. 2021-08-021

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE PLANNING, AMENDING BELLINGHAM MUNICIPAL CODE (BMC) TITLES 16 AND 20 REGARDING ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADUs), INCLUDING ALLOWING DETACHED ADUs IN SINGLE FAMILY ZONES CITYWIDE, A DETACHED ADU PILOT PROGRAM FOR THE HAPPY VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD, AND RELATED AMENDMENTS TO BMC 20.30.100 AND 20.32.110 TO ELIMINATE THE REQUIRED 10' GARAGE DOOR SETBACK FROM PUBLIC ALLEYS FOR DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS.

WHEREAS, State Law RCW 43.63A.215 and RCW 36.70A.400, adopted as part of the 1993 Washington Housing Policy Act, require Washington cities with populations over 20,000 to adopt regulations to allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs); and

WHEREAS, in 1995, the Bellingham City Council (Council) approved Ordinance No. 10643 which allowed attached ADUs (A-ADUs) citywide and included a provision that Council shall review said Ordinance 1) two years following the effective date of the ordinance, and 2) after the 20th ADU permit is issued in any neighborhood as defined by the Comprehensive Plan, with intent to determine how the ordinance was working and to determine what, if any, of the regulations needed to be modified or eliminated; and

WHEREAS, in 1997, Council reviewed Ordinance No. 10643 whereupon 14 ADU permits were issued, 6 ADUs were completed and the ADUs were dispersed throughout the City's neighborhoods, and Council elected to make no changes to the ordinance at that time; and

WHEREAS, in 2001, Council adopted Ordinance No. 2001-01-001 which added a new chapter (16.80 - Lake Whatcom Reservoir Regulatory Chapter) to the BMC, and included provisions restricting ADUs within the Lake Whatcom Watershed; and

WHEREAS, in 2009, Council adopted Ordinance No. 2009-08-047 which added a new chapter (20.28 - Infill Housing) to the BMC, and included provisions allowing carriage units and detached ADUs (both ADU housing forms) generally in areas that allow housing other than most single family zones and within the Lake Whatcom Watershed; and

WHEREAS, in 2016, Council adopted the 2016 Bellingham Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan) via Ordinance 2016-11-037 which includes updated goal and policy guidance on neighborhood preservation, infill development, housing, and ADUs; and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan directs that the unique character and qualities of existing neighborhoods be protected, while identifying opportunities for improved livability, safety, and housing affordability and diversity (Policy LU-4); and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan directs that the City make more efficient use of the remaining City land supply by facilitating development on existing lots of record; developing flexible code provisions that allow a range of housing types; and other steps necessary to make better use of the remaining land supply (Policies LU-10, CD-32 and 33, ED-30, H-16); and
WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan directs that the City encourage preservation, restoration, and appropriate adaptive reuse of historic properties (Policy LU-76); and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan directs that the City accommodate the changing needs of residents as they age (Policy LU-85); and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan directs that the City provide builders, developers and architects with a set of clear objectives and performance goals which promote the highest attainable standard of quality consistent with economic feasibility for new development (Policy CD-14); and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan directs that the City limit urban sprawl by linking land use and transportation planning (Goal T-1), reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles (Goal T-4), and review parking standards to reduce the impacts of parking on urban form, pedestrian mobility, and the natural environment (LU-71); and

WHEREAS, ADUs can provide housing options for those at the beginning of their housing cycle, and those at the end of their housing cycle; and

WHEREAS, in 2017, the 20th ADU permit was issued in the South Hill Neighborhood, triggering this second review of Ordinance No. 10643; and

WHEREAS, the City conducted outreach and attended numerous neighborhood sponsored meetings; and

WHEREAS, the City convened an ADU Focus Group of 13 members from a cross section of different interest groups and tasked them with identifying opportunities and concerns with allowing ADUs; and

WHEREAS, the City convened a Technical Group of 5 local architects, designers, and builders to review the City's ADU development and design standards, and identify recommended changes; and

WHEREAS, the Happy Valley Neighborhood Association formed an ADU Committee and conducted outreach within the neighborhood promoting innovative small scale infill housing, including detached ADUs (D-ADUs), and engaged staff for assistance, culminating in a vote of its officers at a quarterly meeting for a Pilot Program allowing D-ADUs in single family zoned areas of the Happy Valley Neighborhood which was submitted to the City for incorporation into this ordinance; and

WHEREAS, on January 4, 2018, the City of Bellingham as lead agency under the procedures of the State Environmental Policy Act issued a Determination of Non-Significance; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Growth Management Act, the State of Washington Department of Commerce was notified on January 4, 2018 of the City's intent to adopt the amendments to the City's environment and land use regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Bellingham Planning Commission held two work sessions in 2015 and three in 2017, on staff's preliminary findings and recommendations for amendments, with appropriate public notice provided; and
WHEREAS, the Bellingham Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 25, 2018 on the amendments, with appropriate public notice provided, and held two work sessions following; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered the staff report and comments received, and recommended approval of the proposed ordinance with some changes to the proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission adopted Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Recommendations to the City Council on February 15, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Bellingham City Council held a public hearing on April 9, 2018 on the amendments, with appropriate public notice provided; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the amendments are appropriate and consistent with the State Growth Management Act and the Bellingham Comprehensive Plan;

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM DOES ORDAIN:

Section 1. BMC 16.80.060(A) regarding Permitted Uses within the Lake Whatcom Reservoir Regulatory Provisions is amended as follows:

A. Residential Single Permitted Uses – Uses Permitted Outright. No building or land shall be used within an area designated residential single, except as follows:

1. Single-family dwelling unit with less than 5,500 square feet of total floor area.

2. Publicly owned parks, trails and playgrounds.

3. Private recreation facilities and/or common open space (when approved by council as part of a subdivision).

4. Mixed use (where such a use is specifically listed in a neighborhood land use plan, which has been designated with a “mixed” use qualifier).

5. Public utilities (when located within a public right-of-way).

6. Attached accessory dwelling unit approved prior to January 8, 2001 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.036).

6.7. Attached and Detached accessory dwelling units existing prior to January 1, 1995 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.036).

7. Confidential shelters subject to the provisions of BMC 20.10.047.

8-9. Wireless communication facilities, subject to the provisions of Chapter 20.13 BMC.

9. Co-housing developments subject to the requirements of BMC 20.10.048.

10. No residential single lot or parcel may be partially or entirely cleared of vegetation or used as a soil/earth/rock material fill site without having first obtained a valid...
building permit subject to this regulatory chapter. Written exemptions may be issued by the director for minor clearing for land surveying, hazard tree removal, or abatement of noxious weeds. Hazard tree determinations shall be made by an ISA certified arborist; replacement trees shall be required.

11.12. Animal husbandry including the breeding, rearing or keeping of livestock such as, but not limited to, cattle, bison, horses, mules, ponies, donkeys, llamas, alpacas, sheep, goats, pigs or poultry shall not be permitted. Except, properties at which animal husbandry is currently being conducted as of the effective date of the ordinance codified in this chapter may be permitted to continue at existing sites, provided the existing use shall not be expanded, enlarged or increased in intensity by any means nor shall animals be replaced due to death of an animal. It shall be the property owner’s responsibility to obtain a certificate of nonconforming use and provide evidence that such use was established, including the specific type and quantity of animal(s) as of the effective date of the ordinance codified in this chapter. The certificate of nonconforming use shall not be transferable to another person or entity.

Section 2. BMC 20.00.200 Sunnyland Neighborhood Table of Zoning Regulations, Attachment 1 to Area 8, is amended as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Use Qualifier</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Special Conditions</th>
<th>Prerequisite Considerations</th>
<th>Special Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Residential Single</td>
<td>Detached, mixed. (See Special Regulations)</td>
<td>5,000 sq. ft. per unit</td>
<td>Restrict through vehicular access between Sunset Drive and Illinois Street. Provide a public nonmotorized connection between Sunset Drive and Illinois Street.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>All residential development is limited to those housing forms listed in Attachment 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment 1

Residential development in Area 8 is limited to:

1. Attached and detached accessory dwelling units subject to the provision in BMC 20.10.035.036.
2. Infill housing subject to the provisions in Chapter 20.28 BMC, and further limited to the following infill housing forms and standards:
   a. BMC 20.28.060, Smaller house, and
   b. BMC 20.28.070, Small house.
   c. BMC 20.28.080, Cottage.
   d. BMC 20.28.090, Carriage house.
d. BMC 20.28.100, Detached accessory dwelling unit.

e.d. BMC 20.28.140, Townhouse. Maximum of two units may be attached with each unit located on a "fee simple lot." Townhouses are not permitted along Illinois Street.

3. Single floor area limits specified in Chapter 20.28 BMC may be exceeded on the first story of a dwelling unit, provided the maximum floor area ratio allowed for each housing type is not exceeded.

Section 3. The following definitions in BMC 20.08.020 are amended as follows:

"Accessory dwelling unit," or "ADU," means a second, subordinate dwelling unit located on the same lot as, and subordinate to, a single-family dwelling unit for use as a complete, independent dwelling with permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation. An ADU may consist of either of the following:

A. "Attached accessory dwelling unit," or "A-ADU," means an accessory dwelling unit located within or attached to a single-family residence. To be considered attached the roof and wall of the accessory dwelling unit must be an extension of the roof and wall of the existing single-family residence. In no case shall the attachment be made through an unenclosed structure.

B. "Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit," or "D-ADU," means an accessory dwelling unit that consists partly or entirely of a building that is accessory to a single-family dwelling unit. No new accessory dwelling unit may be located within a detached structure. Unpermitted detached accessory dwelling units existing prior to January 1, 1995, may be permitted. Approval shall be consistent with the accessory dwelling unit regulations and process outlined in BMC 20.10.035. The detached accessory dwelling unit shall be reviewed using the building code in place at the time its owner brings the unit forward for permit.

Section 4. BMC 20.10.035 relating to Accessory Dwelling Units is hereby REPEALED in its entirety.

Section 5. A new section, BMC 20.10.036 Accessory Dwelling Units, is hereby adopted as follows:

BMC 20.10.036 Accessory Dwelling Units.

A. Purpose and Authority.

1. It is the purpose of this legislation to implement policy provisions of the City’s Comprehensive Plan promoting increased housing options and innovation that will help meet the needs of the many sectors of the community, including smaller households, students, millennials, Baby Boomers, people with disabilities, and low-income families; make more efficient use of public infrastructure and services; are within walking distance to shops, jobs, and amenities; encourage well-designed infill development; and improve the economic and social well-being of the community.

2. The director shall have the authority to approve accessory dwelling units (ADUs) which are consistent with single-family neighborhood character and the regulations and
provisions herein. It is not the intent of these regulations to provide for ADUs on every residential property and they shall not be deemed to create a right or privilege to establish or maintain an ADU which is not strictly in compliance with these regulations.

3. Enforcement. The city retains the right (with reasonable notice) to inspect the ADU for compliance with this section.

B. Standards and Criteria.

1. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) may be allowed in use qualifiers where listed as a permitted use if they comply with the requirements listed in this section, BMC 20.10.036, except on property regulated by Chapter 16.80 BMC, Lake Whatcom Reservoir Regulatory Provisions.

2. An ADU shall comply with all zoning code provisions for the primary residence, including height, setbacks, accessory buildings and open space, except as provided in this section, BMC 20.10.036. This provision shall also apply to ancillary structures attached to a D-ADU such as garages, carports, garden sheds and work-shops.

3. Applicants may request minor modifications to the development and design standards for ADUs. A minor modification is a request by the applicant to meet or exceed a particular ADU standard through the use of a technique or alternative standard not otherwise listed under the applicable requirement. Minor modifications are not variances and are not required to meet all of the criteria typically associated with a variance application. The director may grant a minor modification if the following criteria are met:

   a. The site is physically constrained due to, but not limited to, unusual shape, topography, easements, existing development on site, or critical areas; or

   c. The granting of the modification will not result in a development that is less compatible with adjacent neighborhood land uses and character; and

   b. The granting of the modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other land or improvements in the vicinity and district in which the property is situated; and

   d. The granting of the modification is consistent with the purpose and intent of this section BMC 20.10.036; and

   e. All reasonable mitigation measures for the modification have been implemented or assured.

4. Ownership and Occupancy.

   a. The ADU, or the land on which the ADU is located, shall not be subdivided or otherwise segregated in ownership from the primary dwelling unit or the land on which the primary dwelling unit is located.
b. The total number of persons who may occupy the accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed four (4), regardless of relationship.

c. The owner shall record a covenant with the Whatcom County Auditor, approved by the director, which shall run with the land as long as the ADU is maintained on the property. The property owner shall submit proof that the covenant has been recorded with the Whatcom County Auditor's office prior to issuance of the building permit. The covenant shall specify the requirements for owner occupancy, purchaser registration, and biannual verification as follows:

1) The owner of the subject property shall reside on the premises, whether in the primary or accessory dwelling; provided, that:

a) In the event of illness, death or other unforeseeable event which prevents the owner's continued occupancy of the premises, the Director may, upon a finding that discontinuance of the ADU would cause a hardship on the owner and/or tenants, grant a temporary suspension of this owner-occupancy requirement for a period of one (1) year. The Director may grant an extension of such suspension for one (1) additional year, upon a finding of continued hardship.

b) In the case of bringing an unpermitted ADU into compliance with BMC 20.10.036, if the property on which the ADU is located complies with all of the requirements of BMC 20.10.036 except owner-occupancy, the property may continue without occupancy by the owner for the remainder of the lease(s) on the property, not to exceed one year. Thereafter, the property shall be occupied by the owner, or transferred to a different owner who will reside on the premises.

2) Purchasers of homes with an ADU shall register with the Planning and Community Development Department within 30 days of purchase.

3) An affidavit, prepared by the Planning and Community Development Department and signed by the property owner, must be submitted to the Department on or before January 1st of every odd numbered year attesting to owner occupancy.

5. Site Requirements.

a. Only one ADU shall be allowed per lot. The lot may not contain more than one primary dwelling unit. The ADU is exempt from density limitations due to its small size and low occupancy.

b. For a D-ADU, the lot shall have alley access, access to more than one public street, or the lot size shall be at least 5,000 square feet.
6. ADU Size.

a. Attached and Detached ADUs.

1) An ADU shall not exceed 66% of the floor area of the primary dwelling (excluding any related garage area attached to the primary dwelling), or 800 square feet, whichever is less, and shall contain a minimum square footage as required by the building code.

2) No more than two bedrooms may be located within an ADU.

b. Attached ADUs. The Director may allow increased size for an A-ADU in order to efficiently use all, or a portion of, the floor area on one floor of an existing dwelling unit constructed as of (January 1, 1995), provided the ADU does not exceed 800 square feet.

c. Detached ADUs. The floor area for D-ADUs shall be calculated using the "general" definition of floor area in BMC 20.08.020, and include ancillary space (garage, workshop, garden shed, etc.) within. However, an accessory building that includes a D-ADU and ancillary space may exceed 800 square feet when approved by the hearing examiner by conditional use permit pursuant to BMC 20.16, provided the floor area of the D-ADU does not exceed that specified in subsection (a)(1) of this section.

7. Minimum Yards for D-ADUs.

a. Front and side-flanking yards shall comply with the zoning code provisions for the primary residence except that when the vehicular entrance to an attached garage or carport faces a street, the entrance shall be set back a minimum of 25-feet from the front property line, and 10-feet from a side flanking property line.

b. A five-foot (5') side and rear yard setback shall be provided, measured from the property line to the foundation of the structure, except as follows:

1) When abutting an alley, there is no required side or rear yard setback from the alley.

2) A D-ADU may be located in a rear yard and in the rear 22 feet of an interior side yard, provided:

a) If such an accessory building is to be located less than five feet from any common property line, a joint agreement with the adjoining property owner(s) must be executed and recorded with the Whatcom County Auditor's Office and thereafter filed with the city, or

b) If site characteristics warrant such that, in the opinion of the director, impacts to abutting property would be negligible due to, but not limited to, one or more of the following:
i. The existing use and development pattern on abutting property.

ii. Minimal disruption of solar access to outdoor recreation or garden space on abutting property compared to what may otherwise occur with the application of standard development regulations.

iii. Site characteristics such as building a D-ADU downslope from abutting property.

iv. Conversion of a detached accessory building existing as of the date of adoption of this Ordinance to a D-ADU.

v. Any minor modification from standard development regulations requested pursuant to this subsection (b)(2)(b) shall be processed as a request for minor modification pursuant to subsection (B)(3) of this section.

c. A minimum six feet (6') of separation is required between the primary residence and a D-ADU.

8. Building Height for D-ADUs. A D-ADU shall be no higher than 20 feet under BMC 20.08.020, definition No. 1.

9. Parking. Parking required for an ADU is in addition to that required for the primary dwelling unit.

a. One on-site parking stall is required for an ADU, except as follows:

1. No parking is required when adding a street curb cut for private on-site parking would eliminate public on-street parking.

2. The director may reduce parking requirements based on the applicant’s demonstration of site-specific factors that justify a lower standard.

Any request for a parking waiver shall be processed as a request for minor modification pursuant to subsection (B)(3) of this section.

b. Parking stalls shall be at least 9 feet by 18 feet.

c. Parking shall not be located in required front or side street setbacks. Parking in the front portion of the lot shall be discouraged.

d. If the lot abuts an alley or private access easement, parking shall be accessed from said facility except when the director determines that such access is impractical or environmentally constrained. Any request to forgo alley access shall be processed as a request for minor modification pursuant to subsection (B)(3) of this section.

e. Parking accessed from a street or lane shall be limited to one driveway per frontage with a maximum width of 20 feet.
10. Privacy. Where practical, locate and design the ADU to minimize disruption of privacy and outdoor activities on adjacent properties. Strategies to accomplish this include, but are not limited to:

a. Stagger windows and doors to not align with such features on abutting properties.

b. Avoid upper level windows, entries and decks that face common property lines to reduce overlook of a neighboring property.

c. Install landscaping as necessary to provide for the privacy and screening of abutting property.

11. Design Standards. ADU design standards are intended to ensure the single-family appearance and character of the property is maintained or improved when viewed from the surrounding neighborhood. Any minor modification granted from compatibility with the design of the primary residence should be compatible with the prevailing architectural character of the area.

a. An ADU shall have similar roof pitch, siding, and windows as the primary dwelling.

b. Design the size and proportions of a D-ADU to give the appearance that it is secondary to the primary dwelling unit on the site.

c. ADU primary entry.

1) The ADU entry shall be clearly subordinate to that of the primary dwelling when both are visible from the street frontage. Strategies to accomplish this include, but are not limited to, architectural design, entry location, and landscaping.

2) Include an identifying feature such as a stoop and/or an eave overhang that is integral to the overall building design.

3) The main ADU entry shall be a swing door, not slider.

4) The entrance shall have direct access to a street via a lighted pedestrian path, driveway or alley.

12. Utilities

a. Water, sewer, storm. A primary dwelling unit and an A-ADU may have a shared water service to a water system, a shared sewer service to a sewer system and a shared storm service to a stormwater management system. A primary dwelling unit and a D-ADU may also have shared service connections, however separate and independent services from each building may be required to meet City’s adopted plumbing code. In all cases, the water service shut-off must be accessible to occupants of both units.

b. Electrical. A primary dwelling unit and an A-ADU shall have no more than one electrical service. A primary dwelling unit and a D-ADU are permitted to have one shared electrical service or two separate electrical services. A separate meter is
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permitted to serve an A-ADU or a D-ADU, subject to compliance with the City's
adopted electrical code. A single main service panel may be allowed; provided, that
occupants of both dwelling units have access to the overcurrent devices supplying
their occupancy.

c. Gas. A primary dwelling unit and ADU may share natural gas services. An accessible
shut-off valve must be upstream of the gas meter, on the exterior of the
structure(s).

d. Any utility lines being installed or altered must have their connections inspected as part of the building permit process.

13. Compliance with Applicable Codes. The ADU shall comply with all standards for health and life safety as set forth in the International Building Code, International Residential Code, Uniform Plumbing Code, National Electrical Code, International Mechanical Code, International Fire Code, and Washington State Energy Code as each code is adopted by the city; and any other applicable codes or regulations, except as provided in this section 20.10.036 BMC.

14. Accessibility. To encourage the development of housing units for people with disabilities, the director may allow reasonable deviation from the stated requirements to install features that facilitate accessibility. Such facilities shall be in conformance with the City Adopted Building Code.

C. Existing Illegal Units.

1. Application may be made for any accessory dwelling unit existing prior to January 1, 1995, to become legally permitted, pursuant to the provisions of this section, BMC 20.10.036. Whether an ADU permit is approved or denied, the owner of any non-permitted unit shall be subject to the penalties provided in this code.

2. An application to legalize an existing ADU shall include an application for an ADU permit and a building permit application, showing changes made to the main residence or detached accessory building to accommodate the ADU. Approval shall be consistent with the ADU regulations and process outlined in this section, BMC 20.10.036. The ADU shall be reviewed using the current editions of building codes in place at the time its owner brings the unit forward for permit.

3. Nothing in this section shall require that the City permit existing ADUs that are determined to be dangerous.

D. Permitting Process. An ADU is required to obtain approval following the procedures established in Chapter 21.10 BMC.

E. Threshold Review. This ADU Ordinance shall be reviewed by City Council, whichever comes first:

1. By December 31, 2025, or
2. When the city issues 200 D-ADU permits citywide, or

3. When the city issues 25 D-ADU permits in any one neighborhood as defined in BMC 20.00 Zoning Tables.

The unit count trigger shall only apply to new D-ADUs approved following adoption of this ordinance. The unit count trigger shall not apply to D-ADUs in those areas that were annexed into the city after 1995 with a "mixed" use qualifier that allows multifamily residential.

Section 6. Amend BMC 20.12.010(B)(3)(a) regarding the number of parking spaces required for an accessory dwelling unit, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. through v.</td>
<td>[NO CHANGES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td>One for each bedroom, minimum of one for each ADU. These spaces must be located on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. vi. Senior Citizen Housing</td>
<td>The planning director may reduce the parking requirement below the amount required for other dwelling units, but not less than one-half space per unit, based on the actual anticipated demand after considering the following factors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. A parking study supplied by the proponent showing the actual anticipated demand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Minimum age requirement to reside in the residential facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Amount of services provided at the residential facility, including transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Parking management methods to be employed. If senior citizen housing ceases to be used for such purposes, additional off-street parking shall be required in compliance with this chapter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. vii. Live/Work Unit</td>
<td>One parking space per live/work unit or one parking space per 500 square feet of gross floor area of all units in a project, whichever is greater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 7. BMC 20.28.020 regarding Infill Housing Applicability is amended as follows:

A. The housing types in this chapter are not permitted in residential single zones, neighborhood commercial zones or property regulated by Chapter 16.80 BMC, Lake Whatcom Reservoir Regulatory Provisions, except in those areas that were annexed into the city after 1995 with a “mixed” qualifier that allows multifamily residential, and in Area 8 of the Sunnyland neighborhood. The housing types in this chapter are permitted in all other zones that allow residential, including specifically designated areas of urban villages. In the residential multi-duplex zone, only small house, smaller house, cottage, detached accessory dwelling unit, carriage house and duplex are permitted.

B. If the provisions of this chapter conflict with any other provision in BMC Title 18, 20, or 21, the provisions of this chapter shall apply.

Section 8. BMC 20.28.040 regarding Infill Housing Definitions is amended as follows:

The following definitions apply to this chapter:

“Carriage house” means a second dwelling unit located above a parking garage and subordinate to a single-family dwelling unit on the same lot.

“Common shared structure” means a building or structure designed and intended for the common use of the residents of the cottage housing.

“Cottage housing” means a coordinated grouping of four to eight small detached single-family dwellings clustered around common open space and having shared parking.

“Design guidelines” means guidelines for meeting the intention of the ordinance.

“Design standards” means requirements related to the design of the project. Developments are required to meet the design standards in this chapter.

“Detached accessory dwelling unit” means a second dwelling unit subordinate to, and detached from a single-family dwelling unit on the same lot.

“Duplex” means a building containing only two dwelling units.

“Garden court housing” means four to eight dwelling units clustered around a common open space or courtyard.

“Shared court housing” means four to six dwelling units oriented to a shared courtyard providing access for both vehicles and pedestrians but designed to give priority to pedestrians.

“Small house” means detached single-family dwelling units on lots over 3,000 square feet but not more than 5,000 square feet in size.

“Smaller house” means detached single-family dwelling units on lots 1,800 square feet to 3,000 square feet in size.
“Townhouse” means a dwelling in a row of units in which each unit has its own front and rear access to the outside, no unit is located over another unit, and each unit is separated from any other unit by one or more vertical common walls.

“Triplex” means a building containing only three dwelling units.

**Section 9.** BMC 20.28.060(C) regarding Smaller House Bulk and Mass is amended as follows:

**C. Bulk and Massing.**

1. Maximum floor area ratio (FAR): 0.4, or 0.5 when an accessory dwelling unit is included pursuant to BMC 20.10.036. Attached garages are included in FAR. Detached garages up to 220 square feet, or 440 square feet with an ADU, are exempt from FAR.

2. No single floor shall be greater than 600 square feet.

3. Maximum height is 25 feet under BMC 20.08.020, height definition No. 1 and 15 feet under definition No. 2.

**Section 10.** BMC 20.28.070(C) regarding Small House Bulk and Mass is amended as follows:

**C. Bulk and Massing.**

1. Maximum floor area ratio (FAR): 0.35, or 0.5 with an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) pursuant to BMC 20.10.036. Attached garages are included in FAR. Detached garages up to 220 square feet, or 440 square feet with an ADU, are exempt from FAR.

2. No single floor shall be greater than 800 square feet.

3. Maximum height is 25 feet under BMC 20.08.020, definition No. 1 and 15 feet under definition No. 2.

**Section 11.** BMC 20.28.090 Carriage House is REPEALED in its entirety.

**Section 12.** BMC 20.28.100 Detached ADU is REPEALED in its entirety.

**Section 13.** BMC 20.30.030(A) concerning Permitted Uses for Residential Single Development, is amended as follows:

**A. Uses Permitted Outright.** No building or land shall be used within an area designated residential single, except as follows:

1. through 5. [NO CHANGES]

6. Attached accessory dwelling unit (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036).
7. Detached accessory dwelling units existing prior to January 1, 1995 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036).

8. through 10. [NO CHANGES]

Section 14. BMC 20.30.040(A) regarding Standard Development Regulations for Residential Single Development, is amended as follows:

A. Applicability.

1. The regulations of this section shall apply to the development of any main building in an area designated RS to be occupied by a principal use designated in BMC 20.30.030, unless the optional regulations of BMC 20.30.050 are utilized.

2. The regulations of this section also apply to the development of a single-family home where permitted in other designations (residential multi, commercial, institutional or planned).

3. The regulations of this section shall apply to the development of any permitted conditional use in an area designated RS unless other applicable regulations appear within Chapter 20.16 BMC.

4. Except where other applicable regulations appear within BMC 20.10.036 or 20.30.100, the regulations of this section shall apply to the development of any accessory building in an area designated RS.

Section 15. BMC 20.30.100(B) regarding Regulations for Accessory Buildings and Uses for Residential Single Development, is amended as follows:

B. Regulations.

1. The regulations of BMC 20.30.040 shall apply to all accessory buildings except that:

   a. Accessory buildings shall not exceed one story in height, or 12 feet under either height definition.

   b. Accessory buildings may be located in a rear yard and in the rear 22 feet of an interior side yard; however, a garage, the entrance of which faces the rear lot line, shall not be located within 10 feet from the rear lot line.

   c. An accessory building that consists partly or entirely of a detached accessory dwelling unit may be allowed pursuant to BMC 20.10.036.

2. Buildings accessory to single-family homes shall not be used for human habitation other than the resident family, nor used to conduct any business, unless specifically permitted.
3. Accessory buildings shall not be constructed prior to the commencement of the construction of the main building.

4. An accessory building may not exceed 800 square feet in area, provided:
   a. The hearing examiner may approve, by conditional use permit, larger buildings after proper review and consideration; or
   b. If the accessory building consists partly of a detached ADU, the standards in BMC 20.10.036 shall apply.

**Section 16.** BMC 20.32.030(A) regarding Permitted Uses in Residential Multi Development, is amended as follows:

A. Uses Permitted Outright. No building or land shall be used within areas designated RM except as enumerated below corresponding to the applicable use qualifier:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Qualifier</th>
<th>Permitted Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>1. through 6. [NO CHANGES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Attached accessory dwelling units (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Detached accessory dwelling units existing prior to January 1, 1995 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. through 11. [NO CHANGES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>1. All those permitted within the duplex use qualifier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Multifamily dwelling units (apartments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Attached accessory dwelling units (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Unpermitted detached accessory dwelling units existing prior to January 1, 1995 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-3. Billboards, subject to the provisions of this chapter, and only within the billboard overlay zones delineated by BMC 20.08.020, Figure 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>1. [NO CHANGES]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 17. BMC 20.32.110(B) regarding Regulations for Accessory Buildings and Uses for Residential Multi Development, is amended as follows:

B. Regulations.

1. The regulations of BMC 20.32.040 shall apply to all accessory buildings except that accessory buildings may be located in a rear yard and in the rear 22 feet of an interior side yard. However, a garage, the entrance of which faces the rear lot line, shall not be located within 10 feet from the rear lot line.

2. Accessory buildings shall not be constructed prior to the commencement of the construction of the main building.

Section 18. BMC 20.34.030(A) regarding Permitted Uses in Commercial Development having a “Neighborhood” Use Qualifier, is amended as follows:

A. Uses Permitted Outright. No building or land shall be used within an area designated with a commercial general use type except as permitted below corresponding to the use qualifier designated for such property.

The following uses shall be permitted outright corresponding to the designated use qualifier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Qualifier</th>
<th>Permitted Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>1. through 17. [NO CHANGES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Attached accessory dwelling unit (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Detached accessory dwelling unit existing prior to January 1, 1995 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. through 21. [NO CHANGES]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section 19.** BMC Chapter 20.37, Article II, Table 20.37.120, concerning Permitted Uses in the Samish Way Urban Village, is amended as follows:

**Table 20.37.120 – Permitted Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. through 24. [NO CHANGES]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Attached accessory dwelling units (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036)</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Detached accessory dwelling units existing prior to January 1, 1995 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036)</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Chapter 20.28 BMC, Infill Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Smaller House</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Small House</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cottage</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Carriage House</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Detached ADU</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. d. Duplex/Triplex</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. e. Shared Court</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. f. Garden Court</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. g. Townhouse</td>
<td><strong>P(5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. through 42. [NO CHANGES]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 20. BMC Chapter 20.37, Article III, Table 20.37.220, concerning Permitted Uses in the Fountain District Urban Village, is amended as follows:

Table 20.37.220 – Permitted Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Core</td>
<td>Commercial Transition</td>
<td>Residential Transition 1</td>
<td>Residential Transition 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. through 27. [NO CHANGES]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Attached accessory dwelling units (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Detached accessory dwelling units existing prior to January 1, 1995 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Chapter 20.28 BMC, Infill Housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Small House</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Duplex</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Triplex</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Shared Court</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Garden Court</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Townhouse</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. through 46. [NO CHANGES]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 21. BMC Chapter 20.37, Article IV, Table 20.37.320 - Permitted Uses, A. Residential, concerning the Fairhaven Urban Village, is amended as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC(2)</td>
<td>RT-1 and RT-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit per BMC 20.10.035.036</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit existing prior to 1/1/1995, per BMC 20.10.035.036</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. through 8. [NO CHANGES]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Infill Housing per Chapter 20.28 BMC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. through 14. [NO CHANGES]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

(1) Through (3) [NO CHANGES]

(4) Infill housing uses allowed in RT-3 are limited to carriage house and detached accessory dwelling unit, per Chapter 20.28 BMC.

(5)(4) These uses, when established by a private (not public) entity, require a conditional use permit.

(6)(5) Regulated by BMC 10.24.120.

(7)(6) A restaurant may include licensed provision of beer and wine for consumption on the premises when accessory to such food service. Sales of beverages having a higher alcohol content than beer and wine require a conditional use permit.

(8)(7) The “work” component in live/work is limited to those permitted and conditional uses listed under the applicable zoning subarea in Table 20.37.320.

(9)(8) When entirely enclosed within a structure.

(10)(9) Including construction businesses (such as construction offices and storage yards).

(11)(10) May only be located on those properties where they currently exist south of Larrabee Street.
### Table 20.37.320 – Permitted Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avenue as of August 28, 2012.

11 Institutions of higher education and art schools are permitted. All other schools are conditional, per Chapter 20.16 BMC.

12 The manufacture, compounding, processing, refining, and treatment of significant quantities of the following materials, products or operations is prohibited. For the purpose of this section, “significant quantities” consist of a barrel or more at a single time. Acetylene, distillation of alcohol, asphalt and tar, brick, tile, terra cotta, concrete, cement, lime, gypsum, and plaster of Paris, fats, oils and soap, fertilizer, garbage, offal, bones, and the reduction of dead animals, forging or smelting of metal, lampblack, stove and shoe polish, lumber and planing mills, oilcloth and linoleum, paint, shellac, turpentine, lacquer and varnish, paper and pulp, petroleum processing and storage, any explosive or highly inflammable material, slaughtering and processing of meat or fish products, tannery and curing of raw hides, chemicals such as acid, ammonia, bleach, chlorine, dye stuff, glue, gelatin and size, automotive wrecking, or junk yards.

13 Excluding the storage and handling of explosives, ammonia, chlorine, and any other similarly dangerous or toxic substances.

14 Conditional except for those uses permitted in subsection (D)(9) of this table.

15 Wireless communication facilities may only be allowed as an accessory use or conditional use under the provisions of Chapter 20.13 BMC pertaining to the location of these facilities in public zones.
Section 22. BMC Chapter 20.37, Article VI, Table 20.37.520 - Permitted Uses, A. Residential, concerning the Downtown District Urban Village, is amended as follows:

Table 20.37.520 – Permitted Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit per BMC 20.10.035.036</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit existing prior to 1/1/1995, per BMC 20.10.035.036</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. through 12. [NO CHANGES]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 23. BMC 20.38.050(B)(2) concerning Range of Uses Possible in Planned Residential Development, is amended as follows:

2. Range of Uses Possible. Any of the following uses may be permitted in a planned proposal within a residential general use type designation; provided, that any of such uses shall not be permitted where prohibited within the applicable neighborhood plan. Certain uses may also be excluded from a particular planned residential area if such use(s) are found by the planning director to be incompatible with the surrounding area or unsuitable to the particular site. The final decision shall set forth the uses permitted for the subject property.

a. through i. [NO CHANGES]

j. Attached accessory dwelling unit (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036).

k. Detached accessory dwelling unit existing prior to January 1, 1995 (consistent with procedures and requirements outlined in BMC 20.10.035.036).

I. through o. [NO CHANGES]
**Section 24.** The Council agrees with, and hereby adopts the **February 15, 2018** Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Planning Commission, attached as **Exhibit A**.

**PASSED by the Council this ______ day of _____________, 2018**

__________________________________
Council President

**APPROVED by me this ______ day of _____________, 2018**

__________________________________
Mayor

**ATTEST: ________________________**
Finance Director

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

__________________________________
Office of the City Attorney

**Published: ________________________**
BELLINGHAM PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FEBRUARY 15, 2018

SUMMARY
Following several work sessions, a public hearing and deliberations, the Bellingham Planning Commission has determined that the proposed amendments to Bellingham Municipal Code provisions regarding accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are supported by, and will help implement, the goals and policies of the 2016 Bellingham Comprehensive Plan.

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

The proposal includes a review of the City's municipal code provisions related to accessory dwelling units.

Background Information/Procedural History

History of the City's current ADU regulations –

- State Law RCW 43.63A.215 and RCW 36.70A.400, adopted as part of the 1993 Washington Housing Policy Act, required Washington cities with populations over 20,000 to adopt regulations to allow accessory dwelling units.
- In 1995, the City approved Ordinance No. 10643 which allowed attached ADUs citywide and included a provision that required the City Council to review the ordinance 1) two years following the effective date of the ordinance, and 2) after the 20th ADU permit is issued in any single neighborhood, with intent to determine how the ordinance was working and to determine what, if any, of the regulations needed to be modified or eliminated.
- In 1997, after two years, the City Council reviewed the ADU ordinance. At that time, 14 ADU permits had been issued and six were completed. Council elected to make no changes to the ordinance at that time.
- In 2001, Ordinance No. 2001-01-001 added a new chapter (16.80 - Lake Whatcom Reservoir Regulatory Chapter) to the BMC, and included provisions restricting ADUs within the Lake Whatcom Watershed.
- In 2009, Ordinance No. 2009-08-047 added a new chapter (20.28 - Infill Housing) to the BMC, and included provisions allowing carriage units and detached ADUs generally in areas that had been or would be annexed to the city. Carriage units and detached ADUs were not allowed in most single family zones or within the Lake Whatcom Watershed.
- In 2015, the City launched the review and update to the ADU ordinance after the 20th ADU permit was issued in the South Hill Neighborhood. Focus and technical groups were used to inform the initial review of the ADU rules. The effort was tabled while the required update to the comprehensive plan was completed.
- In 2016, the 2016 Bellingham Comprehensive Plan was adopted, including updated goal and policy guidance with respect to growth management, infill development, housing choice and affordability, and ADUs.
• In 2017, the Happy Valley Neighborhood submitted a proposal to amend the City's ADU regulations to allow a limited number of detached ADUs in their neighborhood.

• In 2017, the ADU ordinance update process was restarted. The Planning Commission held a series of work sessions throughout the fall and a public hearing on January 25th, 2018. Additional work sessions were held on February 1st and February 15th.

• On January 2, 2018, A non-project SEPA Determination of Non-Significance was issued. The SEPA review process evaluated the potential impacts from the Planning Commission's preliminary recommended changes to current ADU regulations (including allowing detached ADUs in all single-family zoned areas).

• On February 15, 2018 the Planning Commission adopted recommendations for changes to the existing ADU regulations as shown in the ordinance (Attachment B) to the staff report.

Proposal

Staff's 2017 proposal originally included a series of relatively minor changes to the City's ADU regulations. These changes were intended to improve the permitting process, as well as consolidate and clarify the regulations. Since no major changes were proposed, the intent was to make these improvements in a timely fashion and support Happy Valley's pilot proposal to get some detached ADUs built relatively soon. Our original scope of the project anticipated that major changes to ADU regulations would be evaluated during the update to the “Infill Toolkit” section of the BMC.

The following is a partial list of changes to current ADU regulations originally proposed by staff. See Attachment C to the staff report for a complete list.

1. Consolidating and standardizing existing ADU code provisions.
2. Allowing minor modifications to code provisions to increase flexibility.
3. No changes to where detached ADUs are currently allowed.
4. Removing the “cap” on the number of attached ADUs (20) that would be allowed in each neighborhood prior to reviewing the ordinance.
5. Reducing the minimum lot size for detached ADUs from over 10,000 sq.ft. to 5,000 sq.ft.
6. Reducing the maximum allowed height of detached ADUs from 25 feet to 20 feet.
7. Increasing the maximum allowed size of an ADU from 40% to 50% of the sq.ft. of the main residence, not to exceed 800 sq.ft.
8. Revising required building setback requirements for detached ADUs.
9. Limiting the number of bedrooms in a detached ADU to two.
10. Revising on-site parking requirement from one stall per bedroom to one stall per attached ADU.

Along with staff's proposed changes, the Happy Valley Neighborhood proposed a pilot program to allow a limited number of detached ADUs in their neighborhood. The specifics of their proposal are contained in Attachment D to the staff report.

The Planning Commission, in their initial discussions at three work sessions in the fall of 2017, directed staff to include a number of additional changes to the current ADU regulations. A draft ordinance was prepared that includes the changes proposed by staff, the HVNA and the Planning Commission. See the Planning Commission's recommendations section for a list of the additional changes proposed by the Commission.

The draft ordinance was the subject of a public hearing held on January 25, 2018.
Issues and Opportunities

A number of issues have been raised and discussed by members of the community and the Planning Commission. Some of the issues include, impacts on neighborhood character, parking, design, cost to construct ADUs, illegal units and homeowner occupancy. See Attachment E to the staff report, Opportunities/Concerns matrix, where staff has responded to many the issues raised during the Commission's review process.

Some of the potential benefits of allowing ADUs identified during the process include:

- Housing choice – ADUs can provide housing opportunities for those who may not be able to otherwise afford to live in an established single family neighborhood. These areas have convenient access to services, employment, transportation options, parks, trails and neighborhood schools. These units can also provide housing for friends or family members and those in need of caretaking. Statistics from Portland, Oregon show that 30% of current homeowners with ADUs charge no rent to their tenants.

- Appropriate forms of housing for shifting demographics in Bellingham.

- Help meet Growth Management Act goals to reduce impacts of sprawl.

- Financial benefit to homeowner – ADUs can provide income for the homeowner, allowing folks the opportunity to stay in their home and age in place. ADUs add value to the property for resale purposes.

Consistency with the Bellingham Comprehensive Plan

Development regulations, like those governing the location and construction of ADUs, are intended to implement the goals and policies of the Bellingham Comprehensive Plan. The goals and policies provide guidance and policy direction in the establishment of development regulations. The following are some examples from the 2016 comprehensive plan relevant to the discussion regarding ADUs.

Land Use Chapter

Policy LU-1  The Single-Family Residential designation permits a range of housing densities to achieve the City's housing diversity and affordability goals. In undeveloped or infill areas, new housing may include single-family detached, single-family attached, townhouses, cottage housing, accessory dwelling units, clustered housing and other small-scale housing forms. Accessory, public and semipublic uses are also allowed.

Policy LU-4  Protect the unique character and qualities of existing neighborhoods, while identifying opportunities for improved livability, safety, and housing affordability and diversity.

Policy LU-5  Foster neighborhoods with a balanced mix of housing prices that are compatible with the wages and incomes in the community.
Policy LU-10 To achieve a healthy mix of housing that is affordable to a wide range of incomes, implement and seek new, innovative tools, including, but not limited to:

- Density bonuses;
- Inclusionary zoning;
- Cluster subdivisions that preserve open space, retain natural features and provide other public benefits;
- The Infill Housing Toolkit, which includes small lot homes, townhomes and other housing forms;
- Accessory dwelling units;
- Adaptive reuse of existing buildings;
- Purchase and transfer of development rights (TDR) programs; and
- Public-private partnerships for shared parking facilities, wetland mitigation, and regional stormwater management.

Note: The Planning Commission finds and concludes that the ADU code amendments proposed by staff, the Planning Commission and the Happy Valley Neighborhood Association are consistent with the Land Use chapter goals and policies referenced.

Housing Chapter

GOAL H-1 Ensure that Bellingham has a sufficient quantity and variety of housing types and densities to accommodate projected growth and promote other community goals.

Policy H-9 Update the City's ADU ordinance with priorities on:

- Evaluating and inventorying ADUs in the City;
- Identifying appropriate areas for detached ADUs;
- Improving permitting and enforcement; and
- Requiring owner occupancy in single-family zones.

Policy H-10 Permit owner-occupied attached ADUs in single-family and multi-family zones.

GOAL H-2 Foster housing that is safe, healthy, livable, and affordable for all income levels in all neighborhoods.

Policy H-13 Consider the impacts on citywide housing capacity, affordability and diversity when making land use policy decisions and code amendments.

Policy H-15 Support fair and equal access to housing for all persons, regardless of race, religion, ethnic origin, age, household composition or size, disability, marital status, sexual orientation or economic circumstances.

Policy H-16 Increase the supply of affordable rental and ownership housing that is context sensitive throughout the City, especially in areas with good access to transit, employment, education and services (see Land Use Chapter for definition of "context sensitive").

Policy H-17 Consider the impacts of transportation costs on housing affordability and accessibility of services and other opportunities when planning for housing.
Policy H-18  Continue evaluating the recommendations of the City's Community Solutions Workgroup on Affordable Housing, including:

- Detached ADUs, small lot and cottage housing in single-family zones;
- Impact fee reductions for ADUs;
- Reduced parking requirements; and
- Other code changes and incentives that allow and encourage well-designed infill development.

Policy H-19  Continue providing incentives to support housing affordability (e.g. density bonuses, expedited permitting, multi-family tax exemption program and fee reductions) and consider including workforce housing as part of certain incentives programs.

Policy H-31  Promote high-quality design that is compatible with the overall style and character of established neighborhoods.

Policy H-34  Encourage the rehabilitation, relocation and reuse, rather than demolition, of existing housing.

Policy H-44  Periodically review and update the City's residential zoning regulations and design standards to promote quality development with timely and predictable outcomes.

Note: The Planning Commission finds and concludes that the ADU code amendments proposed by staff, the Planning Commission and the Happy Valley Neighborhood Association are consistent with the Housing chapter goals and policies referenced.

Community Design Chapter

Goal CD-6  Encourage contextually-appropriate infill development projects and property renovations.

Policy CD-7  Ensure that new development is of a type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetics, and livability of neighborhoods. While compatibility is more of an issue in established neighborhoods, new development needs to take into account the context of the area and should result in an improvement to the surrounding neighborhood.

Policy CD-24  Provide adequate resources to ensure that conditions of approval placed on development projects are monitored and enforced.

Policy CD-32  Provide development standards that are adaptable to a variety of conditions to allow for diversity in building styles within districts and neighborhoods.

Policy CD-33  Encourage the construction of small-scale housing types that fit the context of single-family neighborhoods, such as accessory dwelling units, cottage housing, townhomes, zero lot line homes, and small lot housing.

Policy CD-38  Promote the maintenance and improvement of the existing housing stock.
Note: The Planning Commission finds and concludes that the ADU code amendments proposed by staff, the Planning Commission and the Happy Valley Neighborhood Association are consistent with the Community Design chapter goals and policies referenced.

Public Comment

Notice of the Planning Commission hearing was mailed to the Mayor's Neighborhood Advisory Commission, registered neighborhood associations, and a list of groups and individuals who expressed interest in the ADU ordinance review process. The notice was also published in the Bellingham Herald.

Extensive comments were submitted throughout the Commission's review process. Public comment was taken at four work sessions (two in 2015 and two in 2017). Approximately 60 people spoke at the January 25 public hearing. The Commission also received a significant number of letters and emails regarding this topic. Staff has responded to many of the issues in the Opportunities/Concerns matrix (see Attachment E to the staff report).

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Determination

A non-project SEPA Determination of Non-Significance was issued on January 2, 2018. The SEPA review process evaluated the potential impacts from the Planning Commission's preliminary recommended changes to current ADU regulations (including allowing detached ADUs in all single-family zoned areas). All public comments received concerning the proposed amendments prior to issuance of the determination of nonsignificance were used to inform the SEPA analysis and determination.

Staff received a number of letters and emails in response to the SEPA determination (see comments submitted during the comment period for the SEPA determination of non-significance between 1/2/2018 and 1/18/2018 in Attachment H to the staff report). All comments received during the comment period will be used to inform the final determination. Many of the issues raised during the comment period were addressed in the Opportunities/Concerns matrix (Attachment E to the staff report). Staff and the SEPA official are continuing review of the public comments received in response to the determination of non-significance. The SEPA Official will issue a final determination prior to a decision on the proposed amendments by the City Council.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The Planning Commission concludes that the proposed code amendments are consistent with, and will help implement, the land use, housing and community design goals and policies in the 2016 comprehensive plan.

The Commission concludes that the proposed code amendments will help meet Growth Management Act goals to encourage growth in urban areas, reduce the impacts of sprawl and promote a variety of housing types.

Noting that attached ADUs are currently allowed in all single family zoned areas of the city, the Commission concludes that allowing detached ADUs in these areas would expand the opportunities to utilize this housing form without increasing the allowed zoning density. With no increase in allowed density, concerns about impacts on City facilities and services are reduced.
The Commission concludes that the proposed regulations which limit the size, height, number of bedrooms and number of residents will reduce the potential impacts on surrounding properties and result in D-ADUs that are of an appropriate scale for an accessory building.

The Commission concludes that the proposed design guidelines will help retain the established character of the single family neighborhoods.

Recognizing that ADUs are relatively expensive to build and that the costs can be a barrier, the Commission recommends that transportation and parks impact fees be waived for ADUs.

The Commission concludes that ADUs can provide housing opportunities for renters who may not be able to otherwise afford to live in an established single family neighborhood. These areas have convenient access to services, employment, transportation options, parks, trails and neighborhood schools. These units can also provide housing for friends or family members and those in need of caretaking. Statistics from Portland, Oregon show that 30% of current homeowners with ADUs charge no rent to their tenants.

The Commission concludes that ADUs can provide income for the homeowner, allowing folks the opportunity to stay in their home and age in place. ADUs can add value to the property for resale purposes.

The Commission concludes that the current regulation requiring the homeowner with an ADU to live on site is an important factor in addressing concerns about impacts on surrounding properties. This requirement should be retained.

The Commission acknowledges that establishing an occupancy limit of three persons for ADUs could pose an unnecessary hardship in some situations. Therefore the Commission concludes that the occupancy of ADUs should be limited to four persons, and that occupancy is ultimately self-limiting given the inherently small size of ADUs.

The Commission further concludes that the proposed amendments will provide a reasonable and equitable opportunity for locating ADUs, both attached and detached, throughout Bellingham.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Planning Commission supports allowing detached ADUs in all single family zoned areas of the city. This approach would undoubtedly result in more units being constructed, and in more neighborhoods. 93 attached and detached ADUs have been constructed in Bellingham since the original adoption of code provisions allowing this form of housing in 1995. Other cities that have successfully sought to make this form of housing more available generally permit all forms of ADUs in all or most areas, have a relatively simple permit approval process, and have reduced or eliminated many fees, such as impact fees. Currently, ADUs are charged transportation and park impact fees. These fees, added together, add about $5,000 to the cost of an ADU permit. To eliminate these fees, separate BMC changes to the transportation and parks impact fee ordinances would be required.

The Commission’s final recommendations are summarized below and specified in detail in the attached ordinance.

1. Allow detached ADUs in all single family zoned areas citywide.
2. Consolidate and standardize regulations for attached and detached ADUs.

3. Change the maximum number of occupants from three to four for all ADUs.

4. Include a date certain and a unit-count trigger to evaluate and review the ADU ordinance. The Commission recommends that the ordinance be reviewed by December 31, 2025, or when the city reaches 200 detached ADUs citywide or 25 detached ADUs in any one neighborhood, whichever occurs first. The unit count trigger would only apply to new detached ADUs approved following adoption of the ordinance. The unit-count trigger would not apply in those areas that were annexed into the city after 1995 with a “mixed” qualifier that allows multifamily residential.

5. Allow ADUs to be no more than 66% of the size of the primary residence. Allow detached ADUs with ancillary space such as a garage or shop to exceed 800 sq.ft. with approval of a conditional use permit. However in no case should an ADU be larger than 800 sq.ft.

6. Limit the number of bedrooms in detached ADUs to two.

7. Require one parking space for each ADU.

8. Allow administrative minor modifications to ADU regulations consistent with criteria listed in BMC 20.10.036 B.3.

9. Eliminate transportation and park impact fees for all ADUs.

10. Regarding the Happy Valley proposal, the Commission recommends that a single set of development regulations and design standards apply to all areas of the city.

11. Should the City Council decide not to allow detached ADUs in all areas of the city, the Commission recommends that the Happy Valley D-ADU proposal be approved as modified by the Commission, and including the 20-unit cap for D-ADUs as proposed by the Happy Valley Neighborhood Association.

Based on the findings and conclusions, the Planning Commission recommends adoption of the ADU code provisions detailed in the attached ordinance.

ADOPTED this 5th day of February, 2018.

Planning Commission Chairperson

ATTEST:

Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Dear City of Bellingham Councilors, Mayor, and Planning Department personnel,

We write in support and favor of the proposed DADU regulations, permitting them in neighborhoods zoned single-family. With one proviso - they must be restricted to owner-occupied dwellings.

Thank you for making changes which will permit owner-occupiers to enhance their properties, and their neighborhoods, and provide additional housing which is sorely needed in B'ham. And also to permit younger people to afford to buy houses in a market which is increasingly out of reach for first-time buyers - by allowing them to rent out their ADU's and have the added income to cover their mortgages.

Sincerely,

David and Vilma Camp
1121 Grant St.
Marchand, Marie M.

From: LESLEY KEENHOLTS <lesliejkc@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 4:16 PM
To: CC - Shared Department
Cc: Koch, Christopher J.
Subject: ADA ordinance update

Dear Council Members,

I was reading a comment that a member of the pro-DADU group posted online the other day. It referenced the “Against DADU Citywide” crowd as 100% homeowners, as if being a homeowner is now something to be ashamed of. Many of us purchased our homes years ago, struggling with payments and upkeep, property taxes and homeowners insurance. We sacrificed and worked hard to be able to have a home. We have skin in the game. We care what happens in our neighborhoods and have participated in our neighborhood associations, to work with the city to plan for growth in a way that is responsible and contributes to the quality of life and preservation of our neighborhoods.

We welcome new people into our neighborhoods, and have a mix of families and students and seniors in most of our neighborhoods. We have a mix of homeowners and renters as neighbors. Many of us have asked council to only approve a pilot project in Happy Valley for DADU’s to evaluate the environmental impact, the repercussions of increased density on services, quality of life, and overall effectiveness in addressing Bellingham’s housing shortage.

This is a necessary FIRST step before approving DADU’s in single family neighborhoods and the only really sensible way to proceed.

Thank you for all you do,

Lesley Keenholts
York Neighborhood
lesliejkc@msn.com
Marchand, Marie M.

From: colors4life@juno.com
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:52 PM
To: CC - Shared Department
Cc: Koch, Christopher J.
Subject: the ADU ordinance update

Dear Council Members,

I'm writing this letter to ask you to NOT vote for a city-wide DADU ordinance. More time is needed to inform homeowners about this issue. What is needed is a city-wide mailer from the City Council informing each residence of the consequences of this bill. Since these DADU's are not going to solve the affordable housing problem, there is no need to rush this action.

Thank you,
Hilary Cole
Bellingham, WA.

After Weeks Of Rumors, Joanna Gaines Comes Clean risingstarnewspaper.com
http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131/5ae40c0f4b32cc0f6b56st02duc
The primary function of government is providing for the health and safety of its citizens. I am wondering how not following up about enforcement of the regulations you propose for the citizens of the City of Bellingham promotes health and safety for us? How does ignoring what is actually going on allow you to make good recommendations as to where our city should be putting more development? Without an inventory how can you know where infill is a good, safe choice?

My husband and I have invested most of our life savings in our retirement home here in Bellingham.

The first picture shows a house two down from ours. No it did not look like this when we purchased our home. You may wonder as we do, why do the folks that own this house need 2 ton utility vehicles without commercial licenses. The homeowners say they are NOT running a commercial business from their home.

You may wonder if emergency vehicles-ambulance, fire trucks can pass on this shared private driveway if the 2 homes past this one need assistance.

You may wonder why the window is boarded up from the storm of 2007.
You may wonder why this home has renters when the owner applied for an ADU and then decided they didn’t want to go through with the permit. So they just do as they please and have renters in there anyway.

This is a house that has become a rental on Morey Lane. Parking is an issue. What if the elderly neighbors past this house need assistance? Is it just too bad for their health and safety if the ambulance or fire truck is delayed because of parking issues?

This is a letter from a student who is living on campus looking for off campus parking.

Please do not recommend less parking per house or ADU as the letter shows, we should have owners provide more parking and perhaps request WWU provide
Dear Homeowner,

Hello, my name is Cameron Suits. I’m an incoming freshman at Western Washington University. I’m writing you this letter because I noticed you have an extra parking spot by your mail boxes. I was wondering if you would be willing to rent me the spot for the school year; my car is a small 1997 Volkswagen Beetle so it wouldn’t take up much space (and it’s very clean). Thank you for taking time out of your day to read my letter, if you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me anytime.

thank you,
As you can see all single family housing zones are not the same. Some neighborhoods have accepted more neighborhood overfill and live with conditions that impede the health and safety of the residents more than others. I ask that you not keep overfilling these neighborhoods. My neighborhood does not have covenants to prevent the type of overfill and crowding that we experience. I deserve as much consideration for my health and safety as any other City of Bellingham residents. Let Happy Valley have their pilot project. And let the rest of the neighborhoods have as much input as Happy Valley does in their fate. If you can look at these pictures and vote with good conscience to turn all single family housing zones into a pilot project for the city I will remember your vote the next time there is an election and it will influence my vote. And please no more disingenuous talk that the older established neighborhoods could put a covenant on their property if they want, because for that to be effective the problem houses in my neighborhood would have to agree to the new condition.

Deborah Middaugh

South Hill
A final word from me on this most disheartening of processes.

The DADU issue must be looked at as a part of a greater whole of land and zoning issues coming before you, the city council. Lose sight of that and you have lost sight of even the vaguest of objectives of the city and those who think that the free market (build, build, build) will take care of the problem. Unless we focus on the problems we are trying to solve and devise measured and measurable means to get to our goals, we are not going to succeed in the realms of affordability and availability. We are throwing spaghetti on the wall to see what sticks because there is no coherent program to unite all the issues that face us this year: ADUs, the Infill Tool Kit, illegal rooming houses, the subdivision ordinance and vacation rentals.

The housing issue is being sliced and diced by city hall (to include the planning commission) like salami, losing sight of the big picture and exhausting those in the neighborhoods with an unrelenting and overlapping series of work sessions and hearings. One cannot look at this without saying divide and conquer is alive and well. Heaven forbid those who might call out the futility of it all, for they are labelled NIMBY, racist, exclusionary, privileged or worse. This has all the hallmarks of a cruel joke on those facing hardships with housing yet the advocates, self-labelled YIMBYs, flock to solutions that have not worked elsewhere and only serve to split us as a community. I cannot be the only one who wants something that will actually work for the people we are supposedly trying to help. Without increased wages or subsidies of some sort, these isolated efforts will fail for those of modest means and those in poverty.

Ironically, a Bellingham public bank that I proposed to the city council over a year ago, would provide a citizen-owned entity into which a housing trust fund would be deposited and leveraged for the good of the community. However, nobody in this city took up the challenge in joining other Washington cities to create such authorizing legislation in Olympia. Such banking would work directly for Bellingham residents instead of depending on the private sector to do what it will never do, provide affordable housing. Instead we have wasted a year bickering about accessory dwelling units and vacation rentals. Shame on us.
Greetings Council,

I just wanted to reiterate some points I made at the public hearing. Since local builders and designers have estimated the cost of a new DADU at a minimum of $135,000 to $160,00, these new dwellings will not be accessible to those needing affordable housing. Given this fact, it seems only prudent to at least complete the Happy Valley pilot project so that we have hard data on which to base our planning decisions. Right now we have very little info.

Thank you for your service!

Warren Sheay
April 23, 2018

Dear Bellingham City Council and Mayor Kelli Linville,

Bellingham’s housing prices continue to climb and it’s getting even more difficult for people to find affordable homes. Rentals hard to come by and many in our community—including students, seniors, and families with children—are on the brink of living on the street. Working and middle class people are getting priced out of town, increasingly forced to commute from Ferndale or Mount Vernon. This multiplies our community’s contribution to carbon pollution and intensifies pressure for sprawl.

Unfortunately, resistance to building more homes in Bellingham’s neighborhoods is worsening the housing shortage and helping to drive price increases. We need to change the status quo and say YES to inclusive neighborhoods, affordable homes, and ADUs!

SAY YES! to more housing opportunities for people across the financial spectrum:
We need more housing choices for people at all income levels. This means voting YES on the next Bellingham Home Fund initiative and building new, innovative housing forms in existing neighborhoods.

SAY YES! to accepting growth across all neighborhoods:
As Bellingham grows, we risk concentrating pockets of poverty and wealth across the city. We must reject housing policies that create exclusive neighborhoods. We cannot allow neighborhood associations to ban affordable housing forms, in effect banning people with limited incomes from their neighborhoods. More people should have options to find affordable places to live near great neighbors, parks, and schools.

SAY YES! to passing the citywide ordinance for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs):
ADUs are small homes added to lots alongside existing larger homes. They are often called backyard cottages, granny flats, or mother-in-law units. Since they’re much smaller than a typical single-family home, they’re cheaper to rent. This makes them a practical housing option for the elderly, people with disabilities, empty nesters, young workers, and anyone with limited incomes. ADUs allow access to neighborhoods where people
would otherwise be unable to live.

Currently, detached ADUs (DADUs, which typically look like tiny homes in backyards), are only allowed in multi-family zones. However, 70% of residential land in Bellingham is zoned single-family, which means these affordable home types are excluded from 70% of our city. Despite the potential for DADUs to provide more housing, these unfair bans are preventing people from living in these modest homes.

The Bellingham Planning Commission has recommended that DADUs be allowed citywide! Our Bellingham City Council must say YES! to inclusive neighborhoods and approve this ordinance immediately.

We believe in a vibrant Bellingham that people of all incomes can live in, not just the wealthy or lucky few. We are a healthier, happier, and more just city when every neighborhood is diverse, which means every neighborhood has diverse housing options. Together, we can make this happen. We can make Bellingham an inclusive city.

Signatures included:
Aaron Tapscott, Columbia
Abbie Lindeberg, Columbia
Abigail Alpers, Happy Valley
Abigail Hobart, Happy Valley
Adam Van Ness, Sunnyland
Addie Candish, Birchwood
Aimee Wright, York
Alan McConchie, Unknown
Aleta Baxley, Happy Valley
Alex Ramel, South Hill
Alex Smith, Sunnyland
Alexander McIntyre, Silver Beach
Alexandra Nordin, WWU
Alice Clark, Silver Beach
Alicia Dir, Happy Valley
Alisha Hugo, Puget
Alison Fykerud, Samish
Alicia Hawkins, Barkley
Alyssa Horry, Roosevelt
Alyssa Webster, York
Amber Hixson, Columbia
Amber Owen, Cordata
Amelia Vado, Sunnyland
Amy Coughlin, Puget
Amy Kraus, Birchwood
Amy McGregor, Roosevelt
Amy Vergillo, Columbia
Andrea Luce, Sunnyland
Andrea Whitwings, Unknown
Andrew Campbell, Happy Valley
Andrew Eckels, Happy Valley
Andrew Eddy, City Center
Andrew Reding, York
Andrew Walton, Unknown
Andronetta Douglass, Cordata
Ann Beck, Sunnyland
Anna Kemper, York
Anna Santo, Lettered Streets
Anna Vowels, WWU
Anna Wolff, York
Anthony Chapin, Sunnyland
April McCabe, Puget
ash goddard, Sunnyland
Ashley Bennett, Whatcom Falls
Ashley Renfro, WWU
Austin Aumell, WWU
Austin McClure, WWU
Autumn Baughn, Lettered Streets
Barbara Jean Monroe, City Center
Barry Dikeman, Sehome
Becce Bayne, Roosevelt
Ben Fehrner, Samish
Blair Murphy, Happy Valley
Bob Burr, Barkley
Brett Bennett, Roosevelt
Brian Davidson, Puget
Brittany O'Brien, Birchwood
Brooks Collins, Sehome
Caleb Sanders, Roosevelt

Cameron Burger, City Center
Carmen Gilmore, Samish
Caroline Abbott, Columbia
Caroline Martin, WWU
Caroline Vogl, York
Charles Asher, Columbia
Charlotte Davis, Roosevelt
Chelsea Mahnk, Columbia
Chelsea Tilley, Unknown
Cherish Eastwood, Alabama Hill
Chiara D'Angelo, Happy Valley
Chloe Smith, York
Chris Robinson, York
Christen Glass, Lettered Streets
Christina Blank, Cordata
Christine Frederick, Birchwood
Christine Morton, Lettered Streets
Christopher Burch, Meridian
Christy Nieto, Birchwood
Cindy Madigan, Puget
Claire Mannino, Columbia
Clay Williams, Happy Valley
Conner Darlington, Puget
Cora Cole, Lettered Streets
Cori Maher, Roosevelt
Dale Hunt, York
Dana Ericksen, WWU
Dane Johnson, Lettered Streets
Daniel Starnes, Birchwood
Danielle Kazemzadeh, Unknown
Danielle Olson, York
Danielle Rosellison, Iron Gate
Danne Neill, Lettered Streets
Darci Duncan, City Center
Darren Brown, WWU
David Barton, Sunnyland
David Ghan, Birchwood
David Stephen, Sunnyland
David Zhang, Sehome
Dawn Parker, Whatcom Falls
Dean Fearing, Fairhaven
Del Lowery, Edgemoor
Derek Long, Lettered Streets
Diana Meeks, Lettered Streets
Diane Tanner, Columbia
Donna Marcantonio, Cornwall
Doug Starcher, York
Edward Alexander, Samish
Eli Loomis, Birchwood
Elizabeth Hartsch, Columbia
Elizabeth Schultz, Lettered Streets
Elizabeth Watt, Roosevelt
Elizabeth Clark, Happy Valley
Elizabeth Montoya, Birchwood
Elizabeth Schacht, York
Elizabeth Stuart, Columbia
Ellen Barnes, Barkley
Emily Boyle, Fairhaven
Emily Karmy, WWU
Emily Trabolsi, Happy Valley

Emily Waters, Sehome
Emma Walter, York
Emma Scalzo, Sehome
Emmaline Bigongiari, Happy Valley
Eowyn Savela, Sunnyland
Eric Pierson, Happy Valley
Erika Charbonneau, Sunnyland
Erika Millage, Columbia
Erie Barton, Sunnyland
Erie Kretz, Puget
Erie Ruirar, Sehome
Fawn Sterling, Sehome
Francesca Cruz, Sehome
Gabe Gossett, Roosevelt
Galen Herz, Lettered Streets
Geneva Graham, Lettered Streets
Genevieve Jones, York
Geoff Munley, Samish
Ginny Cleaveland, Columbia
Grace Bouna, Happy Valley
Grace Coffey, Happy Valley
Greta Miller, Sunnyland
Hannah Sear, Happy Valley
Hannah Spencer, Sehome
Hannah Klabo, Lettered Streets
Hannah Voss, Birchwood
Heather Baker, Columbia
Heather McGuinness, Columbia
Heather Williams, Fairhaven
Heidi Lehman, York
Helga Aldrich, City Center
Henry Pollet, Happy Valley
Henry Haro, Sehome
Hilary Scheibner, Roosevelt
Ian Rae, Birchwood
Ignacio Perez, Happy Valley
Iris Maute-Gibson, Lettered Streets
Ivy Burt, Happy Valley
Izaac Post, Happy Valley
Jack Tabone, York
Jackie Kersten, Puget
Jamie Gough, Happy Valley
Jamie Jednak, Unknown
Janet Marino, Columbia
Janice Richardson, Puget
Jasmine Johnson, Unknown
Jason Devitt, Lettered Streets
Jeff Aslan, Birchwood
Jeff Braimes, Sunnyland
Jenn Mason, City Center
Jenn Daly, Columbia
Jenna Noeller, Puget
Jenna Veatch, Happy Valley
Jennifer Dolese, Fairhaven
Jennifer Moon, Columbia
Jennifer Teed, Unknown
Jenny Hanson, Birchwood
Jenny Van Dyke, Lettered Streets
Jesse Stanton, Fairhaven
Jessica Cox, Birchwood
Lindsay Knight, Columbia
Lindsay Gard, Sunnyland
Lindsey Nordberg, City Center
Lindsey Payne Johnstone, City Center
Lisa McShane, York
Liz Darrow, Lettered Streets
Lyndz Kelly, Samish
Lynn Allen, Birchwood
Lysa Rivera, Columbia
Maria Jose Palacios Figueroa, WWU
Marían Beddill, Fairhaven
Maríssa McGrath, Columbia
Mary McDowell, Whatcom Falls
Matthew Smiley, Alabama Hill
Matthew Atkins, Roosevelt
Maureen Monroe, Silver Beach
Max Morange, Birchwood
Meg Harris, Sunnyland
Megan Runkel, Alabama Hill
Megan Yeates, South Hill
Melissa Gong, Barkley
Michael Chiavario, South
Michael Harris, Alabama Hill
Michael Heintz, Birchwood
Michael Penuelas, Sunnyland
Michael Stubbs, Barkley
Michael Swift, Alabama Hill
Michelle Tanz, South
Mitchell Harter, Sunnyland
Molly Maguire, Silver Beach
Morgan Kay, Fairhaven
Morgan Lingpbloom, Sunnyland
Nancy Orlowski , Edgemoor
Naomi Tataran, Fairhaven
Naomi Edelstein, Happy Valley
Natálie Baloy, Lettered Streets
Natálie Ransom, Columbia
Natasha Hessami, York
Nathan Carnes, Sunnyland
Nathan Shorb, South Hill
Neah Monteiro, Happy Valley
Nicole Burdick, Barkley
Nicole Champagne, Cornwall
Noah Burns, Birchwood
Nora Hughes, Alabama Hill
Nova Clark, Happy Valley
Olivia Heimann, WWU
Olivia Slama, Lettered Streets
Paige Swift, Alabama Hill
Pamela Fuller, Columbia
Patrick Martin, Birchwood
Paul Haycox, Happy Valley
Peter Frazier, Sehome
Phoebe Wahl, Sunnyland
Rachel Belisle, Fairhaven
Rachel Weasley, Barkley
Rainey Deford, WWU
Ramon Torres, Birchwood
Randi Casbar, Unknown
Rashaan Lightpohl, Lettered Streets
Rashmiika Eisenberg, Columbia
Rebecca Niemier, Whatcom Falls
Rebecca Hargraves, Happy Valley
Rebecca Marrall, Puget
Rebecca Meloy, Columbia
Rebeckque Asher, Columbia
Riannon Bardsley, Alabama Hill
Roberta Adcox, Birchwood
Robin Cooke, Columbia
Roger Schuettke, Happy Valley
Rose Crow, Sunnyland
Rose Lathrop, Happy Valley
Sam Main, Cornwall
Samantha Bennett, Roosevelt
Samantha Delanty, Alabama Hill
Sara Ihmoda, York
Sarah Cederberg, Fairhaven
Sarah Jennings, Sehome
Sarah Jones, Sehome
Sarah Kaal, Unknown
Sarah Pudell, York
Sarah Woods, City Center
Sarah Zarrow, York
Savannah Jackson, York
Scott Macdonald, Silver Beach
Scott Sanderson, South
Sebastian Paige, York
Seth Mangold, Lettered Streets
Shannon Maris, Happy Valley
Sharon Shewmank, Lettered Streets
Shelby Kremenich, York
Simran Chhabra, Happy Valley
Sky Hester, Fairhaven
Sondra Matara, Columbia
Sophie Miller, York
Stephanie Gaona, Happy Valley
Stephanie Liu, Happy Valley
Stephanie Manzo, Columbia
Stephanie Oppelaar, Unknown
Stoney Bird, York
Stuart Sepp, Lettered Streets
Sue Cottrell, Happy Valley
Suneeta Eisenberg, Samish
Susan Donnelly, Birchwood
Susan Holland, Columbia
Sydney Murrey, Happy Valley
Tamara Tregoning, Roosevelt
Tannmi Laninga, Edgemoor
Tasha Kern, Lettered Streets
Taylor Salo, Sehome
Taylor Ingram, Unknown
Taylor Webb, Happy Valley
Teizeen Mohamedali, Samish
Tessa Reyes, Sunnyland
Therese Kelliher, Puget
Thomas Buskirk, Fairhaven
Thomas Dolese, Fairhaven
Timothy Costello, Happy Valley
Tina McKim, Sunnyland
Marchand, Marie M.

From: Addie Candib <addie.candib@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 9:05 AM
To: CC - Shared Department
Subject: ADU Ordinance

Dear City Council Members,

I'm writing to ask you, one more time, to please approve the ADU ordinance as proposed by the City Planners. Thank you for your patience and consideration thus far, as I know this topic has generated a lot of strong feelings on all sides of the issue.

Here's what it would mean to me if City Council were to pass this ordinance: That you are a forward-thinking body, that is willing to take risks, willing to try something rather than do nothing, and committed to finding multiple solutions to our city's multi-faceted problems.

Here's what it would be mean to me if City Council were to vote down this ordinance: that you are afraid.

To quote Winston Churchill, "Success is not final; failure is not fatal. It is the courage to continue that counts."

Be brave! Make a choice in favor of the future, rather than the past. Our city is changing, and changing fast. Will you steer the ship, or will you swim desperately in its wake?

Respectfully,

Addie Candib
Birchwood Neighborhood
To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing in support of the proposed amendments to the Bellingham Municipal Code allowing detached ADUs in single family zoned areas citywide, and do so based on the benefits outlined in the opportunities/concerns matrix on the COB ADU website.

I currently own a detached ADU on a single family zoned lot, and I look forward to the opportunity to bring my unit into full compliance as soon as this amendment is passed.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Peace
Alabama Hill Neighborhood
Dear councilmembers:

I write to support your favorable consideration of allowing ADUs and DADUs even in single-family neighborhoods.

I grew up in a single-family neighborhood and, aside from a few years of apartment living while in college, I have lived my entire adult life in a singly-family neighborhood. My life has been one of privilege.

While certainly desirable by many who are fortunate enough to afford such living, I have concluded that there are more important values that need to be advanced than preserving single-family neighborhoods. As housing has become ever more costly even as incomes for vast numbers within our communities have remained stagnant, we all have a responsibility to do a better job of accommodating those less fortunate. Too many low-income families must double up in order to afford shelter. That is, multiple families must share one abode.

Unless we wish to witness the growth of sprawl into our beautiful county destroying our rich agricultural lands and further damaging our environment, we must give serious consideration to appropriate infill. As our urban centers necessarily become more dense, it seems wrong to allow wealthier members of the community to shirk their share of welcoming more neighbors. Additionally, there are important benefits to encouraging economic - as well as racial and ethnic - diversity into our housing. It is well understood that living in homogeneous neighborhoods tends to harden perceptions of those unable to afford to live near us as being different and, by implication, lesser.

I could go on at greater length, but given my understanding of your time constraints, I will simply close with this thought: If it takes sacrificing single-family zoning to achieve affordable, single-family housing, then that is a price worth paying.

Sincerely yours,

Tom and Rainbow Goetzl
Susan Bayer  
825 Queen Street  
Bellingham, WA 98229  
April 26, 2018

All Members of the Bellingham City Council

Mayor Kelli Linville  
210 Lottie Street  
Bellingham, WA 98225

I am writing to urge the City Council and Mayor’s office to extend the period of time necessary to make a wise and thoughtful decision regarding the DADU changes proposed to the entire city’s zoning code.

I am in favor of either maintaining the Conditional Use Permit Process or allowing for DADU’s under very strict ordinance conditions. In any case, there must be more time given for community input and outreach. In my letter to the Planning Department I mentioned many issues of concern that come to my mind. Those issues are now expanded as the Planning Commission recommends unacceptable changes.

I am completely opposed to increasing the number of occupants from the current 3 to 4. By increasing the occupancy number, you are effectively turning every backyard into a mini development for single family homes at the expense of all the residents of Bellingham who have correctly assumed that the backyard that they could afford and have tended to for decades are now patches of land ripe to be one’s own micro developer.

I am opposed to this change moving forward unless and until the COB addresses and enacts rigid policy regarding short term rentals aka AirB&B’s. These two issues (short term rentals and DADU’s / ADU’s) are going to be entwined for the foreseeable future. Bellingham must take the lessons learned from great cities and small communities all over the world and rein in the number of days per year a space or house may be rented out to a number not to exceed 120 days per year. Additionally, Bellingham residents must be able to TRUST that the city will enforce all housing regulations. We labor over rules and what are they without enforcement?

I feel most strongly that no DADU should be of a height taller than 16 feet or one story. 20 ft height is unacceptable and not necessary for any one story structure. Where a property owner would apply to create a DADU over an existing garage, they must fall into the Conditional Use
Permit Application realm. There is no justification for permanently altering the vertical space we treasure in our selected neighborhoods. I must not be forced into a sloppy change in the code that would lend to unattractive to outright ugly/cheap two story chimney stack like structures popping up like bean sprouts all around me and everywhere my eyes land.

How will the animals per property be addressed? There should be no change to the current rule. The idea of doubling the maximum number of pets per lot is unacceptable.

Parking. Please be real. In my neighborhood there is zero street parking. Homeowners generally create strips out of their front yards next to the pavement to provide for extra parking for themselves and their guests. We encounter countless situations, particularly with renters and their friends parking in our yards, not understanding that it is private property. I have been pinned into my own yard countless times by ‘guest’ cars, being left to knocking on neighbor’s doors to find out whose car or cars are blocking me in from leaving my private property. One dedicated parking space per adult renter for every DADU constructed. Dedicated.

Owner occupancy a must. Either in the main house or the DADU. A truly heavy fine must be given should the homeowner break this rule. If the homeowner defaults on the fines, the property should have a lien placed on the property by the city. Hefty fines please.

Guidelines for the exterior appearance must include a mandate that any DADU has the same physical style and appearance of the primary residence. The DADU structure must truly appear to have been a coordinated planned accessory structure. No funky town - beauty is in the eye of the beholder stuff. The precedent has already been established by the original house architecture. We have wonderful varieties of house styles throughout the neighborhoods of Bellingham, respect for visual harmony from lot to lot is essential to the future of DADU’s. Is COB willing to set up countless conflicts between neighbors because they can’t stand the appearance of the DADU next door? Without thoughtful and detailed guidelines for construction we are going to see unnecessary hostility between people.

Will the DADU have separate meters? Water? Trash cans?

How much cut/fill/grading will be allowed?

Will the city wisely adopt not only property line clearances but permit footprint of DADU’s by a set percentage of the size of the existing (buildable portion – not including easements!) lot? A percentage formula is the only agreeable way to determine the maximum size limit for any and each DADU.
In no event should a DADU obstruct sunlight, view, solar panels, etc from adjoining neighbors. Every effort should be made to create landscape guidelines to mitigate privacy concerns, noise absorption and green visual harmony.

How will the serious impacts to neighborhood traffic be resolved?

In my opinion, the notion of this proposed zoning change to the entire city would bring about monumental changes to many neighborhoods. The COB Council has no justification to ram these changes through in such rapid fashion. Citing 2015 as the year that Planning Dept. began under the radar discussions regarding a zoning change for DADU's and now in 2018 “there’s been plenty of time given to consideration” is beyond absurd. The vast majority of Bellingham property owners are completely unaware that this change is looming. I want to see much more outreach.

On a personal note, I designed and had a large house built in another state some years ago. I designed a DADU as part of that project. The design elements were completely harmonious between the house, DADU and garage. The property was three acres. This was pre-Air B & B/VRBO days. These detached structures were used solely as guest houses, mother-in law type dwellings or for live-in household staff. In my case it was a nanny's quarters for years and then live-in help. It was typical in the area I lived for a property to have a “DADU” which was always listed as “the guest house”. The difference is that they would never have been considered as something to “rent out”. In fact, CCR’s would have prevented renting. I have no objection to detached units on an adequate sized lot with careful consideration made for regulations. And, if the trend will be to attempt to use such structures as supplemental rental income, utmost care must be made in creating such opportunity. Careful planning is paramount. Not every property in every neighborhood should be considered eligible for a DADU permit. That fact should be made abundantly clear for any real estate transaction for a single family house going forward.

I implore everyone concerned at a policy change level to please take more time on this matter.

Please remember that this zoning upheaval is not accurately YIMBY. It is more accurately YIYBY: yes in your backyard. Please don’t be inclined to cavalierly take away what Bellingham homeowners have worked their lives away for – comfort, quiet, safe and attractive places to be happy in.

Respectfully,

Susan Bayer
Marchand, Marie M.

From: Anita Ballweg <anitaballweg@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 4:35 PM
To: CC - Shared Department
Subject: ADU Ordinance Comment

April 26, 2018

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to encourage you to be cautious in adopting any updated ADU ordinance that would allow detached ADUs in all single-family zoned areas of Bellingham. I also offer some ideas for increasing housing stock, affordability and diversity of population.

Allowing Detached ADUs throughout Bellingham may not be an official “up zone” but it will have the effect of eliminating all single-family zoned areas in the city, zones which are still highly desirable to many people. These families who want a home in a single-family zone will look to locate in the county, outside of Bellingham with undesirable sprawl.

Allowing Detached ADUs throughout the city may not result in more affordable housing, either for rent or for purchase, and may actually accelerate rising housing costs and affordability as it has done in numerous other cities across the country.

Without substantial impact fees, taxes will rise for everyone to support the extra infrastructure, schools and services needed. Owners of ADUs and other rental units will raise rents to cover these costs. With rising taxes, some who now own will be forced to sell and only the more affluent will be able to buy. Speculators will buy properties, tear down a modest home and build a lot line structure with extra units that will raise area housing prices even further. The requirements of owner-occupancy and limit of one ADU per home may be unenforced just as most code violations are unenforced now.

One thing that allowing detached ADUs certainly will do is change Bellingham forever.

Here are some steps that you could take in addition to monitoring and assessing the neighborhood approved Happy Valley detached ADU experiment.

- Address short term vacation rentals FIRST. Regulations that are adequately enforced may result in more units available for residents instead of vacationers.
- Since ADUs can be built now.... including detached ADUs using a Conditional Use Permit which allows neighbors input.... consider updating the CUP.
- Encourage new co-housing and small cottage communities like the Kulshan development on Harris on appropriate sites.
- Require Urban Village developments to include a variety of housing types and sizes for sale and for rent priced from high to low including some defined as “affordable” in perpetuity. (All of the units currently being constructed in Fairhaven are expensive and affordable only for the wealthy.)
- Encourage more density in Downtown and the waterfront area with high-rises.
• Encourage subsidized apartment buildings like the existing Squares for seniors for all low-income populations with rents based on a percentage of income.
• Partner with WWU and WA state to provide more on campus housing for the increasing numbers of students.

It's probable that all of you have already decided how you will vote. Nevertheless, I thank you for reading my letter and considering all constituents' viewpoints and the consequences of such a major decision for which all of you will be remembered in Bellingham's history.

The future of Bellingham as a unique, livable city rests in your hands.

Sincerely,

Anita Ballweg

812 16th Street

360 738-1341
Marchand, Marie M.

From: Helen Moran <helens.ranch@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 7:30 PM
To: CC - Shared Department
Subject: ADU's

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a final comment.

While I whole heartedly support the new ADU ordinance - city-wide - my continuing one concern is the large amount of "illegal ADU's" in the city and the overwhelming task of investigating and upgrading or removing these units. Hiring only one code enforcement position is not enough. We need more. I think the ADU ordinance would have had more acceptance if the planning and building department had been able to report that one complete neighborhood (or more) had been investigated and corrective action had been taken. If the City Council does approve the ADU ordinance, I think it is the responsibility of planning and building to follow up so that designs, initially for example, a garage, does not become an ADU.

Thank you.

Helen Moran, 2815 Russell, A101, Bellingham
Dear City Council Member,

I am writing today to remind you that 529 individuals signed a letter stating their objection to allowing DADUs in single family neighborhoods citywide.

And consider the following:
No inventory of existing illegal DADUs
No agreement from the single-family neighborhoods that will be affected
No results from a “pilot study” in Happy Valley
Revoking agreements about the Tool-Kit
No EIS
No regulation of STRs

What could go wrong? What’s wrong with this picture?

Judith Green
Bellingham
I write today to urge the Council to require some form of community/neighborhood input at a fairly fine-grained level for construction of an Detached ADUs in Single Family neighborhoods.

Touring York the other day with a reporter from the Bellingham Herald, it struck me that in issuing permits The City has to work, more or less, with the paper trail that exists. There are previous permits, studies, records and data of various sorts that inform this process.

In York at least, and I dare say across Bellingham, there is a vast chasm between the paper trail and the reality on the ground. That's simply how it is. There has been so much construction and remodeling done "off the books" that York (for instance) in no meaningful way resembles the "paper York" that lives in the files in City Hall.

The easiest way to bridge this gap is to involve the neighbors, who live on the ground, who can tell you about everything from parking to drainage.

This is not to suggest that neighbors should be allowed to veto projects, of course not. Merely that they can and should be called upon to provide information that can inform and improve the process. We're here, we're not bad people, and we'd like to help.

Let's keep Bellingham great, let's keep Bellingham open, let's give everyone a seat at the table, a voice.

Sincerely,

Andrew Molitor
1326 Grant St,
360 738-6677
April 24, 2018

To City of Bellingham City Council

Attention: Christopher Koch - Planning

Comment: Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance

Dear Council Members:

I just have a brief comment on this ordinance after I watched the April 23rd Committee meeting.

I know the rental income from a smaller dwelling on a homeowner’s lot might help some people a lot. After watching all the meetings it seems clear some people don’t want more density in their neighborhood and its their home and they’d like to stay the way is was. I live in the County and the sprawl into the rural areas is also bringing more density.

The only idea I have to offer is to approve the ordinance for a limited time period and then review what happens during that time. Measure how many permits were issued with units built and also measure how many illegal units were brought into compliance.

Data sometimes solves many conflicts of interest. It might erase some of the fear. The changes might also be significant enough to ask for adjustments.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Tani Sutley
City Council DADU Comments:

I want to begin by saying I am a proponent of action, b/c inaction will result in an unbridled loss of neighborhood character. However, after having spoken to those skeptical of an updated infill toolkit, I have learned some legitimate concerns that I want to share with the council to consider as they move fwd with this important task:

- All neighborhoods are different, therefore they need to have their own unique infill toolkits. Happy Valley is doing some wonderful things for the Happy Valley neighborhood, but the number one concern have I heard was, “We don’t want to become Happy Valley!”

- Neighborhood pilots are needed. Aside from Happy Valley, there has been interest for pilots in Columbia, Sunnyland, and Birchwood, plus the Fountain District might be open to an Urban Village model. These pilots must be each defined with a local comments and a set review period.

- AirBnB’s, longterm rentals and parking need to be part of the discussion and perhaps a permit process could be involved.

- Size limits needs to be a consideration

- Can neighborhoods be incentivized to participate in pilots, eg discounted waterbills or property taxes?

- It needs to be explicitly clarified in whatever plan that private property is still respected, and those property owners who wish to remain single family can and always will be able to.

There is no doubt that population growth is happening and to do nothing would mean more McMansions and unaffordable living near the heart of the city. I believe most are willing to see action, as long as it is a controlled process. Thank you.
TO: Bellingham City Council
FROM: Harry and Marian Ritter, 207 Morey Lane, Bellingham 98225
DATE: April 23, 2018
SUBJ: Planning Commission’s Recommendation to Legalize Detached ADUs in all Single-Family Zones Citywide

We want to register our opposition to this proposal. We have lived in Bellingham for 49 years and have lived in our current home for 41 years, so we have seen lots of change. This particular proposal for blanket change is not a good idea for many reasons which have already been pointed out in meetings, letters, and petitions by other community members. Bellingham is a city of diverse neighborhoods—topographically, demographically, and aesthetically. To propose a blanket policy such as this—top-down—does not respect this diversity, and unfairly ignores the voices of neighborhood residents. Our part of the South Hill is a case in point. Morey Lane is a one-lane alley near WWU, situated on a very steep hill and uphill from Morey Avenue. Morey Avenue itself is a narrow road along which, wisely, no parking is permitted by the city due to the steep hill. Two cars can just manage to pass on it. Morey Lane is even narrower. Two cars cannot pass on the lane, and emergency vehicles such as ambulances and fire engines, as well as service vehicles such as garbage trucks have barely enough space to travel one-way. There is no adequate off-alley parking space, due to the steep slope, aside from house carports or garages allowed by building variances. This entire area simply cannot bear the traffic and parking demands that would come with D-ADUs, which would amount to overfill, not prudent infill. That may be true of many of our other neighborhoods and their unique characters, topographies, and aesthetic features.

We are also concerned that this proposal would open a wide door to the damaging effects of absentee landlordism, Airbnb and short-term rentals in single-family neighborhoods. A property located immediately behind us—212 Highland Drive—has long been milked for rentals and has been allowed to sadly deteriorate.

Aside from such pragmatic concerns, the D-ADU legalization proposal violates the trust between the city and its neighborhood associations, which seem to have been by-passed in this matter.
Marchand, Marie M.

From: mary loquvam <maryloq@q.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 1:31 PM
To: CC - Shared Department
Subject: Comment on D ADU policy changes

Dear City Council,

I am a resident of the York Neighborhood and I support the proposed changes to the City’s policy governing Attached Dwelling Units. I support both attached and detached dwelling units, provided an owner lives on site and they do not exceed 800 sf in area or 20 f in height (I’d prefer 400 sf!!).

Thank you.

Mary Loquvam
1417 Grant Street
Bellingham, WA 9822
Greetings!

Having just reviewed the proposed ADU Ordinance in its entirety, I urge support! While I don't see many new ADUs being built in my South Hill neighborhood as a result, I feel it is an option that would work well for some people in some situations. In any case, the guidelines are sufficient for protecting the liveability of the neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Tom Buskirk
507 16th St.
Bellingham, WA 98225
To whom it may concern on the Bellingham city council;

I'm writing in regards to the proposed shifts to the Detached Accessory Dwelling Units code in Bellingham.

My wife and I purchased a home in Bellingham 2 1/2 years ago. At $276,000, It was about the lowest priced house in the city limits we could find. It had been a rental for 20 years, and required many safety and functionality updates. It still needs a lot of work but is livable as it is and we love it.

While the house is small and humble (1150sf), the property is about 1.2 acres. Most of the land is wetland, so it is unable to be developed, but we love it because we know it will remain a wild patch within the city limits for our 4 year old son to grow up in. Additionally, on our property we have a detached garage/workshop pole building which is just under 1000sf. While I love my workshop, I don't need that much space, and would love to renovate part of it to rent out as a studio or one bedroom apartment to help subsidize our mortgage. Currently, we can't legally do that in Bellingham.

My wife and I work in public education and nonprofit fields, which is to say, we are motivated more by our values than money. However, we struggle monthly to make ends meet to cover our mortgage, preschool for our son, health insurance, and basic living expenses. We are truly frugal people in that we shop smart, don't have any expensive vices, and do most of the work on and around our house ourselves. Converting part of our workshop to an apartment and renting it out for around $800/month would make a big difference in our lives financially. And we would be thrilled to build our community at home, sharing our property with another individual or couple.

I believe we represent a large demographic within Bellingham of working couples that struggle to afford living here. Bellingham is an expensive place to live, with wages that don't match the inflated cost of housing. I know the city is trying to limit sprawl and make housing more accessible for everyone. To me, easing regulations on ADUs and DADUs is a no brainer to help both of these issues. It seems like basic economics to me: increased supply (of housing) eases housing shortages, therefore decreasing competition, lowering (or at least stabilizing) housing prices. In addition, homeowners like us can help offset the high cost of living by renting out DADUs. To me it seems like everyone wins here.

The arguments against allowing DADUs generally seem to fall into the category of "fear of change," that inevitably arise with any proposed change in regulations. Fear of loss of character in the neighborhood, disruptive neighbors, less parking, decreased property values. With all due respect to those who are afraid of the proposed changes, I'd bet that most are likely higher income earners or already have their homes paid off. From what I've read, there is no evidence to support any of these claims and in fact, there is evidence to the contrary - that allowing DADUs improves community strength, safety, and the local economy.

The fact is that the population of Bellingham continues to grow because it is a desirable place to live, and these people are going to go somewhere. Do we want to completely gentrify Bellingham (seriously impacting the desirability of Bellingham) and encourage sprawl? Or do we want to grow the type of community we are known for, which is inclusive, sustainable, healthy, supportive, and friendly?
I believe the city planners created a great proposal and have put a lot of thought and research into it, with respect given to all stakeholders. I hope the city council acts in the best interest of Bellingham and supports this proposal.

Please don't hesitate to get in touch if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Dallas Betz
927 Yew Street
Bellingham, WA 98229
360.739.2537
Bellingham City Council
210 Lottie Street
Bellingham, Washington 98225

April 23, 2018

City Council,

Hello, my name is Anna Kemper, and I work at Western Washington University as the Local Liaison to the city for the Associated Students. You’ve heard from me a few times during public comment periods about allowing DADU’s in single-family zoned neighborhoods, so I’ll keep this note brief.

I work with and have interviewed hundreds of students who attend Western, who also pay rent, earn a living, vote, and contribute to the economy in Bellingham. These students are not “college kids”, they are people of various age who attend Western but also contribute to the community of this city. Number one priority for students this year, as in years past, is availability and affordability of housing in Bellingham— not only for themselves as students, but for low-income families and minorities who also are struggling with finding a place to live. A big concern for students is people living without shelter in their community, and some of our students are currently experiencing houselessness now, or have in the past.

Allowing for detached ADUs in Bellingham will not fully solve any of the above problems described, but it will be a step in the right direction in regards to housing in this city. Bellingham, like many cities in the Northwest, are experiencing some of the fastest growth in the country, bringing unprecedented housing problems to the community with rising rental prices and a rental vacancy rate of less than 2%—some of the lowest in the country. Allowing for more choices such as DADUs, with the restrictions given by the planning commission, including ban on short-term rentals, will allow for more choices and affordability for residents.

How we choose to build Bellingham and deal with this housing crisis is an important step to a sustainable future. We love Bellingham because of its walkable neighborhoods, and we should keep future plans people-centered so that we can spend less time commuting, reducing our population’s carbon footprint.

I urge the city council, on behalf of the 16,000 Western students who live, rent, and work (and will continue to do so) to allow for DADU’s in single-family neighborhoods to increase affordable and available housing in Bellingham. A Bellingham that allows for DADU’s means a bright and vibrant city that all people of various income levels can enjoy.

Thank you for your time,
Anna Kemper
WWAS Local Liaison
TO: Bellingham City Council, Planning Staff, Planning Commissioners, and Mayor Kelli Linville
FROM: Happy Valley Neighborhood Association (HVNA)
RE: Build Small Live Large Housing Infill Toolkit Booklet

Please accept this little gift from the Happy Valley Neighborhood Association, who has been working hard to promote a deeper understanding of housing infill in our city neighborhoods.

This booklet has been compiled completely by volunteers, with language from the City of Bellingham’s Urban Infill toolkit.

HVNA also invites you to view our new: Build Small Live Large Happy Valley video, posted on YouTube by producer Eero Johnson, EJ Visuals. This 5-minute video features three families who live in smaller homes in Happy Valley on smaller lots. You can view the video at our neighborhood website:
  ▪ hvnana.org
or on Youtube
  ▪ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f-NxUDJStmY

Thanks for your work to achieve progress in bringing a unified vision and a toolkit for creating more opportunities for diverse housing in Bellingham.
Hello City Council,

I realize you may not have time to read this before your meetings this afternoon. I do hope at least one of you has a chance. I’ve been out of town for a few weeks and am just now catching up. I have read through the materials that Christopher Koch has provided to those of us who have commented about the updated proposal regarding ADUs, and I have watched 2 of the 3 hours the video of of the April 9th City Council Meeting and community comments. I have several concerns, many of which were stated at the hearing in front of the Council. The issue I feel strongly about that didn’t seem to get brought up was in regards to the height allowance of the proposal for the smallest lot sizes.

As I understand it the new proposal reduces the allowable lot size by 50% (from >10,000 to 5,000 sq ft), but only lowers the height by 20%, from 25ft to 20ft. A 5,000 sq ft lot is not a big lot for a residential neighborhood. I live on one. I’m fortunate to live on a corner with southern exposure. Being on a corner our lot seems larger than it is. In neighborhoods with 5,000 sq ft lots, a flanking neighbor’s 20ft ADU building, just 5ft from the fence, can have multiple detrimental impacts, including significant loss of sunlight to the yard and house and decreased privacy. The proposal makes a case for the addition of an ADU increasing the property value for the property owner building the ADU, but it does not mention, which seems to mean it does not consider, that the flanking neighbors’ property value is most likely to decrease as a result of a neighbor’s new ADU— if it is a 20 ft building.

I urge you to consider a change to the current proposal that on the smallest allowable lots (maybe in the 5,000 to 7,500 ft range) ADUs can be one story only, not two stories (i.e. 10-12 ft tall rather than 20ft). The proposal could have an option for those smaller lots to apply for an exception or variance to have a 2 story structure providing the plans go under additional review with consideration for the impacts to the flanking neighbors, recognizing that on certain unique small lots a 20 ft structure might not have significant negative impact on the neighbors.

I urge you to not just blanket allow a 20 ft ADU structure on the smallest lots sizes. Fences between neighbors in the City are allowed to be 6 ft. A 20ft building is more that 3 times that height— and just 5 feet off the fence line. That is a significant impact.

If you don’t think this is important and you don’t live on a 5,000 sq ft lot, I encourage you to spend some time in the yard or in the kitchen at the back of the house of a friend who does live on a 5,000 sq ft lot. Take the time to do a little measuring, do a little basic geometry with the angles of the sun etc… and then consider a few windows looking down at you. And remember that a 20 ft tall structure is likely to run along that fence line for at least 10-15 feet and have similar depth. And then for kicks maybe consider one on each side, definitely a worst case scenario, but it could happen. (Curious, what happens if a new ADU blocks the sun to the neighbor’s existing solar panels? Do you still let it get built?) If you don’t have access to a 5,000 sq ft lot let me know I’ll
take you to my sister’s house which is not on a corner and so would be more relevant to this exercise than our lot.

Other concerns I have:

Covenants Exclusion: I was shocked to learn that the proposal is being talked about as “city wide” when in fact it won’t be because the newer neighborhoods have covenants. (Thank you Terry Borneman for calling that out at the beginning, this is just the kind of thing that lay people like myself would not know and it is clearly not being called out in the materials). I think this covenants issue further negatively impacts the trust between the City and the community. If it isn’t actually going to be “city wide” the planning department should be transparent about that… and clearly list out which neighborhoods have covenants and which neighborhoods would this proposal actually affect. I have no idea what is considered a “newer neighborhood with covenants”. I think I heard everything built after 1960…that sounds like a lot of neighborhoods. Off the top of my head (again as a non-builder/non-realtor/non-planner) that seems to mean: Ridgemon, Puget, Geneva, South Hills by Padden, all of Barkley, of course Cordata, etc… Covenants are a form of creating an intentional community. So are neighborhood planning tools, clearly people feel disenfranchised that their neighborhood planning efforts are being disregarded, but a developer’s covenants are non-negotiable.

Enforcement of Owner Occupied: I can’t imagine how the City is going to enforce the owner occupied part of this proposal, the idea that the property owner live in either the original house or the ADU. I can see how you could have a building permit require that, but once the D-ADU is built that seems unrealistic that the City can regulate who’s living where. Say the owner has to go into a nursing home, what’s the City going to do? Tell them they can’t rent out their house to help pay for the nursing home? Force the sale of the house? I think it is totally unrealistic that the City can regulate keeping one of the units owner occupied. Chris Koch’s presentation mentioned the regular registration that will be required, but again this sounds like it could easily become complaint driven like one person mentioned is happening with the lack of enforcement on the illegal D-ADUs currently.

Short-Term Rentals: And lastly I don’t remember seeing anything indicate whether or not these additional units can be short term rentals or not (i.e. AirBnBs)… and maybe that’s because the City is still in the process of figuring out how it is going to regulate short term rentals. I would imagine many people would feel more comfortable with the possibility of these D-ADUs if they had some confidence that they would indeed be for long term housing and not vacation rentals. The whole argument for the D-ADUs is about providing long term housing for people in our community. Not for tourists. The reality is an owner of a D-ADU that is desirable as an AirBnB can make 2-4 times the amount renting it short term than long term. That is going to be very tempting for both onsite and offsite owners.

And lastly, as basically an aside — the idea that current codes allow someone to build a 35ft tall 800 sq ft garage with no design guidelines sounds like a bad piece of building code and not a reason to permit D-ADUs. Chris Koch implied that this was allowed throughout the City — again bad idea in small lot neighborhoods. Maybe fixing that makes sense as part of this process.

Anyway, back to my most important issue... I urge you to not just blanket allow 20 ft ADU structures on the smallest lots sizes... It can have a huge negative impact on neighbors who will have no voice. Please reduce that to a single story, that would fit in with the older small lot neighborhoods and be more in line with those neighborhoods’ plans. I think you’d find you might get a lot more support if you changed that and got transparent about the covenants and short term rental guidelines.

Thanks for listening and considering.

Alexandra Spaulding
2200 Williams Street, 98225
Columbia Neighborhood

Alexandrea Spaulding
360.224.0094 :: mobile
alexandreaspaulding@comcast.net
Marchand, Marie M.

From: J. Gabe Gossett <g8briel@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2018 12:23 PM
To: CC - Shared Department
Subject: Housing

To whom it may concern:

I'm writing to you as a resident of the Roosevelt neighborhood in Bellingham. I'm proud to live in one of the more affordable, and diverse, parts of our city. I'm looking to the Council and other government bodies to support policies that result in further infill development and residences. By that I mean infill that goes beyond how the term tends to be used now in Bellingham. ADUs are one step towards helping the environment by limiting sprawl and housing affordability. We also need to promote building upwards. Increasing residential density allows for lively neighborhoods, more units to help stabilize housing costs, and helps protect the environment from sprawl and less effective energy use.

Thanks for considering my input on this matter.

Regards
Gabe Gossett
Dear Council Members:

My husband and I are two of the people who signed the neighborhood's opposition letter to DADU's. We have lived in our home on South Hill for almost 35 years but my family has lived on the hill since the 1930's and my husband's since the 1890's. We love all of our neighborhoods and have lived in many of them, including our childhood neighborhoods of Sunnyland and York and our college and early working years in Columbia and the Lettered districts. They are all unique and very, very special. We are not opposed to ADUs and have lived in a few of those as well here on South Hill but we are opposed to the detached versions for several reasons. The most obvious is the fact that many of the people we have we have talked to - both here on S.H. and elsewhere - are interested in the profit aspect of building these units. They need to be not only because they need to recoup their costs as these structures are not going to be inexpensive but also because they are anticipating profit. Profit that won't be gained by renting at less than full market value. We feel we have somewhat of an awareness of this aspect of interest in DADU's as we are long term landlords (26 years) and, as result, not only know many current landlords but also have been sought out by potential landlords to ask our opinion as to the financial rewards of building DADU's. To date, no one has identified renting to homeless or lower income people as their reason for building. Our duplexes are all in areas zoned for multi-families. They are not dispersed throughout single family residential neighborhoods but are part of section of a neighborhood that are zoned for them with sufficient lawn and parking space provided as part of their design. This will be difficult to achieve in many of Bellingham's older

- 193 -
neighborhoods with small lot sizes such as found on South Hill, Sunnyland, York, etc. Not only should this be a consideration but since Bellingham has no view protections, many neighborhoods may find their views, not to say their privacy, obstructed by their neighbor's DADU. (We have friends who moved from Birchwood because when their neighbor built a DADU it affected their privacy and blocked the sun from their backyard.) Instead of going ahead with a proposal that is only partially supported by the community and will have a very detrimental effect in some cases, we encourage you to first inventory the number of current DADU's in neighborhoods, register them and make certain illegal ones are brought up to code. Then, armed with this assessment, you and the neighborhoods will be able to determine factually the need and then proceed. In any case, neighborhoods need to be involved in the process with full representation, such as a neighborhood vote, rather than the current individual presentations of opinions.

Thank you for listening to us.

Jan Olson and Dan Burghoffer
Marchand, Marie M.

From: John <azzaro@pacific.net>
Sent: Saturday, April 21, 2018 10:21 AM
To: CC - Shared Department
Subject: ADU Ordinance

Council members,

As a long-time South Hill property owner, I’m hoping you will pass the citywide ADU ordinance Monday as recommended by the Planning commission. It just makes good sense.

We need more affordable housing in Bellingham, not less. It’s getting so that average, read young, folks just can’t afford to live in town anymore.

70% of Bellingham's population is 1-2 person households (US Census)
70% of houses built are 3+ bedrooms (City of Bellingham building stats)
70% of land in Bellingham is single family zoning which is prohibited from building detached ADU's (accessory dwelling units) (City of Bellingham building stats)
Median price of houses in Bellingham $388,000. (real estate stats)

I urge you to approve this ordinance.

Thank you,

John Azzaro
Dear Bellingham City Council,

Please pass the citywide ADU ordinance as recommended by the Planning Commission.

My husband and I live in the Columbia neighborhood and we can barely afford to pay the mortgage on our little house (a Kulshan Community Land Trust home), due to unforeseen and ongoing medical expenses (not to mention an extremely competitive job market that makes it very hard to find employment.)

Installing a tiny home and renting it out to a college student, elderly person, or someone who is currently homeless would bring in just a bit of income to help subsidize our living expenses and possibly take the edge off our financial needs.

We would absolutely stand behind a decision to prohibit using a DADU as an "Air BnB" if that would placate the opposition.

Thank you for your consideration,
Rebecque Asher

Rebecque's Portfolio - https://www.rebecque.com
Dear City Council Members,

Please pass the city-wide ADU ordinance that has been recommended by the Planning Commission. For me, as a retired single person on a fixed income, building a DADU will provide income that will allow me to "age in place" in the Columbia neighborhood, where I have lived for 15 years. I love this neighborhood, but increasing property values are forcing the issue of selling or renting my home and moving to a less expensive neighborhood.

If the ordinance passed, I could build a small DADU, live in it, and rent my too-large home to relatives or friends—and those who would be respectful of our neighborhood’s values. It could be a win-win for all involved.

Thank you for all you do.
Diane Tanner
Columbia
Marchand, Marie M.

From: Tina North <tlnorth77@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 9:25 AM
To: CC - Shared Department
Subject: ADU's

Hello,

I'm in support of a new ordinance to allow ADU's in the entire city of Bellingham. I hope you will address my one caveat with this new ordinance: concern over developers using a new ordinance such as this one to develop in neighborhoods and charge exorbitant amounts of rent.

Thank you,
Tina North

Sent from my iPhone
Marchand, Marie M.

From: christine morton <chrismblm@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 8:21 AM
To: CC - Shared Department
Subject: DADUs

Dear City of Bellingham Council,

Please vote Yes got DADUs because we need affordable housing in our community as it grows and rent and housing prices rise. Rather than build new sprawl let’s build a strong city core for all with the population able to bike and walk to work and services.

Thank you,

Christine Morton
2600 G St
Bellingham Wa

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

I urge you to pass the DADU proposal so that we can have a greater variety of housing options in the city. I think it is going to take many solutions to resolve our housing crisis and so we should try all of them.

Thank you!
Rosie

Sent from my iPhone
We are concerned about the rising costs and limited availability of housing in Bellingham. This need is not going to decrease anytime soon and the need for small, affordable housing units will continue to be a huge need. The stated objective of managing growth through in-fill needs to extend to ADU's in all neighborhoods and we urge you to pass the recommendation of the planning commission!

Thank you,

--

Matthew Atkins
Financial Advisor, Clearbrook Investment Management, LLC
Independent Life, Disability, LTC and Annuity Representative
360.815.1910
For the record I am absolutely apposed to the change in ordinance to allow ADUs for the following reasons:

1. Current infrastructure is not design to accommodate additional dwellings and additional populations. I.E. parking, traffic, noise pollution, pollution, lose of Bellingham charm.

2. You are introducing low income housing in areas of higher end housing which will decrease property values.

3. With today's environment of drug use and sex predators it is very likely these types of people will find their way into neighbor hoods putting the elderly and younger population at risk.

4. Crime will go up.

5. Look at Seattle and what it has become, a magnet for drug users and all the issues that go along with it.

6. If this passes it will be a disaster and no way to stop it or turn the clock back. The precedent will have been set.

7. If this measure passes you are making a very big mistake which I'm sure will end up in court costing the tax payers a ton of money.

These are just a few of the intended consequences. You don't even know what the un-intended consequences will be.

You don't even know what you don't know. Take more time to study what has happened in other parts of the country that have done/ tried this before you make a decision.

Concerned Citizen,

Scott Rzemien
Honorable City Council Members, Marie Marchand, Greg Aucutt and Chris Koch.

Although the City needs a Detached Accessory Dwelling Ordinance, there are certain things that should be in the ordinance and others that in my opinion will be detrimental to the City if added to the ordinance.

The most important modifications to the proposed ordinance in my opinion to maintain the character so many people hold dear to living in Bellingham are listed below.

Eliminating the 10’ garage door setback from public alleys for Detached Accessory Buildings would not be in the best interests of the citizens of Bellingham as it provides no buffer. Keep the 10’ alley setback and allow bonuses for additional area, height or other criteria.

Parking within front yards and on the street presents a detraction to people living along these public streets and presents a safety hazard to bike riders. In some areas of the city, you are proposing to remove the on street parking and add bike lanes. This alone points to the necessity of keeping the parking on the site that needs it.

Having buildings with no rear or side setbacks is not a way to enhance the city. Require the setbacks and give bonuses in area, height or other criteria if those areas are landscaped. Let’s build cottages like those in many areas of Bellingham that are desirable from an aesthetic and neighborhood design perspective. We don’t need to cram all the development we can on a lot.

Some lot sizes can’t accommodate the area to build an adu on. Be realistic about what size lot can be a wise use of the land and which lots will be detrimental to the character of a neighborhood. Lots with less than 8,700 s.f., or 0.20 ac. are detrimental to a neighborhood’s character if adu’s are added.

The dwelling units should be constructed to a high quality of resource conservation. Energy efficiency and minimizing water & sanitary sewer uses should be encouraged so the units are not seen as a detractor, but in the forefront of the best that City of Bellingham can build.

The storm drainage for the units should incorporate rain barrels, infiltration, dispersion or other low impact development features (if the soils are suitable) to minimize their footprint on the City’s limited resources. The City should allow credits for incorporating these features that can lessen the impacts on the City’s infrastructure.

The dwelling units should be allowed to be independent living quarters (meaning kitchens, bathrooms etc.) for the many people that can’t afford to buy the expensive Bellingham homes that are out of reach for most ordinary folk such as myself.
Please continue the effort to adopt a meaningful Detached Dwelling Unit ordinance that can serve residents coming to Bellingham to care for their elderly family and others to have a reasonable way to live here.

Thank you for working to make Bellingham a better place.

Gratefully Yours.

Gary Barnhart
Dear members of the council,
Thank you for your time and consideration on this important issue. I urge you to pass the citywide ordinance on ADU's as recommended by the planning commission. Our community is in a housing crisis, with miniscule inventory of available homes for sale and rental prices that would have made Seattle blush ten years ago. This small step toward diversifying our housing stock and giving flexibility to law abiding homeowners to build ADU's is the tip of the iceberg when it comes to changes the City should adopt to address this housing challenge. It is a good way to add more units to the city and also to begin the creative process I know we are capable of having around additional solutions to the challenge before us.

Please pass this ordinance as the city's own professional planning department recommends. They have done their due diligence. This is a good step to take.

Yours,
Max Morange
Birchwood Neighborhood
Dear Council,

I just found the link to the Terner Study cited in the next-city link of my 4/11/18 email that found 58% of ADU owners rent below market rates that I had referenced. I thought it would be helpful to have the actual link for the study for your deliberations and to enable you to draw your own conclusions. I have excerpted the citation re: the 58% & other statistics along with part of the paper's conclusion. Please see below.

Again, I support the adoption of city wide D-ADUs with the removal of the parking requirement.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration and service,

Kristina Heintz,
Birchwood

Excerpt:
"...,ADUs appear to provide "naturally affordable" housing and feature unique renter characteristics. Terner Center’s 2017 report found that 58 percent of ADU owners rented their units at below market rates. Additionally, 29 percent of ADU residents were family or friends of the homeowner. The 2012 study of the East Bay had similar findings: the average ADU was advertised at a rental rate that made it affordable to a household earning 62 percent of the area’s median income. Moreover, in 51 percent of cases, ADU occupants were either staying for free or were friends or family who were likely receiving reduced rent. This suggests homeowners who build ADUs are filling important affordability gap in many cases by opening their ADU to those who would otherwise have to find housing in the broader market.
Beyond their "natural affordability", there are also opportunities to target ADUs for particular under-housed populations and help lower income homeowners build wealth.... ADUs are inherently a unique development type as they are driven by individual homeowners who have numerous reasons for exploring an additional unit, from housing relatives to providing rental income to help with their own expenses. Given their unique nature, ADUs should be treated as an entirely separate form of housing, and as such, several existing policies should be revisited to ensure that they make sense for ADUs. In this brief, we have identified two specific areas-- school fees and building code -- that should be examined for further regulatory changes that could further ease the path to widespread ADU adoption. Other revisions should be considered as well to ensure that the momentum California has seen in ADU interest is sustained and even increased."
ADU Update: Early Lessons and Impacts of California’s State and Local Policy Changes. David Garcia | December 2017. Introduction. As California’s housing crisis deepens, innovative strategies for creating new housing units for