

**Memo**

To: Ryan Countryman  
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services  
ryan.countryman@snoco.org

---

From: Dan Seng

---

Date: April 17, 2017

---

Subject: PFN 11-101457 LU, Point Wells – Review Comment Responses to Revised Application Letter from Ryan Countryman dated November 15, 2016

---

The following items are in response to the Point Wells Revised Application Letter. Please feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions:

Dan Seng

206-381-6021

[Dan.Seng@perkinswill.com](mailto:Dan.Seng@perkinswill.com)

Responses to these comments are as follows:

**A. Necessary Revisions:** The following revisions to the permit applications are deemed necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable County Code requirements for purposes of being able to proceed with preparation of the Draft EIS:

A-1: Compliance with Snohomish County Critical area regulations, including *Chapter 30.62A SCC Wetlands and Fish & Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas* and *Chapter 30.62B Geologically Hazardous Areas*. Of particular concern, the site plan:

- (a) Exceeds allowable impervious surface near Puget Sound;
- (b) Does not adequately protect onsite streams; and
- (c) Fails to properly identify landslide hazard areas.

***Response: A-1.a) Refer to attached Targeted Drainage Report from MIG/SvR for impervious surface calculations A-1.b) Refer to attached restoration drawings RP-1 through RP-4 and Critical Area Report for Innovative Development Design and comments regarding protection of onsite streams. A-1.c) Updated landslide hazard setbacks and buffers are shown on sheet A-051.***

PDS repeats the recommendation from the April 12, 2013, Review Completion Letter that the proposal should include a request for Innovative Development Design as allowed for under SCC 30.62A.350. The applicant must also revise the site plan to properly identify geologically hazardous areas.

***Response: Refer to attached Critical Area Plan and associated Innovative Development Design letter.***

A-2. Lack of Second Access. To meet fire code requirements in Chapter 30.53A SCC, the project must include two access routes to the overall site, across the railroad tracks, and to internal portions of the site that would generate more than 250 average daily trips. Second access must include appropriate turning radii for larger ladder trucks and temporary access as needed during construction.

***Response: The site plan design now includes a second access route to the site from 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue West in Woodway and will be incorporated into phase 1 of the project. See attached secondary access "Exhibit A".***

April 17, 2017

Re: PFN 11-101457 LU, Point Wells – Review Comment Responses to Revised Application Letter from Ryan Countryman dated November 15, 2016

***Site access and circulation meets current building code standards for 40' ladder truck turning radius criteria. Refer to attached fire truck apparatus turning radius "Exhibit B".***

***Elevation of pier access over esplanade has been adjusted to meet vertical clearance criteria.***

***An onsite fire-station is not required per the Snohomish County Fire Marshal, however, a fire station and community service building is identified at the southern portion of 'Urban Plaza'. Buildings can be served in emergency situations from the on-site circulation. Parking garages are equipped with fully automated sprinkler systems.***

A-3. The site plan must include floor plans for all buildings. Typical floor plans are acceptable where floors will be the same. Unit counts must match the floor plans. Floor plans must show the square footage of each unit.

***Response: Upper level plans are shown on sheet A-053. Below grade floor plans are shown on sheet A-054. Floor plans for entry and grade level are shown on A-100 series drawings for each village. Units are numbered in plan and tabulated with square footage information on sheets A-200 through A-202.***

A-4. The site plan must identify which buildings or portions of buildings are for senior-only or non-age-restricted residents.

***Response: The quantity and location of senior living residential units are identified on the data tables on sheet A-200 for the North Village, Sheet A-201 for the Central Village and sheet A-202 for the South Village. There are no senior living units in the Urban Plaza***

A-5. Parking. The site plan must show adequate parking. Stalls and drive aisles must meet dimensional requirements. Adequate parking includes accessible parking, an appropriate mix of conventional and compact parking stalls, and provision of appropriate loading areas. The site plan must number proposed stalls. Parking calculations on the site plan must agree with items 3 and 4 above and the parking requirements in effect at the time of the original application.

***Response: Refer to sheet A-053, A-054 and 2/A-100 for parking layout, dimensions, accessible parking and numbered stalls. Stalls are shown with dimensions to meet or exceed standards for large stall. Loading is provided at Urban Village, South Village and Central Village per the loading quantity indicated on sheet A-200 through A-202. Bike parking is shown on enlarged floor plans at a rate of one rack for 5 bicycles at each building.***

***The development meets total parking quantity required. Refer to attached zoning code variance application to allow for cross-parking agreement and increased travel distance to parking provided.***

A-6. Landscaping. The applicant must revise the landscaping plans for consistency with the site plan. Proposed landscaping must be able to survive in the proposed location and show native vegetation in areas where required for protections of fish and wildlife habitat areas.

***Response: See revised planting plan sheets L-100 and L-101.***

**B. Recommended Revisions:** The following revisions or additional information are recommended by PDS to be included with any revised submittal to allow for coordinated review of the project as a whole (although not within the immediate scope of the draft EIS). Specifically, the project may also need to be revised to comply with other non-environmental County Code requirements regarding urban design standards which revisions, in turn, could

April 17, 2017

Re: PFN 11-101457 LU, Point Wells – Review Comment Responses to Revised Application Letter from Ryan Countryman dated November 15, 2016

influence how the applicant addresses the necessary revisions identified above (or require further revisions if not addressed concurrently with the necessary revisions noted above). Accordingly, PDS recommends that the applicant coordinate consideration/response to the following issues in any revised submittal to minimize the need for further significant revisions being required following review by the Urban Centers Design Review Board and/or staff:

B-1. The project application does not include sufficient information to evaluate the Urban Center design standards in Chapter 30.34A SCC. Procedurally, the Urban Center Design Review Board (DRB) will be making recommendations after the DEIS is published. Since compliance with the design standards is not in the scope of the DEIS, is not strictly necessary to have all of the information necessary for DRB recommendations until after the DEIS. However, to avoid delays caused by the possible need for staff to request revisions or additional information, we suggest including this information in the revised application.

***Response: Accommodation for Design review will be submitted to the County after the DEIS has been completed and prior to the FEIS phase.***

B-2. Many details in the proposed project design would deviate from the applicable Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS). Before PDS can make its final recommendations, the applicant must apply for and obtain EDDS deviations for individual elements of project design that differ from EDDS or the applicant must revise the project to comply. Alternatively, the applicant may negotiate an overall development agreement with Snohomish County that exempts the project from certain EDDS standards. While compliance with EDDS on issues such as the width of private roads or for design of planter boxes for street trees on top of parking garages does not have significant environmental impacts outside the site, postponing work on the many necessary deviations or overall development agreement could create time-consuming delays in the review process.

***Response: County road standards are not appropriate for a unique project such as this. As such, we hereby request that the access and circulation be addressed by means of a Development Agreement coupled with Design Guidelines. The cross sections on sheets C-500 and C-501 shall serve as the preliminary design guidelines for site access.***

B-3. Targeted Drainage Plans and Report must show viability of the proposed design, consistent with the updated site plan. At present, the targeted drainage plan does not show all drainage facilities connecting. Of particular concern is whether it is realistic to convey Chevron Creek in the manner proposed in the current application. Revisions to the site plan to address issues above will also require updates to the targeted drainage information for internal consistency.

***Response: Refer to attached revised Targeted Drainage Report from MiG/SvR.***

B-4. The proposal would convert the existing pier to public recreational use, however, much of it is in waters where the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has jurisdiction. Please include a legal description of the existing facility and identify what changes would be made in each jurisdiction. Snohomish County will need this information to clarify in its recommendations the extent to which any possible future from us approval would apply and where approvals from DNR would be necessary.

***Response: The limits of the existing DNR lease area are shown on the Record of Survey recorded under AFN 200205065001, records of Snohomish County. A copy is transmitted herewith as "Exhibit C". This information has also been added to the existing conditions map for the project, found on Sheets EX 1 and EX 2.***

***All work on the dock and piers is expected to be subject to approval by the Washington State Dept. of Natural Resources. Work associated with the demolition and replacement of the access piers and the improvements to the dock within the boundaries of the aquatic lands lease is expected to be under jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers. Pier work landward of this boundary is expected to be under the jurisdiction of both the***

April 17, 2017

Re: PFN 11-101457 LU, Point Wells – Review Comment Responses to Revised Application Letter from Ryan Countryman dated November 15, 2016

***Army corps of Engineers and Snohomish County. Building permits for improvements on the piers and the dock, subject to the counties building codes, will be obtained as required.***