

Countryman, Ryan

From: Tom McCormick <tommccormick@mac.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2015 5:36 PM
To: White, Clay
Cc: Countryman, Ryan; Clifton, Stephen; Richard Schipanski; Gretchen Brunner; Tom Mailhot
Subject: EIS Alternative 2 needs to be changed

To: Clay White, PDS Director and the County's responsible SEPA Official

As you know, a project-level EIS is being prepared for BSRE's application to develop Point Wells as an Urban Center.

The Preliminary draft DEIS, Chapter 2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION(S) AND ALTERNATIVES (03/11/2015), includes three alternatives: Alternative 1 (Urban Center), Alternative 2 (Urban Village), and Alternative 3 (No Action). Alternative 2 is described as follows:

Alternative 2 – Urban Village Alternative: The site would be redeveloped as a mixed-use urban village, consistent with the current Urban Village land use designation of the site. The urban village development would include the same site plan as Alternative 1 [(Urban Center)]. However, the maximum building height would be less. Approximately 2,600 residential units would be provided under Alternative 2. The same amounts of commercial/office uses with space for on-site police and fire stations (32,262 SF), retail uses (94,300 SF), and parks and open space as Alternative 1 is assumed for Alternative 2.

Because the developer has applied to develop Point Wells as an Urban Center (a non-conforming use under the County's current rules), and not as an Urban Village, it is misleading, confusing, and wrong to use the term "Urban Village" in the EIS.

In order for the developer's project to fall within the Urban Village rules, the developer would need to withdraw its Urban Center application, and submit a new application — an Urban Village application. The rules governing Urban Villages are different in significant respects from the rules governing Urban Centers; for example, SCC 30.31A.115(9)(a) provides that, "The applicant shall successfully negotiate binding agreements for public services, utilities or infrastructure that are to be provided by entities other than the county prior to the county approving a development permit that necessitates the provision of public services, utilities or infrastructure;..."

Sometime after a final EIS is published, the hearing examiner will decide whether to grant the developer a permit to develop Point Wells as an Urban Center, under the Urban Center rules. In the Urban Center proceeding, the hearing examiner is without authority to grant a permit to develop the site as an Urban Village. To obtain a permit to develop the site as an Urban Village, the developer would need to start all over, and submit an application to develop the site as an Urban Village. In that event, a new vesting date would apply.

For the above reasons, I hereby request that you delete from the EIS all usages of the term "Urban Village." The application is for an Urban Center not an Urban Village.

In addition, I request that Alternative 2 be downsized to make it a reasonable mid-range alternative, one with 1,500 - 1,800 residential units, instead of the 2,600 units currently being studied. The need for a more appropriate mid-range alternative was raised previously. See the March 3, 2014, scoping comment letter submitted by Save Richmond Beach.

It's common sense that an alternative with with 1,500 - 1,800 residential units is more appropriate as a mid-range alternative than one with 2,600 units, considering that the applicant's full-scale Alternative 1 has 3,081 units. Further,

an alternative with with 1,500 - 1,800 residential units satisfies the County Council's directive to study an alternative that produces no more than 8,250 ADTs (the exact unit count to be studied in Alternative 2 should be the number of units that produces 8,250 ADTs under current assumptions approved by the County). David Killingstad's June 8, 2012, email to Clay White is telling:

"The County Council expectation is that the third alternative assumes 8,250 average daily trips; this needs to be reflected in the third alternative (in other words the Council expects to open the SEPA addendum and see an alternative which results in 8,250 ADT and seeing any other number would violate that expectation)."

While the Council's directive was in the context of the County's 2012 Addendum No. 1 to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Urban Center Amendments to the County's Comprehensive Plan, its directive should apply equally to BSRE's project-level application. The Council has obvious reservations about approving a development that would put more than 8,250 ADTs onto roads in the City of Shoreline, recognizing that 8,250 ADTs is the two-directional traffic limit to and from Point Wells that is contained in the City's pre-2011 Comprehensive Plan (the City's current limit, adopted February 14, 2011, is 4,000 ADTs).

Finally, it makes sense that the mid-range Alternative 2 be combined with the 90-foot maximum building height alternative that I discussed in previous emails. Alternative 2 would then study a development with no more than 1,800 residential units (or whatever lower unit count produces 8,250 ADTs under County-approved assumptions), with no buildings taller than 90 feet.

In sum, I request that the EIS delete all references to the term "Urban Village." Second, I request that the EIS's Alternative 2 be revised to study a development with no more than 1,800 residential units (or whatever lower number of units would produce 8,250 ADTs), with no buildings taller than 90 feet.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick