

## Countryman, Ryan

---

**From:** Tom McCormick <tommccormick@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2015 1:13 PM  
**To:** Countryman, Ryan  
**Cc:** Gretchen Brunner; Richard Schipanski; Gary Huff; Douglas Luetjen; Tom Mailhot  
**Subject:** Re: Step-backs for 90-foot buildings

Thanks Ryan. Yes, I was referring to SCC 30.34A.120.

You mention that the Point Wells proposal is for private roads internal to the site, presumably referring to Jack Molver's request made March 4, 2011 (attached). It is uncertain whether the private roads request can or will be granted. Accordingly, I respectfully request that the DEIS be written to explain what happens to the site and building designs if the private roads request is not granted.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick



DAVID EVANS  
AND ASSOCIATES INC.

March 4, 2011

Mr. Mark Brown and Mr. Darryl Eastin  
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services  
3000 Rockefeller M/S 604  
Everett, WA 98201

**SUBJECT:** Point Wells Redevelopment Road Standards

Dear Mr. Brown and Mr. Eastin:

This letter is to request approval for the exclusive use of private roads within the subject project.

The subject project contains unique elements that make the use of private roads mutually beneficial to the County and to the project developer. SCC 30.24.060 2 makes provisions for the use of private roads. SCC 30.24.060 2(f) specifies the circumstances to be considered by the County Engineer when making a determination if private roads are appropriate. Such circumstances exist for this project.

The Point Wells Redevelopment project is accessed from Richmond Beach Drive NW, within the Town of Woodway, immediately adjoining the site, and the City of Shoreline. Ownership and maintenance of the roads and bridge within the proposed development by Snohomish County, would require that County vehicles travel approximately three miles over City of Shoreline roads to access the site.

In addition to the above, as a planned state of the art Urban Center Development, the intent of the ultimate project is to utilize various innovative pavement design and road sections, to achieve the objective of creating a walkable community. Current County road design standards and specifications, do not allow the level of innovative design and selection of materials, sought by the applicant for this unique project.

Upon consideration of this request, please inform us of the County Engineer's decision on the use of private roads for this project.

Sincerely,

DAVID EVANS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Jack N. Molver, P.E.  
Vice President

PFN: 11 101457 000 00 LU Point Wells Development

Received - 03/04/2011



Copies: Mark Wells – Paramount Petroleum, Gary Huff, Karr-Tuttle-Campbell

Project Number: PARA00000030600.com

1620 West Marine View Drive Suite 200 Everett Washington 98201 Telephone: 425.259.4099 Facsimile: 425.259.3230

On Nov 4, 2015, at 1:02 PM, Countryman, Ryan <[ryan.countryman@snoco.org](mailto:ryan.countryman@snoco.org)> wrote:

Hi Tom,

I think the reference you are asking about is SCC 30.34A.120, which has been in effect since 2010. This code section will be a minor point in the context of the ongoing EIS work for a couple of reasons.

First, SCC 30.34A.120 applies only to projects “facing a **public right-of-way** and those portions of buildings facing” lower density residential zones. The Point Wells proposal is for **private roads** internal to the site, so only a handful of the buildings at the perimeter of the project would be subject to step-back requirements.

Second, the purpose of the EIS is to identify probable adverse impacts of the project as proposed, not to approve a project as being wholly consistent with county code. The visual impact assessment will look at the project as proposed; one possible mitigation will be to revise the perimeter buildings to conform to code requirements such as the step-back requirement. Other moving parts, including as a possible design for the second access, may modify the perimeter buildings in a way that also reduces visual impacts, thereby providing another possible mitigation of the visual impacts.

By modeling visual impacts of the project as proposed, any future modifications necessary to bring the project into conformance with SCC 30.34A.120 and/or other codes, will almost certainly reduce the overall visual impacts. In other words, the EIS will be looking at a worst-case scenario for visual impacts. If, for some reason, a future modification to the design would create a greater amount of visual impact, then supplemental visual impact analysis would likely be required.

Ryan Countryman

---

**From:** Tom McCormick [<mailto:tommccormick@mac.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2015 12:31 PM  
**To:** Countryman, Ryan  
**Cc:** Gretchen Brunner; Richard Schipanski  
**Subject:** Step-backs for 90-foot buildings

Ryan,

Could you please confirm that SCC 30.34A.110 (2011 version) applies to the Point Wells development. It appears from the attached picture that the buildings do not comply with SCC 30.34A.110's 10-foot step-back provision.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

<image002.png>