

From: Tom McCormick <tommccormick@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 1:48 PM
To: Mock, Barb
Cc: MacCready, Paul; Countryman, Ryan; Bloodgood, Jim; Olson, Erik; Rowe, Tom; Brown, Mark A.; McCrary, Mike; Otten, Matthew; Klein, Ken; Wright, Stephanie; Eric Faison; Tom Mailhot; Debbie Tarry
Subject: No 180-foot buildings at Point Wells

Director Mock:

Imagine an urban center at Point Wells without high capacity transit access. You don't need to imagine it. SCC 30.34A.085 (2011) requires access to public transportation, but it doesn't require high capacity transit stops at the site. A permissible alternative is "van pools or other similar means of transporting people on a regular schedule" to high capacity transit stops or stations located miles away. As the GMHB said in its 5/7/2011 decision (page 69; also see page 46), the "language [in SCC 30.34A.085], on its face, makes van pools a permanent, not merely interim, substitute for high-capacity transit access."

Who would have thought that a Point Wells urban center without high capacity transit access could become reality?

Now imagine 180-foot buildings at Point Wells. Fortunately, you can stop this image from becoming reality.

I respectfully request that you recommend to the hearing examiner that, because Point Wells is *not* located near a high capacity transit route or station, the maximum building height at Point Wells is 90 feet, per SCC 30.34A.040(1) (2011). (The County's 10/6/2017, Review Completion Letter (page 32) promises that "PDS and DPW will eventually make a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner on the issue.")

I further request that you recommend to the hearing examiner that BSRE's applications be denied on account of BSRE's failure to comply with the 90-foot building height limit.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick