



Stay to
Grutchen

Eastin, Darryl

From: ronald trompeter <rtrompeter@hackettbeeher.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 02, 2014 8:20 PM
To: Eastin, Darryl
Cc: Margaret Evans; ronald trompeter
Subject: Point Wells Development / File Number 11-101457-LU

Mr. Eastin

My wife and I were in attendance at the scoping meeting on February 18, 2014 at the Shoreline Conference Center. We are landowners in Woodway. According to the notice we received, and the announcement at the meeting, comments are invited on or before March 3, 2014. Below are our observations and comments on this project.

Preliminarily, we believe that the scale of this project is excessive, for reasons that will be discussed below. It is not possible to mitigate some of the project's negative impacts without scaling back the project.

1. Traffic. As was discussed at the meeting, the traffic impact of this project would be extreme, both during the construction period and after the construction was finally completed. The most direct access to the property is down Richmond Beach Road to Richmond Beach Drive, what is now a narrow, two-lane road. That would undoubtedly change if the project goes forward, but what cannot change is Richmond Beach Road and the roads connecting to Richmond Beach Drive (NW 195th Street and NW 196th Street). At rush hour, a large percentage of the residents of Point Wells will be attempting to leave or return to the property. Many will be attempting to get to the freeway, which is miles away. (The remoteness of the freeway is one of the major reasons why this project is objectionable). Those who are going to Seattle will attempt to follow Richmond Beach Road up to 185th, then 185th to 99 or some other side street to cut over to 175th and the southbound freeway entrance. Residents who wish to go north on I-5 are apt to elect to avoid the congestion caused by the southbound residents. Their option is to cut over to Edmonds Way (Route 104) through the Westgate neighborhood. The side streets that would be used for that route are narrow two-lane roads used by residents for bicycling, dog-walking, people-walking and other similar activities. The conversion of these side streets into arterials connecting Point Wells to 104 and I-5 is wholly incompatible with the legitimate use of these residential streets by persons residing in the nearby single family neighborhoods.

Another traffic-related issue is availability of emergency services. We understand that the developer has proposed to include a fire and police station within the development, but we don't know anything about the proposed services. It seems highly unlikely that sufficient fire suppression capability would be on site to handle a major fire or other disaster. Fire trucks, ambulances, and police vehicles would have to use the same limited-capacity streets to gain access to the property.

What we've described so far relates to the traffic issues that will plague the area once the construction is finished. Bear in mind, however, that this project is to be built in phases, meaning that construction will go on for up to twenty years. Unless the developer can use barges or other vessels during the construction phase, all the contaminated soil would have to be transported along the beach and up Richmond Beach Road, 185th, 99, and 175th. The noise, dust, crowding, and danger of such heavy vehicular traffic is another reason why this project should not be permitted at its present scale.

2. Incompatibility with surrounding neighborhoods. In evaluating the environmental impact of a proposed development, the surrounding uses must be taken into account. The areas surrounding Point Wells are single-family residences that enjoy peace and quiet, dark nights, and natural views. This project, and the scale proposed, would dramatically change the landscape for the people living in the neighborhood. During the

summer, there are several celebrations and parties in the Richmond Beach area. They involve music and other noisy activities. Apparently due to the topography, the noise from these events is very noticeable to the nearby residents in Richmond Beach and in Woodway. If over three thousand units are built on Point Wells, there will be constant noise day and night.

One delightful aspect to living in Woodway is the darkness the residents enjoy once the sun has gone down. The darkness contributes to the feeling of solitude and peacefulness. Three thousand living units on Point Wells would be a constant source of light pollution. The effect of the glare from a development of this size cannot be overstated.

Many people in Woodway and Richmond Beach enjoy views of the Sound and the Olympic Mountains and the serenity of a woodland environment. A landowner is entitled to make use of his property, but, the purpose of land use regulations is to insure that growth is compatible with the uses and enjoyment of property by the landowners in the adjacent communities. To construct numerous buildings over 100 feet tall on the beach would not only block views of people living above the project, but would destroy the character of the surrounding neighborhoods by inundating them with noise pollution, light pollution, and traffic congestion with its resulting air pollution. It would also substitute an urban canyon for the majesty of the views of the Olympics now enjoyed by many neighbors above the Point Wells property.

3. Schools. I am not knowledgeable about how funding for schools is managed when a development is in one county but the most likely schools to be attended by residents of the development are in another county. It is certainly an issue to be considered. It appears that Snohomish County stands to gain very substantial property tax revenues if this project goes forward, but the residents of the Point Wells project may well attend Shoreline schools.

It appears to the citizens that Snohomish County may be the beneficiary of a windfall--property tax revenues without offsetting service to be provided to persons living in the project. Perhaps this explains why Snohomish County has been extraordinarily accommodating to this developer and has seemingly collaborated with the developer to assist the developer in furtherance of the developer's goals. We hope that a very broad SEPA review will be completed without any influence, undue or otherwise, by the county or the developer. We believe that any even-handed review of the impacts of the project as currently proposed will indicate the detrimental effects on the environment, adjacent properties, and adjacent communities far outweigh any legitimate benefit of the project.

Ronald J. Trompeter
Hackett, Beecher & Hart
1601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98101

206.624.2200