

From: John Wolfe <stableplatform@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 3:28 PM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: Point Wells DRB 11 101457 LU written comments
Attachments: Point Wells DRB 14 March 2018.pdf

Dear Paul MacCready,

Attached are my written comments for the SnoCo DRB regarding the Point Wells project. Please add them to that file.

Thanks, John Wolfe

TO: Snohomish County Design Review Board
RE: Point Wells Development
FILE: 11 101457 LU, et al

3-14-2018

Dear Snohomish County Design Review Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to present my concerns and observations regarding the proposed redevelopment of the BRSE property on Point Wells, presently a petroleum tank farm servicing the shipping, asphalt and roofing industry at the very tip of southwest Snohomish County, as an Urban Center.

I understand that the scope of your review concerns only property located in Snohomish County. Unfortunately, the brunt of negative physical, fiscal and social impacts during the proposed redevelopment occur in King County, the City of Shoreline and its Richmond Beach neighborhood in particular.

Snohomish County cannot now provide any services to the site requiring direct access by existing roads. Direct access is only via Richmond Beach Drive NW, Shoreline. All BRSE's examples of streets comparable to Richmond Beach Drive are through streets. Point Wells is a dead end.

Access to the site through the City of Shoreline overwhelms present infrastructure for which neither Snohomish County nor BRSE have any intention of paying significant mitigation costs to upgrade.

The level of residential unit development (3080 condominium units) is a third again larger in numbers as the present community of Richmond Beach (2400 single family residences) and powers of ten smaller in land area. Presentations by BSRE stating that existing surface streets serving the proposed development are adequate and are presently underutilized are demonstratively wrong.

The above arguments also pertain to any City of Shoreline attempt at annexation and redevelopment of Point Wells. It is polluted, there is no public money to clean it up. Street access is inadequate even for a park, and the scope of residential or multi-use projects overwhelm existing infrastructure and life safety services. The existing use as a petroleum tank farm is essential to industry

Preliminary engineering by MIG/ SvR dated 4/12/2017 generally describes a new secondary access from the site cutting across a wetland and associated buffers on colluvial soils then up a steep 15% grade plateauing at 116th Ave W. This new 40' ROW

with two 12' lanes would become the most direct access to SR104 for the proposed 3100 unit residential development with over 100,000 SF of retail space.

Snohomish County Bulletin #96, Urban Centers, give examples of Urban Centers constructed noticeably around the rapid transit hub of 164th St. SW and I-5. These developments are at most, five stories of wood framing on two stories of concrete slab construction, adhering to the 90' maximum height allowable without use of the allowable height bonus.

I will not support BRSE's proposed re-development of Point Wells from an industrial site to a mixed use residential Urban Center community for the following reasons.

BRSE has failed to provide a plan that conforms to requirements set forth in SCC 30.34A Urban Center.

BRSE's plan is vested under an earlier code. Height bonuses used are for sites within one half mile of high capacity transit, major transit corridor or transit center. No such site exists nor are any planned. Base height of 90' maximum must be observed. Present code is more restrictive, requiring said services to be within an eighth of a mile. Present code allows less of a height bonus.

BRSE has asked for a parking stall requirement variance. Their proposal rests on non-existent high capacity public transit. Present calculations of approximately 3,200 parking spaces for 3,080 residential units, 100,000 SF of commercial space and public beach amenities are unrealistically small.

Slopes east of the BNSF tracks are steep, wet, colluvial soils. Snohomish County reviewers rightfully express concerns about the proposal's geo hazard buffers at the slope's toe that cross the tracks.

The proposed secondary access road is:

Too small for the TPD (trips per day) it will experience as the closest route to SR104.

Crosses a wetland, then follows a steep route uphill, all on colluvial soils.

Accesses existing two lane 116th Ave W, also unable to handle required TPD.

ROW shown is not in conformance with Town of Woodway UR zone road standards under which it would be permitted.

ROW design fails its own detail of having no shoulder grading greater than 2H/ 1V as it descends from elevations +70' to the BNSF property.

ROW shown does not conform to plans submitted to Town of Woodway by BRSE spinoff corporation Point Wells LLC for their 36 lot subdivision on the plateau directly above Point Wells.

WSDOT transportation mitigation costs related to the project are slated for the Mukilteo Speedway and I-5 at 128th, not the Town of Woodway, City of Edmonds or City of Shoreline. SR99 and SR 104 will be highly impacted by the BRSE proposal.

Clean up of the site for change of use would create more of a problem than it now poses. The site is now "locked", clean up disturbance and dredging will "unlock" petroleum toxins including PCB's into Puget Sound at an intolerable level.

The best use of this property is in its present state, a petroleum tank farm. Industry on lower Puget Sound requires it. A second best use would be a tertiary sewer and storm water treatment plant. A third best use would be a wildlife refuge. High density residential/ multi-use is very far down the list.

This BRSE proposal does not satisfy the requirements of SCC 30.34A.

Respectfully,

John Wolfe
20207 23rd Ave NW
Shoreline, WA 98177
206-542-5727 stableplatform@gmail.com