

From: MELISSA WEISSMAN
To: [Davis, Kris](#)
Subject: Comment for Point Wells Hearing
Date: Sunday, May 13, 2018 2:55:37 PM

Dear Hearing Examiner:

Here are my top 4 concerns about the Point Wells proposed development project.

Issue 1: How onsite contamination will be cleaned up

- The application identifies some of the contaminants, but not all their locations.
- The cleanup plan must be approved by the state Department of Ecology. There is no such plan submitted yet.
- After waiting 5 years for a response there's no reason to believe BSRE will be any more diligent if given another delay. These problems are critical enough for you to reject the application.

Issue 2: Second access road

- The proposed second road crosses the train tracks, a landslide hazard area, a creek, and a wetland. There is inadequate documentation about how the road will be engineered to successfully cross these sensitive areas.
- The proposed second road crosses private property. There is no documentation about how BSRE plans to acquire the right to cross that property.
- The drainage plan for the road is inadequate.
- After waiting 5 years for a response there's no reason to believe BSRE will be any more diligent if given another delay. These problems are critical enough for you to reject the application.

Issue 3: Height of planned buildings

- The proposed tall towers (up to 180 feet) are out of scale in a single family neighborhood.
- The plans show more than 20 building over 90 feet in height even though the height limit is 90 feet unless the development is near high capacity transit. BSRE proposes to build a station as part of Phase 3 but does not explain why that should permit them to have buildings taller than 90 feet as part of Phase 1 or Phase 2.
- The Urban Plaza is east of the railroad tracks and immediately next to low density zones. County code requires these buildings to be scaled down so that they are no more than a single story as they approach the zone boundary. All 6 of the buildings in the Upper Plaza are higher than allowed, some by more than 100 feet.
- After waiting 5 years for a response there's no reason to believe BSRE will be any more diligent if given another delay. These problems are critical enough for you to reject the

I-357 Weissman, Melissa -- May 13, 2018
PFN: 11 101457 LU

application.

Issue 4: The plan fails to properly document critical areas including landslide hazards and wetlands.

- The plans ask for a deviation from landslide hazard setback requirements but offer no reason why alternate plans that follow the requirements are not possible.
- The deviation request fails to demonstrate that ignoring the setback requirements will not result in a reduction in resident safety.
- The application does not include a critical areas site plan.
- After waiting 5 years for a response there's no reason to believe BSRE will be any more diligent if given another delay. These problems are critical enough for you to reject the application.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

Melissa Weissman