

From: billk
To: [Davis, Kris](#)
Cc: [MacCready, Paul](#); [Countryman, Ryan](#)
Subject: RE: Bill Krepick Public Testimony Comments at today's Point Wells Examiner Hearing
Date: Thursday, May 17, 2018 6:29:24 PM

May 17, 2018

To: Mr. Paul Camp
Hearing Examiner
Point Wells Development
cc Ryan Countryman
Paul McCready
Snohomish County Council Members
From: William Krepick
11402 239th PI SW
Woodway, WA 98020
Subj: my testimony at today's May 17th Public Hearing

Dear Mr. Camp-

Thank you very much for giving me and my neighbors the opportunity to speak at today's Public Hearing. We appreciate your due diligence process that will result in you ruling on the Snohomish County Planning Staff's recommendation to terminate the Point Wells project .

Here are my key talking points from today's Public Hearing testimony:

- I am a 5 year resident of Woodway. Small house on 1/3 acre with views of Puget Sound and Olympics.

- 5 years is time that has passed since BSRE has been given numerous extensions to respond to 30 – 40 deficiencies raised by County Planning Staff

- For 5 years the BSRE developer has essentially stonewalled the County Planning Staff and the citizens of Woodway, Richmond Beach, Shoreline, and Edmonds by not addressing major issues of traffic, parking, emergency access, setbacks, shoreline management, and environmental impact. Enough is enough – that's what the County Planning Staff is saying by recommending rejection of the application – and that is what we and all our Woodway and Richmond Beach friends and neighbors are saying.

-My wife and I have submitted separate emails as testimony to our support for the County Planning Staff recommendation to deny the BSRE Point Wells application. I wanted to make a few additional points in person – so I appreciate the opportunity to give further testimony.

- I have scanned through almost all of the 2018 file correspondence on this project and I think it is noteworthy that there is not a single resident who has responded in favor of the Point Wells development unless they are associated with BSRE. Over 120 residents have taken the time to write letters and emails this year alone indicating their frustration with the developer and their support for the County Staff recommendation to terminate the

I-428 Krepick, William -- May 17, 2018
PFN: 11 101457 LU

application.

- My conclusion is that BSRE should be sent back to square one and required to file a new application subject to very stringent prerequisites – including proposing a project of limited scope and size meaning a limited number of buildings, of limited heights, with limited residents that will be compatible with surrounding communities' zoning and lifestyle standards and will be safely and transparently integrated into the existing neighboring infrastructure of roads, walkways, houses and fragile ecosystems.

- I would like to emphasize three watchwords for the fundamental prerequisites for any new development application: compatibility, transparency, safety. Compatibility should dictate a design that 'fits' with the character of the surrounding single family neighborhoods and with all other developments from Seattle to Everett that are on or within a few hundred yards of the Puget Sound waterfront. Transparency means that the existing adjacent neighbors and surrounding transportation infrastructure, ecosystems and environment should not experience any interruptions or negative impacts from Point Wells. Safety encompasses adequate and accessible fire and emergency services; landslide protection; manageable road traffic and provision for safe walking and biking on neighboring streets. These fundamental prerequisites have all been violated by the deficiencies of the existing application that have been identified by the Planning Staff. Not only should the Planning Staff's many deficiencies be addressed BEFORE any new application is filed, but BEFORE any new application is filed, the concepts of compatibility, transparency, and safety for surrounding infrastructure, ecosystems, and housing MUST BE ADDRESSED.

-My reference to limited scope and scale means that the Point Wells development should not compromise the capacity and safety of the existing road infrastructure in both Woodway and Shoreline. Before the County accepts any new application from BSRE or any other developer, it should require getting approval from both Woodway and Shoreline for their respective limited roads to handle the incremental ADT (average daily trips) for new residents of Point Wells.

-Importantly, the ADT calculations need to be based on reliable statistics for incremental auto traffic – and should not be based on hypothetical assumptions that the developer suggests to offset incremental auto traffic with non-existent railway or ferry traffic. I hope you will carefully review Tom McCormick's very detailed testimony about how the project deficiencies and lack of real mass transit solutions should negate all buildings over 90 ft tall. Otherwise, the mass transit deficiency, coupled with 3,000 housing units, would result in unmanageable and unsafe increased auto traffic on existing single lane roads. The only real solution is for the County, Woodway, and Shoreline to limit the number of housing units and the population of the Point Wells development.

- The deficiency of the yet-to-be built 2nd access road also needs to be resolved before a new application can be filed. Woodway and other private property ownership rights must be resolved. Traffic and safety considerations must be resolved. Landslide and subterranean streams must be resolved. There are a host of geological preconditions that must be resolved for safety and feasibility. Several qualified civil engineers and geologists have pointed out the extreme complexity and risks associated with constructing a 2nd access road and have testified that it is quite possible that a safe road cannot be constructed within the limited right of way path.

-The developer has proposed at least 20 buildings over 90 ft tall and several 180 ft towers. The standard definition of a skyscraper is any building over 75 ft. How can anyone think that skyscrapers will be compatible, transparent, and safe for the surrounding communities? Between downtown Seattle and Everett I don't believe there are any waterfront buildings that are taller than 4 stories (45 ft tall). Why should any developer be allowed to create a skyscraper community where none has ever existed – especially when it will violate and break existing building setback codes, view rights, and existing transportation infrastructure?

-Again, I would ask that in conjunction with the termination of the Point Wells application, and because of the extremely restricted road access/egress, that the County Planners and/or Council Members establish limits for the Point Wells building heights and residential capacity BEFORE any new application is filed.

-In conclusion, I hope you will consider my comments and the comments of all other private citizens who are 100% in support of the Planning Staff recommendation to deny the BSRE application for Point Wells. The developer has shown a consistent pattern over 5 years of ignoring requests from the Planning Staff to address deficiencies and to engage the public and neighboring communities in supporting the development. As this saga has unfolded it has become more and more apparent that there are a large number of 'deal-killer' deficiencies that have not been and cannot be addressed, and it is time to terminate the project and start over with new guidelines and prerequisites that will make the application process more efficient and less costly for the County and will address the critical elements of compatibility, transparency, and safety.

THANKS FOR GIVING ME THE TIME TO SPEAK AT THE HEARING.

Sincerely,

Bill Krepick

Bill Krepick