February 10, 2020

Snohomish County Planning Department
3000 Rockefeller Ave
Everett WA 98201

RE: Point Wells Development Urban Center & Request for Zoning Variance

Dear Sirs,

We are writing to oppose BSRE Point Wells Development & Request for Zoning Variance. BSRE has not provided sufficient mitigation for the increased traffic impact on residential streets, taken measures to combat slope instability, and respected the surrounding neighborhood in terms of scale and proportion. The Zoning Variance Request has also failed to justify granting a variance.

The Point Wells project as proposed is relying on two one lane access routes that feed directly into residential areas. The second access point has not been constructed and there is a question of soil stability. The impact of 3-5000 additional cars on a residential street is incomprehensible. If the majority of the cars take the second access road, it ends on a residential street, 116th Ave West in Woodway. If the cars turn right and head south on 116th Ave West in Woodway, they will arrive at a 3 way intersection where they are the only direction that has a stop sign. The intersection is hidden, includes a sharp left turn going up a hill and enters the town of Shoreline. Directly across is a ravine where we have seen at least one person miss the turn and perish. There are no dividing lines on the street as it goes up the hill; it is a residential area devoid of sidewalks, but has deep open drainage ditches on either side. Cars that park along the side of the road create a hazard as it becomes a one lane road-2 cars cannot safely pass. There is not enough room on either side of that street to increase its width in order to accommodate a little more traffic, let alone a few thousands daily trips. The secondary access has been identified but there has not been a traffic study to consider it a viable option.

Secondly, it proposes a transit center including vans and a train stop. Sound Transit (Sounder train) has previously stated they do not intend to add a new stop at Point Wells when there is a stop in Edmonds just a few minutes away. BSRE wrongly assumes that Sound Transit rail line is akin to the Link transit system—Sound Transit is on a single track line sharing the line with the freight trains and this rail line is owned by Burlington Northern, not Sound Transit therefore the sounder trains are tolerated only.
What if freight increases and Burlington Northern decides to remove all rights to the Sounder train? Further, there is always at least one closure of the track in winter for landslides, let alone any time of the year for cars on the tracks or fatalities at crossings. It is the least reliable of all transit options.

BSRE requests a Zoning Variance for the southeast portion of the proposed project. They are requesting a variance of height and setback due to the narrow site presenting challenging development conditions. By their own admission, the small portion of land is next to a critical area uphill. This should be cause for caution so as not to disturb the slide area. Further, BSRE again admits that there is limited access to the property. They are requesting a height and setback variance at the very limited access/entry point. This makes little sense to create traffic congestion at the entrance. BSRE contends that the height will not affect views uphill. The variance is double the allowable height, where it would be placed at the highest elevation on the entire project. They fail to visualize future development uphill will be affected by what they build downhill. It will create a domino effect such that existing properties become directly affected by their actions. Just a review of their renditions shows buildings at bluff treetop height. We personally are not located at the ridgeline and our light, view and air would definitely be affected by a variance in height.

Lastly, to request a dimensional variance, the applicant must show a practical difficulty and justify the request. Simply stating that it presents complications to follow the existing code does not prove a hardship. BSRE has not provided any cost comparisons between strict compliance and a variance. Based on the scale and scope of the proposed project, this appears to be a request to squeeze the maximum amount of profit at the expense of the surrounding neighborhood that will bear the long term impacts. Simply, this is a bottom dollar wish list, not a hardship, very typical to most developers.

For the reasons stated above, we request Snohomish County Planning and Development Commission to deny the requested variance and the proposed project by BSRE.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Frederic and Janet Laffitte

24140 116th Ave West

Woodway WA 98020