

Curt Pearce Script (1)

Hi,

My name is Curtis L. Pearce
My address is 18220 8th ave.NW. Shoreline, WA 98177

In 2018, Mr. Examiner, you denied BSRE's applications due to substantial Code conflicts.

A year later, a King County court gave BSRE a one-time reactivation opportunity. BSRE was supposed to fix the substantial Code conflicts.

But it didn't.

Instead, BSRE submitted applications that still substantially conflict with County Code.

Take buildings heights, for example. BSRE's project still has 17 buildings taller than 90 feet.

In 2018, you concluded that buildings taller than 90 feet are in substantial conflict with the Code because there is no high capacity transit at Point Wells, and because BSRE never proved that buildings taller than 90 feet were necessary.

Nothing has changed. There still is no high capacity transit.

So what does BSRE do to deal with its height problem? It submits a frivolous variance request, asking you to simply waive the high capacity transit requirement, and approve its 17 extra tall buildings. BSRE says that it needs a height variance so that it can build enough square footage to satisfy the Code's minimum density requirement.

But BSRE has everything backwards. If it was having difficulty complying with the minimum density requirement, it could have and should have asked for a variance from the minimum density requirement.

One of BSRE's biggest mistakes is that it should have sorted out the high capacity transit issue years ago. What developer in its right mind would proceed to design a project with 180-foot buildings without knowing for sure that it meets the requirements to have 180-foot buildings? For many years, because of BSRE's negligence and lack of diligence, the public and the County have had to waste valuable time and resources.

It's the same sort of mess that BSRE muddled into with the ordinary high water mark. It is unbelievable that from 2011 to 2018, BSRE located a bunch of its proposed buildings illegally within the shoreline buffer. What developer in its right mind would design a project without first knowing the site area within which it could lawfully locate its buildings, or without first knowing with certainty the maximum building height for its project.

I should also add that BSRE illegally located buildings in a landslide hazard area east of the railroad tracks, jeopardizing the safety of the public and future residents. Once again, what developer in its right mind would do that? BSRE should have located all of its buildings west of the railroad tracks.

BSRE deserves to have its urban center project denied without any further opportunities to resurrect it.

Thank you.
CURT Pearce

From: [cncpearce](#)
To: [Hearing.Examiner](#)
Cc: ["Jerry Patterson"](#)
Subject: Comments on Point WellsI
Date: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 1:23:48 PM
Attachments: [Curt Pearce 1.docx](#)

Please call with any questions.
206 817 0487

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Curt Pearce Script (1)

Hi,

My name is Curtis L. Pearce

My address is 18220 8th ave.NW. Shoreline, WA 98177

In 2018, Mr. Examiner, you denied BSRE's applications due to substantial Code conflicts.

A year later, a King County court gave BSRE a one-time reactivation opportunity. BSRE was supposed to fix the substantial Code conflicts.

But it didn't.

Instead, BSRE submitted applications that still substantially conflict with County Code.

Take buildings heights, for example. BSRE's project still has 17 buildings taller than 90 feet.

In 2018, you concluded that buildings taller than 90 feet are in substantial conflict with the Code because there is no high capacity transit at Point Wells, and because BSRE never proved that buildings taller than 90 feet were necessary.

Nothing has changed. There still is no high capacity transit.

So what does BSRE do to deal with its height problem? It submits a frivolous variance request, asking you to simply waive the high capacity transit requirement, and approve its 17 extra tall buildings. BSRE says that it needs a height variance so that it can build enough square footage to satisfy the Code's minimum density requirement.

But BSRE has everything backwards. If it was having difficulty complying with the minimum density requirement, it could have and should have asked for a variance from the minimum density requirement.

One of BSRE's biggest mistakes is that it should have sorted out the high capacity transit issue years ago. What developer in its right mind would proceed to design a project with 180-foot buildings without knowing for sure that it meets the requirements to have 180-foot buildings? For many years, because of BSRE's negligence and lack of diligence, the public and the County have had to waste valuable time and resources.

It's the same sort of mess that BSRE muddled into with the ordinary high water mark. It is unbelievable that from 2011 to 2018, BSRE located a bunch of its proposed buildings illegally within the shoreline buffer. What developer in its right mind would design a project without first knowing the site area within which it could lawfully locate its buildings, or without first knowing with certainty the maximum building height for its project.

I should also add that BSRE illegally located buildings in a landslide hazard area east of the railroad tracks, jeopardizing the safety of the public and future residents. Once again, what developer in its right mind would do that? BSRE should have located all of its buildings west of the railroad tracks.

BSRE deserves to have its urban center project denied without any further opportunities to resurrect it.

Thank you.
CURT Pearce

From: [cncpearce](#)
To: [Hearing.Examiner: cncpearce@seanet.com](#)
Cc: ["Jerry Patterson"](#)
Subject: RE: Comments on Point WellsI
Date: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 6:36:26 PM
Attachments: [Curt Pearce 1.docx](#)

Please confirm receipt.
Thankyou

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: "Hearing.Examiner" <Hearing.Examiner@co.snohomish.wa.us>
Date: 11/24/20 6:06 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: cncpearce <cncpearce@seanet.com>, "Hearing.Examiner" <Hearing.Examiner@co.snohomish.wa.us>
Cc: 'Jerry Patterson' <jerryapat08@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Comments on Point WellsI

I believe this is the email comments you resent because the initial sending was blank? Let me know if this is the case or if there was supposed to be a comment in the first email a short time ago, too.

Thanks,

Clerk Yount

From: cncpearce <cncpearce@seanet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 1:23 PM
To: Hearing.Examiner <Hearing.Examiner@co.snohomish.wa.us>
Cc: 'Jerry Patterson' <jerryapat08@gmail.com>
Subject: Comments on Point WellsI

Please call with any questions.

206 817 0487

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [cncpearce](#)
To: [Hearing.Examiner](#)
Cc: ["Jerry Patterson"; cncpearce@seanet.com](#)
Subject: Curt Pearce statement at Point Wells Hearing.
Date: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 7:37:17 PM
Attachments: [Curt Pearce 1.docx](#)

Hope this is all that is needed.
Thank You.
Curt Pearce

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone