

**From:** [Chris/Lisa Neal](#)  
**To:** [PCD](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Commission - Wintergreen project  
**Date:** Friday, September 24, 2021 11:57:06 AM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the City of Bainbridge Island organization. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good day - below is the close-to-verbatim text of my comments to the Planning Commission on September 23, 2021, regarding the Wintergreen project.

Lisa Neal – I am an Island Resident, and have lived here for over 25 years.

Commission – I have three comments, one overarching, one specific, and then a comment about two questions I have.

My first comment is about the draft Buildable Lands Report. If you have reviewed it, you know that we now have 150% of the zoning capacity needed for population allocation through 2036. Councilmembers involved in population allocation through 2050 have confirmed that our allocation will for 2050 will actually go down from the 2036 level. That means we have more than 150% of the required zoning through 2050. Every time you add density, you add straws in the aquifer, threatening more shallow private wells of those who already live here, and put more cars on our roads. This project is adding significant density over and above what is required by the Growth Management Act. Density is not free.

My second comment is about the false dichotomy set up by some that suggests that unless the rules are bent, we cannot get affordable housing. Note that the developer is going to make a profit on even the affordable units, as the developer's representatives mentioned at the last meeting. Taking the bonus density offered by our Code will give them more money. The units must be affordable under the Code to get the bonus, and the promise to covenant the units as affordable is not a grant by the developer. If the units are not affordable, they cannot be built, it is that simple. This is not a "give back to the community" situation. There has been no compromise by the developer that is not required by the Code. The developer has not gifted us anything, and we don't owe them anything beyond what the Code allows. Please do not ignore regulations and guidelines. Please do not allow more density than is allowed. Our Code simply does not allow any such gifting. The developer can easily provide the affordable housing desired without running roughshod over our regulations and without building buildings that do not conform to our Design Guidelines. Don't allow the developer and the public comments to set this up as a situation where you have to bend the rules to get affordable housing. That is a false dichotomy.

My third comment is comprised of two questions. I will note I reached out to a few people I know on the Design Review Board and on the Planning Commission, and these appear to be open questions. I would like to flag these questions for the Planning Director, and I hope either she or another Staff person can explain the conflicts I see in the documentation. Here are my two questions:

--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->How did the base FAR for this remaining, unbuilt portion of the project, which was 21,700 SF, and which was already approved under the CUP and may have been greater than usually allowed, increase to base FAR of 38k? These numbers are in the Staff memo. The base FAR for this portion of the project has almost doubled. Why? Shouldn't base FAR for this changed project be 21,700, the remainder of the amount previously approved?

--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->Further, why is the bonus density .18? Maximum FAR including bonus for this district is .6. Base FAR is .3 and bonus density is .3 FAR. The Staff memo at page 12 confirms the maximum bonus FAR should be .3, and yet it is .18. No explanation is in the Staff memo is provided regarding this discrepancy. This is a significant difference. The developer makes more money the more units it builds, including affordable units. The total FAR is now almost three times what was left from completion of the prior project portions.

If there is no explanation for these discrepancies, I urge you to reject this application. In that event, the extra-Code density, combined with all of the livability issues raised by the Design Review Board and by the Commission, support rejection.