

January 9, 2020

DCD Director, Hearing Examiner

City of Bainbridge Island, WA

From: Kjell Stoknes, 168 Wood Avenue SW, BI

Subject: Winslow Hotel: PLN50880 SPR/CUP

**Comments on the Notice of Determination
of non-significance (MDNS)
on the Winslow Hotel permit # PLN50880
SPR/CUP**

SUMMARY: There are several concerns. One is that many of the proposed mitigation measures do not really provide mitigation under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). Secondly, some of the proposed mitigations are already required by city codes. Thirdly, some of the proposed mitigations are not enforceable over time since they only come into effect after the hotel is completed. This third category of proposed mitigations are not considered enforceable. They are of particular concern because they are not really mitigations, but appear to be temporary pacifiers in order to get the hotel built. The primary mitigations that are of

concern or need to be added are as follows:

COMMENTS:

Mitigations 1 &2. Artifacts and existing building – No comment.

Mitigation #3. To mitigate traffic impacts on adjacent properties and with permission of the property owner, the applicant shall develop the frontage of the adjacent property to the east (TA#: 272502-4-099-2008) consistent with the street standard for an urban collector roadway in the Winslow Core per drawing DWG. 7-030. The frontage.....”

Comment: Improving the street is a positive benefit to the city, but it does not reduce (mitigate) traffic volumes. It just provides a new and smoother roadway to drive on. This is not meaningful mitigation for traffic.

Mitigation 4. Crosswalk – No comment.

Mitigation #5. To mitigate traffic and infrastructure, the applicant shall repave the right of way

along the Winslow Way W frontage of the subject properties and the adjacent property to the east (TA#: 272502-4-099-2008). Repaving shall extend from the frontage of the above described properties to the centerline of Winslow Way West.....

Comment: Improving the street is a positive benefit to the city, but it does not reduce (mitigate) traffic volumes. It just provides a new and smoother roadway to drive on. This is not meaningful mitigation for traffic.

Mitigations 6 & 7. Shuttle bus and shared bicycle – These have the potential of reducing some traffic mitigation.

Mitigations 8 & 9. Communicating alternative transportation available and requiring staggered check-in times to hotel guests.

Comment: It is unlikely that these conditions will influence how and when customers will arrive. The hospitality industry is about providing the best possible service to guests so they will come back, not limiting their

options. This is not a realistic attempt to mitigate traffic.

Mitigation 10. Place signs at each vehicle entrance denoting the purpose. This is common sense.

Mitigations 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16: (#'s 11 & 12) - These include requiring reports and possible additional mitigation measures after the hotel has been constructed. (#14) - Informing neighbors if there are going to events that will create noise. (#'s 15 & 16) - Limiting solid waste pick up time to 10:00 AM to noon and requiring waste facilities to be enclosed.

(11 & 12): After the fact conditions are difficult if not impossible to enforce; (14): Informing neighbors of future noisy events that are scheduled is not mitigation; (15): Putting conditions on solid waste pick-up times will get lost over time and become an on-going enforcement problem for the city and a permanent nuisance for the neighbors; (16): Enclosing waste facilities within the building does not mitigate that trucks must enter and exit the service entrance when needed. There will be

substantial noise created by garbage trucks and all other types of delivery trucks, especially with the beeper noise when backing up. Bulk food delivery to the restaurant and various supplies for banquet operations is required quite regularly and it typically is delivered quite early in the morning and is noisy.

Mitigations 13 & 18. Dust management during construction and marking limits of clearing. While these are mitigations, they are believed to be covered under current code requirements so they are not meaningful mitigations.

Mitigation 19. City arborist to advise for best practices during excavation around trees. This seems like a wise precaution.

Mitigation 17 & 20:
Mitigation 20 requires additional vegetation in three areas to mitigate visual, light, and noise impacts: 1) Along the south portion of the east property line (tax lot ending 098) where there is an existing single family home (on land zoned MUTC); 2) Along the southern boundary of the westerly

(tax lot ending 097) adjacent to vacant R-8 zoned land, and 3) Northerly along the west property line from the southwest corner of (tax lot ending 097) northerly to the edge of the paved parking.

Mitigation 17 is to mitigate light and noise impacts, but not visual impacts. It requires a solid six-foot high wall or fence along the west property line abutting the townhouse access drive. Based on what is proposed in mitigation 20 above, the wall or fence would be located from the southwest corner of the paved parking to Winslow Way, less any needed sight distance at the driveway entrance.

CONCLUSIONS:

Mitigation 17. It is difficult to understand why the mitigation along the Wood Avenue Townhomes and Cornerhouse property line would also not include visual mitigation similar to what was required for other properties in mitigation 20. Instead, the required six-foot high wall or fence would run within inches and parallel to an existing fence owned and maintained by

the adjacent properties. This is inconsistent! **The same mitigation should be required as is imposed in Mitigation #20.**

This is supported by the BIMC 18.15.010.A.1.e which states “providing vegetative buffers between residential and non-residential areas.”

Mitigations 15 and 16. These proposed mitigations are at best an attempt to pacify the residential neighbors nearby. There is no meaningful way to mitigate noise from garbage trucks and various types of delivery trucks for an 87-room full-service hotel which includes a restaurant with a combined 5,145 square feet, event/meeting space totaling 7,500 square feet, and a 3,916 square foot spa. When people from the neighborhood met with the architect and developer early in the process, they were asked if they could put the loading facility on the east side of the building next to office uses, rather than where it is next to residential uses. The answer provided was that this was not feasible due to the terrain of the land, yet this is the only effective mitigation. **Moving the service**

entrance and loading docks to the east side of the building is the only effective mitigation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Revise Mitigation # 17 – That vegetation providing mitigation for visual, light, and noise impacts shall be required along the entire western property line the same as the required landscaping in mitigation # 20.

Proposed Mitigation # 21 - (From proposed Mitigations 15 & 16): That the service entrance and loading docks must be relocated to the east side of the building. Not moving the service entrance to the east side of the building should be grounds for denying the project.