

Mon 2/8/2021 4:53 PM

Mark Hood [Mhood@vjglaw.com](mailto:Mhood@vjglaw.com)

Good afternoon Doug – I am writing in my individual capacity as a property owner in the Chambers Bay II subdivision. I am not writing on behalf of the Chambers Bay II homeowners association, although I expect that many of my comments are shared in part with the association and its members.

My comments are largely derived from the position that while I support redevelopment of the former Abitibi property, I support changes to the Steilacoom Comprehensive Plan and related planning documents only to the extent that they support the concept that a Master Planned Development by necessity combines commercial and residential uses. Most of my suggested changes address this point and trying to tighten up language to ensure what most people anticipate – a high quality development that combines residential and commercial uses rather than the possibility of both uses. As drafted, the proposed language is aspirational rather than requiring residential and commercial uses being developed concurrently.

I ask that you make these comments part of the record, and if you have any issues with that to please let me know.

Starting with the Comp Plan:

1. Regarding the description of Master Planned Development insert for page 37, I recommend a sentence be added stating “A Master Planned Development **shall** include a mixture of commercial and non commercial uses.” I want to emphasize that development must include a mix of uses and avoid nothing but apartments. I also think in the second sentence we should delete the word “establishes” and replace that with “that is consistent with.” Development agreements should not dictate zoning. Rather, they should follow zoning. As drafted it’s the tail wagging the dog.
2. Regarding the Housing Intensity provisions for insert into page 40, I would modify the second sentence to read “In 2021 the former mill site was re-designated to permit master Planned development that encourages development sufficient meet the Town’s residential density requirements combined with mix use including commercial uses.” My thought here is to remove language encouraging high density residential (but still allowing it) and combing with commercial uses. I am again trying to preclude an apartment only development and provide for concurrent commercial development.
3. Regarding the commercial building intensity insert for page 41, I would delete the last sentence of proposed language. I see no reason to waive either height or setback requirements that could impact view or allow construction nearer to CB II than would be allowed under zoning code.
4. Regarding the neighborhood character insert for page 52, I would change the suggested language change for policy LU 1.1 to read “provided, however, that multi family housing combined with commercial development should be encouraged in the master plan development area.” Again I am trying to add language the requires more than just residential development and requires concurrent commercial.
5. Regarding the economic development goal three insert for page 168, I recommend that in policy Econ 3.2 the second sentence replace the word industrial with the words master plan development.”

There is no more industrial use and the language should reflect that while preserving buffer from residential development such as CB II.

Regarding the document called the Land Use Element:

1. On page 5 under housing I recommend a new sentence be added to the new paragraph (green highlight) that reads "Residential development **shall be** combined with commercial development to achieve appropriate mix use in the Master Planned Development." Again I am trying to ensure real commercial development and not just housing.
2. On page 8 under Master Planned Development, as also described in paragraph 1 above, I recommend a sentence be added stating "A Master Planned Development **shall include** a mixture of commercial and non commercial uses." I also recommend in the second sentence that we delete the word "establishes" and replace that with "that is consistent with." Development agreements should not dictate zoning. Rather, they should follow zoning.
3. On page 11, and as described in paragraph 2 above, the yellow highlighted language in the last paragraph on the page should be modified to read "In 2021 the former mill site was re-designated to permit master Planned development that encourages development sufficient meet the Town's residential density requirements combined with mix use including commercial uses."
4. On page 23 and as described in paragraph 4 above, the suggested change to LU 1.1 should be modified to read "provided, however, that multi family housing combined with commercial development should be encouraged in the master plan development area."

As you can discern from my comments I am primarily focused on correcting language that gives the developer wiggle room on making this a purely residential development. While that may be my goal, it may not be exactly in line with what the CB II Board has in mind. The Board needs to do what it deems in the best interest of our neighborhood, of course.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Mark

**Mark A. Hood**

Attorney at Law

253-383-3791 x6571



VANDEBERG  
JOHNSON &  
GANDARA, LLP

[www.vjglaw.com](http://www.vjglaw.com)

---

*This email and any files transmitted with it are from the law firm of Vandeberg Johnson & Gandara, LLP and may contain privileged, confidential, or protected information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure,*

*copying, or use of the contents of this message or any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us and delete this email and any attached files.*