

**From:** [Kate Walsh](#)  
**To:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**Subject:** OFL development and 8/14 meeting comments  
**Date:** Thursday, August 17, 2023 2:05:00 PM

---

Dear Barb,

Thank you for allowing me to comment following the August 14 meeting, where there (inadvertently) was no second public statement time allowed and thank your staff for clarifying the submission process.

My comments are based on the OFL Subarea Plan Community Design Strategies document and on interactions at the 8/14 meeting and the prior productive planning meeting a month or so where people worked in groups.

1. **At the planning meeting** where citizens worked in groups and at the August 14 meeting, participants repeatedly stated that they did not want multi-family dwellings, such as condominiums, because such dwellings would attract low-income criminals, and were occupied by short term, two-year turnovers. The inference seems to be that multi-family dwellings, such as Palisade Park Condominiums, or the town houses adjacent to the village green, would be inconsistent with or reduce the value of custom and luxury single-family housing, or that the OWNERS of condo units like Palisade Park have no interest in the city's planning and decision-making (though developer proposals so far consistently seem to require funneling traffic from 7-story towers down Palisade Boulevard and Center Drive, near and past the condominiums, destroying the value of condo owners' investments).

The stated view about low-income, criminally-inclined, two-year turnovers is factually incorrect and ignorant. The City should not consider that view in its decision-making. I'm an attorney and worked 34 years for the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, the Office of the Attorney General of Washington, and the federal government. I own and have lived in my Palisade Park condo for 22 years. I am not criminally-inclined. Neither are the neighbors around me, many of whom have lived here longer than I have, nor are the Palisade Park condo board members I work with. On the contrary, these long-term neighbors include senior bridge engineers, senior DOC officers, college instructors, nurses, accountants, and lawyers. They have invested, just like other DuPont residents, in their homes, and like custom single-family dwelling neighbors, they have a financial stake in the City's OFL planning decisions.

2. At the 8/14 meeting, the City said it had reached out to stakeholders about the OFL planning. No one has contacted the Palisade Park Condominium Association that represents and acts for the 78 Palisade Park Condominium unit OWNERS. The condo association board members and owners have views on the planning process that the city has not solicited. Please include the Palisade Park Condominium Association Board as a stakeholder in the OFL planning and decision-making process, since the City's OFL planning decisions will negatively affect Palisade Park's neighborhood safety, traffic congestion, pollution, and the housing values of 78 condominium OWNERS. The condo home owners deserve a say before the City allows a developer's plan to destroy their investments and neighborhood.

**As to questions prompted by the OFL Subarea Plan handout:**

1. The subarea plan document states that the City has heard from the public its "appreciation

of existing open space, tree coverage, and historic/cultural elements." At the prior meetings I've heard a sentiment stronger than "appreciation." I heard a clear request that the city, in its ultimate plan, maintain and preserve the existing open space, tree coverage and historic cultural elements. It is especially important that the City accurately "hear" the citizens will on the open space and historic/cultural elements, given the unrelenting drive of corporations like Northpoint, which does not live in and hopes not to be a taxpayer to DuPont, to destroy those same elements.

2. I agree that the city should use traffic calming measures, like roundabouts attractively planted/mulched, to better control traffic/speeding. Such measures have worked on Palisade Boulevard, making that street safer for children who daily bike, walk, scooter and skateboard to school (Chloe CLark, Pioneer). They troop by my front window twice a day, from September through June.

3. YES to bike lanes on the major streets in the subarea development. One of the missions of DuPont was to support pedestrian and non-motorized vehicle transportation in the community. The City (seemingly unlike developers) should not ignore it. Relatedly, no golf carts on city streets or trails. DuPont is not advertised or designated as a gated, over 55+, golf community, and golf carts on major streets, or on walking trails like Sesqualitew, would be dangerous and incompatible with DuPont's pedestrian priority. Golf carts belong on golf courses, which are designed specifically to safely accommodate them. Who will be liable when one of the semi trucks improperly using Center Drive hits a golf cart?

4. Regarding parking and street parking, any 5-, 6-, or 7- story residential tower is going to create a traffic/street parking nightmare. The city should avoid that nightmare by not allowing 5-, 6-, or 7- story residential towers. When DuPont was built, the two-story condos and apartments were the "low income housing" and any increase in density now should be limited to 4-story housing (double the low-income standard) with parking incorporated into the developer's design. By example, Palisade Park has a garage and asphalt apron area associated with and behind each condo unit, greatly reducing the need for street parking for the 78 units and street traffic wear and tear. A four-story doubling standard with garages and an alley may be contrary to developers' goal to shove people into towers like sardines in a can, at the DuPont taxpayers' expense, but DuPont's planned community mandates, and its successful growth and property value increase demonstrates the value of, *community-oriented* planning that avoids traffic/parking problems and costs.

5. Regarding "Street Grid", if the photograph is the model for OFL, it seems way too dense, especially if you want custom and luxury housing.

6. Regarding transportation policies and block size standards, policies should ensure conformity and appropriate size and scale of block size in relations to surrounding structures. Don't repeat the debacle of the storage unit structure that looks like an ICE detention facility and ruined the until-then picaresque downtown.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and for conveying this to each of the council members. I am also forwarding this to my fellow Palisade Park condo association board members, so they are aware, should you reach out.

Sincerely,

Kate Walsh  
2180 Palisade Blvd  
DuPont WA 98327

March 10, 2024

Dear City Council and Planning Commission:

Please accept this letter for public testimony regarding DuPont's Fort Lake Development.

My name is Rebecca Toppenberg I have lived in Dupont since 2006 and have owned 2 homes along the Martin Street golf course side. I am concerned and opposed to developing the natural areas of the property. When we moved here, we were informed that the soil is contaminated from the Dupont Dynamite Plant along with the issue in the soil from the Smelter that made this land unusable for housing. We purchased our home(s) 2866 and 2806 along the golf course for its serene beauty and connection to wildlife spaces and nature trails. One of the many things' citizens and our family love about Dupont is that there is so much nature and wildlife for a city so close to the city.

As DuPont citizens, it is one of my highest priorities to see our priceless, irreplaceable wilderness spaces preserved. I would argue that the nature trail Also known as the tunnel trail that follows the train tracks is equally valuable to our city and its citizens. It holds historic lands and amazing views the provide solace from a busy world. The local human population, the wildlife, including bats and birds and coyotes and said bear and many other species rely on the dense forests that exist around the lake and golf course and habitat to survive.

I have many concerns about developing and modernization of this area besides obviously selfish ones of losing my home property values and views. One of the main concerns that I have with this development other than the effects on nature and the beloved wildlife that DuPont citizen encounter on the trails and living near this natural land is traffic and overcrowding. I would ask that if any building takes place that we minimize the effects to the Natural spaces to allow wildlife to still have untouched lands at Fort Lake.

If I wanted to live in an area like Point Ruston with high rises and cement walkways along the sound, I would have moved to Tacoma.

I am glad that the movement of keeping industrial buildings was mostly successful for this area of land. Who would put a warehouse next to a beautiful lake or around a golf course? However, just like with the warehouses and lite industrial zoning, with homes comes traffic.

That area has minimal access to roads from the McNeil which will bring lots of traffic through local neighborhoods. Recently, Wallace Street had a traffic and speed study done allowing signage to be in place for 20 MPH traffic. This area is already a challenging area with traffic and blind spots and bus stop challenges and making it a main throughfare (Jensen and Martin St) will only increase the safety concerns.

A more appropriate access would be near Pioneer (Wren Rd) and Palisade at the baseball fields and Civic drive.

Dupont is already affected by major traffic challenges especially if there are any closures or accidents near our exits. With the city's inability to open Mounts Road, I feel with poor transit set up and access that adding more housing to area with poor transportation alternatives is just setting us up for a disaster.

Alternative that would need to be considered would be opening Mounts Road and creating that access point and building up that area first.

Also allowing for transportation between Old Dupont and new Dupont. I realize that this can add to safety concerns in our neighborhoods but at this point if you are adding that many more units to Dupont this would be needed.

Adding these additional housing units without the school infrastructure already planned and in place is harmful to our current families and taxpayers. If the citizens voted down a much-needed school on McNeil St due to traffic, then adding all the drivers from this housing development is also a concern. While I am here my personal view is that Salters should be made into an elementary school and the focus should be on building a new Highschool and possibly another middle school. The grades would be 1-3 4-6, 7-9, 10-12. We really need to look at the schools and what activities are locally supportive of our youth. If this project eventually comes to be this all needs to be addressed prior to building.

Lastly, I am concerned about the land use and with a huge construction project even if the land is remediated there will be significant construction dust. Although it may be challenging to determine, what are the ramifications of making this soil airborne (due to construction) and the affects on nearby citizens. And later what will the effects be on those that may live in homes and play at the Parks on this property.

When I looked at the studies it looks like much of the studies are repeated from previous projects. I did not see anything in regard to coyotes referenced in the wildlife survey. Please hire a qualified wetlands biologist and classify DuPont's wetlands and wildlife so we can better preserve these sensitive areas. We already have documentation from the state that provides solid, science-based examples of DuPont's wetland delineation. Edmonds Marsh, Bell Marsh and our other city wetlands are precious resources. They're critical areas of aquifer recharging. They're also important parts of wildlife habitat and integral to our trail system, our walkability and our recreation opportunities. No business should be allowed to threaten these sensitive areas through mistaken or sloppy wetlands assessments.

I am also requesting that the city adopt the best available state of the science regulations. Surveys should be thoroughly done to assess all issues and challenges not just from the Builders side. I also would like to see a town hall to present all of the information to citizens before a final decision is voted on, there should be booths for asking questions about this project at community events. Again, I feel that DuPont's wetlands and wildlife are worth preserving and I am opposed to the building of high rises and would like the minimal numbers of housing units added if it is absolutely necessary.

We citizens of DuPont love our natural resources. Trails, walkability, clean water and natural beauty are high priorities for us. We're counting on you to craft laws that are rock-solid in protecting DuPont's sensitive areas.

Rebecca Toppenberg  
2806 Martin St  
Dupont WA 98327  
253-970-5221

**From:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Cc:** [Lisa Klein](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Concerned DuPont Homeowner  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 13, 2024 12:13:50 PM

---

---

**From:** Eric Goltry <ericgoltry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 12, 2024 10:00 PM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid <bkincaid@dupontwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Concerned DuPont Homeowner

**Ms. Kincaid**

Good evening. I'm very concerned that the face of DuPont is going to change for the worse due to the proposed construction project surrounding the golf course. I don't support the construction of huge apartment complexes in DuPont. I'm concerned about the 2nd and 3rd order effects this will have on our quiet community that I have fallen in love with over the last 3 years. Increased crime, drugs, traffic, noise, litter, school overcrowding.

How do you see this being a benefit to the community and existing residence?

Thanks  
Eric Goltry

**From:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Cc:** [Lisa Klein](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Concerns old fort lake  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 13, 2024 12:16:19 PM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Katrin Hill <cathrina81@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 6:37 PM  
To: Barbara Kincaid <bkincaid@dupontwa.gov>  
Subject: Re: Concerns old fort lake

Mrs. Kincaid,

I wanted to follow up and see if my email was received? I attended last nights meeting but had to leave at 8pm to take care of my children and didn't get a chance to share my concerns.

Where do they get the estimate off 2.5 per unit? I feel like that is VERY low even for apartments it's in the low range. Most homes have 4 plus residents.....Also I been told there is the State Farm Lot to be developed and the Manchester lot. I'm really concerned adding this many residents to DuPont. It will only have negative impacts on current residents. We need businesses who bring in consistent revenue not more residents which take away our little resources. I understand there are state mandated guidelines to meet, but we only need to meet the minimum and not all in the Old Fort Lake Area. Even this updated plan puts us over the minimum required and that is based of the 2.5 residents per unit which will not be the case. This plan would change DuPont forever and many current residents would move. This would not be DuPont we fell in love with and call home. Please safe DuPont from this major change in quality of life. What I'm most concerned, is adding these huge 200 unit multi family units, alone those would change our demographics. Can we please zone for businesses, upper scale homes and some duplexes?

Looking forward to hearing from you,

Katrin Hill  
Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 5, 2024, at 2:51 PM, Katrin Hill <cathrina81@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>  
> Hey there,  
>  
> I wanted to share my concerns regarding plans for the old fort lake area.  
> DuPont needs more recreational facilities which would benefit all current residents and would bring in revenue. If the state indeed mandates adding X amount of residents then we should provide the bare minimum and not all in the old fort lake area. Adding that many residents especially proposed multi family units would change DuPont forever and would be a traffic nightmare and also would bring in more crime. Many residents moved here for the small town feel and adding that many new residents would take that away. It also would change our demographics drastically.  
>  
> Please do not allow multi family homes. Duplexes would be ok but please no high rising buildings and only the minimum required by the state. Please safe DuPont.  
>  
> Thank you,  
> Katrin Hill  
>  
> Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Old Fort Lake Development Comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 12, 2024 12:56:29 PM

---

---

**From:** Barbara Kincaid <[bkincaid@dupontwa.gov](mailto:bkincaid@dupontwa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 12, 2024 12:34 PM  
**To:** Janet Howald <[JHowald@dupontwa.gov](mailto:JHowald@dupontwa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Lisa Klein <[LKlein@AHBL.com](mailto:LKlein@AHBL.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: Old Fort Lake Development Comments

---

**From:** RALPH DORNSIFE <[rjdornsife@comcast.net](mailto:rjdornsife@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2024 11:06 PM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid <[bkincaid@dupontwa.gov](mailto:bkincaid@dupontwa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Old Fort Lake Development Comments

---

Barb,

As a 25-year resident of DuPont, I recently became aware of a high-density housing project being proposed for Old Fort Lake. I understand that the size of this development could potentially double the population of our DuPont community. I am adamantly opposed to any development that would double our community population. DuPont does not have the infrastructure to handle the increased population. Nor does the I-5 corridor currently have the capacity to handle the additional traffic. This would likely turn the morning commute into gridlock, as it often is now going northbound in the mornings. Furthermore, adding an additional 6,000 to 12,000 citizens to the DuPont community would totally change the character of our community. I request that you pass along my comments to the planning commissioners.

Ralph Dornsife  
2181 Hammond Ave.  
DuPont WA 98327-9602

**From:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**To:** [1doratheexplorer@gmail.com](mailto:1doratheexplorer@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Old Fort Lake housing  
**Date:** Monday, March 11, 2024 8:56:29 AM

---

Thank you for your email.

Sincerely,  
Barb

-----Original Message-----

From: Gomez Leticia <[1doratheexplorer@gmail.com](mailto:1doratheexplorer@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Saturday, March 9, 2024 8:04 AM  
To: Barbara Kincaid <[bkincaid@dupontwa.gov](mailto:bkincaid@dupontwa.gov)>  
Subject: Old Fort Lake housing

Barb Kinkaid,

To the planning commission, take note that I am against development of housing for the maximum units. The minimum units of 2672 is sufficient for this area to avoid overcrowding and traffic problems.

I ask the planning commission to consider other areas of DuPont for more housing units.

Thank you,  
Leticia Gomez  
803 Barksdale Ave  
DuPont, Wa 98327

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Cc:** [Lisa Klein](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Old fort lake plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 12, 2024 12:48:25 PM

---

---

**From:** Kristy Francis <k.francis44@protonmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2024 6:20 PM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid <bkincaid@dupontwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Old fort lake plan

Ms. Kincaid,

I am very concerned about the plans for the old fort lake area primarily related to the large number of multiple family housing numbers. I am concerned that this will vastly increase the population of DuPont without the needed infrastructure to handle the increase in population. Our school system is already over capacity and there is no accounting for the increased children that will be entering our community. This also does not factor in the additional traffic, police, fire personnel etc that will be required. Additionally, this is just one area of DuPont that is being looked at for further development and does not account for the other areas. I'm not opposed to continuing to improve DuPont but not without looking at the entire community while trying to preserve what makes DuPont so great.

Please feel free to contact me with further questions.

Thank you.

/r,  
Kristy Francis  
1813 palisade blvd  
480-286-2450

Sent from [Proton Mail](#) for iOS

**From:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**To:** [Robin Barrow](#)  
**Cc:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Old Fort Lake Subarea plan  
**Date:** Monday, March 11, 2024 8:55:14 AM

---

Thank you for your email. Janet will include yours with the other correspondence we have received to send to our Planning Commissioners.

Sincerely,  
Barb

---

**From:** ROBIN BARROW <barpow1@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 10, 2024 10:29 PM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid <bkincaid@dupontwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Old Fort Lake Subarea plan

Mrs. Kincaid,  
I want to share my options with you about the proposal from the developers in the Old Fort Lake Subarea.

1st. I'm concerned about the density. To meet the state regulations now required we should only need approximately 2000 residences especially if we include the Patriots Landing development and the other areas in transition.

The higher the density the problem with traffic and noise will be a concern. It will also be a consistent strain on city resources.

2. Streets. At the strategic planning meeting our Fire Chief indicated that the roundabouts on our current streets hinder a rapid response. I hope we will take that into consideration.

3. Parking availability. Our current streets are over-crowded for a number of reasons one being the driveways. Many of them are so small you can't park a mini-Cooper in them. Adequate parking should be required for safety reasons throughout the development.

4. Trees and sidewalks. Let's learn from our current problems and avoid allowing trees that will cause future problems.

Thank you for doing such an excellent job in keeping things moving forward. And, thank you to the members of the planning commission for their diligence on this task. It is very much appreciated.

Robin Barrow

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

**From:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Cc:** [Lisa Klein](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Old Fort Lake  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 12, 2024 1:02:30 PM  
**Attachments:** [\\_WRD0000.jpg](#)

---

---

**From:** Christopher Fletcher <fletcher4hwang@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2024 2:56 PM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid <bkincaid@dupontwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Old Fort Lake

I'm a little concerned about the density of population in the Old Fort Lake. Need to moderate it.

Chris Fletcher



Virus-free [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

**From:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Cc:** [Lisa Klein](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning commission for old Fort Lake  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 13, 2024 12:07:15 PM

---

---

**From:** Angela G <rememberangela@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 13, 2024 9:27 AM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid <bkincaid@dupontwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Planning commission for old Fort Lake

Hello,

I've been a resident and homeowner here in DuPont for almost 10 years and I've just looked over the planning commission notes and possible plans for around the golf course. It actually gave me such a bad physical feeling thinking about that many apartments and such crammed into that beautiful area. I think it's a HUGE mistake to add that many multi family units around the lake, please consider lessening the possible added population to that area. Keep it peaceful and quiet around that treasured area.

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

**From:** [Barbara Kincaid](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Cc:** [Lisa Klein](#)  
**Subject:** FW: POTENTIAL OVERCROWDED HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON OLD FORT LAKE  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 12, 2024 12:48:39 PM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Simone Amadee <simone45@comcast.net>  
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 5:52 PM  
To: Barbara Kincaid <bkincaid@dupontwa.gov>  
Subject: POTENTIAL OVERCROWDED HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON OLD FORT LAKE

Dear Ms Kincaid & Planning Commission,

As a concerned citizen that has lived in DuPont for 19 yrs, I am totally against the massive building project of multiple high density housing developments planned by Albatross!

I am against this expansion that will in every way negatively impact the quality of life for those of us that call DuPont our home.

My reasons against this project are as follows:

1. The size & density will cause our population to double, if not more.
2. Our roads, specifically the ingress & egress in/out of our town is NOT set up for the traffic nightmare that will ensue. Our quality of life will surely suffer!
3. Our first responders will not be able to handle this population. Taxes will surely need to be raised for all citizens to fund this population explosion.
4. Our schools will be too small & inadequate.
5. Our native wildlife will sadly be displaced & our air quality will decrease for certain with all of the added traffic.
6. There are other vacant properties where some housing could reasonably be added. Since an increase of only 5,000 is mandated by the state by 2044, why pack all of this new construction into one small area?

Please do the right thing for all citizens of DuPont and do NOT approve this proposal.

Sincerely,  
Simone Amadee  
3183 Brown Loop

Sent from my iPhone

## Barbara Kincaid

---

**From:** Kate Walsh <3mcwals@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 8, 2024 11:32 AM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid  
**Subject:** Re: FW: OFL housing development.

Thanks Barbara!

On Fri, Mar 8, 2024 at 11:11 AM Barbara Kincaid <[bkincaid@dupontwa.gov](mailto:bkincaid@dupontwa.gov)> wrote:

Hi Kate,

I did receive your email – am forwarding to you for you to have a copy.

Barb

**From:** Kate Walsh <[3mcwals@gmail.com](mailto:3mcwals@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 6, 2024 9:13 PM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid <[bkincaid@dupontwa.gov](mailto:bkincaid@dupontwa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: OFL housing development.

Please share this with all commissioners, or other interested persons.

Thanks

Kate Walsh

On Wed, Mar 6, 2024 at 9:12 PM Kate Walsh <[3mcwals@gmail.com](mailto:3mcwals@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Ms. Kincaid,

The planning commission is finalizing its Old Fort Lake Subarea Plan work. The density of any development of this unique green space/recreational/ and water-front property is significant to all the citizens of DuPont, whether business or residential members. The current developers' plan could build from 2,600 to a maximum of 5,000 units of housing. The guidelines for these residential units assume 2.5 people per dwelling, or, at maximum, 10,000 to 12,000 residents. Essentially, the developers plan would meet the state mandate that the City of DuPont add 5,000 people to the entire city--NOT just the

OFL subarea--by 2044, by overburdening and destroying the OFL subarea in 2024. Once destroyed, how could the green and waterfront areas that comprise the OFL subarea be reclaimed?

Moreover, the developers' plan does not address: (1) the absence of available parking for up to 12 thousand new residents; (2) the car and truck exhaust pollution the proposal will bring; (3) the car and truck noise and light pollution of the developers' proposal; (4) the risk of injury to pedestrians from increased automobile traffic in such a densely populated area; (5) the cost of increased police and fire safety services for up to 12,000 new residents in the OFL subarea and the city at large; (6) the loss of property value that the towers needed for 12,000 residents will impose on current DuPont property owners; and (7) impact on the Nisqually tribal lands adjacent to DuPont.

Furthermore, because of intelligent action by the city, other land, such as the State Farm property, is available to develop diverse multi-family, multi-unit housing and meet any state housing mandate. For example, the former State Farm property as it is now rezoned could be a multi-unit housing facility for our elderly population or as a memory care facility. Has the city invited the interests behind facilities like Merrill Garden or Peace Village to consider DuPont? Make the best, not the worst, use of the available land!

And spreading residential growth throughout the city, instead of destroying the Old Fort Lake subarea green space, will serve the initial purpose of DuPont's founding--to promote pedestrian living. Also when DuPont was originally built, around 1996 or 1997, the developers, at the city's insistence, included Palisade Park as the low-income housing option. The two-story Palisade Park Condominiums thus set the standard for low-income housing in DuPont, consistent with the overall plan for the City. 12,000 person residential towers are not consistent with the plan and purposes for DuPont. Setting growth targets at 2,600 units of housing and NOT 5,000 units, is the best use for the OFL subarea and the city.

In sum, I oppose the developers' destructive proposal to build housing for up to 12,000 people in the Old Fort Lake subarea, and urge the planning commission members to limit housing development to 2,700 units of housing MAXIMUM, for the Old Fort Lake Subarea Plan.

Thank you,

Kate Walsh

2180 Palisade Boulevard

DuPont WA 98327

## Barbara Kincaid

---

**From:** Judy Norris <piebaldsatil@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 5, 2024 8:35 PM  
**To:** Barbara Kincaid  
**Subject:** Old Fort Lake Density

Good evening, Director Kincaid

I watched the February Special Planning Commission Meeting, and I thank you and the commission for all the work you have done so far on the subarea plan.

According to the concept map, developers could build between 2,672 units of housing to 4,880 units of housing. If a max of 4,880 units were built, that could mean that 12,200 people would live in the Old Fort Lake area. Guidelines are for approximately 2.5 people per dwelling.

DuPont's current population is only approximately 10,500 people spread throughout all of DuPont's village, and Madrona. Maxing the density would more than **DOUBLE** the size of DuPont in this one area. The state mandates that by 2044 we need to add approximately 5,000 people to DuPont, not just the Old Fort Lake Area.

Why would we consider adding so many people into this one area?

There is other land in DuPont to be developed. The former State Farm property was rezoned, thanks to input from the citizens, to allow for single-family, middle housing, and multi-family housing. Also, the Manchester Place property on Center Drive is vacant and could be rezoned to allow for housing. In addition, we have a residential reserve in the future Sequalitchew Creek Village.

Why overcrowd this beautiful piece of property, creating a traffic nightmare for all citizens as well as burdens on our public services?

I'm thankful that many planning commissioners addressed the same concerns I have.

Again, thank you for the hard work all of you are doing on the subarea plan.

Judy Norris  
DuPont, WA

--  
**"Be well, be love, be loved"**

# Albatross Estates, LLC

17837 - 1st Avenue SE  
Normandy Park, WA 98148

December 10, 2024

Barb Kincaid, Public Services Director  
1700 Civic Drive  
DuPont, WA 98327

**Re: Property Owner Responses to 11/13/2024 Public Hearing Comments &  
November 25th Planning Commission Meeting Discussion**

Steilacoom Historical School District

The District's written comment requests relief from certain design standards specific to the school site, which the property owner does not object to. During the November 13, 2024, public hearing, Comm. Schou also asked about the school mitigation site and the extent to which the property owner's agreement with the District needs to be finalized prior to approval of the subarea plan. Staff's response indicated that a change to the site could be accommodated through later amendment if necessary.

The draft OFLSAP identifies a 10-acre potential school site with CIV zoning designation along the western boundary of the property. However, the property owner is actively negotiating a school mitigation agreement with the District to provide a ten-acre school site on the eastern boundary, adjacent to Pioneer Middle School. There are a number of reasons why this alternate location is preferable to both the property owner and to the District. The alternate location is also preferable to the operators of the Home Course, who expressed concerns at the public hearing about noise and liability which could arise from the proposed school location.

In order to avoid the need to later amend the plan to address this issue, the property owner requests that the Planning Commission consider amending the draft to swap the 10 acres of CIV zoned property on the western boundary for 10 acres of MH zoned property on the eastern boundary closest to Pioneer Middle School. The area immediately adjacent to the current proposed school site is already proposed to be zoned MH, and the area to be removed from MH and replaced with CIV would be accessed easily from the main street and located adjacent to planned parks and open space.

While the property owner understands that the DEIS has been published, the change in school location would not alter any overall plan boundaries, nor would it change the overall acreage of the MH or CIV zoning designations from what was analyzed in the draft. The change in location would not result in any overall increase in traffic, and it appears that any changes to trip distribution could be addressed with a limited supplemental analysis published by the FEIS. The property owner noted the need for potential change in school

location in its comments on the DEIS and requested any additional analysis be completed and published with the FEIS to allow City Council to consider the alternate location being discussed in negotiations with the District.

#### DuPont Historical Society

A representative of the DuPont Historical Society testified at the public hearing about the many years of planning which had gone into developing a vision of DuPont as a tourist destination because of the City's unique history. The property owner supports this vision of DuPont and believes that the future commercial/retail development envisioned by the plan, which is expected to include a new boutique-style hotel along the bluff, will help attract visitors to DuPont's historic sites as well as to the Home Course. To facilitate this future hotel development, the property owner specifically supports the draft dimensional regulations in DMC Table 25.58.060.A which would allow hotels up to 50 feet in height.

The Historical Society also submitted written comments requesting that road improvements and utilities be stubbed to the 1833 Fort Nisqually parcel boundary, and that the plan address providing access to the 1833 Fort Nisqually site and the Wilkes Observatory historic site. These requests were repeated during the public hearing.

As noted during the November 13 staff presentation, both Fort Nisqually and the Wilkes Observatory are publicly owned, and future improvements to the sites, such as access and accessible parking, will be dependent upon City funding. The draft also reflects that public access to the 1833 Fort Nisqually site would also require coordination with the Home Course (Goal CR 3.2). However, the property owner would not object to adding a goal and corresponding development regulation requiring development of streets on property adjacent to these sites to plan for future road connections to serve planned or existing access to Fort Nisqually and the Wilkes Observatory, including the stubbing of necessary utilities to the relevant property boundary.

#### Multi Family Building Sizes/Densities

Several local residents provided written comments expressing concern over the size and scale of future multi-family buildings. The property owner strongly supports the proposed draft development regulations which would allow multi-family residential buildings which are no taller than 50 feet and have no more than 200 units per building (DMC 25.58.030(3)).

At the November 25, 2024, Planning Commission meeting, recommended changes were discussed which would limit multifamily density to 20/du acre, no more than 150 units/building, and reduce building height to 45 feet allowing no more than three stories. The property owner strongly urges the Planning Commission to reconsider these recommendations to allow no less than what has already been permitted elsewhere in the City, such as at the Affinity Senior Housing project – that is, a maximum of 170 units/building with 4-5 stories and no less than 50' in height. This approach represents a reduction from the draft while providing the type of flexibility needed to ensure future development envisioned by the plan can be feasibly accomplished given the significant investment in infrastructure improvements and environmental remediation needed to support any development in the plan area.

To the extent there are concerns about the relative size and scale of multi-family buildings, the draft development regulations include a range of design standards regulating the size and scale of multi-family structures, including, but not limited to, Block Frontage, Landscaping, Setbacks (including light/air privacy standards for multifamily residential buildings along interior side and rear property lines), and Building Design (including variety, articulation, and facades). These standards will result in thoughtfully designed future multi-family projects which will be at a size and scale which is appropriate within the overall Old Fort Lake Subarea.

### Overall Density/Impacts

During the public hearing, several local residents also expressed concern about the maximum overall density which could be accommodated within the subarea, largely due to expected increases in traffic. Regarding traffic, as the property owner's traffic engineer Jeff Schramm pointed out during his testimony at the public hearing the DEIS traffic analysis shows that the traffic impacts and required mitigation are the same with the proposed new zoning density with the subarea plan as they are for the existing zoning (see summary excerpt below):

#### **1.6.4 Impacts - Proposed Subarea Plan and Zoning Amendments**

Trip Generation from projected uses allowed by existing zoning and judged to be probable uses that may develop on the site (see land use analysis) results in 47,062 daily trips, 3,152 AM peak hour trips, and 4,232 PM peak hour trips added to the system. This represents a 25 percent increase in daily trips compared to the existing zoning, but only a four percent increase in AM peak hour trips and a 15 percent increase in PM peak hour trips. This results in eight intersections decreasing in LOS function during at least one of the peak hours, exactly the same impacts as for existing zoning.

#### **1.6.5 Mitigation - Proposed Subarea Plan and Zoning Amendments**

Mitigation to bring intersections operating at worse than LOS D to that standard would be the same as for existing zoning, above.

During the November 25 Planning Commission meeting, recommendations were discussed that would limit total density within the subarea to 3,120 units. The property owner believes that to be a workable number for purposes of future development provided that the size/scale of multi-family buildings are not unduly restricted (see prior comment). However, based on review by our planning consultants, the developable areas shown in the plan materials appear to be significantly more than what was considered developable in the past, based on road layouts and right-of-way widths, not even taking into account setbacks, utility easements, landscape buffers, and other logistical items. Indeed, based upon comparison of the draft plan analysis to prior plat layouts done for the property, the property owner believes that the overall developable area in the plan and corresponding density is overestimated by 10-15%. Given that, assuming a reduced total density from the maximum analyzed in the DEIS as recommended by the Planning Commission is prudent.

### Middle Housing

The property owner supports the Planning Commission recommendation for middle housing discussed at the November 25 meeting – specifically, allowing all of the middle housing types, up to six units per lot, with density at 10 du/acre and an 1,880-unit cap. This approach – when development occurs as part of a unit lot subdivision – would allow development consistent with existing middle housing stock in DuPont described in the staff presentation, such as Clocktower and Heath Court. However, the presentation materials show that without segregation of the units, however, the 10 du/acre density proposed for middle housing would represent a reduction from the current 18.4 du/acre allowed at Clocktower.

#### Single Family

The property owner also supports the Planning Commission recommendation for single-family housing discussed at the November 25 meeting, which would allow (but not require) 2 units/lot with a minimum lot size of 6,000 SF and minimum density of 4 du/acre. The property owner notes, however, that given the location of the property adjacent to the Home Course and the expected development of some portion of the property with premium view lots along the bluff area, development at the maximum possible permitted SF density of 560 (2 units per lot) appears unlikely.

**From:** [BRYAN BRIGHT](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Cc:** [piebaldsatil@gmail.com](#); [Mike Winkler](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, December 16, 2024 2:41:22 PM

---

J. Howald,

Due to work and family obligations, I am not able to attend the 16 Dec 2024 Planning Commission meeting to provide my comments in person. Please, convey my comments to the commission, thank you.

To: DuPont Planning Commission

I am baffled at why the commission is entertaining any proposal that is doubles the density required by the state. I do not see any advantage for current and future DuPont residents. Lowering the middle housing level to four units per lot is still double the state mandate. Impacts on parking and traffic will be significant and likely exceed current and future infrastructure capacity. This type of density will also quickly overwhelm the capacity of emergency services (it is my understanding that the DuPont Police Department is woefully understaffed) and the school district. The current multi-family code is sufficient to meet state mandates, blends with the current aesthetic, and does not need to be modified. If these are to be market rate units, it is my understanding that the currently available units are not occupied at capacity. Why the need to provide additional units? If these are to be below market rate or subsidized units, how will these additional residents be serviced without public transportation or a nearby grocery store?

I see no reason to consider any proposal that goes beyond the increase housing requirements that is mandated by the state. This type of additional density was not part of the concept of the Northwest Landing development, or the reason that people chose to live and raise families here. Any additional density beyond state requirements is unnecessary, provides no benefit to the current residents of DuPont, and is the antithesis as to why families, like mine, started moving here over 20 years ago.

Thank you,

Bryan and Leslie Bright

**From:** [karenkonrad@aol.com](mailto:karenkonrad@aol.com)  
**To:** [Janet Howard](mailto:Janet.Howard@ci.denton.tx.us)  
**Subject:** Comments for the 12/16/24 OFL Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, December 16, 2024 4:38:16 PM

---

## 12/11/24

Hi Ms. Howard

My comments for tonight's OFL Discussion are outlined below.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->[Reduce proposed density to from 6 to 5 units per lot.](#)

This will help balance traffic and is still double the required state mandate.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->[Reduce multifamily buildings from 4 stories with 200 units to 3 stories with 150 units.](#) As a result, Dupont's existing aesthetic. Existing apartments like Clocktower Village, The Trax, and Creekside Apartments all blend seamlessly into the Northwest Landing area. Why not stick to the current multifamily code?

Current code for multifamily housing in Northwest Landing(DMC 25.20.050):

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->[Multifamily projects cannot exceed 120 units.](#)

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->[Larger projects \(80+ units\) must be at least 250 feet apart.](#)

The 200-unit, 4-story buildings are designed for an urban with mass transit. The Old Fort Lake's building site is not an urban area without mass transit.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]--> [Impact on DuPont's sense of community.](#)

These large buildings would disrupt the density balance of well a planned community and one that does not support city infrastructures, resources, and livability. For example:

The massive construction is completely disconnected with Dupont's architectural theme. It will stick out like a sore thumb.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->[Environmental impact:](#)

Massive building structures will reduce the surrounding land's ability to absorb rainwater, leading to drainage issues and pollution from run-off.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]--> **Blocked views:**  
These large multifamily units will block natural views, further changing the character of DuPont. These are important factors in non-compliance to the city planning and future development.

Sincerely,

Karen Konrad

2361 McDonald Ave

253-912-4764

[karenkonrad@aol.com](mailto:karenkonrad@aol.com)

**From:** [Kate Walsh](#)  
**To:** [Kate Walsh](#); [Janet Howald](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Before I press send, does this read okay to you? The last meeting and this meeting both concern the same OFL development, right?  
**Date:** Monday, December 16, 2024 11:53:18 AM

---

Dear Ms. Howland,

The Planning Commission is meeting to consider the proposed Old Fort Lake Development. At the last meeting I attended, the daughter of the developer, who doesn't live in DuPont and whose qualifications regarding development issues were not clear, spoke, as did an employee of the developer who lived in Steilacoom and not in DuPont. Another developer employee, who groused about having to drive down from Bellevue and doesn't live in DuPont, also advocated for the developer's plan. By hearsay, we learned that the developer considers the proposed residential towers a "legacy," like this project was some kind of charitable endeavor.

But the proposed development of Old Fort Lake is no philanthropic or charitable project. It's the disregard of founding DuPont comprehensive plan values and is being pursued for the hundreds of thousands of dollars of profit it will generate for the corporate developer. And that's okay: that's what corporations exist for, whether selling insurance or buildings: generating profit for shareholders.

But the Commission must not cater blindly to corporate developers that want to destroy DuPont. It must also listen to the people who live in DuPont. Who pay taxes in DuPont. Who elect the officials and pay the employees of the City. Who recognize and follow the original vision and values, and the and currently established comprehensive plan for DuPont (with which plan I know the commission are very familiar) and the law, chapter 25.20.050, of the DMC of DuPont.

The developer proposes middle housing density of six units per lot density, with **one** off-street parking lot for every **four** living spaces. This won't work. The Commission should reduce middle housing density at least to four units per lot. And the commission should reduce multi family buildings from four stories with 200 units to 3 stories with 150 units, or consistent with DuPont law, which states that multi family units "shall not"--mandatory language--exceed 120 units, 3 stories with 120 units.

No one is above the law, corporations, as I'm sure the developer appreciates, are not above the law. The commission should reduce the proposed middle housing density the developer proposes to four units per lot and should reduce multi family buildings to 3 stories with 120 units. The 3 story 120 unit limit also is consistent with the other multi-apartment and condominium communities in DuPont: Clocktower Village, The Trax, Creekside Apartments, Palisade Park. This reduction in middle housing density and and multi family buildings would allow the developer to realize its "legacy" dream and e city to meet the state mandates for increasing housing and allow DuPont to continue to the the "hometown" it always has promised to be and has been for the last 25 years.

Thank you for your consideration. Please circulate this to all concerned members.

Kate Walsh



**From:** [ROBIN BARROW](#)  
**To:** [Janet Howald](#)  
**Subject:** Old Fort Lake Sub Area Plan  
**Date:** Saturday, December 14, 2024 6:46:45 PM

---

Janet,

I am sorry I can't be at the planning commission meeting on Monday the 16th. Please forward my comments to the planning commissioners.

I do have a few concerns that I hope the planning commission has an opportunity to discuss. First,

it involves the the Albatross EIS about moving the elementary school location.

If the location is changed to be placed near Pioneer Middle School then I would suggest the area that it moves from be zoned for Single Family. We need more single family homes. That would decrease the multi family units and allow for more single family homes similarly to the current city design.

Second, Co-living,

I just heard about co-living during the last council meeting.

The law states for multi family lots and lots zoned for mixed use that have 6 or more units they must also allow co-living housing.

Co-living is described as a structure with multiple bedrooms being rented with a shared kitchen and bathroom.

The law also states that with co-living housing a city cannot require more than .25 off Street parking per rented room. . With that said it means if you have a house renting out 4 bedrooms only one car will be off Street parking and the others will be on the street.

If we only allow 2-5 units per lot co-living will not be required.

This Co-living requirement has not been addressed to my knowledge with the planning commission. It can have major impacts on street congestion. We already have that problem within DuPont. We are not required to put all of our housing in Old Fort Lake. We still have other parcels that will add housing units and increase the density to the city.

Thank you to the commission for the long hard work on this very important project. I hope the members know how much their volunteer time is appreciated.

Robin Barrow  
DuPont Resident

I've attached a copy of screenshots from the RCW that I printed out for your review.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

**RCW 36.70A.535**

**Co-living housing.**

(1) Cities and counties planning under this chapter must allow co-living housing as a permitted use on any lot located within an urban growth area that allows at least six multifamily residential units, including on a lot zoned for mixed-use development.

(2) A city or county subject to the provisions of this section may not require co-living housing to:

(a) Contain room dimensional standards larger than that required by the state building code, including dwelling unit size, sleeping unit size, room area, and habitable space;

(b) Provide a mix of unit sizes or number of bedrooms; or

(c) Include other uses.

(3)(a) A city or county subject to the provisions of this section also may not require co-living housing to:

(i) Provide off-street parking within one-half mile walking distance of a major transit stop; or

(ii) Provide more than 0.25 off-street parking spaces per sleeping unit.

(b) The provisions of (a) of this subsection do not apply:

(i) If a city or county submits to the department an empirical study prepared by a credentialed transportation or land use planning expert that clearly demonstrates, and the department finds and certifies, that the application of the parking limitations of (a) of this subsection will be significantly less safe for vehicle drivers or passengers, pedestrians, or bicyclists than if the jurisdiction's parking requirements were applied to the same location. The department must develop guidance to assist cities and counties on items to include in the study; or

(ii) To portions of cities within a one-mile radius of a commercial airport in Washington with at least 9,000,000 annual enplanements.

(4) A city or county may not require through development regulations any standards for co-living housing that are more restrictive than those that are required for other types of multifamily residential uses in the same zone.

(5) A city or county may only require a review, notice, or public meeting for co-living housing that is required for other types of residential uses in the same location, unless otherwise required by state law including, but not limited to, shoreline regulations under chapter **90.58** RCW.

(6) A city or county may not exclude co-living housing from participating in affordable housing incentive programs under **RCW 36.70A.540**.

(7) A city or county may not treat a sleeping unit in co-living housing as more than one-quarter of a dwelling unit for purposes of calculating dwelling unit density.

(8) A city or county may not treat a sleeping unit in co-living housing as more than one-half of a dwelling unit for purposes of calculating fees for sewer connections, unless the city or county makes a finding, based on facts, that the connection fees should exceed the one-half threshold.

(9)(a) A city or county subject to the requirements of this section must adopt or amend by ordinance and incorporate into their development regulations, zoning regulations, and other official controls the requirements of this section to take effect no later than December 31, 2025.

(b) In any city or county that has not adopted or amended ordinances, regulations, or other official controls as required under this section, the requirements of this section supersede, preempt, and invalidate any conflicting local development regulations.

(10) Any action taken by a city or county to comply with the requirements of this section is not subject to legal challenge under this chapter or chapter **43.21C** RCW.

(11) For the purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(a) "Co-living housing" means a residential development with sleeping units that are independently rented and lockable and provide living and sleeping space, and residents share kitchen facilities with other sleeping units in the building. Local governments may use other names to refer to co-living housing including,

but not limited to, congregate living facilities, single room occupancy, rooming house, boarding house, lodging house, and residential suites.

(b) "Major transit stop" means:

(i) A stop on a high capacity transportation system funded or expanded under the provisions of chapter **81.104** RCW;

(ii) Commuter rail stops;

(iii) Stops on rail or fixed guideway systems, including transitways;

(iv) Stops on bus rapid transit routes or routes that run on high occupancy vehicle lanes; or

minutes for at least five hours during the peak hours of operation on weekdays.

[ 2024 c 180 s 2.]

## NOTES:

**Intent—Findings—2024 c 180:** "(1) The legislature makes the following findings:

(a) Washington state is experiencing a housing affordability crisis;

(b) Co-living housing is a type of housing that can provide rental homes affordable to people with moderate to low incomes without requiring any public funding, and rents in newly constructed, market-rate co-living housing in the Puget Sound region can be affordable to people with incomes as low as 50 percent of area median income;

(c) Co-living housing is a residential development with sleeping units that are independently rented and provide living and sleeping space, in which residents share kitchen facilities with residents of other units in the building;

(d) Co-living housing historically provided a healthy inventory of rental homes on the lowest rung of the private housing market, comprising up to 10 percent of housing in some cities;

(e) Starting in the mid-20th century, local governments began adopting restrictive zoning and other rules that increasingly prohibited co-living housing, or made it impractical to build or operate, and its numbers plummeted;

(f) Today, many cities and counties outright prohibit co-living housing on most of their residential land, or they enforce any number of restrictions that make it effectively impossible to build new co-living housing or to convert existing buildings into co-living housing;

(g) Co-living housing provides options for people who:

(i) Wish to lower their housing expenses by paying less for a smaller home;

(ii) Prefer a living arrangement with shared community spaces that facilitate social connections;

(iii) Wish to trade off location for space and, by living in a small home, also get to live in a high opportunity neighborhood they could not otherwise afford; or

(iv) Want a low-cost, more private alternative to having a roommate in a traditional rental;

(h) Many communities throughout Washington face a severe shortage of workforce housing, and co-living housing provides housing affordable to that income range and below, without public funding;

(i) Co-living housing reduces pressure on the limited amount of publicly funded affordable housing by providing housing that is affordable to lower income residents who might otherwise wait years for subsidized housing;

(j) Co-living housing works best for single-person households, but the housing for singles that it provides reduces demand for family-sized rentals from singles who would otherwise group together to rent large homes;

(k) Co-living housing provides a good option for seniors, especially those who want to downsize, or those who desire a living arrangement that is more social than a standard apartment. When located in walkable neighborhoods, co-living housing gives mobility options to seniors who can no longer drive;

(l) Co-living housing is well-suited for the conversion of office buildings to housing, because it typically requires less plumbing and fixtures for kitchens and bathrooms;

(m) Co-living housing is well-suited for very low-income people, supportive and recovery housing, and "housing first" homes for the formerly homeless;

(n) State building codes have established minimum sizes and other standards to ensure that co-living housing meets modern health and safety standards;

(o) Creating co-living housing near transit hubs, employment centers, and public amenities can help the state achieve its greenhouse gas reduction goals by increasing walkability, shortening household commutes, curtailing sprawl, and reducing the pressure to develop natural and working lands; and

(p) Co-living housing, because the units are small, is inherently more energy efficient than standard apartments, both saving residents money and reducing the state's energy demand.

(2) Therefore, the legislature intends to allow the creation of co-living housing as a means to address the need for additional affordable housing options for a diversity of Washington residents." [ 2024 c 180 s 1.]