

Nicole Gaudette

From: SC REAL ESTATE <sabinachang@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 3:50 PM
To: Evan Maxim
Subject: Comments on Tonights Agenda

The following was posted on next door app that I want the committee and all commissioners to please be aware of that another resident has highlighted:

This is link to agenda including diagrams and plans what SJCC, Herzel and FASP are trying to do. The commission is positioning it as isn't it great these community organizations are collaborating together to create a master plan that serves community and their needs and not trying to cause more traffic and construction than is necessary. Which is a smokescreen statement.

This last post from daniel Thompson on the thread I started on the nextdoor app sums up what we are up against

I am afraid the citizens and neighbors are correct on their concerns about this proposal. This post is to explain why the proposed development at the JCC/FAS site is inconsistent with the neighborhood and traffic patterns, and why the proposed comprehensive plan amendment is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

First I want to thank Jenni Mechem for posting on this subject. I have been trying to get more Planning Commission and council members to post on ND and become part of the discussion. As Jenni notes Wednesday is the first view of the JCC's proposed development and the comprehensive plan amendment, and this review of both is just the beginning.

Second, I cannot stress enough to the neighbors and citizens who have posted on this thread the importance of organizing your neighborhood and becoming very vocal with the PC and council. Begin an email group and begin to organize, and become public. Use social media. You will be surprised at how quickly it will expand if someone just starts it. No one else is going to do this for you. I would strongly urge this group to pool their resources and hire a land use attorney to advise you, and if you PM me I will give you some names of very good and aggressive land use attorneys. You don't have to just accept this because the city and a powerful developer tell you you do. I know that. I changed the entire residential, tree, and appeals and permitting ordinances along with a few other citizens. ND is your best friend, and council elections, and the city's and council desperation for a tax increase.

Third as a past critic of the PC I want to note what a good job this PC is doing in 2018 on a nearly impossible agenda/docket. From updating the critical areas ordinance to a new code enforcement ordinance to 14 proposed comprehensive plan amendments the PC's schedule has been punishing. Wednesday's agenda packet alone is nearly 100 pages of dense legalese. This is the first PC I have seen in some time that understands it represents the citizens and not the city, and that the DSG is just another interested party before the PC, and our city and DSG in the past have been huge proponents of increased development and density for the revenue.

Now I will address first the proposed development, and then the proposed comprehensive plan amendment.

Several posters have noted the obvious, the JCC would not need a code amendment and comprehensive plan amendment unless the proposed development did not fit within the existing code, and was consistent with historical uses of the property and the surrounding RESIDENTIAL neighborhood.

The scope of the proposed development is simply enormous, and basically is equivalent to placing a full sized middle school on the properties, without the public green spaces or fields. The development will occur in six stages, over many years.

First the FAS will build a much larger building across the street with underground parking, and the JCC will move the Jewish Day School from Bellevue to a new building onsite. Next a new synagogue will be built onsite. In the fifth stage a new, second JCC will be built with two pools and two gyms that dwarfs the current building. When the construction is done the total square footage will have more than doubled, several single family homes will have been purchased and demolished despite the goals in the comp. plan to preserve our single family homes and address lack of housing on MI, and most of the mature trees and green spaces, especially along 40th, will have been removed.

Despite the fact private community facilities in the neighborhoods are suppose to be rare and usually, like the Beach Club, contain large green undeveloped areas, when this proposed construction is done it will resemble an industrial park, not unlike the Costco development in Issaquah.

Not only that the traffic at this intersection is some of the worst on MI due to WSDOT ramp metering eastbound,

drive through commuter traffic, and just local traffic. I cannot imagine how a new traffic light exiting the JCC and FAS across the street won't be necessary at this location. Both my children attending preschool at the JCC and traffic and parking were terrible back then.

In my opinion this proposed development is completely inconsistent with our comprehensive plan and the surrounding residential neighborhoods, and begins a very slippery slope for every other private facility on the Island. It is inconceivable to me the DSG and city are proposing allowing single family homes to be demolished to expand a non-conforming private facility. I can only hope as this planning commission learns more it rejects this proposal.

Now let me turn to the wolf in sheep's clothing, the proposed comprehensive plan amendment that creates a "master plan" process for private facilities in our single family neighborhoods without any concurrent or accompanying development regulations that are usually mandatory whenever the comp. plan is amended.

There are two critical land use documents required by the growth management act: the comprehensive plan and the development regulations. The comprehensive plan is written in a manner that non-lawyers can understand, and requires citizen participation. Basically it sets out the goals and vision we want for our Island. Not surprisingly, single family neighborhood "character and consistency", green spaces, and trees are three of the most cherished goals. The comprehensive plan contains a land use map that designates every property, its allowed use, and its zone.

The development regulations are technical and written in legalese. The growth management act generally requires the comp. plan amendment and the development regulations to be adopted concurrently, or at the same time, and to be consistent with each other because cities and councils have a bad habit of promising citizens one thing in the comp. plan and doing something else in the development regulations because increased development results in increased development revenues for the city.

This disconnect is what we saw with our past residential neighborhood development I spent four years exposing and changing, and our town center. In both cases the city and council blatantly ignored the promises in the comprehensive plan for the development revenue, and now this residual citizen anger is why the city cannot get a tax increase passed. Unfortunately when our council decides to sell our neighborhoods and town center for the revenue (in secret of course) it permanently damages the

character and use of our Island, especially the neighborhoods.

The 2018 docket has an unusually large number of abusive comp. plan amendments that originated from the past council and Bruce Bassett, Dan Grausz and Debbie Bertlin, three huge proponents of increased town center and neighborhood density. Their desire is to promise and enact what sound like innocuous comp. plan amendments without concurrent development regulations, and then later to adopt arcane, difficult to understand development regulations and "code interpretations" that are directly contrary to the promises in the comp. plan amendments.

To be fair this PC has so far done a very good job of shooting down these abusive comp. plan amendments, such as giving the council unbridled discretion to waive any town center development regulation or to raise building height, or to increase maximum house size for "green building" which would have gutted our recent residential development reforms.

This proposed comprehensive plan amendment that will apply to every single "private facility" on MI, including future private facilities that currently don't exist, wasn't originally the desire of the JCC but the city's DSG, in part because without such an amendment the JCC's proposed plan is not feasible. What this comp. plan amendment is really about is allowing development on private facilities throughout the Island that would never be allowed under our current code, and to create new private facilities in our neighborhoods that will swallow up single family homes, mostly to allow industrial and commercial developments and multi-family housing.

The first concern about this proposed amendment is its scope. It will apply to any "contiguous properties", which basically is any two combined lots, and is a huge loophole.

Second the language is just dishonest. The agenda packet states:

"Community Facilities are most appropriately located in the general vicinity of existing facilities".

What "general vicinity" really means is new community facilities for any contiguous lots can be created where none exist now, swallowing up existing single family homes that are the bedrock upon which our comp. plan is based, along with the endless goal of some to upzone our neighborhoods to reduce minimum lots size and build

"affordable" housing by which they mean multi-family housing.

A third but very common ruse is the statement that MI will soon run out of its mandated housing allotment under the GMA, and must plan for more housing. This is how we ended up with five story developments in the TC. In fact MI has met its goals under the GMA through 2035, and some on the council know our housing goals were inflated by past councils and the DSG to support upzoning our town center, and now our neighborhoods. If MI's housing goals are increased it is likely the council will vote to sue to lower them, and win. But what really angers me is the dishonesty. Rather than just say the city and council want to put condo and apartment buildings and other multi-family housing in the neighborhoods the council knows the citizens would adamantly object to we get these endless legal gymnastics as though the DSG and council know better than the citizens.

What these master plans are are the mixed use "planned" developments one sees on the Sammamish Plateau that contain commercial enterprises and apartments and condos, essentially expanding our town center into our neighborhoods. The point of the master plan and new development regulations is to remove the more restrictive zoning and development restrictions on height, use, and density in the neighborhood zones to allow multi-use development in the neighborhoods. Otherwise the JCC would not need a new development regulation, and the DSG would not need a new comprehensive plan amendment applicable to the entire Island, would they?

Anyone who reads the agenda packet will see there are no concurrent development regulations accompanying any of the innocuous sounding goals and comprehensive plan language, just a lot of pretty promises. I have spent four years battling our DSG and city and council and past planning commission over their lack of oversight and abuse of our development codes and comprehensive plan, both in the neighborhoods which are our most cherished goal, and the TC, and if there is one thing I can tell you it is you don't want our DSG and the developers to have "wide latitude" to create "master plans" for private community facilities in the neighborhoods that every one of us knows will be done in secret, create special regulations for these planned facilities, and will begin to erode what we cherish about our most cherished part of the Island, our neighborhoods and single family homes that are under constant attack. Especially when the city

sees this development as revenue to a city claiming it is broke.

I raised these same concerns to the PC about the proposed comp. plan amendment to give the council the discretion to upzone our TC without any concurrent development regulations, and the proposal to allow maximum house size to increase 5% for "green building" which is an oxymoron since a larger house by definition is less green, and the PC recognized these wolves in sheep clothing and rejected them. There are still the arts council's proposals that don't have the teeth they did when proposed after the PC rejected the council's ability to upzone the TC, and one more Dan Grausz proposal on his last day to allow lots smaller than the zone's minimum in subdivisions to again create these "master planned" communities that have different development and zoning requirements than the surrounding neighborhoods..

Finally next November four council seats are up for election, and like every election before it the main issues will be residential and TC development, so join the fight. Organize, and become public. Otherwise you will get screwed, and you already can sense this proposed development and comp. plan amendment are not designed to protect your neighborhoods, you, or make where you live better. They are designed to SELL your neighborhoods. Unfortunately no one trusts our city or council when it comes to development, for damn good reason.