

From: [Sarah Fletcher](#)
To: [Parks & Rec Commission](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Jeff Thomas](#)
Cc: [Meg Lippert](#); [Ira Appleman](#)
Subject: Parks and Planning Commission Meeting tomorrow night
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:00:32 PM

All I can say is that every single thing that we DID NOT WANT IN OUR PARKS, the City staff and city manager managed to SOMEHOW put in the draft. It is actually quite unbelievable. We didn't even ask for her to create a parks zone. Who came up with that idea?

Here is my version:

No different Recreational uses to what is there.

No more Recreational facilities.

No Agricultural activities for educational or recreational purposes, such as community gardens.

No toxic herbicides in our parks or on the ballfields

No Government offices and government services. No Public parking, parking structures, and underground parking.

No more than what we already have: Temporary uses and structures, including farmer's markets and special events, authorized by the City Manager or designee. Perhaps on a case-by-case permit basis.

No Transit stops.. Buses can drop people off and pick people up from the rights of way and it is common sense. There are buses which drop people off in the parks, you don't need a code on that.

No Public art.

Signs (remove this altogether)

No Wireless communications facilities. No Utilities. Utilities must be placed underground whenever feasible.

No commercialization of our parks.

No housing apart from the one house in Luther Burbank Park, no affordable housing, no using the current impervious surface and amending it so that someone can use the impermevious surface square footage and instead, use it to allow a house or multifamily to be built in any park.

No more lighting. People shouldn't be in the parks after dark and they need to think of the wildlife.

And I am sorry, putting the police in Luther Burbank Park was a terrible idea. They have ruined a whole grassy area, not to mention they shouldn't be speeding in a park getting to an incident. I don't know if they want to put a building in the park to accommodate police to operate out of on a permanent basis is a terrible idea.

And this business of impervious surface, you don't even know all the impervious surfaces in each park. How about you document each impervious surface so that there are no surprises so let's say, after the fact,

they come up with an impervious surface we were not told about, it does not count. like the Yeshiva fiasco.

And I am sorry, the City manager should not be involved in this. She doesn't know the first thing about protecting parks. Until she takes every single suggestion out of the draft, I am not supporting her.

And another thing, after that O'Brien business, all the history went in one fowl swoop. The historical buildings in Luther Burbank Park and the old cow milking station need to be put in the Historical Register and not be allowed to be torn down. Our city staff are intent on tearing down anything that they deem to be old and past its useful life. There are buildings in Europe which have lasted for centuries, yet our old buildings can't be saved. It is ridiculous. As she wants to take the blame, then you might want to ask her how come she didn't even realize that the thrift shop was not even in the park, and did she not notice that The Aubrey Davis Park and The Greta Hatchett Park were deemed "open space on the map yet she did not bother correcting it?

And there should be no government building in the park by Tully's. I don't care about Tully's and that should never have been allowed to have a 5-storey building built on it, government or otherwise. I have simplified the language for the code above.

And who cares about what the zone is neighboring the parks. To make it simple you just make it that regardless of what zone is neighboring the park zone, no buildings are allowed and certainly not 35ft tall buildings.

And why didn't you think to contact the MI Save Mercer Island Parks Group ? It is like she didn't want them to know about her proposal.

If you just don't allow development, you won't have to bother with height, lot coverage or impervious surface limits, gross floor area of buildings to lot area ratio, setbacks, etc.). I don't know how you all have time for this. It should either be shelved completely or add the word "no" before all of Jessi's suggestions in her draft.

Thanks.

Sarah Fletcher