

**From:** Kurt Bulmer  
**To:** ["MONICA and MARK ROBBINS"; Lauren Anderson](#)  
**Cc:** ["McIntosh Janet & Dick"; "Miriam Bulmer"](#)  
**Subject:** RE: File Nos.: CA017-005, DEV17-009, ADU17-003, SHL17-007, SUB17-004--The Lady Bug Trust  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 30, 2017 12:32:01 PM

---

Dear Ms. Anderson:

We want to have a positive relationship with our new neighbors (we are the owners of the lot directly to the south of the property being developed), so do not want to seem unwelcoming, but we do have concerns regarding the development plans.

1. We leave to experts like Monica Robbins and the city engineers the appropriateness of the impervious surface variance, but if the owners are allowed to use the undeveloped lot closest to us as mitigation for a larger impervious surface area in the lot(s) being developed, it is important to make sure that some sort of restriction is put on the empty lot so that in the future it cannot be developed unless the area used for mitigation is left in place. We are concerned that the variance will be granted and that in the future, when the remaining lot is developed, a new request for an impervious surface variance will be granted, leaving the property with extensive impervious areas that will cause attendant runoff and pollution into the lake and onto our property.

2. We are concerned about the hillside variance and tree removal. We ask that the city be very careful in allowing any variance until it is quite sure that any changes to the hillside and any tree removal will not increase the chance of slides. All the recent wet weather, a large slide on a property several lots to the south of us, and a slide on West Mercer Way a short distance north that moved a utility pole downhill into the bike path have made us particularly aware of this ongoing issue in our area. In addition, because the only way to reach our property is via a path downhill from the street to the lake, and because the hillside on the neighboring property is contiguous with ours, any disruption that causes a slide will make us vulnerable to loss of access. We want the city engineers to know of our concern to make sure the issues of slides gets a full and complete review.

3. Granting changes in the size of any dock is also a concern, as this may allow very large boats to be moored, creating significant sightline issues from our property and others to the south.

Accommodating large boats may also require dredging, which disturbs the lakebed and causes all sorts of other environmental issues, such as damaging fish migration patterns, degrading habitat for fish and other aquatic life, and creating silt accretion or erosion. Also, these large boats can create larger prop wash turbulence, which raises the issue of damage to the lakebed and to neighboring bulkheads, as well as stirring up debris, which has the potential to cause problems for those of us directly down-lake from them. The current dock size limits are intended to prevent large boats from being moored in this part of the lake. This is a public policy we would like the city to enforce. Most of us along this shoreline have managed to make do with docks within the allocated size, and we think a variance for docks larger than the two already present is not necessary. Also, it is not clear to us from the plans if the southernmost dock of the two existing docks is on the property being developed or is on the lot that will be temporarily undeveloped. In any case, no additional docks on either of the two properties should be allowed.

Please list us as a Party of Interest.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Kurt and Miriam Bulmer  
3699 West Mercer Way  
Mercer Island, WA 98040

---

**From:** MONICA and MARK ROBBINS [mailto:4waterdawgs@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 30, 2017 10:33 AM  
**To:** Lauren Anderson  
**Cc:** McIntosh Janet & Dick; Kurt Bulmer; Miriam Bulmer  
**Subject:** File Nos.: CA017-005, DEV17-009, ADU17-003, SHL17-007, SUB17-004--The Lady Bug Trust

Hello, Lauren--

We have had a chance to do a review of the documents that you forwarded regarding the above noted project located to the north of our property. We have the following comments on this project.

1. We do not think that there is adequate justification offered to grant the Impervious Area Deviation. This is a very large property consisting of two lots that are being consolidated with the lot line consolidation request. The owner will have 36,598 sf of property on which to construct a very large dwelling unit with two garages and an ADU. The evidence that there is adequate area available for development is that there is an 8290 sf existing house (according to tax assessor records) plus garages (all of which are proposed to be demolished). The statement in the application by the "owner" (Michael E. Morgan, Trustee) that "The proposal seeks to build, where feasible, on areas of the site already disturbed by existing development (driveways and structures)." is contradicted by the site plan included in the application that shows the outline of the existing house with garages and paved areas is smaller in footprint than the proposed new residence with associated structures and paved areas and by the calculations in the application. According to the applicant's calculations, the existing impervious area is 28%, well below the normal code allowance. The calculations for the proposed project show 32% impervious area and the application requests 35% impervious area (the maximum allowable by code if an Impervious Area Deviation is granted by the City). There does not appear to be sufficient justification to grant a deviation from the maximum of 30% allowable by code, which was set for good reason. It appears that the only reason that the "owner" is requesting this deviation is to maximize the size of the mega house and associated structures (currently proposed at 12,581 sf!).
2. Consideration of the third lot of the parcel (southernmost) as justification for the Impervious Area Deviation should not be allowed. As proposed, the "owner" is proposing to consolidate only the northernmost two lots, preserving the third

(southernmost) lot for future development (more impervious area) and allowing for two rather than one dock on the property.

3. The significant construction activity associated with this project will undoubtedly involve significant traffic and parking impacts on West Mercer Way. We have seen months of significant traffic and parking congestion in this area on West Mercer Way associated with the construction of the large house located two properties north of this proposed residence over the last year. Neighbors and residents travelling south on West Mercer Way have expressed safety concerns about the long term safety of this construction traffic and parking, especially with the anticipated significant increase in West Mercer Way traffic associated with the impending closure of the SOV access to westbound I-90 from Island Crest Way. Mitigation such as bussing of workers from offsite should be required to alleviate these adverse impacts.
4. No details for the dock expansion are included in this application other than a general outline on the site plan showing a much larger dock with added covered boat moorage and a very long pier. We hope to have a chance to review the Substantial Development Permit referenced to determine the impacts of this additional significant aspect of the project.

Thank you for the City's consideration of these comments.

Monica Robbins, P.E. and Mark Robbins  
3817 W. Mercer Way  
Mercer Island, WA 98040

(206)232-5838



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