



March 27, 1979

TO: THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF MERCER ISLAND  
ATTENTION: ROBERT KEEVER, CHAIRMAN

- The Banks are not asking for a small variance of 1 or 2%, but a substantial variance of about 10% in both area and width from the R-12 classification. In effect, where the neighbors voted to support an R-15 classification, the Banks are attempting to establish a precedent to downgrade the neighborhood to almost an R-9 classification.
- This request for variance was previously opposed by her neighbors and is currently opposed by her neighbors. There are insignificant changes from the original variance request which has already been rejected by both the Planning Commission and the City Council.
- The purposes of the zoning codes are to protect the character and values of the neighborhood and not allow the individual to downgrade the area at the expense of his neighbors.
- Finally, Section 18.02 of the Zoning Code requires that all of the following circumstances must be found to apply before a variance can be granted.

"(a) That there are special circumstances applicable to the particular lot or tract, such as size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, trees or ground cover or other physical conditions;"

Answer: The Banks' request has failed to identify any material special circumstances.

TO: THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF MERCER ISLAND

"(b) The granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity and zone in which the property is situated;"

Answer: There are long, narrow lots in this area, and the addition of more houses to each piece of property lowers the livability of the area from the standpoint of family privacy, noise level and traffic levels.

"(c) The granting of the variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood, nor impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;"

Answer: Increasing the housing density always detracts from the character of the residential neighborhood by reducing adjacent property values and making the area less desirable to live in. If this were not true there would be no purpose to zoning codes with minimum areas.

"(d) The granting of the variance will not conflict with the general purposes and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan."

Answer: Adding more houses in a mature built-up neighborhood is in direct conflict with the Comprehensive Plan as well as the desires of the Island population as a whole, as evidenced by the overwhelming passage of the open spaces bond issue.

- The neighbors request that this variance be rejected.

March 27, 1979

TO: THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF MERCER ISLAND  
FROM: THE NEIGHBORS OF BLOCK 2 MCGILVRA'S ISLAND ADDITION  
SUBJECT: A. LAWRENCE BANKS' SECOND APPLICATION FOR ZONING VARIANCE

The neighbors listed below are against adoption of the A. L. Banks' petition for zoning variance.

<u>LOT NUMBER</u>	<u>NAME</u>
# 2 3 PARCELS	Marjorie H Moore; Violet R. Neal; Kenneth W Neal.
# 4 4 LOT No. 7	Margaret E. Gray - Conner Gray Erica A. Sundsten Betha Sundsten
1	Josephine M. Spickard
2 Parcels 3+4	Wynne D. Moore David Pallock Elinor Pallock

Mr.- Mrs. Kenneth W. Neel  
7414 North Mercer Way  
Mercer Island, Washington 98040  
February 19, 1979

Mr. Gerald M. Bacon, Director  
Dept. Community Development  
City of Mercer Island, Wash.

Re: Zone Variance - Banks

Dear Mr. Bacon:

We wish to register our continued objection to this zone variance. We still feel this would have an adverse effect on the feeling of the neighborhood.

It seems inconsistent with zoning management to try on one hand to secure open space on the island and on the other allow large nicely planted areas to be cut to bits and pieces.

Please do what you can. Thanks.

Very truly yours,

*Kenneth W. Neel*  
Kenneth W. Neel

vn

7410 N. Mercer Way  
Mercer Island, WA. 98040

February 20, 1979

Gerald M. Bacon  
Department of Community Development  
3505-88th Ave. S.E.  
Mercer Island, WA. 98040

Dear Mr. Bacon:

Since I will be unable to attend the hearing concerning the variance request by Mrs. A. L. Banks of North Mercer Way, I want to go on record as opposing it.

Though I appreciate her right to appeal, I am <sup>CONCERNED</sup> ~~certain~~ that the original Planning Commission Hearing and review by the City Council could not suffice as a complete and fair consideration of her request. Though the rezone up to R-15 does not apply to Mrs. Bank's request, I hope you will acknowledge this serious effort by the neighbors to preserve the character of this area. If this extensive variance is granted, there is no doubt that an appropriately designed house will follow - as we have become accustomed to on Mercer Island. However, it will be a major step in defeating the attempt to preserve this neighborhood and should be construed as an obvious step toward "down zoning" the area so that others could exploit their land asset for their families or personal gain.

If this variance is granted, I feel you must consider this a precedence and be prepared to deal with it consistently as you are confronted by similar requests from the rest of us. Do you really want this pattern to be a part of Mercer Island's comprehensive plan?

Sincerely,



Loyal D. Moore