

| SEPA COMPLIANCE  |  |
|--|--|
| Exempt D5 (E15 required) Draft E15 leaund Finel E15 leaund DMS w/15 day comment period MM15 upsted DMS w/15 day comment period DMS (Finel) |  |
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY  |  |

| F       | OR OF  | FICE US        | E ONLY   | _             |   |
|---------|--------|----------------|----------|---------------|---|
| E ! 1 - | No     | M. T 1/-       | 89-0     | 3             |   |
| Filir   | g Fee  | Receip         | t 4450°  | <u>=</u> 437! | 5 |
| Date    | Receiv | ved <u>3</u> : | -16-89 - |               |   |
| Area    | Map _  | 13-1           |          |               |   |

## CITY OF MERCER ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FORM

| ••••••••   |   |
|--|---|
|  |   |
| Name of Property Owner Helene Bender   |   |
| Mailing Address: 2765 60th S.E.  |   |
| Daytime Phone: 232 4600  |   |
| Property Owner's Representative: Property owner  |   |
| Mailing Address: Same  |   |
| Daytime Phone:   |   |
| Location of Proposal: (Street Address) 2765 60th Ave. S.E.   |   |
| Tax Account No.: 217450 2870   |   |
| Property Size (Square Feet): 15,600 Sq. Ft.  |   |
| Brief Summary of Request: A variance to allow creation of 2 lots   |   |
| one of 8400 Sq. Ft. and one of 7200 Sq. Ft.  |   |
|  |   |
| AFFIDAVIT  |   |
| STATE OF WASHINGTON: )   |   |
| )SS<br>COUNTY OF KING )  |   |
| HELENE G. BENDER, being duly sworn, depose and say that  |   |
| we are the owner_ of the property involved in this application and that the foregoing statements and answers herein contained and the information herewith submitted are in all respects true and correct to the best of our knowledge and belief. |   |
| Golenny Binder  (Owner)  |   |
| Subscribed and sworn to before me this Luthday of March 1907   |   |
| Notary Public in and for   |   |
| OF MASSING   |   |
| of WASHINGTON the State of Washington residing at FONDING.   | _ |

MAR 1 6 1989

## CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF A ZONING VARIANCE (ZONING CODE, SECTION 19.04.1404(B))

Your answers to the following questions will be used in the decision on your application. Please respond fully to all of the following questions (attach extra sheets, if necessary). It is the applicant's responsibility to show the Hearing Examiner that all four of the variance criteria are satisfied.

- Describe the special circumstances applicable to the lot or tract (e.g. size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, trees or vegetation, other physical conditions, installation of a solar energy system, or the orientation of a building for the purposes of providing solar access.
   A short plat was approved in 1960 for two lots. At that time, second class shorelands
  - A short plat was approved in 1960 for two lots. At that time, second class shorelands could be included in lot area. Since both lots remained under common ownership when city laws changed to exclude second class shorelands, the city will not recognize the validity of this short plat. The property itself has a house on the eastern portion and apx. 140 of rolling lawn between the house and lake. The lawn area is a logical
- 2. Explain why the variance would helther after the character of the neighborhood nor impair the use or development of adjacent property.
  - Other lots in the neighborhood have been divided into two (see attached map.) particularily to the east, 2 lots of 7,500 Sq.Ft. were created through the variance process; 2 more lots of 7,500 Sq.Ft.received variances on 61st; 4 lots of 8,400 Sq.Ft. were created to the north. Access from S.E. 28thSt. will not encroach on Calkins' Landing, and will be similar to the existing access to the Gai's on the south side of S.E.28th.
- 3. Explain why the variance would not be deterimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is situated.
  - Public use of Calkins Landing will not be affected. An additional house along the waterfront will actually continue the present development pattern established on a number of nearby lots. Both lots would be larger than many existing lots in the neighborhood (see attached map.).
- 4. Explain why the variance would not conflict with the general purposes and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

Two houses would not overcrowd the land-there is plenty of property for two houses; adequate light and air would still be available to Calkins Landing and surrounding properties.

RECEIVED

MAR 1 6 1989

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



