

## Ryan Harriman

---

**From:** Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 16, 2023 6:56 PM  
**To:** Ryan Harriman  
**Cc:** Suzanne Skone; Dan Thompson; Mike or Susie Cero; Carv Zwingle; Thomas Acker; Council; Traci Granbois; Robert Medved; Jessi Bon  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comments SUB 19-002/Boys and Girls Club Long Subdivision

Thank you Daniel, I am 100% behind you on this. And will someone from the City please respond to me? I asked Andrew Leon whether the City is going to have the applicant correct the application form and all he tells me is: "You have been added as a party of record for this permit."

I am loathe to have to spend the \$850 on appealing this which is money I don't really have,. What happens if I don't file the appeal, does that mean the applicant will get the go ahead?

Will someone from the City please explain what the situation is.. Daniel has pointed out the issues, and I have emailed with regard to the statute of limitations, the mature trees which should not be removed and the fact that the applicant lied on the application form. Please let me know if I need to appeal or what? They have made no effort to retain the trees, the house heights are too high and out-of proportion with the other houses, I am concerned about all the bins which will have to be put out each week and I am concerned about the climate which I don't believe adding 14 houses is going to do anything to curb the carbon emissions.

Thank you.

Sarah Fletcher

On Thu, Mar 16, 2023 at 2:33 PM Dan Thompson <[danielphompson@hotmail.com](mailto:danielphompson@hotmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Ryan, I am a long-time resident of Mercer Island, and have been involved in this subdivision since the property was originally purchased from the Boys and Girls Club, a very unfortunate situation. The purchasers never honored their promise to build and provide ballfields for Island youth and the city never required a deed on the property despite the fact the Boys and Girls Club, city, and private citizens spent several million dollars to build Peak rather than buy this parcel for roughly the same price. Many citizens, and council members, felt deceived.

The last public meeting was pre-pandemic and held by Evan Maxim, former dir. of the DSG. The plans presented at the public meeting were a surprise to Evan in that the number of lots went from 13 to 14, there was no green space as in the original plans, and many of the houses had access directly to the surrounding streets that increased danger for pedestrians and kids on these fairly low volume streets from so many cars accessing or leaving their houses.

At that time Evan decided a SEPA application would be required to demolish the building. Although there were several options the DSG selected the option with virtually no mitigation for removal of the historic building.

Well before your time there was a high-profile long subdivision called Coval that raised several issues that are present in this application. The council rejected the long plat under state statute and local ordinances

applicable to long plats., finding permitting staff had done an inadequate job in requiring the necessary mitigation for a long plat.

I worry permitting staff are making the same mistake in this application since the plans appear to be identical to those Evan Maxim found unacceptable under our codes.

The two key concerns I have are:

A. There is no green space at all, despite the demolition of an historical building and removal of many mature trees. I believe some green space setaside should be required as in the original plans although it reduced the total number of lots from 14 to 13.

B. Ingress and egress should be by internal road for each house. The applicant no doubt does not like this since the internal road counts against lot area and lot coverage limits, but in my opinion the current plans are a danger to those walking or biking along adjacent streets. There is some internal access to some lots, but all access should be by an internal access road.

MICC 19.08 contains the local regulations applicable to a long plat (over four lots). [Chapter 19.08 - SUBDIVISIONS | City Code | Mercer Island, WA | Municode Library](#)

MICC 19.08.020(D)a-c state:

*Findings of fact.* All preliminary approvals or denials of long subdivisions or short subdivisions shall be accompanied by written findings of fact demonstrating that:

a.

The project does or does not make appropriate provisions for the public health, safety, and general welfare and for such open spaces, drainage ways, streets or roads, alleys, other public ways, transit stops, potable water supplies, sanitary wastes, parks and recreation, playgrounds, schools and schoolgrounds and all other relevant facts, including sidewalks and other planning features that assure safe walking conditions for students who only walk to and from school;

b.

The public use and interest will or will not be served by approval of the project; and

c.

The project does or does not conform to applicable zoning and land use regulations.

MICC 19.08.030(C) states:

C.

*Control of hazards.*

1.

Where the project may adversely impact the health, safety, and welfare of, or inflict expense or damage upon, residents or property owners within or adjoining the project, other members of the public, the state, the city, or other municipal corporations due to flooding, drainage problems, critical slopes, unstable soils, traffic access, public safety problems, or other causes, the city council in the case of a long subdivision, or the code official in the case of a short subdivision, shall require the applicant to adequately control such hazards or give adequate security for damages that may result from the project, or both.

MICC 19.08.030(D) states:

D.

*Streets, roads and rights-of-way.*

1.

The width and location of rights-of-way for major, secondary, and collector arterial streets shall be as set forth in the comprehensive arterial plan.

2.

Public rights-of-way shall comply with the requirements set out in MICC [19.09.030](#).

3.

Private access roads shall meet the criteria set out in MICC [19.09.040](#).

4.

Streets of the proposed subdivision shall connect with existing improved public streets, or with existing improved private access roads subject to easements of way in favor of the land to be subdivided.

My belief is the MICC requires the applicant to set aside an area equal to one lot for green space, and all access should be by internal roads. These are the same findings Evan Maxim made if you review his file, and were the findings of the council in the Coval long plat process.

Thank you.

**Daniel Thompson**  
**Thompson & Delay**

Attorneys at Law

80th Avenue Professional Building

2955 80th Ave SE, Suite 202

Mercer Island, WA 98040

Phone: (206) 622-0670

Fax: (206) 622-3965