

From: [Ali Spietz](#)
To: [Robin Proebsting](#); [Evan Maxim](#)
Subject: Fwd: Sub19-002 Old Boys and Girls Club
Date: Wednesday, May 8, 2019 5:05:14 PM

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 8, 2019 4:41 PM
To: Robin Proebsting; Evan Maxim
Cc: Council
Subject: Re: Sub19-002 Old Boys and Girls Club

I was not sure if you received my email, here it is again, in case you did not.

On Wed, May 8, 2019 at 4:40 PM Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com> wrote:

Good afternoon. Would someone like to explain how the property got into the hands of the owner(s) in that from what I was told, the owners of the property got the School District to donate the land for PEAK, and the citizens donated the construction costs, **on the promise the old Boys and Girls Club would be converted to ball fields, and not developed.** Why didn't the owner nominate the Old Boys and Girls Club as a historical site? Was the plan to develop the site all along?

This needs to go before the City Council and be voted on to see who is in favor of this demolition of the Old Boys and Girls Club building and who is against it? If it is unanimous that the building should remain and be declared a historical building by the owner, then wouldn't the owner have to abide by their vote?

And did the Planning Commission not ask that the residential development for the Old Boys and Girls Club as part of the rewrite of the residential development code to rezone the Old Boys and Girls Club ball fields, because that was the promise?

Reviewing the "Plat Map" the lot sizes range from 8,400 square feet to 8,636 square feet. Homes in the subdivision, presuming the subdivision is approved, are subject to the 30 foot height limit.

And do you know if the permit for the subdivision is under the optional subdivision standard listed below?

"19.08.030 Design standards. drainage problems, the [city](#) engineer may require that a Washington registered civil engineer perform a geotechnical investigation of each [lot](#) in the [projts-of-way](#) shall comply with the rege proposed [subdivision](#) shall identify the location of [building pads](#) for each proposed [lot](#) per MICC [19.09.090](#). No cross-section dimension of a

designated [building pad](#) shall be less than 20 feet in width.

G. Optional Standards for [Development](#). In situations where designing a [subdivision](#) to the requirements of subsections A through F of this section would substantially hinder the permanent retention of [trees](#); interfere with the protection of [critical areas](#); preclude the provision of [parks](#), playgrounds, or other [noncommercial recreational areas](#) for neighborhood use and enjoyment; or negatively impact the physiographic features and/or existing [ground cover](#) of the subject area, the [applicant](#) may request that the project be evaluated under the following standards:

1. The use of the land in the [long subdivision](#) or [short subdivision](#) shall be one permitted in the zone in which the [long subdivision](#) or [short subdivision](#) is located.
2. The number of [lots](#) shall not exceed the number that would otherwise be permitted within the area being subdivided, excluding the [shorelands](#) part of any such [lot](#) and any part of such [lot](#) that is located in a [street](#).
3. An area suitable for a private or public open space [tract](#) shall be set aside for such use.
4. The [lots](#) may be of different areas, but the minimum [lot area](#), minimum [lot width](#), and minimum [lot depth](#) shall each be at least 75 percent of that otherwise required in the zone in which the [long subdivision](#) or [short subdivision](#) is located. In no case shall the [lot area](#) be less than 75 percent of that otherwise required in the zone. [Lot](#) size averaging must be incorporated if [lot width](#) or depth requirements are 75 percent of the minimum that would otherwise be required for the zone without utilizing the optional [development](#) standards. Any designated open space or recreational [tract](#) shall not be considered a [lot](#).
5. The ownership and use of any designated open space or recreational [tract](#), if private, shall be shared by all property owners within the [long subdivision](#) or [short subdivision](#). In addition, a right of entry shall be conveyed to the public to be exercised at the sole option of the [city](#) council if such area shall cease to be an open space or recreational [tract](#).
6. The open space or recreational [tract](#) must remain in its approved configuration and be maintained in accordance with approved plans. Any [deviation](#) from the foregoing conditions must receive expressed approval from the hearing examiner. (Ord. 17C-15 § 1 (Att. A); Ord. 08C-01 § 4; Ord. 99C-13 § 1).

"The applicant has previously applied for a permit to demolish the East Seattle School. The demolition also requires a SEPA review – the SEPA review is not complete and the demolition permit has not been issued."

I take it that you did not approve the demolition of the East Seattle School. That is a historic building and must be kept at all costs.

With regard to the 30ft high houses, that is too high. You are not clear, as to whether that includes appurtenances or not. Then, you mean, the houses can go up to 35ft high which is too high.

If the owner is going to include a "community open space," would that not then have to be deemed a "Community Zone?" And how large an area will the "community open space" be relative to the whole development? And what will the purpose of the community open space be? Will it be offering a place for people to play volleyball, or what?

If the Old Boys and Girls Club was kept, the parking in front of it, and the volleyball fields, how much space would that give the owner to develop the rest of the property behind the Old Boys and Girls Club? If each lot was between 8,400 sq ft and 8,636 sq ft?

Would someone like to give the detail as to how many car parking garages will be assigned per each house and where will the additional cars park and what would that be like for the neighbors? If there are 2 vehicles per property, that is now 28 vehicles being brought in from zero. And what happened with the subdivision next door, the houses were built with an area to put the trash and yard waste bins, but instead of the one homeowner putting his bins there, he is parking a car, and on the other side of the house, the homeowner is putting the bins there so when the neighbor (house in the middle) looks out, he is looking out at bins. That is not fair and it is not right. What is in the Code which prevents this kind of thing happening and will not allow it in the proposed development?

I would respectfully ask again that the Old Boys and Girls Club remain as is and be nominated as an historic building, as well as the parking in front and the fields, and that should the remainder be developed, the Applicant then applies for a subdivision of the back portion only so that we can see what he would be applying for? Sub-dividing a property into 14 property lots is too much and is going to cause a degrade in the area for the neighbors who live there and just does not offer anything for the "community".

At least, if the owner kept the front part - the Historic building, the volleyball field and the field, and the parking in front, that would show, in good faith, that the owner really does want to genuinely do something for the community.

I would like to know if the owner/developer is actually going to be living in one of the houses being built? If he is not going to be living in one of the proposed houses, then that means that he is in it for investment purposes only and that he is not in it for the good of the community. If he says that the development is for the good of the community, could he please explain how exactly, it is for the good of the community if he is

going to take the Old Boys and Girls Club building away, as well as the parking and the ballfields?

And the houses should not go higher than the height of the Old Boys and Girls Club and that the proposed properties behind should also not go higher than the Old Boys and Girls Club meaning that if I look at the Old Boys Club from across the road, I don't want to see houses that go up higher than what is currently there.

Which point would you be using as "the average" as there are two different levels, the level along West Mercer Way and the level on the roadway behind which is quite a few feet lower? Attached is a photograph showing you houses were built higher than the 30ft and the average went higher than the neighbors' properties. And I am trying to show you how, when you build houses which just have 15ft between them, it is just too close together and ends up looking like one building mass. There needs to be more space between each property.

Is there a reason why the owner does not want to keep the Old Boys and Girls Club, the parking in front and the volley ball field? I mean, he will make some profit will he not even if he just developed one section (the back part)? I did see quite a lot people going to the Old Boys and Girls Club site on Sunday afternoon which shows, it is being used and you will see children playing volleyball. It is nice that whatever is going on there, the community have the owner(s) to thank. I would very much like to make sure that the owner should he opt to retain the Old Boys and Girls Club and fields that he be recognized by the City.

Thanks for your consideration and please thank the owner(s) for taking into consideration the historical value of the Old Boys and Girls Club.

Sarah Fletcher