

From: [marianne leslie](#)
To: [Deb Estrada](#)
Cc: [marianne leslie](#)
Subject: SUB19-002
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2024 9:00:33 PM

Below are my comments and concerns for consideration by the developer and the City. I know others who have submitted comments have knowledge and memories going way back to when Mr. O'Brian first purchased this property. There were promises made, agreements made, and many discussions back and forth. I do remember the public hearing that I attended in Dec 2019. It seemed then that the developer's representative was open to working with the neighborhood to minimize negative impacts to existing properties. After reviewing the 10 page plat drawings, I don't see any considerations to neighboring homes. That is painful. I am also disappointed that we cannot have in person hearings. I hope through these hearings there are changes and concessions that the developer will consider, and the City will enforce so we might get to "*can live with*" on all sides.

1. Appears that utilities will be underground, and I thank the owner/developer for doing that. The last thing Mercer Island needs is more power poles.
2. I did not see a drainage or sedimentation pond where water will be filtered prior to draining into storm drains and eventually emptying into to Lake Wash. Did I miss that? How does this fit with environmental issues and doing the right thing for the environment? Most all long plats in King County are now required to construct these drainage or sedimentation ponds. Why isn't Mercer Island aligned with that requirement, especially with a proposed development only two blocks from Lake Wash?
3. If there is a 30' max height on homes, including FP, railings or other structures, there should be no variance granted above this, AND when grading occurs, the 30' height limitation should be the lesser of existing grade or the regrade level. No fill to build up the lots should be allowed. This would further have a negative impact on existing views from neighboring properties.
4. Current plan shows 26 new trees are required by City, yet the plan shows an additional 37 trees will be planted around the perimeter. What viable reason is there to cut down existing mature evergreen trees? The City of MI has strict rules that prevent removal of many trees. What would make the City now allow these mature trees to be cut down?

The replacement trees proposed to be planted along SE 28th and West Mercer will grow taller than the homes at maturity. Some will grow 45-50' tall, unlike the heights reported on the developers plans. The notation on page 9 of the BlueLine

plans read “*Space planted to provide screening from adjacent built environment*”. The developer identifies to screen new homes from existing homes, and shows no regard for the negative impact tall trees will have on the neighboring properties, “...*adjacent built environment*”. If you want a buffer, then plant trees that will only grow 20-25’. You don’t need trees like Red Cedars that will grow to 45-50’ just to provide a buffer to a 30’ tall house.

In Dec 2019 at the “in person” hearing regarding this development, I personally asked Eric Hansen to please use dwarf trees and plantings that would not grow taller than the new homes. He acknowledged that was a reasonable request. Somehow, that consideration was either overlooked or never considered at all. I will ask again for dwarf trees and no plantings in or around this community that will be taller than the homes at maturity. The mature tree heights listed on the plat plans are not all correct. The City should also support this so those neighboring properties with existing views do not lose those views over time. That would devalue those property values. By limiting plant and tree height, it will preserve and protect current views from many neighboring properties, and provide buffers and greenery for the new community.

5. It appears that at least 6 street lights will be installed on the private driveway inside the development. In order to preserve night sky and city views from existing neighboring properties, the City should require lower 8’ or less poles with low lumens that only illuminate downward on the private driveway. Lighting that interferes with existing night sky views of many existing homes nearby should be prohibited.

6. It is not clear if the developer will be building the new homes, or if there will be other home builders, or CCRs for this development. Either way, ALL exterior lights on the new houses should be downlights only with low lumens. This will also help retain night views from many existing neighboring properties. I would hope the City would support this.

7. Flagpoles, other structures or new trees and shrubs on any of the lots must not extend more than the height of the houses.

8. Six of the proposed lots along 62nd Ave SE currently have driveway access from outside of the new community and along 62nd Ave. This makes no sense and will negatively affect those existing homes on 62nd Ave. Why are those driveways NOT required to be inside the community and accessed from the new private driveway? Where would guests, trades, repairmen, housekeepers, and vendors park when going to these 6 new homes. It is unconscionable and a grave

mistake to not require these 6 driveways to be inside the community with driveway access from the private driveway.

If the City allows these driveways to be outside of the community, then the City is not representing everybody equally who will be affected by this development, and doing a disservice to those existing families and homes along 62nd Ave.

9. Long plat development should include improving the infrastructure around the development. With the additional traffic from 14 homes, and for the safety of pedestrians, the developer should, at least, be required to install a paved walkway all around this new development.

10. I do recall discussions or promises of an open space area in the development and being available to all residents as public space. Im not seeing that on the current plans.

In closing, it puzzles me that our City is not requiring more from this developer for a proposed long plat just two blocks from Lake Washington. Further, the City is not doing enough to preserve and protect our environment and those existing properties with lake, city and mountain views. Many people in this neighborhood have lived here longer than me. I have lived here just over 25 years. With all the combined property taxes from people who have lived here 20, 30, 40+ years, shouldn't our city do more to preserve what we have been paying for? I would say, yes they should, but it feels like the City may not be supporting "their" supporters!

I will be out of town all day Jan 24, otherwise I would join the Zoom hearing. If the hearing continues to Thursday, Jan 25, please let me know as I would like to attend.

Thank you,
Marianne Leslie
2815 67th Ave SE

Marianne Leslie
206-399-0984

I do not always have access to emails. So if I do not respond in the time you want, please call.

Sent from my iPad. Sorry for any typos.