

Molly McGuire

From: Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 6, 2023 8:32 AM
To: Jessi Bon; Jeff Thomas
Cc: Thomas Acker; Dan Thompson; Planning Commission
Subject: Fwd: Comments to Public Notice of Application SHL23-044 Against it

Hello Jessi, I just do not for the life of me understand what is going on. There are four Notice of Public Applications which have gone up at Luther Burbank Park and each one is asking for a variance from our City Codes (for a City project). I believe it was tom who had brought up the state of the docks and that they were in need of repair, but I do not believe he or anyone would want it at the expense of breaking the Codes for the docks in all four instances. Will you please get down to what is going on and why the contractor cannot do the project within our City Codes? And if variances are required, wouldn't the City have to file official amendments to the Code? And if you, the City, are allowing Code variances, then you are opening the door to every single citizen, developer being able to have variances for their projects. What is good for the goose is good for the gander and if that is not the case, please explain why it is not?

I am sorry, Jessi, but will you please have a word with staff and tell them that allowing variances is just not permitted. Otherwsie, what is the point of having Codes if they can all be broken as is the case with what the City is proposing.

Please look at hiring another contractor if they can't build a dock within scope and within codes and if they can't, then just look at basic repair of the docks.

Thank you.

Sarah Fletcher

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 4, 2023 at 2:57 PM
Subject: Comments to Public Notice of Application SHL23-044 Against it
To: <molly.mcguire@mercerisland.gov>, <paul.west@mercerisland.gov>, <council@mercerisland.gov>, <alison.vangorp@mercerisland.gov>

Hello, for the life of me, I just do not know why for every single thing, you are asking for a variance. Something is just not right.

It has in the Notice of Public Application: "to allow the first set of piles at the proposed central and south docks to be **GREATER THAN 10 INCHES** IN DIAMETER AND THE REMAINING PILES TO BE GREATER THAN 12 INCHES IN DIAMETER," but there again, it specifically states in the MICC. 19.13.050(H)(7) "**The first in-water** (nearest the OHWM) set of pilings shall be steel, **ten inches in diameter or less**, and at least 18 feet from the OHWM. Piling sets beyond the first shall also be spaced at least 18 feet apart and **shall not be greater than 12 inches in diameter.**"

I just do not know why the contractor is not able to do the docks by what is in the MI City Code. Do you not understand that there is a reason why the Code states that the pilings shall not be greater than 12 inches in diameter?

And are the pilings going to be steel or what?

Do you think you should hire another contractor? Why did you choose this contractor?

Before this even got to the public, someone should have explained to the contractor that the Code has this and worked with the contractor to abide by what is in the Code othwise, why bother with a Code if you can allow it to be broken at every turn? The whole process at the City has to change because you are causing a lot of work for everybody when all of this could have just been nipped in the bud. What should have

happened was the contractor came to the City with a plan for everything to be within Code. You would not have had 3 emails from me as there would have been nothing to email you about as it would have all been within Code end of story.

Sarah Fletcher