

From: [Thomas Siedler](#)
To: [Kelly Bacon \(CD\)](#)
Subject: Carey Mini Storage - Siedler Comments
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 12:42:56 PM

Hello:

We are immediate adjacent property owners (Thomas & Claudine Siedler) on the West side of the proposed Carey Mini Storage (CU-20-00003). We are submitting written comments for the record and requesting written notification of any actions or decisions.

The following are our comments:

1. Impervious Surfaces – Applicant states that the project will cover 67,290 sf of the 130,680 sf site or 51%. I do not believe this is accurate given the proposed site plan submitted. The area of the Southern street easement needs to be excluded from the percentage and I believe the calculation itself is in error and understates the area covered. I would estimate the true impervious area coverage to be closer to 85%. This amount of coverage is inconsistent with the character of the area, may not meet code requirements and will cause drainage problems to our property, particularly during snow melt. Typically jurisdictions allow up to 60% coverage by impervious surfaces given an adequate drainage plan.
2. Water Drainage – The application does not contain an adequate water drainage plan which is described as “Sheet Flow with Spreader.” The native plant boundary on the East side of the property is only 20 feet which I am assuming is the filter area for the Sheet Flow. This amount is inadequate and should be 35 feet based on technical data I have reviewed. In addition it lies on the Uphill side of the property. We are downhill from the site to the West. No provision is shown for containing the water flows going to our property unless the whole site is regraded to divert water flows to the East which would be an expensive undertaking. In addition there is no filter area for the Sheet Flow on the South part of the site plan. An adequate drainage plan should be designed by a professionally certified drainage engineer.
3. Screening – As mentioned above this development is out of character with the adjacent land which is designated Rural Recreation. There is no mention in the application of screening of this commercial site from the adjacent recreational residential properties. This should be a requirement if the project is allowed to continue. I would recommend a 10 foot fence that is rustic in nature with visual barriers and consistent with the recreational setting. The applicant states that they will be leaving natural native vegetation as a boundary separator. It should be noted that vegetation is sparse and slow growing in the boundary 20 foot setback since this was at one time a pasture.
4. Density - The application indicates there will be 9 buildings on the site with the area between buildings paved. The height of the buildings is to be 25 feet. This is **extremely high** given the rural recreational nature of the area. There is also no need to build this to a height of 25 feet which is also out of context with the neighborhood given the large number of buildings proposed.

Please let me know if you have any questions on our comments. We would appreciate your response confirming receipt of our written comments. If you need to communicate with us directly I

would be happy to email you our telephone numbers but did not want them entered into the public record.

Best regards,

Thomas & Claudine Siedler

Owners – 250 Sunshine Ave. , Ronald WA

Mailing Address – 15009 SE 64th St, Bellevue, WA 98006