

## Stephanie Keyser

---

**From:** laurelpr@seanet.com  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 4:12 PM  
**To:** 'David Yee'  
**Cc:** Stephanie Keyser  
**Subject:** RE: building height

Dear Dr. Yee,

Thank you for your input. Ms. Keyser will circulate it to the entire Commission.

Just a remark regarding correspondence in the future...I know that I have told you that you are welcome to email me, and we appreciate hearing from you. Going forward, please send any messages that you intend for the entire Commission directly to Ms. Keyser. She will forward your message to all Commissioners. An independent email that includes a quorum could be perceived as a meeting, but the necessary public notification of a meeting has not taken place. So this is a matter of transparency. We cannot conduct substantive discussions via email.

I hope you understand and I do not in any way intend to discourage your input. Thank you again for your message.

Best,  
Laurel

-----Original Message-----

**From:** David Yee <davidyee2006@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 2:02 PM  
**To:** laurelpr@seanet.com  
**Cc:** del@davidlangworthy.com; mark@nelsonarchitecture.net; laurabustamante60@gmail.com  
**Subject:** building height

Dear Chair and Commissioner Preston, Vice Chair and Commissioner Schubring, Commissioner Nelson, Commissioner Hsu, Commissioner Raskin, Commissioner Bustamente, and Commissioner Langworthy:

During a recent city council meeting, Commissioner Preston reported to the city council about the Planning Commission's work on building height. She noted that there was little public input and that she sought such public input. I am writing to comply with that request.

My observations by having an addition built for my house and by reading the proposal are:

1. The proposed code is overly complex. This increases costs to Medina residents. More than one architect has remarked to me that projects in Medina are costly because of many incremental costs associated with compliance. Increased costs harm Medina residents. One architect mentioned that he did not like to design projects in Medina because of the overly complex and legalistic requirements.
2. Overly restrictive and bureaucratic requirements generally do not benefit Medina residents. The larger lots and low density makes it possible to have a varied view, be it of the yard, trees, street, lake (in some cases), and other houses.

3. A sloped property already presents design challenges so additional challenges added by the city creates additional headaches and problems.
4. Land is not 2 dimensional unlike paper drawings. Land elevation varies not only along the length of the house but also the width and all the area within these lines.
5. Most of the time, it is trees, not houses, that block views. I say this as an offender, not a victim, as the many tall trees on my property block others' views.

I would find it acceptable if the maximum building height is measured by the highest point of the original grade where there will be a building. Any other parts of the building may equal this elevation as long as the difference between that maximum elevation and the excess over the maximum building height is less than or equal to one floor or 15 feet, whichever is lower. As floors are level, the undulations of the ground elevation are not replicated in the floor.

As an example, if the elevation of a property is between 5 ft. above sea level and 50 ft. above sea level, the height limitation would be 28 ft. (78 ft. above sea level,  $50+28=78$ ) if the house is built where the land is 50 ft. above sea level. All other parts of the house could be at 78 ft. above sea level IF that area of the house was no more than 43 ft. ( $28 + 15$ ) above original grade or one floor higher than 28 ft., whichever was lower.

I am copying the other planning commission members whom I have an e-mail address for. I do not have all of them.

Best regards,  
David  
David Yee, MD  
3215 Evergreen Point Road