

PCB 26-08 EXHIBIT 4 – WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT INDEX

Commenter	Date
Sarah Fletcher	May 30, 2026
Joanne Greff and Patrick Baker	June 2, 2026
Adam Ragheb	June 2, 2026



CPA26-001 and ZTR26-001 Comments for Public Hearing

From Sarah Fletcher <fletchsa1@gmail.com>
Date Sat 5/30/2026 10:37 AM
To Adam Zack <adam.zack@mercerisland.gov>

I had emailed the council. See message below against where I live for example, not being included in the subarea, nor should the expensive multimillion dollar homes be included. And the Town Center itself cannot have more development because already the traffic is bad on 27th St, 28th St and at the intersection of 78th Ave SE and 27th St.

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

From: **Sarah Fletcher** <fletchsa1@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Mar 7, 2026 at 7:08 AM
Subject: Community Information Session via Zoom!
To: <jessi.bon@mercerisland.gov>, <dave.rosenbaum@mercerisland.gov>, Adam Zack <adam.zack@mercerisland.gov>, Jeff Thomas <jeff.thomas@mercerisland.gov>, <alison.vangorp@mercerisland.gov>, <council@mercerisland.gov>

My comments are as follows:

Re 1) Land Capacity Analysis:

Mercer Island has lost people, not gained and the trend is downwards. At our peak in 2020, we had 25,767, at last count in 2024 (not 2025), we were down to 25,282. I live by the Park and Ride and I know of 3 units in my building where no-one is living in them, and houses within a mile of the Transit Center are just lying empty - no-one living in them, no-one renting them, just empty. And Zillow has it that there are 151 rental properties for rent on Mercer Island currently.

And you need to ask the Growth Management Board, why are they not counting bedroom units, why are they only counting houses as "units" but the multifamily buildings in the Town Center, they are counting each bedroom as a "unit," so for example, the new Xing Hua, that will be adding 146 units of which only 11 are deemed affordable. So, if one had to add up all the bedroom units that have been added, you are going to find that Mercer Island has reached its goal. Please explain to the Growth Management Hearing Board that Mercer Island has reached their bedroom unit goals.

2. Adequate Provisions - adopt incentives that will increase the supply of affordable housing.

All you have to do is instead of making new multifamily developments offer 10% affordable housing, you make them offer 20% flat. And with regards to allowing more storeys in the Town Center, there is a problem with that and that is the roads around 27th St and 80th Ave SE are already at LOS C, adding anymore capacity in the Town Center will lead to a degrade and Evan Maxim told me that an LOS degrade, a development cannot be built if it leads to an LOS downgrade. And I noticed that there was some monitoring equipment up on Wed in and around the Town Center, but that was not representative of a regular day. Traffic was really light the day they had the equipment up so the study is going to be skewed which I suppose is what you wanted to show light traffic.

3) Sub-Area Station Plan

I live in the sub-area station plan. Our one building has water invasion problems because it was built on a wetland where Larry used to catch frogs, and it is built below grade, and we have had to install a sump pump. Now, you want to make it blanket that they can build six storeys, currently, it is 4 storeys, so how are you going to address the wetland issue and building a 6-storey on a wetland area, is that advisable? And we are going to be spending millions on new piping. That would be a waste of money if they were to then demolish the building after condo owners spent millions on the repiping.

Then, you have multi-million dollar homes on the waterfront within 1 mile of the Transit Centers. So, are you going to destroy those multi-million dollar neighborhood and make them allow sixplexes to go next door or across the road, and ruin a single family neighborhood to allow sixplexes? Why?

And there is a forested area parallel to North Mercer Way. You might want to get a stronger tree ordinance to protect trees because as things stand, you have no tree ordinance which would protect that forested area. And you have staff who are telling the applicant what to put down on the application form for development to get away with removing trees. So are they going to be allowed to remove trees for development?

And what you don't realize, if the land value itself around the Transit Centers is high before any buildings are added, how on earth do you expect the buildings to be cheap? It is impossible. They need to go to where there is open land like in Eastern Washington and build whatever they want to build, but not here on Mercer Island. How can you have affordable housing on land that is already higher and before any housing has been built? And that is going to cause a decrease in property values if

you allow sixplexes next door to where you live. Imagine how many people will be parking their cars, how many trash bins will be put out each week, the increase in traffic and for what? If the Growth Management counted bedrooms as housing units, then we would not need to add anymore. Please point this out and see what they say and ask them why they are not counting bedrooms for single family housing, but bedrooms for multifamily properties. So, if a house is being built which adds 5 bedrooms, then that should be 5 housing units, a bedroom being a unit, and if the one bedroom has two parents living in it, that is 5 bedrooms to accommodate 6 people.

And has anyone spoken to the fire marshall about the proposal to add sixplexes in the sub-area? You see, residential code has it that just 15 feet side yard setback, so if you think that someone can build a six plex with just 15ft between the property lines, for fire risk purposes, I doubt that is enough space.

And there is sloped property and at risk of landslide areas, do you think that is a good idea to allow six-plexes to at risk areas?

And then, the sub-area if you are going to allow six-plexes, can no longer be deemed "Single Family Land Use," but "Multi-Family Land Use. And you are going to have to change the whole "Single Family Land Use".

4. Anti-Displacement Measures. I am living in what used to be the lowest place to rent on the island only it is not. Since 2017, my rent has doubled from \$1,000 a month to \$2,000 a month, yet my salary has only increased by \$6 an hour, certainly not doubled and my rent now is half of my salary. And do you want to know why the rents have doubled? Well, I will tell you. It is the Legislature's fault for making condos have to have Reserve Studies done every 3 years. There are two Reserve Association companies who have the monopoly and who are using virtual assistants to come up with figures without doing an onsite visit. The property management and Boards are not doing the repiping since 2017 which is when it was supposed to be done. They keep making condo owners put more and more money into the Reserves, by law, and all that does it make it that by the time it takes to replace the pipes, the costs would have tripled or more than tripled. What is the point of just making condo owners put more and more money into Reservers but not do the essential repairs?

The Legislature allows that. You have a Budget Ratification meeting in which the Legislature makes it that 51% of the condo owners have to attend the budget ratification meeting or the budget passes. When you have foreigners who don't speak English and who don't live on the premises, it is very hard to get 51% so inevitably, the budget passes. The condo dues were raised by 28% in 2025, they tried for 33% but luckily managed to get that thwarted, but then they managed to get an

8.8% increase, so now for a two-bedroomed condo, the dues are over \$1,000 a month. It is not affordable. That is before the property taxes, insurance, mortgage and any other repairs that need doing. What should have been affordable is no longer affordable and I am at high risk of being displaced once I reach retirement age as my social security will not cover my rent here and I will have to move.

None of the measures proposed are going to help me, in fact, if our building has to be demolished and be allowed to be built to accommodate the Growth Hearing Board's request, where do you suggest I go where the rents are under \$1,500 a month which is what the rents were on Mercer Island until the multifamily buildings that got built around the Transit Centers came in. Why did the rents go up so high as a result of the multifamily buildings getting built around the Transit Centers when the council were told that they would not be high. The Legacy Chinn, now The Hadley even told them how much it would cost per month, but it is not what they told the council. They renegged.

Conclusion.

I suggest you go back to the Growth Management Board and Legislature, and tell them that you have added bedroom units to accommodate the growth, and ask the Legislature to change the WUCOIA law which is going to be the death knell for buildings built before 1980 in that they are trying to streamline the condo law, but it is not going to work, and to ask that instead of making this rezoning to accommodate growth around the Transit Centers, to make it for populations of more than 30,000 not 25,000 that they made it at our peak.

Sarah Fletcher



RE: 06/03/26 Special Hybrid Meeting / Public Hearing Mercer Island Rezoning Comments - Displacement

From Deb Estrada <Deborah.Estrada@mercerisland.gov>
Date Wed 6/3/2026 9:23 AM
To jogreff20@comcast.net <jogreff20@comcast.net>
Cc Patrick Baker <pbaker8403@gmail.com>; City Clerk <cityclerk@mercerisland.gov>; Alison Van Gorp <alison.vangorp@mercergov.org>; Adam Zack <adam.zack@mercerisland.gov>

Good morning – please confirm if you intend to speak in person or via Zoom. I am referring your public comments to the staff assigned to this project, Alison Van Gorp and Adam Zack.

Join the meeting at 6:00 pm (Public Appearances will start sometime after 6:00 PM) by:

Telephone: Call 253.215.8782 and enter Webinar ID **840 8220 4932**, Passcode **372429**.

Zoom: Click this [Link](#) (Webinar ID **840 8220 4932**, Passcode **372429**)

In person: Mercer Island Community & Event Center | 8236 SE 24th Street, Mercer Island, WA 98040

Deb

Deborah Estrada, MMC

Administrative Coordinator/Deputy City Clerk
City of Mercer Island- Community Planning & Development
206-275-7791 | www.mercerisland.gov

Notice: Emails and attachments may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (chapter 42.56 RCW). The City of Mercer Island utilizes a hybrid working environment. Please see the City's [Facility and Program Information](#) page for City service hours of operation.

From: jogreff20@comcast.net <jogreff20@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 10:27 PM
To: City Clerk <cityclerk@mercerisland.gov>
Cc: Patrick Baker <pbaker8403@gmail.com>
Subject: 06/03/26 Special Hybrid Meeting / Public Hearing Mercer Island Rezoning Comments - Displacement

Hello,

We understand if we wish to go on record for any comments during the Public Hearing that we need to register with the Deputy City Clerk, that is the purpose of this note. At this point we want to reserve the right to speak should we opt to, as well as the right to appeal. Below find the written comments.

There are words such as "displacement" being included in the meeting notes & agenda, and it appears that our home (condo complex) falls within the properties being considered for displacement. We reject proposals to displace any and all homeowners on the Island, including our property, or others. We've worked hard to purchase our homes, pay our mortgages, & become established in the community. As recently as last month we have been required to update electrical in all units within our condominium complex, so it would appear we are

spending thousands of dollars unnecessarily. Displacement would result in changes to employment proximity, the ability to support elderly parents, locally attend our church, etc. This situation would ultimately result in financial hardship in our scenario. It's an outrage that we may be forced out of our homes to satisfy external interests.

Thank you,

Joanne Greff
Patrick Baker



Re: Public Comment - PCB26-07 Public Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Update & Development Code Amendments

From Adam Ragheb <adam.ragheb@gmail.com>

Date Tue 6/2/2026 10:13 PM

To Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@mercergov.org>

A small typo - in my e-mailed public comment I stated:

****MICC 19.06.080(B)(2)(b) and (B)(3)(b-c)**

- The 1,000 ft and 600 separations from SSTH should be **removed**.

I meant to state:

****MICC 19.06.080(B)(2)(b) and (B)(3)(b-c)**

- The 1,000 ft and 600 separations from SSTH should be **restored**.

Thanks,

-Adam Ragheb

On Tue, Jun 2, 2026 at 10:07 PM Adam Ragheb <adam.ragheb@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Commissioners,

Below are my public comments for the 6/3 Public Hearing on Comp Plan amendments and Development Code Amendments.

Exhibit 1 (Comp Plan):

pp. 36/157

- Change "Barrier's Analysis" to "Barriers Analysis" - simple typo

- References are made to "Appendix X" but I see no such document in any of the exhibits. The Barriers Analysis should be attached, included, and be readily visible to the public as part of the Public Hearing review. As it stands, the document set presented for the Public Hearing is incomplete.

- Adjusting parking minimums poses two main problems. First, the City has already expressed its intent to conduct a parking study to preserve off-street parking to maintain pedestrian, cyclist, and automobile user safety in the future. Reducing parking minimums for affordable housing conflicts with that and could undermine future city efforts to protect residents by keeping parked cars off the streets. Second, reducing parking disproportionately affects families and those with a handicap - groups which otherwise may benefit from affordable housing options. Furthermore, it also has a negative effect on those working multiple jobs, who likely do not have the time to take public transport and must rely on their personal vehicles. This factor is exacerbated since we are not an urban center like Seattle or Bellevue, but are a suburb. As a working father, I do not have the time to take public transport to my place of work - what is a 25 minute commute by personal vehicle would

be approximately 2 hours each way via public transportation.

Parking minimums should not be adjusted - it is simple guidance, not law, from Commerce, and is only 1 of the 10 "Potential Barriers" apparently identified in the missing Barriers Analysis. No one should fault Mercer Island for wanting to preserve pedestrian, cyclist, and auto users' safety by arbitrarily adjusting parking minimums that, in practice, has the real potential to make things more burdensome to affordable housing's future residents. The only entity who benefits is the developer who is able to make a larger profit. Current and future residents are harmed by this policy.

Exhibit 3 (Code):

MICC 19.11.130 (Alternative Minimum Number of Parking Stalls)

- Allowing the Code Official to authorize an alternative minimum number of parking stalls presents an arbitrary standard for granting an unspecified/unquantified alternative number of parking stalls. This is in direct conflict with HB1293 from the 2023-2024 legislative session, which encourages cities to provide objective reviews. Beyond that, it requires cities to apply "only clear and objective development regulations." The development regulation is clear only as to the threshold at which the code official *may* grant an alternate number. The full set of objective criteria for granting this alternate number, and a clear quantification of the alternate number, are not given by the code.

An alternative minimum amount of parking granted at the discretion of the Code Official is contrary to the spirit of HB1293 - this set of code should be removed for this reason as described above, and for the reasons mentioned earlier relating to safety and disproportionately affecting certain subgroups.

**MICC 19.06.080(B)(2)(b) and (B)(3)(b-c)

- The 1,000 ft and 600 separations from SSTH should be removed. These are reasonable restrictions solely intended to protect children. If they specified distances of 1 or 2 miles, they could be construed as being intended to prevent the construction of SSTH, but these are reasonable distances. I would think that anyone would agree that requiring a homeless shelter to be at least 600 feet from the JCC or Lakeridge Elementary School, among other places, is a reasonable ask, and no one would fault Mercer Island for preserving those protections. Removal of this preexisting distance constraint comes from only the strictest reading of the law - let's preserve current reasonable protections for the JCC and our schools, among other places.

**MICC 19.11.020(A)(1) Permitted & Conditional Uses in Subarea

- Hotels should be removed as an allowed use in the TC-8A, TC-8B, and TCMF-6 zones because they compete directly with our city's urgent need for housing. Land in this area is limited, and every parcel developed as a hotel is a parcel that cannot be used for apartments, affordable housing, family-sized units, or senior housing. At a time when Mercer Island is under pressure to increase housing capacity and address housing affordability, zoning should prioritize permanent homes for residents over short-term lodging for visitors.

Hotels also change the economic character of an area. They tend to attract businesses geared toward tourists, business travelers, and short-term visitors, rather than the daily needs of people who live there. That can mean more retail and services designed for visitors, while residents still lack the basics: grocery stores, childcare, pharmacies, medical offices, small neighborhood retail, and other community-serving uses.

Allowing hotels in these new Town Center Phase 1 zones risks turning valuable land into a visitor-

serving commercial district instead of a revitalized Town Center. If the city's policy goal is to create housing near transit, jobs, and services, then the code should reflect that priority. Hotels may have a place in commercial or visitor-oriented districts, but they should not be allowed to displace required housing opportunities in zones where permanent residential development is the higher public need.

-Adam Ragheb