

From: [Erika Shriner](#)
To: [PCD; Council](#)
Subject: PLN51498 RUE/VAR
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 8:34:18 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Bainbridge Island organization. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I had heard a considerable amount about the project proposed on this .2 acre lot on Lytle Rd located on a wetland. I visited the property and ran into two neighbors who were justifiably concerned about further disturbance on this fragile piece of land and the obvious potential for exacerbating already existing water problems.

My first impression on seeing the small parcel was why would anyone consider building on this site which is even below the grade of Lytle Road. It is clear that anything that happens on this property would affect water problems on all properties below the parcel as well as increase contaminated runoff into the Sound.

I read through the environmental report which is in many ways nonsensical. It is stated that the natural grassland has provided an important filtration system, but obviously the grassland is to be reduced substantially. Does one get credit for what they are about to destroy?

I was confounded by the statement: "The project cannot avoid, rectify or reduce" harm to the wetland and stream buffer, "but has minimized the impact **to the extent possible.**"(???) This argument could be used for doing just about anything to a piece of land from using it as a dumping ground for toxic chemicals to covering it with asphalt. The impact will be real, harmful and, by its very nature, unavoidable. That is exactly why projects such as this should never be allowed.

Additionally, the disruptive consequences of having 2,3,4 or more occupants of the proposed 1,800 sq.ft., 3 bedroom, 3 bath home permanently using this tiny property is never discussed. Are they or their children expected to live a greatly altered life due to the limitations the site requires?

When reviewing this application, the word "assault" kept coming into my mind. This project is an assault on a wetland, an assault on neighbors and an assault on the Sound.

I think this project has struck a chord with many island residents because if such a project is allowed, what could be allowed on property next to our own? Is a wetland or a stream only protected on property until someone chooses to develop

it?

Please turn down this irresponsible project which would be just one more example of our failure to protect our increasingly fragile environment.

Sincerely, Erika Shriner

--

"I don't want your hope. I don't want you to be hopeful. I want you to panic. I want you to feel the fear every day. And then I want you to act. I want you to act as you would in a crisis. I want you to act as if our house is on fire... Because it is."

Greta

Thunberg