

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE KITTITAS COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER

Nunnally Holdings, LLC
Administrative Interpretation Appeal

No. SE-21-00006

STATEMENT OF DAN CARLSON

1. My name is Dan Carlson. I am a U.S. citizen. I am over the age of 18, competent to make this statement, and base this statement on my personal knowledge under penalty of perjury.
2. I am the Director of Community Development Services for Kittitas County in Ellensburg, Washington. I make this statement in that capacity.
3. I have reviewed the declaration of Mr. Crews. The two administrative segregation applications attached to the declaration of Mr. Crews are examples of “shuffles” which evaded state and local laws related to lot size, zoning requirements, and frequency of lot division. These were layered applications that segregated parcels, used a BLA to reduce the parcel sizes below zoning allowances leaving a larger residual parcel, reseggregated the residual parcel, used a BLA to reduce the parcel sizes below zoning allowances except for the residual parcel etc. etc. These were done without regard to minimum lot sizes allowable by then current zoning, and by being technically one application, avoided the prohibition of re-segregating previously segregated land on the theory that it had not

1 been previously segregated because this was the first application seeking to do so-
2 regardless of the fact that this application did in multiple times.

- 3 4. The twelve parcels depicted on the original record of survey were created from a single
4 parcel (parcel #1718-04040-0001).
- 5 5. Kittitas County has processed amendments to administrative segregations, such as in the
6 Flying M matter, under the misunderstanding that they were still regulated by the long
7 repealed administrative segregation provisions of Kittitas County code, rather than the
8 current and applicable sections of Ch. 58.17 RCW. This matter is an example of the
9 County, as it goes forward, seeking to correctly apply the law.
- 10 6. Administrative segregations often did not depict roads at all. See the attached examples.
11 By having depicted roads in the original administrative segregation, and now seeking to
12 amend those roads, the decision was made that, in accord with RCW 58.17, a plat
13 amendment was required.
- 14 7. Any existing subdivision seeking these types of changes would be required to go through
15 the plat amendment process.
- 16 8. I make this statement under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of
17 Washington and affirm that the foregoing is true and correct.

18 DATED this 13TH day of SEPTEMBER, 2021 in Ellensburg, Washington.

19 

20 DAN CARLSON