

Response to proposed project regrade community access driveway to lot 16 (Hallisey).

File number SE-23-00015, regarding 1167 Via Kachess Road, Easton W 98925, Parcel # 556635

As co-owners of Lot 17, we are writing to express our concerns and objections to the proposed work intended for the shared access driveway to lots 16, 17, 18, and 19.

We have two primary areas of concern:

1. Potential negative impact to our property
2. Cost, liability and financial responsibility

Property Impact:

The scope of the intended driveway construction has not been disclosed. We have not seen a Geotech survey nor site plans (are there any?). We do not know the location, nor the extent of the work that will be done on our property (lot 17).

The shared access driveway at issue bisects the full length of our property (lot 17). It cuts through a very steep, wooded hillside, which is the downslope below our cabin. We are concerned that widening the driveway would involve cutting trees and digging into the hillside, potentially destabilizing the hillside. Further, there has been no discussion nor agreement as to risk and liability of such work. Who would be financially responsible if the driveway regrade resulted in hillside destabilization, land degradation and immediate or delayed damages?

Financial Responsibility:

There has been no disclosure of the potential cost, nor consideration of unforeseen cost escalations of the proposed driveway regrade. There has been no agreement as to the financial responsibility and liability of the project.

It is understood, per the existing easement, that driveway maintenance is to be financially shared. However, the intended work is not maintenance.

The shared access driveway regrade is necessary for the purpose of one or four parties (required for construction on lot 16). The cabins on lots 17, 18, and 19 were built, and have been accessed, without incident on the existing road for decades. If lot 16 were not applying to build, there would be no plans for a regrade. The existing driveway is fully functional and grandfathered for the purpose of the other lots.

Objections:

- We, the owners of lot 17, do not agree to tree or soil removal on our property for the above stated reasons.

- We, the owners of lot 17, do not agree to financially participate in a driveway regrade for the purpose of construction on lot 16.
- We, the owners of lot 17, would like to note that the owners of lot 16 are not authorized to represent nor communicate on our behalf.

In conclusion, please note that we do not wish to limit nor impede construction on lot 16. We are only objecting to bearing the burden of risk and liability associated with driveway construction as it impacts ourselves and our existing property. In considering cost & risk vs benefit & necessity, we hope that a resolution can be reached where lot 16 does not have to bear undue burden imposed by the county.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Laurette Loera, lot 17- Kachess Ridge