

Ellie Myers

From: Patricio Chase <pnwcarpenter509@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2026 12:12 PM
To: Ellie Myers
Subject: Formal Opposition to VA-26-00003 Swanson (Failure to Meet Title 17.60B Criteria)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Kittitas County network. Do not click links, open attachments, fulfill requests, or follow guidance unless you recognize the sender and have verified the content is safe.

Dear Ellie Myers,

I am submitting this letter as the neighboring property tenant to formally and strongly oppose the zoning variance request under application VA-26-00003 (Swanson).

The applicant is requesting a reduction of the required rear yard setback from 25 feet to 20 feet. Based on the information provided, this request fails to meet the required approval criteria under Kittitas County Code Title 17.60B (Zoning Variances) and should therefore be denied.

Under Title 17.60B, a variance may only be approved if specific criteria are met. This application does not satisfy those criteria for the following reasons:

1. No Demonstrated Special Circumstances or Hardship

Title 17.60B requires that a variance be justified by unique physical conditions or special circumstances specific to the property (such as size, shape, topography, or other constraints).

There is no evidence that this parcel is subject to such limitations. The request appears to be driven by design preference or maximization of buildable area, which does not constitute a legal hardship.

2. Not Necessary for Reasonable Use of the Property

The code requires that the variance be necessary to enable reasonable use of the property.

A single-family residence can clearly be constructed on this parcel while complying with the existing 25-foot setback requirement. Therefore, the variance is not necessary to achieve reasonable use.

3. Self-Imposed Circumstances

A variance cannot be granted if the hardship is self-created.

To the extent the applicant's proposed design does not fit within the required setbacks, that condition is the result of voluntary design choices, not inherent property limitations.

4. Detriment to Adjacent Properties

The criteria require that the variance not be materially detrimental to nearby properties.

As the adjacent property owner, I will experience:

A loss of privacy

Increased visual intrusion

Potential drainage and runoff impacts

These are direct and material adverse effects.

5. Inconsistent with Neighborhood Character

The variance must be compatible with surrounding development.

Reducing the setback disrupts the established uniformity and spacing of structures, creating an incompatible development pattern.

6. Contrary to the Intent of Zoning Regulations

Setback standards are intended to preserve:

Privacy

Open space

Orderly development patterns

Granting this variance without a qualifying hardship would undermine these core objectives and set a precedent that weakens enforcement of zoning regulations.

7. Precedent and Erosion of Zoning Integrity

Approval in this case would establish a precedent for similar reductions, gradually eroding adherence to established zoning standards throughout the area.

Conclusion

Because this application fails to meet multiple required criteria under Title 17.60B, approval would be inconsistent with both the letter and intent of Kittitas County Code.

I respectfully request that this variance be denied in full.

If the County is nonetheless inclined to approve this request, I request that the decision include detailed written findings of fact demonstrating how each required criterion under Title 17.60B has been satisfied, as supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Please include this letter in the official record.

Sincerely,

Patric chase

120 Atlantic Ave W

Ronald, WA 98940

(neighboring property)