

**From:** [Francine Curd](#)  
**To:** [Rachael Stevie \(CD\)](#)  
**Subject:** RU-22-00002 East Peak - Application  
**Date:** Friday, April 22, 2022 4:54:42 PM

---

**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.

Comments on: RU-22-00002 East Peak - Application  
Submitted by: Francine Curd  
721 Hyak Dr. E.

Thank you for giving me a chance to comment on the East Peak Reasonable Use Variance on "Parcel B". East Peak Development, LLC is requesting a reasonable use exception on Parcel B, to the 150-foot buffer and 15-foot setback for a Type III wetland and the 50-foot buffer and 15-foot setback for a Type Ns stream. In my opinion the "Reasonable Use Variance" should not be granted.

In the "Project Narrative" for the Reasonable Use Variance, East Peak Development, LLC states in their response the Hyak PUD Final Development Plan was approved in 2018 by the Kittitas County board of Commissioners showing a 50 unit condo building and 8 detached single family lots. It further states "The approved density was based on an in-depth analysis of surrounding uses". However, during the "in-depth analysis" the original project plan failed to identify the wetland which the proposed 50 unit condo building was to be constructed upon.

East Peak Development incorrectly states in the project narrative for the 2018 Hyak PUD Final Development plan, that documentation from their consultant stated no wetlands were present, satisfying the Kittitas County CDS condition. The county accepted this incorrect statement submitted by the developer, and the wetland condition was incorrectly met as per the FPUD documents.

East Peak claims that they would be "denied all reasonable economic use of the property." Clearly, not granting the variance "DOES NOT" deny all reasonable economic use of "Hyak PUD - Tract B". The construction of eight duplexes can still occur on this site. Furthermore, tract B is only a small portion of the East Peak property, controlled by the developer.

Unfortunately I was not able to comment on the original 2018 PUD due to zero notification from the county, despite living in lower Hyak for over twenty years. Apparently only adjacent properties were notified? Due to the way this plat wraps through the community, very few of the residents were notified of the approval process of this huge project.

I am very concerned that the original 2018 PUD approval seems to be have been approved with very little specific information. It includes 5 sub parcels, A, B, C, D, E, F, which includes over 450 units of additional housing.

There are no elevation profiles for any structures.  
There is no analysis of loss of permeable surfaces.

Is there a traffic mitigation plan?

Was a full environmental review done of site?

The main drainage plan seems to be several 2 foot ponds. Does this low depth not require fencing?

Snow removal plan and storage plan seems to be an addendum that didn't require any changes to building placement?

Emergency access plan for fire and medical vehicles?

How about wildland fire issues?

The development schedule already seems to be not being followed. Since 2018 the only thing they have done is subdivide out three lots, that were then sold. They even requested and were granted variances to shrink each of these 3 lots from a width of 60 feet down to 50 feet.

Is the original PUD a realistic proposal or did East Peak figure once approved, they could just build out or change at their convenience?

I think that East Peak development has done a great job at purchasing land, and will get a great return on any investment. I do not think that their plans are very realistic, and it would be nice to see a better plan. I believe they need to plan more appropriately for better snow removal and storage plans. I think they need to address the drainage and wetland issues in a realistic way. I think they need to reduce their footprint and provide more open space and importantly, snow storage space and drainage. I think they need to have adequate parking, and parking should be appropriately sized for sport utility vehicles. Are they reducing from 1.5 cars per unit down to 1 car per unit? I think that the roadways that they are creating have to have viable snow removal plans that do not involve relocating snow. One cannot underestimate the tremendous financial impact of poor drainage and snow removal planning. I believe their current project at Pass Life at the top of the pass, is researching costs for trucking snow from their property.

I think the county has not provided enough oversight of this plan. When Suncadia was built out they put in a water treatment plant and built a fire station. The environment this PUD is sited in has extreme environmental challenges, yet they seem to not be required to take into account the huge amount of snowfall and rain that this area can receive. I hope East Peak Development can move forward in an environmentally responsible way that reflects the uniqueness of Snoqualmie Pass, without affecting neighbors downstream.