

## Lindsey Ozbolt

---

**From:** Susan Maring <susanmaring@me.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 06, 2018 10:19 PM  
**To:** Lindsey Ozbolt  
**Cc:** Susan Maring; Tom Maring  
**Subject:** Suncadia Phase 3, Division 14 Development

Thomas S. Maring and Susan L. Maring

621 Cabin Trail

Cle Elum WA 98922

[tsmaring@gmail.com](mailto:tsmaring@gmail.com), [susanmaring@icloud.com](mailto:susanmaring@icloud.com)

August 4, 2018

Lindsey Ozbolt

Community and Development Services

411 N. Ruby Street, #2

Ellensburg, WA 98926

RE: Purposed Suncadia Phase 3, Division 14 Development

Dear Ms. Ozbolt,

My wife and I own cabin #4 (621 Cabin Trail, Cle Elum, WA 98922) in the Tumble Creek Community Development. We have owned other properties within the Tumble Creek and Suncadia Development since 2007. Recently, we were made aware of the New Suncadia LLC's application for a boundary adjustment and platting of Phase 3, Division 14 within the Tumble Creek Community. As longtime owners' familiar with Suncadia's development vision, we feel New Suncadia LLC has submitted plans that are inconsistent with original proposed development in several areas. I have outlined some of the main inconsistencies below:

First, the proposed changes with the boundary line adjustment essentially confiscates “open space” from all land owners and golfers who enjoy the natural and untouched surrounding of the golf course. Second, the Division 14 Development, stipulated the cabins were to be similar to the ones originally developed by Opus. It is our understanding that the current proposal would allow building structures to be built to 40’ rather than 34’ feet similar to the original cabins. Third, we understand that a substantial portion of the site is in a landslide hazard zone for which no geological study or evaluation has been performed. Fourth, the existing habitat will most likely be adversely affected by the development if the nearly 7 acres of land are essentially bulldozed to allow easy development of the land. Fifth, there has been no community involvement or input from existing owners to the proposed development. I have personally spoken to several other owners, as well as golfers, who are adamantly against this new proposal due to the dramatic change to the development and the quality of life we enjoy. Sixth, there has been no discussion of lighting and adherence to the dark sky environment that the rest of the homeowners are required to abide by. Lastly, we have a right to a protected view and this development may adversely impact many homeowners as well as golfers who enjoy the surroundings of the course.

We are requesting a full environmental review, adherence to the maximum 34’ building height, a geologic analysis of the landslide area by an independent company, a denial of the boundary line adjustment and keeping the number of building sites as originally proposed in the initial development of land, not the increased number of sites requested by the developer. My wife will be present for the meeting this Tuesday August 7.

Sincerely,

Thomas S. Maring, MD, DMD

Susan L. Maring, DDS