

**From:** [Matt Edmunds](#)  
**To:** [Janis Lamoureux](#)  
**Cc:** [Emily Morgan](#)  
**Subject:** [External!] Written comment for Sunnyside Village Co-Housing  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 8:50:39 AM

---



Janis, Emily

Below is my written comment because I am unable to attend the hearing due to prior commitments:

-----

I first would like to thank those reading or hearing this comment for their time. Thank you for the responses I've received from the city and the applicants from my previous concerns.

After receiving the latest answers to my questions regarding the changes to the city code and the timing of the changes, I can't help but feel as if the city has enabled, complicitly or not, the wishes of those who wish to move into the Marysville community over the existing residents of Marysville. While I understand I may be the most 'vocal' in the form of my three written responses (this and two others), I do feel as though my sentiment is carried amongst other nearby residents even though they may feel our responses will fall on deaf ears.

In my job, many times I'm asked to help figure out why things happened the way they did and what were the guiding principles leading to the decisions being made. The timeline and progression of the development seems fitting to explore the same.

The subject property went sale pending ('pending feasibility') June 22, 2018 and sold September 12, 2018 (Redfin data). At the time, there were no cottage housing developments in Marysville. In addition, the existing city code at the time allowed a maximum of 12 cottages and "single-family zoned parcels adjacent, including across the street in some cases, to multifamily, commercial and industrial zoned parcels, as a *transition* to multi-family, commercial and industrial uses" (the first two placement criteria wouldn't apply in this case).

On July 18, 2019, the city council approved changes to the cottage housing development code that removed the maximum 12 units and replaced the wording with "Maximum 12 cottage unit per grouping. Development may contain multiple groupings". In addition, verbiage was added for placement criteria: "(d) Within single-family zones where two or more unique site circumstances exist. Unique site circumstances may include shared common boundary with a city-owned park or nature preserve; close proximity to multifamily, commercial or industrial zoned properties as a complementary use; or other unique site circumstances as determined by the director". Conveniently, these two changes allowed the development in question in its current form. While open to the public, anyone affected would have needed to know that the hearing was happening and that these changes were seemingly being aimed at this particular development.

Who would primarily be impacted? Residents of Sunset Boulevard and the seller of the property, Tom King. Coincidentally, Mr. King had just been elected to the city council 6 months before the development property was listed for sale and went pending. He was also on the city council that approved the changes to enable development. It's reasonable to assume that the co-housing community developers and owners petitioned for the changes as well. In addition, he

owns the undeveloped property being listed as the complimentary use neighborhood business zone (though this was designated as such well before he became a part of the council) and previously owned the property now owned by the city, but still undeveloped, as a 'city park' providing the second 'unique site circumstance' needed for this cottage housing to proceed forward.

I don't have any grudge or vendetta against Mr. King, nor the co-housing community or its members present and future, and that's not why I raise these points. What I have concern with is how these closely linked chain of events that now impact our neighborhood appear to be set up in a way that has the appearance of the backdoor deals commonly heard about in today's environment. I've been taught to avoid wrongdoing and misuse of power or connections and also the very appearance of wrongdoing and misuse of power or connections. Yes, it's possible these things fell into place with no connection.

My family knows that there will be development around us. We can see it daily as we drive on Soper Hill Road, on Route 9, or even from I-5. We know that our house and neighborhood was also once undeveloped since my personal friend was the initial owner of the house I currently live in. What we also know is that we live in a R-4.5 single family zone that's free of parking lots, free of densely packed structures, and free of heavy traffic. We know there are large areas of Marysville that are already zoned appropriately for the development under consideration without the need for special accomodations and zoning decisions that need the director's special approval.

It is with this I ask and suggest to the city that the proposed development not proceed as-is and instead find a more appropriate location to proceed, one that still can cater to the desires of its residents but doesn't rely on artificially created 'unique site circumstances' for placement at the back of a well established neighborhood with no other paths of entry and exit.

Here's one final thing I know, if anyone has read this far: If my writing does fall on deaf ears or if it's heard and the approvals still move forward, I will still be saying 'hello' to the new residents as they walk the neighborhood. I will still be kind, compassionate, and a good neighbor to each and every member. I will still drive to work each morning passing Tom's property and appreciating and admiring the time and effort he puts into his property to keep it looking good and well maintained. I'll also be working to one day afford a shop like his so I can work on my hobbies while letting my wife park in the garage. I'll wish him well too, as I try to do for all the people I meet.

Thank you for your time.