

Samuel Crawford

Subject: FW: Tojek's Water View Protection Initiative receipt concerns
Attachments: Zone Amendment Receipt.pdf

From: Steven Tojekk [monte402@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 04, 2023 12:09 PM
To: Stacie Pratschner; Stacy Clauson; Richard May; Mike Hill; Michael Harmon; Mary Lou Steward; Rhyan Lopez; Eric Davidson; Kerena Higgins; Garth Baldwin
Subject: Tojek's Water View Protection Initiative receipt concerns

Hello,

I have a question as to why we charge Blaine residents this higher cost for this water view protection initiative proposal? The water view protection initiative proposal doesn't require anything except city council to see the basic written area description and the fact that residents want to protect what is valuable to them. The area only includes both sides of the street and possibly a small piece of Lot 1590 , if that item/factor on the initiative is even allowed. All proposed items on the initiative are considered separate and can be approved separately if/when chosen to do so by City Council.

Why are we paying money for something city council should be doing already? City Council is supposed to represent the interest of the people, and the people have spoken regarding a simple request on a basic topic. Why is this this request being taken out of context and going down an expensive and unnecessary rabbit hole? I was under the impression that you should never incur fees for residents when there is no real need to do so.

Are we charging for processing fees? Processing fees usually equate to 50 - 100 dollars per document. There should only be 1 or 2 docs for something this simple. The \$850.00 is very unreasonable considering processing fees. Is the SEPA a state document and an exception to the rule, or are both Documents State incurred fees? There is nothing involved or intellectual about this basic request, and all you need to do is have 2 people with walkie-talkies and a 12 foot stick and a pickup truck, for 5 minutes in time, to mark the ground or survey the area of Lot 1590. I say this in regards to Lot 1590 because City Council can look at this particular item on the proposal separate from the other items on the proposal, because all items on the proposal can be seen considered individually, and are subject for approval per item. You don't need a map and you don't really need much of anything when considering the simplicity of the proposal. The proposal only is to consider protection of the Water View, and all items in proposal can have an affect on residents water view regarding both sides of the street. The simple verbiage on the amendment should be self-explanatory. No other equipment is required, just a basic measurement, nothing exact or perfect is needed for a request this basic.

I am open for reasonable suggestions concerning the costs for proposal, but I feel this is over-the-top. I would appreciate everyone's individual written explanation for both sides of the argument with regards to costs on simple proposals concerning fair treatment for residents .

Thank you