Ann Hillier

From: Tom Croker <tom@tomcroker.com> Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 11:56 AM To: Ann Hillier Subject: Re: Dock project - Parent SSDE PLN51073 Thank you for the clarification. Tom Sent from my iPhone > On Apr 19, 2018, at 9:59 AM, Ann Hillier <ahillier@bainbridgewa.gov> wrote: > > Hi Tom. > Under the SMP 4.2.1.8., "existing docks floats, and buoys may be repaired and replaced in the same foot print and shall comply with this Program's requirements for materials and standards, to the extent practicable." There is no requirement to replace the pilings that the Parent's already have and are currently using - you are allowed to continue to use and maintain your existing overwater structures, and replace components are you see fit. When you do decide to replace something, such as old pilings, the new pilings must meet the current standards - i.e. they could not be replaced with creosote-treated piles. So when the Parent's do submit a permit for the new pilings, we will make sure that they comply with the standards under Chapter 6.3. Additionally, the Parent's are proposing to meet the no net loss standard through project design, by integrating grating into the structure for increased light penetration. We noticed the entire scope of the project, as this is a requirement under SEPA--hence the different "phases". > I hope this helps clarify. Please let me know if you have any other questions. > Thanks. > Annie > > Annie Hillier > City Planner > www.bainbridgewa.gov > facebook.com/citybainbridgeisland/ > 206.780.3773 (office) 206.780.0955 (fax) > > > -----Original Message-----> From: Tom <tom@tomcroker.com> > Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 9:01 AM > To: Ann Hillier <ahillier@bainbridgewa.gov> > Cc: Luanne Copy <luanne@tomcroker.com>; Rick Robertson <Loon3103@hotmail.com>; leannm@me.com > Subject: Dock project - Parent SSDE PLN51073 > Ms Hillier,

> Our property is 3 homes to the east from the Parent project. Leann McDonald helped us apply for a float/pier replacement in the summer of 2015 and the COBI has still not issued my building permit.

> Our project required the removal of 9 old pilings (the new float has only 2 total!) and float, and the new float was limited to the length of the existing float- 26'. Also, the area covered (shadowed) by the new float and ramp is less than half of the existing float and pier. Since our float had to be in the exact location of the old float, our depth is only 4' at low water. Although our old structures are weak and marginally safe, we have used them since 2015.

> In the Parent project it mentions "phases" and the old pilings would be replaced later. Why aren't the old structures required to be removed as part of the overall project? Their existing float is in better repair than ours and we have used ours since applying for the permit in 2015.

> As mentioned in Rick Robertson's letter, the more important issue is the narrowness of the existing channel, especially at the Parent float location. When we navigate in and out of the bay, we hug the south shore next to all of the floats. It is very important that any replacement float is placed in the exact location of the existing so it does not further encroach on the channel.

> Thank you for your consideration,
>
> Tom and Luanne Croker (206-842-2553)
>
>
>
> Sent from my iPad

>

>