From:	Richard Schmidt <schmidt192@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 13, 2018 1:34 PM
To:	Ann Hillier
Cc:	PCD
Subject:	Hansen Dock Proposal

Hi Annie,
Thank you for meeting with me and my neighbor Tom Bierle concerning the Hanson Dock Proposal.
Tom myself and several of our other neighbors are in agreement as to the negative effect this dock will have on Fletcher Bay and access to it. We are also concerned that it is not in compliance with the SMP.
Fletcher Bay is shallow and access to it by boat is available only at mid or high tide. The access channel runs along the eastern shore. At low tide their is approximately 2' of water in it while the surrounding sand bar is about 4' above water this is a difference of about 6'. The proposed dock extends 112' from the bulkhead to the end of the float add a 10' wide boat and the dock is 122' into. The bay. This completely blocks the excess channel to all but small boats.
SMP3.3,1.3
6. All developments and uses of navigable waters,tidelands or bed lands should be located to avoid and designed to minimize interference with navigation.
This proposal is obviously in violation of this requirement.
SMP 4.1.2.4 Impact analysis No Net Loss Standard This proposal takes away access to and use of the bay to everyone above it.
SMP 4.1.2
E. Avoid hazards to public health and safety.
Navigating around this dock will require a hard turn to port followed by a hard turn to the starboard . Because of the tides night transits are often required . Doing. This in my son's 48' sail boat will be dicey at best. It has been suggested that the dock be equipped with warning lights which will be a nice aesthetic addition to the bay. Their may also be a liability question if a accident should occur and a dangerous situation was allowed to be permitted .
5.3.2 Goal
Prevent conflicts with navigation and other allowed uses;
5.3.3 Policies
3. B. Assure structures and operations will be aesthetically compatible with the area visually affected, and will not unreasonably impair shoreline views from adjacent shoreline properties or the public's visual access to the shore.
This is a huge aluminum structure 122' long which will completely cut off what is now a pastoral view up and down the bay. It can only be described as a monstrosity.
5.9.3
Promote residential development opportunities along the shoreline--- impacts to other shoreline views,aesthetics, and access should be considered and minimized. This proposal does none of the above.
6.3.3
A. Designed in consideration of the proposed. Intensity of use,shoreline characteristics,tidal action,AESTHETICS,and minimization of impacts to adjacent land and public use of the waters of the state. This dock cuts off views from adjacent properties and impedes the use of the bay.
6.3.5 Regulations General
3. Piers and docks shall be located and designed to minimize interference with the use of navigable waters and may be limited in length or prohibited ,where necessary,to protect navigation,public use or habitat values. This dock interferes with navigation and limits public use.
Docks may not extend beyond adjacent docks. This dock begins where all the other docks on the east side of the bay end! The property immediately to the north of the Handson's does not have a dock however it has a shared dock with its neighbor and as such it has a dock. Also 8.0 definitions Adjacent That which is near or close; for example a property

located across the road or highway shall be considered adjacent. The dock to the north of the Hansons is therefor adjacent and there dock may not project beyond it. This rule will also apply to the dock to the south.

Several neighbors have reached out to Mr. Handson to consider well thought out alternatives. Unfortunately he has rejected all of them.

In consideration of aesthetics, navigation,and safety as well of compliance with the SMP I and my wife urge you the reject this proposal .

Sincerely,

Richard and Julia Schmidt

8911 Woodbank Dr.

Bainbridge Island Wa.

206 842 0992   Schmidt192@yahoo.com

Sent from my iPad