

8873 Woodbank Drive NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

April 9, 2018

City of Bainbridge Island
Attn: Annie Hillyer, Planner
280 Madison Ave. North
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Dear Ms. Hillyer:

Re: Hanson Dock Proposal, Fletcher Bay
COBI Reference: SSDP/PLN50901 SSDP

Thank you for both the time you spent, and the information you provided to us at our meeting on Friday. Three things came up that warrant additional comment:

Survey: The only definitive way to settle the navigational issues, as well as the limitations imposed by nearby docks, is to require the applicant to provide a survey that depicts the proposed pier and float, the Croker buoy, the Corbin buoy, the ends of the nearby Morgan and Croker docks and floats, and also the small pier on the property between applicant's and Crokers.

Easement: The recorded easement agreement between the Rynearsons and Harrises, which by its terms is binding on the present owners of both properties, is much more specific about replacement docks than has been represented. It not only, in paragraph 2, specifically contemplates that a future "replacement" dock can be built by either party, it also states that neither one can object to it.

Given COBI's policies of promoting joint-usage docks, and requiring that replacement docks be built over existing locations (compare the requirements that have been placed on the Crokers), this document clearly provides a basis for that to be done. I have heard that there is some marine vegetation issue about that. If so, then the survey should include the identity and location of that as well. Furthermore, if it's "sea beans," they exist elsewhere in the bay, and that should be researched as well.

I feel as though we all (including COBI) should be "third party beneficiaries" of this agreement. The construction of a replacement dock in the existing location would be consistent with the SMP, avoid the navigational issues, avoid aesthetic concerns, and avoid what seems to be becoming an unhappy controversy in which COBI will be a part.

Adjoining Docks: I think I understood you to say that this limitation does not apply because there is no dock on the immediate adjacent property. This is a completely specious argument. In the first place the adjoining tidelands property has a beach structure—call it what you will—plainly intended to give access to the water. More to the point is the clear intent of the limitation, which is to avoid an "outlier" dock, and keep the outer extent of the docks in a uniform line.

There are at least nine docks on the properties that adjoin the applicant's to the west, and ten more on the properties immediately to the east. Looking at the aerial photo of the bay, you can easily see that the outer ends of those docks scribe a surprisingly smooth curve along the whole south side of the bay. That line, because the applicant's property is on a point that juts out into the bay, intersects his property near the base of the bank (whose stability I question, as there has been sluffing there over the years), probably just below the high tide line. That means that the proposed dock will extend beyond the line of existing docks by 60 to 80 feet.

Finally, I think it is clear that the articulated purpose of the SMP is to preserve and protect for all the public the special waterfront character of this island. Fletcher Bay is one of those; its uniqueness is a treasure. It will, sadly, be diminished if the applicant is permitted to impose this private use on, not just his neighbors, but the kayakers, the sailors, and yes, even the mergansers that troll for food along that shore.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'T. Beierle', written in a cursive style.

Thomas R. Beierle

Cc: Darron Hanson
LeAnn McDonald