

Peter Best

From: hab <habvbi@sounddsl.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 10:19 PM
To: David Greetham; PCD
Cc: Heather Wright
Subject: RE: pln50280c

How is the process you describe supposed to work when the public is only given a 30 day window in which to review and comment on the application?

In this PLN50280 instance, this is a Substantial Shoreline Development Variance application presented to the public for comment while missing major design elements. This application has the potential to significantly impact the environment, public use and property values of at least 12 surrounding homes. At this point, the public does not have a clear basic description of the structure or its visual impact and the comment period will very likely end before missing pieces are provided. Given the review process you presented, it seems the public will not ever have a chance to see or comment on what the applicants are actually proposing. What am I missing?

Pete

From: David Greetham [mailto:dgreetham@bainbridgewa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 5:14 PM
To: hab; PCD
Cc: Heather Wright
Subject: RE: pln50280c

Mr. Hill,

Thank you for your comments with regard to lighting and elevation for the Wysong/Ziemba proposal.

While the application was previously determined "complete" for the purpose of starting the review process, staff anticipates requesting additional information from the applicant as the review proceeds. Public and agency comments such as yours will assist staff in determining what additional information may be required in order to make a recommendation on the proposal – your comments will be reviewed and considered in making that determination.

Please don't hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



David Greetham
Current Planning Manager
www.bainbridgewa.gov
206.780.3765 (office)

Planning and Community Development service hours:

- Walk-in customers: 8 a.m. – 12 p.m. Monday-Friday
- Appointments: 8 a.m. – 3 p.m. Monday-Friday

Appointments may be scheduled here: [Planning and Building Submittal Appointment Calendar](#)

From: hab <habvbi@sounddsl.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 2:34 PM
To: PCD <pcd@bainbridgewa.gov>; David Greetham <dgreetham@bainbridgewa.gov>
Cc: Heather Wright <hwright@bainbridgewa.gov>
Subject: pln50280c

Hello,

This application as published by COBI is incomplete. It is not ready for public evaluation or comment and should not have been scheduled for anything beyond requests for additional information from the applicants by COBI Planning. Please remove PLN50280C from the approval process/public comment until it is complete and ready. Below are two examples of major omissions.

There is no mention of lighting for this dock. As a stand-alone structure extending 240' into the bay, this dock will be a significant navigation hazard and will require navigations lights. Additionally, Wysong-Ziemba will likely want lighting for their own use and safety. Based on the 2014 COBI SMP, a variance application of this type for this scale of structure seems like it would require a visual environmental impact study including the impact of direct and reflective lighting on humans and wildlife. For example - Manzanita Creek has an active salmon run and lights reflect upward off the water into houses. At any rate, it is unfair to ask for public comment without providing details (or even mention in this case) of a major component of an application such as this. At a minimum, please require the applicant to update the application to include and fully describe the required navigation lighting and any discretionary lighting. This update should include all lamps by type (hooded, flood, etc...), location, lumens and electrical circuit – the required navigation light circuit or discretionary light circuit. Humans and wildlife also need to know the hours of operation for the navigation lighting and hours of operation for discretionary lighting.

The proposed site elevation plan as available is incomplete as it does not specify any height dimensions for the dock structures. This height information is critical as the actual height of the proposed structure could be as much as 40-50% taller than what is visually represented in the elevation plan – that is significant structurally for engineering purposes as well as visually for the public. The existing elevation plan implies a structure height just above the water line based on the 11.5' mhhw. Given that Port Orchard Sound just went through a period of 13+' tides and has seen a 15' king tide (per NOAA, Brownsville predictions, there were 232 tides over 11.5' with 14 tides over 13' in 2016) the implication of the dock height in the existing plan seems a bit disingenuous and perhaps dangerous. For public safety (engineering – nobody wants to be crushed by a falling 10,000 lbs boat) and for visual impact, please require the applicant to update the elevation plan to reflect structure heights as measured from a specified offset of mllw as provided in the PSAS Eelgrass Survey.

The public comment clock is ticking, please advise me on your plans relating to each of my paragraphs with that clock in mind.

Thank you,

Peter Hill
6682 NE Bayview Blvd