

## Jane Rasely

---

**From:** Charles Schmid <ceschmid@att.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 13, 2017 3:12 PM  
**To:** PCD  
**Subject:** Fwd: Comments on BLD22533 - second try  
**Attachments:** wingpoint.docx

sent again due to used old pcd address

----- Original Message -----

**Subject:**Comments on BLD22533  
**Date:**Fri, 13 Oct 2017 14:48:13 -0700  
**From:**Charles Schmid <[ceschmid@att.net](mailto:ceschmid@att.net)>  
**To:**Heather Wright <[hwright@bainbridgewa.gov](mailto:hwright@bainbridgewa.gov)>  
**CC:**Planning Department <[pcd@ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us](mailto:pcd@ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us)>, Christy Carr <[ccarr@bainbridgewa.gov](mailto:ccarr@bainbridgewa.gov)>

Please note :

After I typed the memo below I decided to make it easier for you read since the internet might screw things up:  
Hence forget the text below and use the attached memo in Word labeled "wingpoint".  
Charles

\*\*\*\*\*use attached\*\*\*\*\*

To: Heather Wright  
From: Charles Schmid, ABC  
Date: 13 October 2017  
Topic: Comments on Vogel Hust BLD22533

This application is to reduce a 50 foot steep slope buffer to 10 feet for a proposed addition.

First of all I find such a reduction to 10 foot buffer too short given all the slides this Island has experienced such at nearby Rolling Bay where I live. There is a technical report included which justifies this buffer reduction- which I can't comment on given this is not my expertise. However I look forward to seeing the third party geologic report to see if it collaborates with this report.

I do note some comments in the geologic report in Chapter 3 Conclusions and Recommendations.

### Section 3.1 General

The second bullet states "Shallow landslides due to shallow groundwater seepage were observed on the steep, east-facing slope during Site reconnaissance." Also in 3.2.1.3 it states "The presence of landslide deposits in the vicinity of the existing residence along the slopes descending to the shoreline suggests a moderate to high risk of seismically induced landslides." and in "3.3.1.2 "We observed evidence of two superficial landslides on the site along the seep east-facing slope."

### Section 3.2.1 Seismic Hazards

This section appears to rely on earthquakes being rare events so the reduction in buffer is therefore not a worry.  
3.2.1.1 "Due to the length recurrence intervals between large seismic events, the potential for strong ground

shaking is considered low during the life of the propose Project.."

3.2.1.4 Superficial Ground Rupture ""Due to the suspected long recurrence interval ...the site is considered low during the expected life of the project."

### 3.3.3 Allowable Slope Setback

"The steep slope(greater than 40 percent) portian of the site is approximately 26 feet tall. The standard buffer and building setback associated with this slope would be 50 feet plus a 15-foot building setback , for a total standard of 65 feet from the top of the slope. However, based on the results of our explorations, reconnaissance, and slope stability evaluations, the slope at the site is relatively stable and meets the criteria, for the limited setback exemption. We recommend the minimum buffer of 10 feet....."

I am not sure the above follows to their conclusion. It will be interesting to see if the third party agrees with their assessment and uses rare occurances as justification.

Other observations include seeing no reference to the Critical Areas Ordinance (Reference application only to BLD22533) or the Shorelines Management Program (Has it been shown the structures lie behind the line drawn between the buildings of the two neighbors? Do the stair replacement meets SMP dimensions?")

Please check the referenced quotes I provided since my keybaording is not the best.

Regards,  
Charles