

Merrill, Hannah

From: John Lewis [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 04, 2011 12:19 PM
To: zSMP
Cc: Michael and Marci Kleinberg; George Moyer; Bill Henry
Subject: SMP Feedback
Attachments: FEEDBACK Inventory and Characterization Report FINAL.pdf

Please accept my feedback concerning the SMP work underway. I have attached a copy of my comments (with photos) and provided a copy (ex photos) below. Thank you for your good work and I look forward to your comments.

John

TO: Clallam Department of Community Development
SUBJECT: SMP Feedback

Please consider the following comments and questions concerning the Clallam County SMP Update Consistency Review and the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report.

Clallam County SMP Update Consistency Review

My questions refer to SMP Section 5.08 -Residential Development and specifically about what is meant by the "Requirement to provide shoreline access for developments > 4 lots," (*Table 1. Summary of Chapter 5 provisions that should be added, etc.*).

We live on Seashore Lane which is in a rural neighborhood of 14 residences along approximately 1500 feet of no bank beach on Dungeness Bay. We own our tidelands and consider our beach to be part of our private property. Access to our homes is provided by Seashore Road which is private and maintained by the property owners. This road crosses approximately 70 acres of open space and wetlands and is just under a mile long.

We consider our environment to be precious and fragile. In addition to protecting and caring for our wetlands, our homes are protected from winter storms by a earthen berm that was restored with native materials (soil, grasses, logs, etc.) following the damaging storm of February 2006.

Public access across our property through our wetlands and over our berm to our private beach would be of great concern to us. Here are some questions and concerns we'd like addressed and you consider amending the provisions for providing public shoreline access:

1. Would the County agree with our understanding that tideland ownership means a beach is private and that owners will not be required to provide public access to their beach?
2. Is the goal to provide shoreline access to all beaches, both public and private?
3. Is this for all developments or is it for new developments only?
4. If access to private beaches will be required for existing developments, who will be responsible for

the liability and costs to construct and maintain appropriate roads, pathways, parking, etc?

I hope you find these questions helpful as you attempt to answer the questions surrounding the SMP update effort.

Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report, June 2011

Below is a table that summarizes feedback to the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Comment</u>
4-10	35	There is no mention of Cooper Creek which is a salmon (Coho) habitat.
4-11	10	The concrete bulkheads along Three Crabs Rd starting from the east bank of Cooper Creek and the concrete flume at Cooper Creek also may impede the sediment transport process.
4-12	17	The extensive residential development along the beach front extending from the Grays Marsh area to Three Crabs Road (Seashore Lane, Jamestown Beach Lane and Jamestown Road) is omitted.
4-12	20	There is public access to the beach at the East end of Jamestown Rd.
4-12	30	Seashore Lane (East and West) is located east of the Three Crabs neighborhood and is separated from Three Crabs Road by Cooper Creek. All parcels along Seashore Lane are minimum five acre parcels, consistent with the R-5 zoning code. Most of the homes along Seashore Lane are located at least 50' from the ordinary high water line.
4-12	35	Three Crabs and West Seashore are distinctly different neighborhoods and should be discussed as such. None of the residences along Seashore Lane are protected by hard armoring. All parcels along the 1500 foot Seashore Lane beach front are protected by an engineered native earthen berm. This beach restoration was completed in 2006 following a February storm that destroyed portions of the natural protective berm that existed at that time. The restoration was designed and guided by the input and support of local, county and state agencies. This restoration resulted in an improvement of the natural beach maintenance processes and the ecological health of the beach along Seashore Lane. Please see photos taken recently of the beach berm restoration in the attachment.
Map This Land conform	5a	The map indicates the parcel that includes Seashore Lane is "Occupied-dividable." is incorrect or at least misleading. All Seashore Lane parcels have been divided,

Use [redacted] to the R-5 zoning code criteria and cannot/will not be further divided. Should the correct [redacted] designation be Occupied - Non-dividable, meaning already divided (developed)?

I hope you find these thoughts helpful and constructive. Please let me know if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sincerely,

John Lewis

[redacted]
Sequim, WA 98382
[redacted]

CC: Jay Petersen, JoAnne Estes

September 4, 2011

TO: Clallam Department of Community Development
SUBJECT: SMP Feedback

Please consider the following comments and questions concerning the Clallam County SMP Update Consistency Review and the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report.

Clallam County SMP Update Consistency Review

My questions refer to SMP Section 5.08 -Residential Development and specifically about what is meant by the "Requirement to provide shoreline access for developments > 4 lots," (*Table 1. Summary of Chapter 5 provisions that should be added, etc.*).

We live on Seashore Lane which is in a rural neighborhood of 14 residences along approximately 1500 feet of no bank beach on Dungeness Bay. We own our tidelands and consider our beach to be part of our private property. Access to our homes is provided by Seashore Road which is private and maintained by the property owners. This road crosses approximately 70 acres of open space and wetlands and is just under a mile long.

We consider our environment to be precious and fragile. In addition to protecting and caring for our wetlands, our homes are protected from winter storms by a earthen berm that was restored with native materials (soil, grasses, logs, etc.) following the damaging storm of February 2006.

Public access across our property through our wetlands and over our berm to our private beach would be of great concern to us. Here are some questions and concerns we'd like addressed and you consider amending the provisions for providing public shoreline access:

1. Would the County agree with our understanding that tideland ownership means a beach is private and that owners will not be required to provide public access to their beach?
2. Is the goal to provide shoreline access to all beaches, both public and private?
3. Is this for all developments or is it for new developments only?
4. If access to private beaches will be required for existing developments, who will be responsible for the liability and costs to construct and maintain appropriate roads, pathways, parking, etc?

I hope you find these questions helpful as you attempt to answer the questions surrounding the SMP update effort.

Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report, June 2011

Below is a table that summarizes feedback to the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Comment</u>
4-10	35	There is no mention of Cooper Creek which is a salmon (Coho) habitat.
4-11	10	The concrete bulkheads along Three Crabs Rd starting from the east bank of Cooper Creek and the concrete flume at Cooper Creek also may impede the sediment transport process.
4-12	17	The extensive residential development along the beach front extending from the Grays Marsh area to Three Crabs Road (Seashore Lane, Jamestown Beach Lane and Jamestown Road) is omitted.
4-12	20	There is public access to the beach at the East end of Jamestown Rd.

Page Line

Comment

4-12 30 Seashore Lane (East and West) is located east of the Three Crabs neighborhood and is separated from Three Crabs Road by Cooper Creek. All parcels along Seashore Lane are minimum five acre parcels, consistent with the R-5 zoning code. Most of the homes along Seashore Lane are located at least 50' from the ordinary high water line.

4-12 35 Three Crabs and West Seashore are distinctly different neighborhoods and should be discussed as such. None of the residences along Seashore Lane are protected by hard armoring. All parcels along the 1500 foot Seashore Lane beach front are protected by an engineered native earthen berm. This beach restoration was completed in 2006 following a February storm that destroyed portions of the natural protective berm that existed at that time. The restoration was designed and guided by the input and support of local, county and state agencies. This restoration resulted in an improvement of the natural beach maintenance processes and the ecological health of the beach along Seashore Lane. Please see photos below taken recently of the beach restoration.



Looking westerly from 62 W Seashore Lane.



Looking easterly from 62 W Seashore Lane

Page Line

Comment

Map	5a	The map indicates the parcel that includes Seashore Lane is "Occupied-dividable." This is incorrect or at least misleading. All Seashore Lane parcels have been divided, conform to the R-5 zoning code criteria and cannot/will not be further divided. Should the correct designation be Occupied - Non-dividable, meaning already divided (developed)?
Land		
Use		

I hope you find these thoughts helpful and constructive. Please let me know if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sincerely,

John Lewis

[REDACTED]

Sequim, WA 98382

[REDACTED]

CC: Jay Petersen, JoAnne Estes