

[REDACTED]

From: pearl hewett <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2014 10:39 AM
To: zSMP
Cc: Karl Spees; Marv Chastain; muddyshoes; Delane Hewett [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] connie beauias [REDACTED]
joni howard; Lynn M Stuter; Lois Perry; Sue Forde; Linda Young; Ed B; Keith Olson; Rick
Forschler -; Frank M Penwell; Jim Boyer; Miller, Sheila Roark; McEntire, Jim; Chapman,
Mike; Steve Gray; Van De Wege, Rep. Kevin [REDACTED] Hargrove, Jim;
[REDACTED] harry bell; Wylie clark; Mike Newman [REDACTED]
Dick Pilling; Chuck Cushman [REDACTED]
Subject: SMP PROTECTING YOUR HOME?

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

[SMP PROTECTING YOUR HOME?](#)

Posted on [September 15, 2014 9:16 am](#) by [Pearl Rains Hewett](#) [Comment](#)

SMP PROTECTING YOUR HOME?

SEPT. 15, 2014 This is YET ANOTHER FOLLOW UP SMP PUBLIC COMMENT TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH RCW 90.58.10

PROTECTION OF SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE

Clallam County Update SMP Comment
Draft 3.18 Shoreline Stabilization
Regulation as applied to RCW 90.58.100

This is my 153rd Public Comment on the Clallam County SMP Update

Fighting "ECOLOGY" for private property rights since Jan. 26, 2011

Pearl Rains Hewett

SMP PROTECTING YOUR HOME?

APRIL 10, 2013 A FOLLOW UP COMMENT TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH RCW 90.58.10

Posted on APRIL 10, 2013 12:49pm by Pearl Rains Hewett comment

Protection of single family residence
Clallam County Update SMP Comment
Draft 3.18 Shoreline Stabilization
Regulation as applied to RCW 90.58.100

The devil is in the details, first, I fought ESA Margaret Clancy for months, to have the words “EMINENT DANGER” removed from SMP 3.18, because it was in conflict with state law. (which achieve effective and timely protection against loss or damage)

Since then, I have been fighting for months with ESA Margaret Clancy to have the words “PRIMARY STRUCTURE” removed, because it did not include “APPURTENANCE” and have asked repeatedly to have it replaced with, the legal wording and definition

Pursuant to chapter 90.58 RCW. “Single-family residence” means a detached dwelling designed for and occupied by one family including those structures and developments within a contiguous ownership which are a normal appurtenance.

THIS IS THE WA STATE LAW RCW 90.58.100 protection of single family residences and appurtenant structures

(6) Each master program shall contain standards governing the protection of single family residences and appurtenant structures against damage or loss due to shoreline erosion. The standards shall govern the issuance of substantial development permits for shoreline protection, including structural methods such as construction of bulkheads, and nonstructural methods of protection. The standards shall provide for methods which achieve effective and timely protection against loss or damage to single family residences and appurtenant structures due to shoreline erosion. The standards shall provide a preference for permit issuance for measures to protect single family residences occupied prior to January 1, 1992, where the proposed measure is designed to minimize harm to the shoreline natural environment.

THIS IS THE RCW 90.58 DEFINITION OF “Single-family residence”

Pursuant to chapter 90.58 RCW. “Single-family residence” means a detached dwelling designed for and occupied by one family including those structures and developments within a contiguous ownership which are a normal appurtenance.

An “appurtenance” is necessarily connected to the use and enjoyment of a single-family residence and is located landward of the ordinary high water mark and the perimeter of a wetland. On a statewide basis, normal appurtenances include a garage; deck; driveway; utilities; fences; installation of a septic tank and drainfield and grading which does not exceed two hundred fifty cubic yards and which does not involve placement of fill in any wetland or waterward of the ordinary high water mark.

If in fact 3.18.10 Regulation The ESA ADOLFSON AND CLALLAM COUNTY’S INTERPRETATION OF THE LAW RCW 90.58.100 IS LEGALLY FLAWED BY WORDING, DEFINITION AND THE INTENT OF RCW 90.58.100

- 1. The words primary structure ARE NOT included in RCW 90.58.100.**
2. There is no definition of primary structure in the SMP Update
3. RCW 90.58.100 specifically states the wording single family residences
4. The intent of RCW 90.58.100 is PROTECTION
5. HAS THE LEGAL INTENT OF RCW 90.58.100 BEEN MET OR COMPROMISED IN CLALLAM COUNTY SMP UPDATED 3.18.10 Regulations – Application Requirements

Shall Clallam County INTERPRETATION of “STANDARDS” UNDER 3.18.10 Regulation as applied to RCW 90.58.100 force private property owners to fight for over 10 years and create a financial hardship

JUST to get the RCW 90.58.100 protection of their single family residence?

An earlier SMP Comment

Will Clallam County Elected Administrators place it's private property owners in the same position as Vicki Luhrs?

"For a decade, as the county has callously looked on, Victoria Luhrs' property has been eroding at an alarming rate," said PLF's Hodges. "In some areas, up to 25

feet of land has eroded, nearly a third of the land between her house and the bluff. After years of litigating against the county's obstruction, Ms. Luhrs will finally be allowed to lay out the facts, in court, that support her urgent need for a rock revetment."

I met and spoke with Vicki Luhrs at the Pacific Legal Foundation meeting in June 2012.

"In some areas, up to 25 feet of land has eroded, nearly a third of the land between her house and the bluff."

Shall Clallam County INTERPRETATION of "STANDARDS"

UNDER 3.18.10 Regulation as applied to RCW 90.58.100 force private property owners to fight for over 10 years and create a financial hardship

JUST to get the RCW 90.58.100 protection of their single family residence?

(full text)

SMP PROTECTING YOUR HOME?

Posted on April 10, 2013 12:49pm by Pearl Rains Hewett comment

Protection of single family residence

Clallam County Update SMP Comment

Draft 3.18 Shoreline Stabilization

Regulation as applied to RCW 90.58.100

A FOLLOW UP COMMENT TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH RCW 90.58.10

The devil is in the details, first, I fought ESA Margaret Clancy for months, to have the words "**eminent danger**" removed from SMP 3.18, **because it was in conflict with state law.** (which achieve effective and timely protection against loss or damage)

Since then, **I have been fighting for months with ESA Margaret Clancy to have the words primary structure removed, because it did not include appurtenance and have asked repeatedly to have it replaced with, the legal wording and definition**

Pursuant to chapter 90.58 RCW. "Single-family residence" means a detached dwelling designed for and occupied by one family including those structures and developments within a contiguous ownership which are a normal appurtenance.

April 10, 2013 on line SMP Draft

3.18

Shoreline Stabilization

3.18.10

Regulations – Application Requirements

1.

Geotechnical reports pursuant to this section that address the need to prevent potential damage to a primary structure shall address the necessity for shoreline stabilization by estimating time frames and rates of erosion and report on the urgency associated with the specific situation. As a general matter, hard armoring solutions shall not be authorized except when a report confirms that there is a significant possibility that such a structure will be damaged within three years as a result of shoreline erosion in the absence of such hard armoring measures, or where waiting until the need is that immediate, would foreclose the opportunity to use measures that avoid impacts on ecological functions. Thus, where the geotechnical report confirms a need to prevent potential damage to a primary structure, but the need is not as immediate as the three years, the report may still be used to justify more immediate authorization to protect against erosion using soft measures.

2.

To verify that the provisions of this section are fully addressed, the Administrator may require information to support a permit application for any type of shoreline stabilization. The Administrator shall consult with the appropriate state and federal natural resources agencies to determine the type and level of information that should be provided. Application information required pursuant to this section shall address the urgency and risks associated with the specific site characteristics and shall include:

My comment

I would like to see the SHALLS replaced with wording that would allow more discretion by Clallam County Planning Dept.

a. A scaled site plan showing:

(1) existing site topography,
and

(2) the location of existing

and proposed shoreline stabilization structures, and any fill including dimensions indicating distances to the ordinary high water mark; and

b.

A description of the processes affecting the site and surrounding areas, including but not limited to tidal action and/or waves; slope instability or mass wasting; littoral drift; channel migration; and soil erosion, deposition, or accretion; and

c.

A description of alternatives to structural approaches, and a thorough discussion of the environmental impacts of each alternative; and

d.

A description of any proposed vegetation removal and a plan to revegetate the site following construction; and

e.

A hydraulic analysis prepared by a qualified hydrologist, professional engineer, geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist that describes anticipated effects of the project on water and wave elevations and velocities; and

f. A biological resource inventory and analysis prepared by a qualified professional biologist that describes the anticipated effects of the project on fish and wildlife resources; and

g.

A description of opportunities for providing public access to and along the affected shoreline, as well as any proposed on-site recreational features, if applicable; and

h.

A description of any waste and debris disposal sites for materials generated during construction; and

i. Any other information that may be required by the Administrator to demonstrate compliance with the review criteria referenced in this section.

An earlier SMP Comment

Will Clallam County Elected Administrators place it's private property owners in the same position as Vicki Luhrs?
"For a decade, as the county has callously looked on, Victoria Luhrs' property has been eroding at an alarming rate," said PLF's Hodges. "In some areas, up to 25 feet of land has eroded, nearly a third of the land between her house and the bluff. After years of litigating against the county's obstruction, Ms. Luhrs will finally be allowed to lay out the facts, in court, that support her urgent need for a rock revetment."

I met and spoke with Vicki Luhrs at the Pacific Legal Foundation meeting in June 2012.

"In some areas, up to 25 feet of land has eroded, nearly a third of the land between her house and the bluff."

Shall Clallam County INTERPRETATION of "STANDARDS"

UNDER 3.18.10 Regulation as applied to RCW 90.58.100 force private property owners to fight for over 10 years and create a financial hardship

JUST to get the RCW 90.58.100 protection of their single family residence?

If in fact 3.18.10 Regulation The ESA ADOLFSON AND CLALLAM COUNTY'S INTERPRETATION OF THE LAW RCW 90.58.100 IS LEGALLY FLAWED BY WORDING, DEFINITION AND THE INTENT OF RCW 90.58.100

1. The words primary structure ARE NOT included in RCW 90.58.100.

2. There is no definition of primary structure in the SMP Update

3. RCW 90.58.100 specifically states the wording single family residences

4. The intent of RCW 90.58.100 is PROTECTION

5. HAS THE LEGAL INTENT OF RCW 90.58.100 BEEN MET OR COMPROMISED IN CLALLAM COUNTY SMP UPDATED 3.18.10 Regulations – Application Requirements

My last SMP Comment

To assist ESA in the legal clarification, definition and correction of WA State RCW 90.58.100, I am providing the following documentation for the SMP Update.

THIS IS THE RCW 90.58 DEFINITION OF "Single-family residence"

Pursuant to chapter 90.58 RCW. "Single-family residence" means a detached dwelling designed for and occupied by one family including those structures and developments within a contiguous ownership which are a normal appurtenance.

An "appurtenance" is necessarily connected to the use and enjoyment of a single-family residence and is located landward of the ordinary high water mark and the perimeter of a wetland. On a statewide basis, normal appurtenances include a garage; deck; driveway; utilities; fences; installation of a septic tank and drainfield and grading which does not exceed two hundred fifty cubic yards and which does not involve placement of fill in any wetland or waterward of the ordinary high water mark.

THIS IS THE WA STATE LAW RCW 90.58.100 protection of single family residences and appurtenant structures

(6) Each master program shall contain standards governing the protection of single family residences and appurtenant structures against damage or loss due to shoreline erosion. The standards shall govern the issuance of substantial development permits for shoreline protection, including structural methods such as construction of bulkheads, and nonstructural methods of protection. The standards shall provide for methods which achieve effective and timely protection against loss or damage to single family residences and appurtenant structures due to shoreline erosion. The standards shall provide a preference for permit issuance for measures to protect single family residences occupied prior to January 1, 1992, where the proposed measure is designed to minimize harm to the shoreline natural environment.

This entry was posted in ["Reasonable Man" understanding](#), [Clallam County SMP](#), [Private Property Rights](#), [Public Access to Public land](#), [The Written Law](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

This entry was posted in [Economic Impact](#), [For The Record](#), [Get Off My Back](#), [How Stupid do they think we are?](#), [Ignore the Crisis? Suffer the Disaster](#), [Legislated Economic Oppression](#), [Man-Made Disasters](#), [Private Property Rights](#), [Shoreline Management Plan](#), [This Is The Law](#).