



Jefferson County Association of REALTORS®

219 W Patison Street
Port Hadlock, WA 98339
(360) 385-6041
jeffrlty@olympen.com
www.jcarwa.com

January 9, 2009

Michelle McConnell
Department of Community Development
621 Sheridan Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368

Re: Shoreline Master Plan draft

Dear Michelle:

Please accept sincere thanks for the recent informational meeting hosted by our government affairs committee at WSU. Thank you as well for your willingness to extend the meeting time to our Realtors® and the members of the public there to learn. It was an excellent meeting.

While the proposed changes in the SMP are under review by the county, we need to understand the impacts and opportunities, and be able to respond to specific questions with information that may not be readily reflected in the written draft.

The questions listed on the attached page were compiled from various notes taken from our meeting with you, and from a follow-up meeting of our committee. Please do not hesitate to call if you need clarification on the questions. My office line is 344-3944. As Realtors, we are often the point of reference for landowners, and in that capacity, seek to have clarity and understanding of this draft now under consideration.

We ask that you respond to us by the 14th of this month to allow us time to share the information with our members in advance of the PC hearing on the 21st? We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Teren MacLeod
Interim Government Affairs Chair, JCAR

SMP DRAFT QUESTIONS – GAC of JCAR

- 1) We understand there was a comprehensive look at shoreline parcels. As it pertains to the changes being proposed, a) what percentage of undeveloped land is there in the various “designations” and, b) what percentage of all parcels affected will have an increase or change in development restriction?
- 2) Criteria has been established for lakes and streams – what criteria has been established for when and how wetlands will be recognized as coming under the SMP jurisdiction? How will that be determined? Will this trigger landowners having to have wetland delineations performed, and if so, what would be the circumstances requiring that? Will the current wetlands mapping be used in any way?
- 3) How was the 50’ distance between homes determined as a requirement for the common line prescriptive option? What is the purpose of this or the impact the SMP is trying to divert? How many waterfront subdivisions have been approved since Oct. 1998?
- 4) You indicated that most of the shoreline is in very good shape, and that the purpose of the SMP changes are to achieve no net loss. What is the 110 or 160 foot setback meant to accomplish, and what is the science to show the added degree of impact to the shorelines with the setbacks as they are in the current SMP ?
- 5) Ag lands are exempt as we understand it, if they are zoned as ag land and active. The trend in new ag is niche farming and much of this is being done on rural residential parcels. There is also likely to be a need for people to grow food in the future – for themselves and to support community food cooperatives. Please define the ag exemption, how is it applied, where and what are the criteria if RR zoning is included?
- 6) What active uses are allowed in the 20% of the buffer that is not required to be “well-vegetated and predominately natural condition.” Are kitchen gardens an allowable use?
- 7) With DCD staff cut back and many of the program changes requiring more of staff, permitting authority and action, what can we expect will be the time frames needed for a buyer to work through the development approval options under a Feasibility contingency? Will we need 18 months in the future to determine if and how a parcel can be developed, and what tests/professional assessments may be required in that process?
- 8) Please explain when an improvement to an existing structure would be subject to the new restrictions? What about in the event of fire or natural damage?