

From: [Bainbridge Citizens](#)
To: [*Bainbridge Citizens](#)
Subject: Vote No on Proposed SMP
Date: Monday, March 18, 2013 12:24:00 PM

From: Janet Sturham sturhamup@comcast.net

Dear Council Members,

I participated in the "March" from T & C to City Hall on Weds., Mar.13th, and then attended the City Council meeting that followed. We were greeted along the way with waves, cheers and honking in favor of our mission. I was impressed with the coordination and intent of the group of marchers. They are, in my opinion, informed, intelligent and concerned owners of waterfront property on Bainbridge Island.

I have lived on the island for 51 years, most of that time on waterfront property. I am concerned with the quality of Puget Sound and its preservation for future generations. My two grandsons, 8 and 10, are growing up on the island and are fourth generation Bainbridge Islanders.

I am concerned with the direction the council is taking in approving the SMP as currently proposed. Changing the wording from "Non-Conforming" to "Existing Development" has NO impact on the consequences of the proposed SMP to the waterfront property owners. The council's concern that the waterfront homeowners "do not understand" the proposal and its consequences, is an insult to the intelligence of the waterfront homeowners. It is the council that does not understand the consequences of the actions being proposed in the SMP.

Prior to my retirement in 2008, I was a Realtor on Bainbridge Island for 32 years. I was an Associate Broker with Deschamps Realty during most of that time, then Coldwell Banker. I can assure you that the terms "Non-Conforming" and "Existing Development" and the related consequences of these proposed designations in the SMP would be an alarming "red flag" to a purchaser of waterfront property on Bainbridge Island.

For a purchaser of waterfront property on Bainbridge Island to be aware that certain conditions would be imposed by the COBI should the purchaser wish to make any changes/improvements to the property requiring a permit, this would be an alarming "red flag".

People buy waterfront property for recreational use and the view of the water among other reasons. The threat of losing these amenities, if imposed by restrictions in the SMP, would certainly be a deterrent for most buyers and a decline in property value for the waterfront homeowner. Such restrictions, if imposed by the SMP regulations on waterfront property uses, would unquestionably constitute a "taking". If COBI is "taking" away rights from the waterfront homeowners then value goes down and

waterfront property homeowners must be compensated for this loss. Do we want to go there?

The council refers to the "science" that has driven them, at this point, to the acceptance of the proposed SMP. The prevailing "science" indicates that storm water run-off causes 99% of the pollution in Puget Sound, not the waterfront homeowners the council would like to blame. The decline of salmon in our local waters is the result of salmon not having access to spawning grounds due to blockage of their waterways, and, overfishing as allowed by the Department of Fish and Wildlife. The COBI is doing nothing, to my knowledge, to address the problem of storm water run-off from Bainbridge Island uplands, the primary contributor to pollution in Puget Sound. Why not concentrate the city's efforts on this issue rather than punish waterfront homeowners in the SMP for pollution issues for which they are not to blame?

I urge you to vote NO when the council votes on approval of the proposed SMP April 10th.

Janet Sturham