

Has the Council entirely missed the concerns and reasons which caused the outrage? Is the Council playing a word game by calling nonconforming existing development without removing the underlying nonconformance? The SMP has been disturbingly biased and appears to still be. Giving theory the legal weight of science and fact is folly.

The land use attorney who stated that we might not even be aware that our lots are nonconforming, as if that is justification, for more regulation should be corrected. It is not the lots which are forced into nonconformance but our low impact homes. His opinion is that Puget Sound has not improved in 40 years of regulation. Why is that? Certainly not because of the present setbacks and buffers on the Bainbridge Island waterfront. Our private homes have negligible impact. Why add ineffective regulation?

The high school girl's comments which were heartfelt and well covered by the Review were, however, lacking in fact and reality. Where on Bainbridge Island does a property exist on which the owner can do anything they want? Where does she get the impression that the thousand plus Bainbridge Islanders who signed the petition and the nearly two hundred who marched don't respect the environment and don't want to go in a positive direction? We cannot help but see she is a perfect example of her groupthink. She admirably exercised her freedom of speech and we hope she will respect ours. Accumulative unfounded regulations are chipping away freedoms and property rights. We fear that!

KEN AND JETTE HAMMER

PORT MADISON