August 15, 2014

August 15, 2014

Dear Ms. Glowacki,

I have been in Alaska for the past several months and am appraised that additional time for submittals was issued.

As a follow up on that time I respectfully request the following:

In Reviewing the “Department of Ecology Recommended Changes to the City of Seattle Comprehensive SMP Amendment (Ordinance #124105) I find a potential issue with two items: 79-C and 80-C.

(SMP Provision 23.60A.502.C.2.b and SMP Provision 23.60A.502.D.1,2.7 and 8)

The language in both 79-C and 80-C requires that Permits issued pursuant to the subsection 233.60A.502. C and D “Shall identify the specific uses and gross floor area of each use that is authorized by the permit under the subsection…”

The problem is that permitting may take more than 5 years of preparation and the use of the building in the future may be different than what it is built for. To explicitly state what “specific use” the structure will be used for 5 or 10 years in the future is impractical if not impossible due to the nature of the economic climate during any decade. The economic climate over the past 15 years has proven two major recessions causing significant financial hardships. Many of those hardships were on businesses that were adjacent to the Lake Washington Ship Canal.

If specific uses are required to be listed when being permitted then economic investment into properties within the shoreline management district will be stifled. Existing and future potentials for development will be eliminated. Many business plans for development have been changed due to economic conditions.

Since the intent is to continue the Water Dependent / Water Related uses on those properties, then that should be the intent and not explicit specific use.

Please consider rewriting the bill format to include “Water oriented or water dependent uses and/or accessory uses for water oriented or water dependent uses” and delete “specific uses”.

Respectfully
Charles Draper
Salmon Bay Marina