

**From:** Daniel Allison [mailto:da5619@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 23, 2011 6:59 PM  
**To:** Glowacki, Margaret  
**Subject:** S.M.P. Draft #2

Margaret Glowacki  
City of Seattle - Department of Planning and Development  
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000  
P.O. Box 34019  
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Dear Ms. Glowacki,

As I mentioned in my previous letter my family and my sisters family own the property along Seaview Ave NW that will be affected by the SMP. This property has been in our family since the 1960's. It was purchased from another family that had lived there since the 1930's.

We understand the need for updated zoning in our community and the Seattle waterfront. We however don't believe that the proposed SMP plan is fair to our long standing and historical community. If the proposed rules are implemented we believe that our rights as private property holders will be severely infringed upon. I believe that the questions our neighbor Ivar Michelsons sent need to be answered and have included them in my letter.

*Please answer the following questions with respect to the draft SMP:*

- 1) How do these SMP changes affect existing historic community of over-water homes along Seaview Ave NW between 34th Ave NW and NW 57th Street?*
- 2) Why is the proposed designation for the Seaview pier homes community specified as UR rather UC, when the lots do not meet location criteria for the former, but do for the latter? Why are existing over-water homes accommodated in UC, but not UR?*
- 3) How can existing floating homes be an allowed use, but existing over-water homes in the community along Seaview Ave NW are not an allowed use? How is this disparity in compliance with WAC 173-26-241 (3)(j)?*
- 4) How can two fundamentally identical residential uses over water (floating and pier homes are both over water, and differ only in the former being floating and the latter on piers) not be required to be accommodated in an equivalent manner under SMP? Please provide the specific legal basis which supports the less than equivalent treatment by SMP of existing floating homes and existing over-water homes along Seaview Ave NW between 34th Ave NW and NW 57th Street?*
- 5) Please explain why the Seaview pier homes community is not*

recognized as historic despite having existed along Seattle's Salmon Bay waterway for 90 years and representing an important cultural resource because of its historic and unique contribution to Seattle's maritime culture and Scandinavian heritage? On what basis are floating home communities considered historic (and thus worthy of preservation), but the similarly long-standing community of existing over-water homes along Seaview is not (despite its similarly unique contribution to Seattle's maritime culture)?

6) If the Seaview pier homes community is indeed considered historic and worth preserving, then why is it not accommodated in a manner equivalent to floating home communities under SMP and not recognized as such in the Comprehensive Plan?

Please provide the results of the economic review that CAC requested to be conducted by the City (see Seattle SMP CAC Report, page 33) with respect to 15 lots with no dry land in the Lake Union area to "determine if the new regulations will result in a reduction in the fair market value of each parcel". Furthermore, I request that a similar economic review be conducted with respect to parcels with little or no dry land (and the existing over-water homes constructed on the lots) along Seaview Ave NW between 34th Ave NW and NW 57th Street.

Thank you for your time and understanding as this is an area we love and care for more than you can know,

Dan Allison, Stephanie Dolan, Henry Allison  
Lorna Allison Seamans, Adam Seamans, Winslow Seamans