

Michael Jones

From: Dana Cohenour <danaRMFK@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2016 5:36 PM
To: Michael Jones
Cc: Jason Cohenour
Subject: Sea Smoke Development

Hello Michael-

My husband, Jason and I attended the Public Hearing regarding the Sea Smoke Development on Thursday, August 25. Jason spoke at the meeting, but we would like to follow up his comments with the letter below.

Thank you for including the letter in the public record and bringing it to the attention of the planning commission.

Best Regards,

Dana Cohenour

Dana Cohenour
danaRMFK@comcast.net
360-201-1229
www.danasmusicplayground.com

Dear Planning Commission:

Thank you for considering input from Semiahmoo residents regarding the proposed Sea Smoke development. My name is Jason Cohenour and I spoke briefly at the August 25 Planning Commission meeting. My wife Dana, son Jack, and I live at 9035 Shearwater Road in Boundary Ridge – just west of the proposed development. We have lived in Semiahmoo for nearly 15 years. We also own a vacant home lot in the Drayton Hillside neighborhood. While we understand that the Semiahmoo SRA has provided input and suggestions for consideration, we feel it is very important that you also consider the views of individual residents. Our concerns regarding Sea Smoke are as follows:

1. Our number one concern is the plan for the self-storage facility. We live in a blissfully aesthetic, exceptionally safe paradise. We believe that a self-storage facility will put both of these treasured attributes at serious risk. While functional, self-storage facilities are, in our experience, eyesores. Furthermore, self-storage facilities are often magnets for thieves. Like moths to a flame, unaccompanied property will attract criminals. We have several friends whose rented storage units have been burgled, resulting in significant loss of property. To secure such facilities, often high (ugly) chain-link fences

are deployed, along with lighting of a suitable intensity to deter criminals, but that also annoys nearby residents. To be blunt, we don't need it and we don't want it – the facility will impair our beautiful aesthetic, make us less safe, and create myriad downstream issues for residents.

2. Our number two objection is the plan for what amounts to (future) public parking. We simply don't want public parking in our semi-private neighborhood. We believe that this will create much more traffic, further impair safety and generate increased noise and disturbance. Furthermore, in our experience, there are very few days of the year where current parking facilities are insufficient to meet demand. July 4th is the one example that I can think of. Perhaps on this day, and similar high use days, the city can make some accommodation for street parking and/or establish a mutually acceptable parking arrangement with the Inn at Semiahmoo.
3. Our number three objection is the proposed density of the project. We understand that the RSMP supports the proposed density. However, Semiahmoo has evolved significantly since the establishment of the RSMP and, in our opinion, the proposed lot sizes are shockingly small compared to everything else in Semiahmoo. According to the PUD, 10 dwellings *could* be placed on a single acre. As I look at our one acre piece of property (that has one house), I cannot imagine how 9 more homes could fit. I am sure it's possible, but I am equally sure that the resulting appearance would be substantially different than we experience around Semiahmoo today. We ask that the proposed density be re-visited so that the resulting development is as pleasing to look at as the rest of Semiahmoo.
4. At the August 25 meeting there was quite a bit of discussion around road access to the PUD. Several Gleneagle residents objected to the proposed 4 way intersection and PUD entrance from Semiahmoo parkway. While I certainly appreciate and respect their valid concerns, our preference is to see entrances to the PUD from both the Parkway and the Drive. We believe that this will result in better load-balancing and traffic management.
5. Stormwater management. The proposed stormwater management plan appears to be well engineered and comprehensive. I will also add that I know nothing about stormwater management. However, two things cause us to be extra sensitive to the stormwater topic. First, our home is (I think) immediately downstream from the PUD. Second, there is evidence of significant bank erosion at several other water-front Boundary Ridge lots. Our only request here is that extra vigilance be applied to the final stormwater management plan and that the resulting design be over-engineered so that we can be comfortable that our home and property will remain at the top of the bank, and not end up at the bottom.

Many thanks again for considering our concerns and input.

All the best,

The Cohenours

<image001.png>

Jason Cohenour :: President & CEO

Main +1 (604) 231 1100 :: **Direct** +1 (604) 231 1170 :: **Fax** +1 (604) 231 1103
13811 Wireless Way :: Richmond, BC, Canada, V6V3A4

jcohenour@sierrawireless.com :: www.sierrawireless.com

This message and any attachments (the "Message") are confidential and intended solely for the addressees. Any unauthorized modification, edition, use or dissemination is prohibited. Neither Sierra Wireless nor any of its subsidiaries shall be liable for the Message if altered, changed, falsified or edited, diffused without authorization.

Michael Jones

From: John Horvatich <illusion43@live.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2016 8:31 AM
To: Michael Jones
Subject: Semiahmoo Zone 3 Project

Sir:

My name is John Horvatich. My wife, Patricia, and I own 9026 Gleneagle Drive.

Since being provided with a copy of the plans for Semiahmoo Zone 3 project, I have taken the time to review. But, I must admit, not as thoroughly as those who have commented thus far.

However, I noted on page 11 of 20, Figure 5 (Southeast Project Edge) deals with a strip of land which occupies about 40-percent of the total project frontage on Semiahmoo Parkway. Furthermore, The project proponent proposes that this strip of land be permitted to serve as a buffer to the parkway and that the project not be required to provide a second buffer which in essence would be a buffer to a buffer. The city staff viewed the request as reasonable.

Since the strip of land in question is not a buffer in fact, but rather property owned by another party, would requiring a second buffer, really be a buffer on a buffer? Granted, the strip is uniquely shaped may not prone to development, but if it were, future abutting property owners may call into question the original premise.

Just a thought!

Respectfully,

John T. Horvatich

Sanidmoor Zone 3

RECEIVED

AUG 26 2016

By *[Signature]*

X Better gate location on Sanidmoor Drive would allow better access for construction and faster access to commercial property - houses - park - ~~sheds~~ ~~garage~~ ~~trucks~~ ~~more~~ ~~visitors~~ ~~to~~ ~~hotel~~ ~~and~~ ~~to~~ ~~park~~ on spit

X The proposed park would do nothing to bring people to it. No beach no water view. no museum. no facilities no boat launch no store all of which are located ~~at~~ a minute down the hill

X Roadside parking on a two lane heavily used road is not possible also along with cars. The Parkway and Drive are heavily used for bikers and walkers and dog walkers and runners and frequent special outdoor activities. Building Const.

Noise from construction (sewers - materials - gas lines, building, parking areas) etc would not be considered if present from owners and property values would drop.

Storage units must be secured and users checked out for backgrounds and illegal guests. Contents should be monitored. See Storage would be inside week

no heavy (Industrial - Load Yachts -
water or marine vehicles) not
covered. With sides + roofs
Special fire fire protection
and security guard a must

X Will it be to the standards of
Semenov?

Elizabeth Cross-Deamer

Michael Jones

From: Larry Berkowitz (via Google Docs) <ytaldb@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2016 1:38 PM
To: Michael Jones
Subject: SEASMOKE COMMENT
Attachments: SEASMOKE COMMENT.docx

[Larry Berkowitz](#) has attached the following document:



SEASMOKE COMMENT



I've sent it embedded in the email and as a word doc in case you can't open the attachment

TO: Michael Jones, Director of Community Development, City of Blaine
Planning Commission, City of Blaine
City Council, City of Blaine

REFERENCE: PUD-2-16 and LOP-1-16 a project also currently being referred to as "Sea Smoke"

These comments were initially made verbally at the Planning Commission meeting of Aug 25, 2016.

My name is Lawrence D Berkowitz. I and my wife Ann Stubenrauch currently live at 9138 Gleneagle Dr in Blaine.

I would like to comment on the traffic safety impact of the above referenced project as currently designed. All the traffic count numbers I refer to in my remarks are directly from the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by the Transpo Group dated June 2016 and submitted by the developer/applicant. Particular reference is made to Figure 6, Future (2020) Weekday Peak Hour Traffic , Intersection 2 (page 12). (1)

This study forecasts that the Project as designed will result in about 130 cars per hour (110 due to the project) exiting and entering Gleneagle Dr onto/off Semiahmoo Parkway during peak traffic. The study also forecasts about 460 cars per hour going through this same intersection during the same peak period.

In this scenario these 130 cars per hour will have to merge into/from the Semiahmoo Parkway through traffic stream of 1 car per every 8 seconds which are going at least 35 mph. This is to be accomplished without acceleration lanes or turn lanes. In addition cars Northbound are going down a fairly steep grade and on a curve which limits their visibility of the upcoming Gleneagle Dr/Semiahmoo Parkway intersection.

In comparison Figure 4 (page 7) which forecasts traffic volumes through this same intersection without the project shows only 20 cars entering the Semiahmoo Parkway traffic stream during this same peak hour.

This is a frightening prospect to say the least. And it can be substantially mitigated simply by moving this Semiahmoo Parkway exit to Semiahmoo Drive. The through volume on Semiahmoo Drive, using Figure 6, Intersection 1 to calculate a future estimate of East/West traffic, will be about 80 cars per hour.

This comment is not about Levels of Service but rather about Lives Saved.

(1) Figure 6 is incorrectly title as Without-Project rather than With. This is the same title given Figure 4. It is clearly With Project as it shows traffic counts leaving the Project! Figure 6 is correctly identified in the Table of Contents.



Google Inc. 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

You have received this email because someone shared a document with you from Google Docs.

Michael Jones

From: rinkege@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2016 3:18 PM
To: Michael Jones
Cc: Jim Hollaway; John Binns
Subject: Semiahmoo Zone 3 – Please Don't Create a Traffic Pinch Point

Dear Michael Jones,

Please pass this email on to the Planning Commission. Thank you commissioners for extending the public input date through September 8, 2016. That gives people a chance to absorb the “Staff Report to Planning Commission”, and the logic used to make their planning decisions. I appreciate your action.

If I had the city guidelines at my side and was designing the Sea Smoke development as a single, isolated entity....I might well have produced a plan very similar to the one presented in the above mentioned staff report.

But when I place it along side of the adjacent neighborhoods, some different factors come into play.

Of the current Semiahmoo condominium neighborhoods, the density of Gleneagle Villas is the greatest at 4.57 units per acre. The average density of the condominium neighborhoods minus Gleneagle Villas is 3.52 units per acre. The density of the proposed Sea Smoke-Phase 1 is 6.25 units per acre. So Gleneagle Villas and Sea Smoke are to be the most dense neighborhoods in Semiahmoo and they will be next door neighbors.

I predict that the current plan will create a traffic pinch point that does not exist today. The entrance and exit of the Sea Smoke development should be routed to a less travelled highway, the Semiahmoo Drive. Yes, this would force much of the new traffic through the intersection of the Drive and the Parkway. I see this as an advantage. A “traffic calming” intersection would help meter the traffic flow past the current entrance to the Gleneagle Villas. These kinds of intersections now installed on the 4th Street of Blaine seem to work well, while handling both flow and speed simultaneously. And they are visually appealing, too.

Planning Commission members, please think this through and improve the plan that both neighborhoods will be best served for the long range future.

Secondly, the property values of all of Semiahmoo stay high because of the high standards applied to their landscape and construction. These standards are regulated by the Semiahmoo Resort Association, (SRA).

All current neighborhoods in Semiahmoo have landscape and construction standards that are regulated by the SRA. The Sea Smoke development should be a member of SRA, and be required to live up to these same standards.

Thank you for your consideration.

Glenn Rinkel

**9039 Gleneagle Drive
Blaine, WA 98230**

**360-371-5445 home
360-303-0472 cell**

Michael Jones

From: Gary Reibman <azfox@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 5:06 PM
To: Michael Jones
Subject: Re: The Semiahmoo Zone 3 Proposal ~ File # LOP-1-16 and PUD-2-16

Michael Jones
Community Development Director
City Of Blaine
435 Martin St, Ste 300
Blaine, WA 98230

Dear Mr. Jones:

After reviewing above referenced Semiahmoo Zone 3 Proposal our main concern is the proposed gate locations on Semiahmoo Parkway. Having one of the entrance/exit gates directly opposite Gleneagle Villas only gate is a disaster waiting to happen. With auto traffic making left turns to enter gate locations, you are going to have dangerous traffic backups constantly. A suggestion we discussed with neighbors is to move the entrance gate and sign that is planned for Semiahmoo Parkway over to Semiahmoo Drive. Semiahmoo Parkway is very busy now and having northbound drivers making a left hand turn into the planned Semiahmoo Zone 3 development will result in cars backing up and causing delays for those of us having to make a right hand turn into Gleneagle Villas gate.

We suggest that developer (Rimland Pacific) add a Third lane for Left and Right turning traffic for access to all gates, including Gleneagle Villas. This would allow the flow of traffic to be much less impacted and safer.

We also would like to propose a larger wider open space around the entire development. There are extensive wildlife using the area.

Can the proposed density of this project be reduced down from 119 units. We feel this density would be is very high for this low density neighborhood.

As discussed with Semiahmoo Resort Association, we also would request that no approval of this project be granted until an acceptable agreement has been accepted the Resort Semiahmoo 3 and the Semiahmoo Resort Association.

Very Truly Yours,

Gary & Marie Reibman
9166 Gleneagle Dr
Blaine, WA 98230
cc Gleneagle Villas Homeowners Assoc.
