

**Lisa Clausen**

---

**From:** Public Council Inbox  
**To:** Paula Anderson  
**Subject:** RE: Re: City of Burien SMP

Thank you for writing to the Burien City Council. Your message will be included in the Correspondence for the Record for an upcoming Council meeting.

L. Clausen  
Burien City Manager's Office

---

**From:** Paula Anderson [<mailto:mudwagon@juno.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2010 4:53 PM  
**To:** Public Council Inbox  
**Subject:** Fw: Re: City of Burien SMP

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Paula Anderson <[mudwagon@juno.com](mailto:mudwagon@juno.com)>  
**To:** [bob.fritzen@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:bob.fritzen@ecy.wa.gov)  
**Date:** Fri, 17 Dec 2010 16:43:53 -0800  
**Subject:** Re: City of Burien SMP

Bob Fritzen and Geoff Tallent,

Problems, corrections, concerns I have with the City of Burien SMP:

- (1) 20.10.001 The reference to RCW 90.58.020 is not complete. If the city feels it is important (and it is) to put some of 90.58.020 in the SMP, I feel they should put all of it in; it is not very long. The City left out some of the most important parts of the finding. I feel that WAC 173.26.176 requires this to be included in the SMP.
- (2) 20.30.040 This is extremely restrictive and would eliminate the use and enjoyment of a property owner of the 20' parallel to the shoreline. I suggest that you draw a mitigation plan for compensating for 2500 sq. ft. of alteration. Then you will understand the impact.
- (3) 20.30.050 Ordinary high water mark when measured from a bulkhead or other stabilization structure should be calculated (measured) from the waterward side because that is where the ordinary high water mark is. Using landward side is not ordinary high water mark and lacks common sense.
- (4) 20.30.095 Residential development. The definition is too broad. This would be construction inside or outside a residence, no matter how minor.

CFTR: 01/03/11  
cc: Comm. Devel.

(5) 20.30.095 Protect water view....this is in conflict with 20.20.015 Pol. PA 3 impact to private property , 90.58.020 priority for single family residence and appurtenant structures, etc., and would be a taking.

(6) Reference to best available science should be changed to no net loss. It is my understanding the legislature directed this change.

(7) WAC 173.26.176 General policy goals (2) In part, The act calls for the accomodation of "all reasonable and appropriate uses". I feel the SMP is too restrictive, cumbersome, and doesn't meet the goals of RCW 90.58 and WAC 173.26 & WAC 173.27.

Thank you,

Greg Anderson  
15451 11th Ave. S.W.  
Burien, Wa. 98166  
206-915-8148