



## PLANNING COMMISSION

# AGENDA

City Hall Council Chambers, 435 Martin Street, Suite 3000  
Thursday, September 8, 2016

7:00 P.M.

### *Planning Commissioners*

Chair

Vernon "Van" Tabb

Vice-Chair

J Calvin Armerding

Sue Sturgill

Richard May

John LeBrun

Ken Ely

Kevin Owens

*For information regarding this  
Agenda, please call:  
(360-332-8311)*

*All proceedings are recorded.*

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **AUDIENCE COMMENTS**  
(regarding items not on the agenda)
4. **PUBLIC HEARING (continued)**
  - Semiahmoo Zone 3  
Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat
5. **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**
6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - August 25, 2016
7. **ADJOURNMENT**



# STAFF REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

**MEETING DATE:** September 8, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

**SUBJECT:** **Semiahmoo Zone 3 - Seasmoke**

**PROPONENT:** Rimland Pacific (Wayne Schwandt)

**APPLICATION TYPE(S):** Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat

**FILE NUMBER(S):** PUD-2-16 and LOP-1-16

**REQUEST:** An application for permits to develop 19.4 acres at the southwest corner of Semiahmoo Parkway and Drayton Harbor Road. The development proposes 40 housing units in Phase 1 and up to an additional 79 units in future phases. The project also includes commercial space for various neighborhood commercial uses and a personal, indoor storage facility. Open space, roads, utilities and a potential park site are included in the project.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Southwest corner of Semiahmoo Parkway and Drayton Harbor Road, a portion of the N ½ of the SE ¼ of Section 10 Township 40N, Range 1W, W.M.

**SUBMITTED BY:** Community Development Services

**AGENDA LOCATION:**

Public Hearing     Unfinished Business     New Business

---

**ATTACHMENTS:**

A. Written comments received since August 25, 2016 (after adjourning meeting)

**NOTE:** The materials that constitute the official record are on file with the Community Development Services Department and may be reviewed upon request.

## **Introduction**

This report is intended to provide supplemental information on some of the most frequently raised comments in spoken and written testimony. Please refer to the Staff Report to the “Planning Commission” dated August 25, 2016 for additional information on the proposed project and the development approval process.

The selection of certain issues is not intended to disregard or diminish other comments. All the comment letters and emails are provided to the Commission for consideration, as was the spoken testimony. Every comment raised is considered and evaluated for relevance and substance. The written comments received since the end of the August 25<sup>th</sup> meeting are included here as Attachment A.

It is often misunderstood that the development review process is a “majority rules” situation, meaning that if many people make one statement it is more heavily weighted than if one person makes a different statement. This is not the case. Each statement is to be given equal consideration and the Commission is to make assessments of them.

The primary task of staff is to illustrate the context of the law and help the Commission to act in a legal manner by providing technical guidance on the Blaine Municipal Code, the City of Blaine Comprehensive Plan and the Revised Code of Washington.

The primary task of the Commission is to consider the public record and make subjective assessments in the context of the Blaine Municipal Code, the City of Blaine Comprehensive Plan and the Revised Code of Washington, and then to formulate a recommendation based on findings of fact for consideration by the City Council.

## **Traffic Safety**

A recurring topic during public comment was traffic safety. It seemed to be focused around two things:

1. Existing conditions at the Semiahmoo Parkway/Drive/Drayton Harbor Rd intersection.
2. Anticipated hazards at the proposed Seasmoke/Gleneagle Drive/Semiahmoo Parkway intersection.

We researched the accident history for the Semiahmoo Parkway/Drive/Drayton Harbor Rd intersection. Any accident that involved a police record would be recorded in the data base. There were two accidents in the data base:

- 12/30/2008 Collision Type: One parked –One moving
- 10/31/2010 Collision Type: Entering at an angle

Although, staff does not question that people show bad driving habits and there are undoubtedly near misses and perhaps some unrecorded accidents. This is the record, and it does not indicate that the intersection has a significantly high number of accidents.

To consider the future intersection we evaluated a nearby and similar intersection. There is a nearby intersection that is similar to the proposed Seasmoke/Gleneagle Drive/Semiahmoo Parkway intersection. The Shearwater/Mallard/Semiahmoo Parkway intersection is just to the north, and down the hill from the project site. It is a 4-way intersection with two gated entrances that have stop signs and the Parkway crosses through with driver right of way. By design it is extremely similar to the proposed intersection.

The location makes it different because it is on a hill and people coming up the hill are leaving the 25 mile speed zone. People going down the hill have just come for the 4-way stop. Drivers on the Parkway are probably going slower than they might be at the proposed intersection. It is not an exact comparison, but it is the closest comparison available.

There are no records for any multiple vehicle accidents at that intersection. There is one record of an accident where a driver on Mallard hit the gate control box. Below is a phot of the intersection, which illustrates the design. The crosswalk on the Parkway is where pedestrians cross from east to west, switching from sidewalk to trail. There is a center island that starts there and runs down the hill.



### **Entrance Road Location(s)**

The project shows two residential entrance roads. One would be built with Phase I, one with Phase II. There is also a driveway onto Semiahmoo Drive for the self-storage facility. There were multiple comments regarding the road location and design.

The arrangement of the two access roads is generally consistent with the RSMP, meaning the RSMP shows two access roads, on those streets, but in slightly different locations. All neighborhoods with frontage on Semiahmoo Parkway have been permitted an access road to Semiahmoo Parkway. Certain neighborhoods with frontage on two streets, such as Gleneagle,

Boundary Ridge and Drayton Cove were approved with access only from Semiahmoo Parkway and were not required to have access on the Drive of Drayton Harbor Road.

There are two neighborhood streets to the north of Gleneagle Drive; Shearwater Way and Mallard Road. They align with each other at a 4-way intersection. There are four neighborhood streets to the south of Gleneagle Drive accessing other parts of the Semiahmoo Uplands. They are Snow Goose Lane, Sandpiper Lane, Goldeneye Lane and Bald Eagle Drive. The land across the Parkway from these streets is currently undeveloped, but it will not remain that way. In time, it will be developed with neighborhoods. When that development occurs, almost without a doubt new streets will be aligned to intersect at the locations of some or all of these four streets.

This information is provided to illustrate that the proposed road alignment is not a unique situation. It is typical of what is located to the north. It is likely to be repeated to the south. It is a typical street pattern and meets design standards and it is generally consistent with the RSMP.

Multiple people commented that this design should be rejected. Others commented that the traffic load should be split with entrance on both the Drive and the Parkway. The applicant noted that all other neighborhoods along the Parkway have been permitted an access road along the Parkway.

### **Buffers and Open Space**

The topic of buffers and open space was raised. Questions and comments addressed landscaping and vegetation within those areas and how they would/should be used. Several comments addressed the size and width of the areas. These are two distinct things under the law; buffers and open space and they are addressed separately, below.

Buffers are described and regulated by BMC 17.68.160. They shall be 20 feet wide. They shall be landscaped with a minimum of a 5-foot wide landscape planting of shrubs, ground cover and trees, with the trees spaced every 25 feet. This is the minimum, and typically the full 20 feet is vegetated. Due to RSMP guidelines, this landscaping should be natural in appearance and should predominantly be made up of native species. The applicant is required to provide a detailed landscape plan after PUD approval.

There would need to be substantial and unusual circumstances to require a different buffer width or to allow a different planting plan. For example if the native landscape buffer would have the effect of blocking water views, then that could be a foundation for allowing a buffer without trees. The reverse is also true, and it may be reasonable to consider the self-storage use as one that has the potential to cause greater impact than typical. As such, it could be reasonable to require a wider buffer and/or a more heavily landscaped buffer.

To summarize, the buffers will be landscaped in a naturalized way based on a final landscape concept in the PUD Master Plan reviewed by the Planning Commission and a planting plan reviewed and approved by staff after PUD approval. They will provide a visual screening effect, but not necessarily a wall of vegetation. They will essentially create a visual screen typical of other areas in the vicinity. Requiring wider buffers throughout the project is not well founded in the law, but giving special consideration to those uses that may have a greater adverse impact does have a foundation in the law.

Open space is regulated by BMC 17.68.120.D. There shall be 15-percent open space in a PUD. There is no provision for requiring more. Critical areas and their buffers are handled separately, for example wetlands and their protective buffers would create extra undeveloped area. That does not apply to this project because there are no on-site critical areas. What does apply to this project is the fact that it was included in the overall Semiahmoo PUD approval in 1985 which set aside over 100 acres of open space, green belts and buffers; over 150 acres for the golf course; and several hundred acres of tidelands dedicated to the City for public use. Semiahmoo as a whole already exceeds the standard and this project will add to it, as a result there is little legal foundation for requiring additional open space.

Under the law the City would have the authority to allow or require a redistribution of open space so that instead of having it spread around the project it could be concentrated in one or two areas. Usually it is spread throughout a project to benefit the largest number of people. It is also usually split between phases. On a relatively small project like this, spreading out the open space is arguably less important because everyone could easily access open space within the 19-acre site.

The adverse effect of moving all the open space to one area would be the removal of more trees from other areas. By keeping the open space spread out, tree preservation will be more evenly dispersed and habitat will be more spread out. It is also worth noting that corridors and connection of open space is beneficial to wildlife.

Another topic is the use of the open space. Some commenters asked if it means “open” in the sense of being cleared of vegetation. It does not. It means undeveloped or developed for recreational use. The recreation can be active, like a tennis court, or passive like a trail with benches to enjoy the scenery. Purely natural forested may not meet the intent of the BMC. Staff advises that if the desire of the City is a natural area, it should be minimally developed to meet the “recreational amenities” standards in BMC 17.68.120.E.

### **Semiahmoo Resort Association Membership**

Many people commented on requiring the project be included in the Semiahmoo Resort Association (SRA) and/or covered by the SRA CC&R’s. Being included in the SRA would mean that the project is covered by the SRA CC&R’s and architectural review would be handled by the Architectural Standards Committee (ASC).

The City cannot legally put one citizen (or group of citizens) in a position to rule over other citizens. The way homeowners associations and CC&R’s are implemented is by voluntary actions by private property owners. If the SRA and the property owner agree, the project could be added to the SRA’s area of jurisdiction. Existing or new CC&R’s could apply to the project through the SRA. This is generally outside the City’s purview and authority.

What the City can and does require is that a PUD project have CC&R’s and that an HOA is established and granted certain oversight authority. The City also can and does require that certain design, management and maintenance standards are included in the CC&R’s. In certain instances, the City also mandates that the CC&R’s allow the City to step in and take action if the HOA fails to do so. This is usually limited to public safety instances, for example if the stormwater system is not being maintained or public trails are not being maintained the City could step in, do the work, and then bill the HOA for the work. Aspects of the CC&R’s that are

mandated by City code are also written in a way that the City must be involved in and must approve changing those, meaning the HOA cannot vote to remove elements required by the City without City approval.

So, while the City cannot legally put one citizen (or group of citizens) in a position to rule over other citizens, the City can establish and set standards and require similar rules and regulations. One example is the twelve design standards in BMC 17.38.055.B that require building and site design to be consistent throughout the Residential Planned Recreation zoning district which contains the Semiahmoo Uplands.

**The following section includes a list of questions asked via email by the Planning Commission, with responses provided by staff. The responses are in *italics*.**

- 1) Is there any legal requirement that developments in Semiahmoo area conform to RSMP?
  - *Yes. The RSMP is a Comprehensive Plan element that includes the Seasmoke site, thus the guidelines and policies of the RSMP apply to the project. The City must determine that the project complies or it should not be approved.*
  
- 2) Is there a legal requirement that developers agree to join the SRA?
  - *There is not a City law that requires the developer or any property owner to join the SRA.*
  - *The City has the authority to regulate development through the “police powers” granted through the US Constitution and through various state laws. This means we can oversee development, but cannot transfer our authority to a third-party, private organization or individual, so we cannot mandate that the developer and future property owners be regulated by SRA.*
  - *As a past practice all or nearly all developments were added to the SRA Homeowners Association as the projects were approved. This occurred while the major developer controlled the SRA (by being the majority property owner, and as defined in the CC&R’s) thus they could essentially require that SRA accept the development and define how SRA would oversee development of the property.*
  
- 3) Who decides what kind of street access should be chosen?
  - *This is primarily something determined through implementation of the Blaine Municipal Code and Public Works Standards. Sometimes those refer to other standards, like the Washington State Department of Transportation design standards. As staff we are essentially told what to do by adopted standards. However, the City Council can decide not to use the standards if they base their decision on sound findings of fact. Because the subdivision is a City Council decision, they ultimately decide.*

- 4) There seems to be significant feeling that the current plan will cause a lot of traffic at that one point, is there any reason that the proposal to put two accesses on Semiahmoo Drive shouldn't be required? Again, do we have the authority to mandate where they go in and out?
- *As currently designed, there will be two residential entrances when the project is done, so traffic will be split. One on the Drive and one on the Parkway. The second entrance would not get built until Phase II.*
  - *The Commission could recommend that be done now to split traffic from Day 1. It is not warrant by standards, and will cost the applicant more at the outset of the project.*
  - *The Commission could recommend that the project only have entrances on the Drive. However, this would be the only project along the entire Semiahmoo Parkway frontage that has been refused an entry on the Parkway. It could be viewed as arbitrary or unfair.*
  - *The Commission only has the authority to recommend. The Council has the authority to require. (See answer 3, above, about findings of fact.)*
- 5) What are the requirements for density?
- *The RSMP has density "targets" or "standards." They are described as maximums. The RSMP also allows for reducing density.*
  - *The RSMP has a standard density of 10-12 units/acre for Zone 3.*
- 6) It seems clear to me that the RSMP allowed for (encouraged?) higher density in some regions. Is there any requirement that Semiahmoo take a fair share? On the same topic, since Residential Zone 3 (Residential Planned Recreational same thing?) specifically allows higher density, RV storage, etc. in that area, what, if any, obligations does the city have to encourage higher density in that area in spite of the wishes of the current residents (see previous comment on apartment buildings).
- *Semiahmoo was proposed for 2079 dwelling units. Currently the unit count is between 700 and 800 units, with about 75-80% of the land area built out. Therefore, Semiahmoo will inevitably fall well below the planned numbers.*
  - *The question of density is a reasonable one to ask. The Growth Management Act (a state law) requires that the City accommodate a portion of an increasing state population. The City has established high goals for population increase. The City Council recently adopted a standard to accommodate 4,414 new residents by 2036. If fewer units are built on this site, where will they go? Under our current Comprehensive Plan and zoning it is reasonable to assume that if density is reduced here, it will inevitably go elsewhere.*
- 7) What is the legality of requiring larger buffers or are these set into the codes? What are the buffers around the existing surrounding developments? Plan says 20', people want 30' (or 40'), can this be required, does everyone else have this? Can we require that buffers be planted

with native screening vegetation? Again, do other developments immediately surrounding have this requirement?

- *Buffers are set by the PUD code.*
- *Special circumstances (and legal findings) could warrant larger buffers in certain areas. That action would need to be pretty specific and limited since the code already sets a standard.*
- *Other projects have buffers that are both larger and smaller than 20 feet. They were approved before a standard was adopted by law.*

8) What is the density of Gleneagle Villas and Country Club Villas?

- *Here is an updated table w/ Country Club Villas*

<b>Project</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Units per Acre</b>
Country Club Villas	4.45	36	<b>8.09</b>
Gleneagle Villas	10.72	49	<b>4.57</b>
Melrose Cottages	4.59	18	<b>3.92</b>
Club House Point	3.98	14	<b>3.52</b>
Aerie Condos	4.90	11	<b>2.25</b>
<b>Zone 3, Phase 1</b>	6.40	40	<b>6.25</b>

9) What is the zoning on building height? Are there any other four story buildings in Semiahmoo? Is this an appropriate design for the area and is it specifically allowed there?

- *The RSMP sets the height (with guidelines):  
Multifamily 40 feet (50 feet if approved through a PUD)  
Single family 35 feet  
Staff can only answer an “is it appropriate” question based on regulations, and since the RSMP specifically calls for multifamily development up to 50 feet tall on part of this site, it seems appropriate.*

10) Tract D - park vs development. Can we require that this area be set aside as undeveloped woodland? Would it need to be maintained?

- *The PUD code and the RSMP call for preserving open space, but they also direct that the open space should be usable and provide developed amenities. At a minimum, open space areas should probably have trails and some basic amenities like benches, signs, etc.*
- *The City does not have much of a case for requiring preservation of the property as open space. That could be considered an illegal taking of private property.*
- *It is important to consider that all of the Semiahmoo Uplands were forested. None of the current neighborhoods existed when the plan was developed, nor was the golf course.*

*This project follows a standard set by the other projects and the RSMP, that being the conversion of forest to neighborhood.*

- *A public park would be maintained by the City.*
- *A private community park would be maintained by the HOA.*
- *Natural open space, it typically not managed. That can be a problem, because it can collect litter or become overgrown with undesirable vegetation.*

11) Is the comment about 400 parking spaces relevant to current discussion? There aren't 400 spaces there now, there won't be 400 spaces when the development is done, this item seems to be causing some confusion.

- *The 400 parking spaces comment is relevant because the RSMP specifically lists it as one of the uses for this site. Whether or not it is needed, appropriate, desirable, etc. – those are totally different issues and need to be discussed.*
- *Staff agrees that at least a few people seem to think that someone is now proposing 400 parking spaces, and we will try to clarify that no one is proposing that at this time.*

12) Can limits be placed on "outdoor storage"? Can Blaine require an "indoor storage" only facility or is there no provision for this? This would eliminate the possibility of a giant lot with piles of junk as can be seen at some storage units in other parts of the city.

- *Yes. There can be limits/requirements and it can probably even be disallowed completely based on aesthetic concerns. As with any condition of approval, it requires a foundation in law to apply the condition to the project.*

13) Can the project be limited to access only from Semiahmoo Drive?

- *Yes, it could. Although the RSMP shows access to both the Parkway and the Drive for this site, the access in the RSMP has been modified in other instances. It is a planning guide, not an absolute decree.*
- *Building access from both the Drive and Parkway is better at distributing traffic and spreading the impacts more evenly over the area.*

14) Will there be buffer planting along the project edges?

- *The PUD code requires a perimeter buffer of 20 feet at the project edges.*
- *Those will be planted with natural and ornamental plants to augment the natural forest and "thicken" the vegetation.*
- *The screening effect will often be added to by planting on private property. For example, people will typically have bushes and trees in the back yard between the house and the buffer. This makes the actual vegetation more substantial than the 20 feet.*
- *In addition there is usually vegetation along the edge of the road on the public right of way. That also adds to the screening or buffering.*



**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](mailto:danaRMFK@comcast.net)  
360-201-1229  
[www.danasmusicplayground.com](http://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 4<sup>th</sup> 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](mailto:jcohenour@sierrawireless.com) :: [www.sierrawireless.com](http://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 *EM*

X Better gate location on Sanidmoor Drive would allow better access for construction and faster access to commercial property - houses - park - ~~sheds~~ ~~garage~~ ~~traffic~~ ~~parkway~~ due to split construction, 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 the park~~ 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 - generators, 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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.

---