

## Index of Comments Rural Element Update (received between June 23 and July 16, 2009)

*Note: Topics of comments have been paraphrased for reference only – please refer to the record for full comments*

Location - Topic of comment	Author – Date Received	Notes
<b>ACME</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		
Acme LAMIRD needs to be larger	Garry Reid - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>AXTON &amp; GUIDE MERIDIAN</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
Does not support proposal.	Dana Johnson – July 13, 2009	
Does not support proposal.	Diana Johnson – July 13, 2009	
Guide Trading Post should retain GC commercial zoning. Guide Meridian not a residential area.	Sandy Lankhaar – July 13, 2009	
Guide Trading Post and Hilltop Restaurant should be included in LAMIRD because both in existence before 1990. Creating non conforming uses will hinder financing from banks. Policy 2A-3 the Guide Meridian in a major is a major highway, logical place for business, not residential or agriculture. Policy 2A-4, GC is best use of land in this area. Policy 2A-5 downzone does not reflect this goal.	Adams/Kilpatrick – July 14, 2009	
Laurel Hills Business Park GC zoning should remain. Commercial landlord – tenant issue with zoning and non-conforming issues. RIM zoning is not appropriate for this area.	Steve Moore - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>BIRCH BAY-LYNDEN &amp; I-5</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		

Area serves as a gateway to Birch Bay and a very important intersection. Wants to keep current zoning (GI).	Goldstar Resorts – July 9, 2009	
Owns 6 acres with GI zoning outside LAMIRD. Retain GI zoning.	Maryann Philipene – July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Discusses Supreme Court Cases, urges county to wait, concerned about non-conforming, concerned about the public process	Jack Swanson - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
GI area a major transportation corridor. Wait for Supreme Court decision. Compliance should take into account lifestyle, economics, etc. Square footage of the existing grocery store will be limited under new zoning, like to see 40,000 sq.ft.	David Moody - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Birch Bay Square – vendors wouldn't be permitted under proposed zoning, would put Birch Bay Square out of business	Adam Ware - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Owns property on east side of freeway, transportation corridor, gas pipeline etc. Leave existing zoning.	Bill Grant - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Owns property on east side of I-5 currently zoned GI proposed R10A. Wants to develop “full service travel center,” not possible with proposal	Stuart Pennington - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>BLUE CANYON</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
<b>CUSTER</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		
<b>DEMING</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		

<b>GOOSEBERRY POINT</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type I)		
<b>GLACIER</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		
Does not support current proposal for Glacier, it greatly reduces the much needed commercial land which reduces the affordable housing. Proposed LAMIRD doesn't have a logical outer boundary, there is additional built environment as of 1990 with the Glacier Water District water system. Suggests including all of "Miller's Addition" (currently STC), square off boundary to the west of this area by including Copp's parcel.	Richard Russell – July 9, 2009	
Glacier LAMIRD is an irregular boundary, proposed zoning does not allow for the needs or future needs of community. Should consider economic development. Water lines in area since 1978 & considered as built environment.	Richard Russell - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Owns RC zoning not included in proposed LAMIRD. Include as much RC zoning in Glacier as possible; services are needed in this area. Need case by case analysis of each area.	Joseph Garcia - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Area needs all the commercial zoning possible. Area very constrained by natural features. Consider water lines as built environment	Russell Pritchett - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Glacier needs as much RC zoning as possible, keep Glacier unique and viable.	Brady Webb - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Observe what the built environment was and include water district as built environment.	Greg Wielinga - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Provides map Glacier Water District transmission lines and describes suggested LAMIRD boundary.	Glacier Water District – July 16, 2009	
<b>GUIDE MERIDIAN BORDER CROSSING</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type I)		

<b>HINOTES CORNER</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		
Property owner on SE corner of Pole & Hannegan (GC zoning). Area is not rural, has the potential to be urban level due to its location on a major intersection. Lack of public process. County needs to address nonconforming issue.	Patrick Timmins – July 13, 2009	
Owns property GC and proposed STC, wants to keep GC. Concerned with the limitations new zoning creates. Concern over the investment in forming the Hinotes Corner Fire Protection District that installs infrastructure such as underground lines and hydrants in order to build commercial buildings.	Dale Vander Giessen – July 14, 2009	
Purchased property in 1990 as GC – area is 75% built out, planned multi family, under proposal only 1 unit allowed.	Patrick Timmins - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
No multi family residential in proposed STC. Need more development potential in Rural Center if development potential is reduced in rural areas.	Truman Sterk - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>KENDALL</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		
Proposed LAMIRD is oversized and contain areas that shouldn't be in LAMIRDs	Cathy Lehman - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>LAUREL</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		
Krause Manufacturing should retain GM zoning	Darrell Krause - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>MAPLE FALLS</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		

<b>NORTH LAKE SAMISH &amp; I-5</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
<b>NUGENTS CORNER</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type I)		
Support for retaining the small commercial center of Nugents Corner. This area serves the greater rural area.	Randal Ellis DMD – July 3, 2009	
<b>POINT ROBERTS</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		
GC change to a “toned down” GC or to STC, the current proposal is to NC.	Jerry White – June 29, 2009	
Supports all of Point Roberts as one LAMIRD	Genine McCurdy – June 30, 2009	
Three separate one acre parcels at border crossing zoned GC & going to NC, too restrictive for what is currently operating, possible go to STC or RC.	Ruby Gibson White – June 26, 2009	
Submitted several pictures of the built environment. No written comment.	Gordon Nielson – July 9, 2009	
GC property owner, proposed for NC. Rather have STC, wants all current uses to remain conforming.	Gordon Nielson - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Proposed LAMIRD is oversized and contain areas that shouldn't be in LAMIRDS	Cathy Lehman - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>POLE &amp; GUIDE MERIDIAN</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
Consider as Type 1 LAMIRD & increase boundary (RB or RC?)		
Relief from split zoning, include entire parcel in RIM. Needs for warehousing, packing processing, shipping facilities (buildings up to 100,000 sqft)	Ismael Gomberoff - July 3, 2009	

Include Elder and Vander Yacht properties in a Type I LAMIRD. Nonconforming status would create hardships.	Brownlie/Evans/Wolf/Lee - June 30, 2009	
Generally supports intent of proposal. Inca Gold Brand Company needs warehouse facilities. Consider allowing RIM to permit facilities up to 100,000 sq.ft. Relief from split zoning of property. Would like to see the parcel south of this (between the gas station and Artistic Farms) to also be considered for the LAMIRD/RIM zoning.	Ismael Gomberoff – July 3, 2009	
Midway Properties used commercial since 1970's, should be included in a LAMIRD	Simon Petree - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Must recognize existing development in rural areas. Keep commercial zoning on Guide. Allow continuance of existing business. Spacing requirements are a hindrance. Impact of commercial changes must be studied	Heather Wolfe - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>PORTAL WAY NORTH</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
Owns and operates trucking company on 5 acres, with proposed changes, will not be able to expand operations. Land is well suited for this type of business, not for residential uses.	Charles Schamel – July 15, 2009	
Consider the greenhouse operation, possible RIM designation.	Lesa Starckenburg - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Owns & operates TC Trans transportation operation. Has been in operation for 1 year and wants to expand, not possible under current proposal.	Charles Schamel - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>SLATER &amp; ELDER</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
<b>SMITH &amp; GUIDE MERIDIAN</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type I)		

<b>SUDDEN VALLEY</b> (proposed as Rural Center)		
Keep “Airport Site” R5A and include it in the LAMIRD. Bellingham School District has been planning to build a school on this site; not including it in a LAMIRD will create serious problems in finishing the proposal.	Ron Cowan – July 10, 2009	
Retain NC zoning in Sudden Valley	Roger Euphils - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Supports areas adjacent to Bellingham’s UGA to be rezoned to a rural density; strong support for the zoning changes that would reduce the allowed densities in the North Shore, South Bay, and Sudden Valley within the Lake Whatcom Watershed to R10A	City of Bellingham – July 6, 2009	
<b>VAN WYCK</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type I)		
<b>VAN ZANDT</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
<b>WELCOME</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
<b>WISER LAKE</b> (proposed as Rural Business, Type III)		
Consider Wisser Lake Storage 7388 Guide Meridian as Type 1 LAMIRD	Ron De Boer – July 1, 2009 Keith Bouma – July 1,	

	2009	
131 E. 74 <sup>th</sup> Lane & 7372 Guide Meridian - Consider including in LAMIRD. Currently zoned for light industrial and adjacent GC parcel, operating a small contracting business from these locations. Address:	Gregg Wielenga – July 7, 2009; July 8, 2009	
Concerns with existing business wanting to expand, financing and insurance issues. There is no demand for residential land on the newly expanded Guide Meridian.	Kieth Bouma – July 13, 2009	
<b>RURAL DESIGNATIONS</b> (proposed as Rural, no LAMIRD)		
<b>Emerald Lake</b>		
Concerned about losing development potential on 8.15 acre parcel	Kim Pierce – June 28, 2009	
Does not support the proposal. Keep existing zoning. Have sewer be just as important as water service.	Paul Isaacson – July 9, 2009	
Owns 190 acres of RR2 proposed RR10A currently undeveloped, will lose financing if proposal goes through	Paul Isaacson - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>Lake Samish</b> Supports County's proposal. Would like to see surrounding R5A changed to R10A.	Mark Herrenkohl – July 10, 2009	
<b>North Shore</b> Support proposal. Area should be kept rural in nature and this proposal is preventing further subdivision.	Pratum/ Leviton – July 9, 2009	
Supports areas adjacent to Bellingham's UGA to be rezoned to a rural density; strong support for the zoning changes that would reduce the allowed densities in the North Shore, South Bay, and Sudden Valley within the Lake Whatcom Watershed to R10A	City of Bellingham – July 6, 2009	
<b>Chuckanut:</b>	Tom Vowiler - July 9,	

Supports proposal in general and for the Chuckanut area. County needs to get into compliance with the GMA. Minimize LAMIRDS, create no loop holes and have stringent review for LAMIRDS, consider environmental overlays	2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>Fort Bellingham</b> Owns and farms 36 acres in Fort Bellingham zoned RR1; proposed change to RR10A would devalue the property.	Jerry and Nellie Johnson – July 13, 2009	
<b>Sandy Point</b> Retain RR3 zoning. Does not support proposal	Ron Jepson - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>South Bay</b> Supports areas adjacent to Bellingham’s UGA to be rezoned to a rural density; strong support for the zoning changes that would reduce the allowed densities in the North Shore, South Bay, and Sudden Valley within the Lake Whatcom Watershed to R10A	City of Bellingham – July 6, 2009	
Owns several parcels currently zoned R2A, no relief from lot consolidation in Lake Whatcom Watershed.	Diane Ramsey - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>North Bellingham</b> RR1 existing zoning, doesn’t want to be in Ferndale’s UGA. Maintain existing character.	Janice Schuch - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
<b>GENERAL POLICY &amp; ZONING COMMENTS</b>		
Proposed RIM chapter: 20.69.300 - .301 & .302 may not allow for big enough facilities ( allow facilities up to 100,000 sqft)	Ismael Gomberoff - July 3, 2009	
Proposed RIM chapter: 20.69.050 allow: automobile sales, repair shops & storage; machinery sales, repair shops & storage. Removal of Light Impact Industrial (LII) from rural lands creates loss of jobs and empty buildings.	Sebulon Were – June 29, 2009	
Recommend low residential density (no more than one house every five/ten acres); Tightly define and limit LAMIRDS and exclude undeveloped areas; Maintain clear distinctions and separation between urban and rural areas	Eric Hirst – July 7, 2009	
Supports preserving farmland and preventing parcelization of	S. Gillfillin – July 4, 2009	

rural lands		
Concerns with: haste in developing LAMIRDs before Gold Star case is heard by Supreme court, proposed LAMIRD boundaries, impacts of downzoning, need more relevant legal information, public process, effect on economic viability, needs more time for analysis	Building Industry Association of Whatcom County – July 9, 2009	
There is no specific deadline. There is no prescribed outcome required from WA or GMHB. A downzone does not address the built environment, creates nonconforming uses and sizes).	Starckenburg-Kroontje – July 13, 2009	
Proposal creates many non-conforming uses, which is not good public policy and have adverse economic repercussions. Birch Bay Square and surrounding parcels is used as example to illustrate the lack of regard for the as built environment and investments made.	Bill Henshaw – July 14, 2009	
Supports the proposal. County cannot indemnify the public against the normal risks associated with speculation. Nonconforming uses are essential to acknowledge problems with existing development and maintaining existing rights of property owners. Rural Land-Introduction of Comp Plan should be clear that rural lands include forestry and agriculture only when determined not to have long term commercial value. Concerned about language in comp plan that refers to “parks, trails, and open space.” Policy Goal 2FF (water & sewer) should address manure management programs and access of livestock to rivers and streams. Goal 2NN (Lake Whatcom Watershed should reference best available science and TMDL requirements.	Wendy Harris – July 10, 2009	
Supports proposal, policies look to future, not for making real estate investments. Citizens of Whatcom County show in polls how much they want to preserve rural lands.	Dan Warner – July 10, 2009	
Process is rushed and creating more sprawl. Lack of proper information to make decisions on this proposal.	Public Policy Perspectives – July 9, 2009	
Supports preserving rural lands but does not support this proposal. Process is happening too fast with no public	Alan MacPhee – July 15, 2009	

notification. Proposal does not reflect the current business.		
Does not support proposal.	Russell Unrein – July 9, 2009	
Does not support proposal.	Jeff Baker – July 15, 2009	
Does not support proposal.	Randy Cross – July 15, 2009	
Does not support proposal.	Carol Henshaw – July 16, 2009	
Does not support proposal.	Whatcom Republican Party – July 15, 2009	
Does not support proposal.	Carol Quinn – July 15, 2009	
Does not support proposal. Requesting an EIS.	Larry Helm – July 14, 2009	
No timeline or mandate for County to act. There is no prescribed outcome from the State, nonconforming has huge impact, consider the as-built environment.	Lesa Starckenburg - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Supports proposal. Need to protect from sprawling development, already proper zoning for enough new homes in rural area. Need for clear boundaries between urban and rural	Eric Hurst - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Represents water districts and associations (Sandy Point, Custer, Acme). LAMIRD boundaries do not match water system plans. Requesting an EIS, skeptical of SEPA.	Doug Campbell - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
GMHB mentions allowance for local circumstances if backed up. Protect rights that county has established in the past.	Adam Morrow - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Does not support proposal.	Whatcom Republican Party – July 15, 2009	
Need to know full economic impact of proposal. Lack of adequate public notice, volume of information too much, need more time on project.	Bill Quern - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Concerned about 10 acre zoning applied to areas like Sudden	Garry Reid - July 9, 2009	

Valley and Cain Lake and how does this affect use? Concerned about lot consolidation changing in the future.	@ Public Hearing	
Lack of support for proposal is alarming. Thurston case demonstrated ability to have smaller lots with justification. Wait for supreme court ruling or request stay. Concerns with public process and lack of transparency. Illogical boundaries.	Mary Dickenson - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Does not support proposal.	Ron DeBoer - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Proposal is too complex and does too much harm. Does not support the proposal.	Bob Weisen - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Proposal is promoting sprawl. Not enough land supply in cities. Growth will likely leapfrog as result of proposal	Jack Petree - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Too much growth in rural Whatcom County. Proposed amendments are acceptable.	Cathy Lehman - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Need more time, illogical spacing requirements	Jay Irwin - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Refer to what GMA says about Rural Lands. Project needs more time.	Danon Traxler - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	
Short time frame and lack of public comment/involvement	Dave Pros - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing	

<b>MISCELLANEOUS NOTES &amp; TELEPHONE CORRESPONDANCE</b>		
<b>Glacier:</b> Straighten northern border in Glacier proper	Joseph Garcia, June 30	
<b>Glacier:</b> Consider river boundary to encompass broader area	Joseph Garcia, June 30	
<b>Accessory dwelling issue in RR/R:</b> Question regarding unintended consequences of 10 ac density on ability to have accessory dwelling unit (see Title 20.32.132(10) and 20.36.132(10)).	STAFF – public mtg question on June 30	