

Index of Comments Rural Element Update (received between June 23 and July 23, 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
ACME	
Acme LAMIRD needs to be larger	Garry Reid - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing
AXTON & GUIDE MERIDIAN	
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 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
5655, 5659, 5673, 5683 Guide Meridian. 5659 “Guide Trading Post” in existence for over 50 years. 5673, 8 bay garage used as commercial. 5683 (.6 acres) is not suitable for a residence, has commercial value. Requesting to keep GC zoning.	Sandy Lankhaar – July 20, 2009
5655, 5659, 5673, 5683 Guide Meridian. Did not receive any notification on LAMIRD process. Requesting to keep existing zoning in order to save small businesses.	Sandy Lankhaar – July 21, 2009
Proposal will cause hardships & burden when trying to sell business & land.	Bill & Lori Schermerhorn – July 23, 2009
BIRCH BAY-LYNDEN & I-5	
Area serves as a gateway to Birch Bay & 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; would 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
TC Trans Inc. Requesting to retain existing zoning. Reiterates that the GMA or any other decision does not prohibit commercial zoning outside UGAs. Transportation corridor is must comply with LAMIRD provisions. Spacing requirements creates nonconforming businesses, should be modified in this area. Area is well suited for business. Under no time obligation to complete rural element update.	Heather Wolf, Brownlie Evans Wolf & Lee – July 22, 2009
Valley View & Birch Bay Lynden Rd. Zoned GI. Supports the idea of this area as a UGA, if not an UGA parcel should be included in a LAMIRD. Alternatively, this area could be considered a Type III, it is isolated, being ¼ mile from nearest LAMIRD. Reasonable place for development to occur.	Bradley Swanson, Belcher Swanson – July 23, 2009
75 acres Birch Bay – Lynden Rd. & I-5. Public input at July 9 hearing suggests that the proposal is deeply flawed. Gateway area is special, in no way is this development going to affect farmable land.	Jack Swanson, Belcher Swanson – July 23, 2009
Completely opposes the proposed downzone of the area. Much time & considerable money has been invested in project with the proper approvals from Whatcom County. Requesting to keep existing zoning. Proposes Custer/Gateway UGA. Rural Element & LAMIRD policies need revisions. Provides details of the built environment as of 1990 for inclusion of Type 1 LAMIRD.	Portal Way Storage, A to Z Storage Studios – July 23, 2009

Current approach will stifle business growth & destroy existing businesses. Urges county to review decision & intended outcome of current proposal & what the court order is.	Stuart Pennington – July 23, 2009
8210 Portal Way (Van Wingerden Garden Center) Current zoning is GI, proposed STC, creates a currently conforming business to become non conforming. Large & successful business & proposed rezone would be detrimental. Consider retaining existing zoning or RIM zoning.	Lesa Starckenburg-Kroontje, July 22, 2009
400122055348, 400122110300. Existing GI zoning & would like to retain it. Area not suited for agriculture or residential uses. Land has infrastructure prior to 1990 (water & fire flow). Requesting to be part of a rural industrial LAMIRD, feels that being included in such LAMIRD would not threaten the rural character of Whatcom County.	Jay Irwin, Irwin Land Use Consulting – July 23, 2009
400122055348, 400122110300. In the process of developing two small business/industrial parks. Wants to retain existing zoning and be included in a LAMIRD. Area not suited for residential development.	Joseph Shen & Dorothy Pao – July 23, 2009
8150 Birch Bay Square. Supports property between Portal Way and I-5 being utilized to the fullest potential. Generally does not support the proposal.	Dan Washburn – July 17, 2009
Details Gold Star Resort Inc.'s property history.	Peter Spencer, Gold Star – July 17, 2009
8390 Portal Way, TC Trans Inc. GI is the logical land use for the area and the county can retain this zoning if contained in a LAMIRD. Spacing requirements are flawed and make TC Trans Inc. not in a LAMIRD. There is no date in which this project needs to be done.	Heather Wolf, Brownlie Evans Wolf & Lee LLP – July 22, 2009
(Birch Bay-Lynden Rd. & Valley View Rd. 400123029037) anticipation of commercially developing property.	Sam Boulos – July 20, 2009
Provides detailed information of the built environment for Gold Star Resorts Inc. 15 properties.	Gold Star Resorts Inc. – July 23, 2009
GLACIER	
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	Richard Russell - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing

1978 & considered as built environment.	
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
Gives several examples of why Glacier Water District’s suggested boundaries are more appropriate than those proposed by Whatcom County.	Ellen Baker – July 21, 2009
Provides water line & rezoning information to create a more inclusive LAMIRD in Glacier.	James Evangelista – July 16, 2009
Glacier is remote and isolated, not subject to sprawl; has absolute physical barrier containment; Glacier is an existing, historic area circa 1910; Glacier is a natural neighborhood; the town has rural character; infill will not affect its visual landscape; compatible with the use of the land by wildlife & for fish & wildlife habitat; open space & natural vegetation predominate the built environment; some areas are fully served by water and fire, no need for extension of urban governmental services. Please reconsider Glacier’s boundary.	Ellen Baker – July 21, 2009
Purchased property zoned RC with intent of building a lodge/restaurant and condos in a sustainable manner. Wants to retain RC zoning.	Rod Cheney – July 20, 2009
Concerning properties: Miller’s Addition to the town of Glacier (STC) and Mt. Baker & Old Mt. Baker Highway (RC). Has a commercial plan for properties. The current zoning in Glacier is delineated predominately by the built environment. Board is clear that the Glacier Water District system constitutes built environment because of its capacity is greatly more intensive than normal rural water system. Board precedent is clear that LAMIRD boundaries need not be “tightly drawn around the existing water system lines” but rather should include adjoining land. Board precedent is clear that existing zoning lines may be a strong factor in designating logical boundaries. Under the GMA, economic development is a major goal to be observed.. The existing zoning for Glacier	Russell Pritchett – July 23, 2009

already limits the possibility of sprawl and reflects a logical outer boundary delineated predominately by the built environment.	
Supports the “Trailhead” project. Potential to stimulate Glacier’s economy. Retain existing zoning in order to complete the project.	Dara Burrows – July 23, 2009
HINOTES CORNER	
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
6757 Hannegan Rd. Wants to be rezoned to from Ag to R10A to match surrounding area.	Starkenbug-Kroontje – July 23, 2009
Look at allowed uses under the General Commercial code & incorporate more of these uses within the STC code, specifically more dense residential uses & commercial uses that mirror the built environment.	Lesa Starkenburg-Kroontje – July 23, 2009
KENDALL	
Proposed LAMIRD is oversized and contain areas that shouldn’t be in LAMIRDs	Cathy Lehman - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing
Owns parcel located between Kendall library & Texaco. Parcel is going to have back three acres zoned to Rural, leaves the front piece of the parcel too small to build. Area needs services and is a good location. Keep all the same commercial zoning.	Shabir Balolia – July 23, 2009

LAUREL (proposed as Rural Center)	
Krause Manufacturing should retain GM zoning	Darrell Krause - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing
5956 Guide Meridian. Property frontage on Guide between equipment repair and fire hall, not suitable for residential. Does not support proposal.	Carole Burton – July 23, 2009
6129 Guide Meridian (Z Recyclers INC.) Existing GC zoning, proposed RIM zoning. Requesting to retain existing zoning. Proposal is going to cause serious & grave consequences to entire Whatcom County.	T “Dan” Thompson – July 23, 2009
Co owner of Rooendaal – Honcoop Construction (5977 Guide Meridian). Concerned over timing of proposal & suggests waiting until a ruling by the court is made; GMA requires that business & property rights are protected & this proposal does not take that into consideration; RH Const. will be zoned from GC to STC removing the ability to expand, create a non conforming use and decrease property value; elimination of the ability to finance non conforming properties; proposal does not protect farmland; an economic study is needed; taxes generated from small businesses will be reduced, spreading the burden to the rest of the county.	Roger & Joan Roosendaal – July 23, 2009
Direct opposition to the proposed rezoning. Co owner of Rooendaal – Honcoop Construction (5977 Guide Meridian). General construction building business. Proposal would have detrimental impacts to the company because they build & short plat small parcels. Also renovate/remodel commercial buildings, will be affected because many clients will now be considered non conforming.	Gary Honcoop – July 23, 2009
Direct opposition to the down zoning of Whatcom County & the removal of the zone designations of UR, RUM, UR-MX, & especially GC, GI, LII, GM. Co owner of Rooendaal – Honcoop Construction (5977 Guide Meridian). Constructed buildings so they conformed to the existing GC zone. With proposed STC zone, business will be nonconforming & have grave impacts. Requesting to retain existing zoning or a zoning that reflects current conforming uses.	Gary & Cindy Honcoop – July 23, 2009
Krause Manufacturing, Inc. 6059 Guide Meridian. Currently GM, proposed Rural – Industrial Manufacturing. Proposed change will create non conforming status because Krause is not limited to serving only the ag or forestry business communities. Requesting to retain GM zoning.	Linda Krause – July 17, 2009
Creative Stoneworks, 6050 Guide Meridian. Successful local business would be in jeopardy if current proposal is accepted. Wants to retain existing zoning. Guide is not a residential area.	Marv Stremmler – July 17, 2009

5946 Guide Meridian, Meridian Equipment Inc. Wants to retain GC (not proposed STC) zoning. Supports saving ag/rural & their business sells to farmers. Guide should not be a residential area. Take more time and effort with proposal.	Bob & Linda VanderPloeg – July 20, 2009
3902244652200000 is a small business. Requesting to keep existing zoning.	Tom & Toni Pullar – July 22, 2009
3902244652200000, west of Guide, south of Laurel, is being short platted in accordance with General Commercial Zoning requirements. Requesting to keep GC zoning, area not suited for residential.	Lesla Starkenburg-Kroontje – July 17, 2009
3902244652200000, west of Guide, south of Laurel, should keep existing commercial zoning.	Jana Kessinger – July 21, 2009
3902244652200000, west of Guide, south of Laurel, should keep existing commercial zoning.	Rich Marsyla – July 17, 2009
3902244652200000, west of Guide, south of Laurel, proposing GC to R10. Property has public water & access to Guide and the area infrastructures sufficient to serve commercial uses.	Barbra Clary – July 13, 2009
3902244652200000, west of Guide, south of Laurel, proposing GC to R10. Parcel has been waiting until Guide project finishes to develop. Please retain existing development.	Jay & Susan Fjellman – July 16, 2009
3902244652200000, west of Guide, south of Laurel, proposing GC to R10. Property better suited for commercial & not residential.	Ron Vander Yacht – July 17, 2009
NUGENTS CORNER	
Support for retaining the small commercial center of Nugents Corner. This area serves the greater rural area.	Randal Ellis DMD – July 3, 2009
Proposed Type 1 Rural Business, Nugents Corner is an existing hub for east county residents. Requesting to retain existing zoning, allowing for expansion of existing businesses (IGA).	Ellen Baker - July 23, 2009
Generally opposes proposal. Current LAMIRD proposal discourages expansion of development. Dodson's IGA service area extends over 30 miles east & 5 miles to the west. Currently 18,000 square feet, would be considered non conforming if rezoned to proposed STC. Attached petition requesting to reconsider zoning changes in Nugents Corner	Larry Stoner Land Development Consultants – July 23, 2009
POINT ROBERTS	

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
Wants to retain all development potential, keep existing zoning.	Sue Cope – July 20, 2009
POLE & GUIDE MERIDIAN	
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
6775 Guide Meridian. Commercial uses on parcel for 30 years. Requesting to be included in	Simon Petree - July 21, 2009

LAMIRD.	
6775 Guide Meridian. Commercial uses on parcel for 30 years. Requesting to be included in LAMIRD. Provides justification for inclusion into a LAMIRD.	Simon Petree - July 21, 2009
6990 Guide Meridian, Country Storage. Requesting to be included in LAMIRD, half way through construction of commercial buildings.	Arlo & Charlotte Schouten – July 22, 2009
PORTAL WAY NORTH	
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.	Leša Starkenburg - 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
SLATER & ELDER	
Requests that the Lummi reservation continue to be undesignated.	Kirk Vinish – July 20, 2009
SMITH & GUIDE MERIDIAN	
Save farms if it is farmable, save forested land if it is forested but if the land is worthless for those, don't try & save it for that. The Guide is not appropriate for residential uses.	David & Susan Peterson – July 21, 2009
119 E. Smith Rd & parcel directly to the east. Currently GC zoning, proposed NC. NC is unacceptable to them. Both parcels should wholly be contained in a LAMIRD. Adequate location for commercial development, commercial node.	Bradley Swanson, Belcher Swanson – July 23, 2009
SUDDEN VALLEY	
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	Ron Cowan – July 10, 2009

in finishing the proposal.	
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
Proposed LAMIRD boundaries are too restrictive, not properly drawn & will not best serve to protect the environment, community, or members. Proposed downzone of Sudden Valley, including fully plated areas of UR3 & UR5 to RR10A not rational. Will have substantial adverse impacts.	David Wareing – July 21, 2009
WISER LAKE	
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 th 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.	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
Opposes rezone proposal for Wisser Lake area.	Dave & Ross Black, Wisser Lake Business Park – July 23, 2009
Smokin' Sam's & parcel due south. Both parcels surrounded by commercial/industrial use & near an intersection. Requests to be included in a LAMIRD & retain existing GC zoning. Spacing requirements should be reviewed & reconsidered.	Bradley Swanson, Belcher Swanson – July 23, 2009
(Guide just south of Wisser Lake, Jansen Nursery & Smoking Sam's) Has considerable time & investment in property (including water shares). Area not suited for residential.	Sam Boulos – July 20, 2009
Look at allowed uses under the General Commercial code & incorporate more of these uses within the STC code, specifically more dense residential uses & commercial uses that mirror the	Lesla Starkenburg-Kroontje – July 23, 2009

built environment.	
RURAL DESIGNATIONS (proposed as Rural, no LAMIRD)	
Emerald Lake:	
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
Lake Samish: Supports County's proposal. Would like to see surrounding R5A changed to R10A.	Mark Herrenkohl – July 10, 2009
North Shore: 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
Chuckanut:	
Supports the change of zoning in Chuckanut area, especially RR3 zoning to a R5 or greater zoning. Governors Point property should be rezoned to rural.	Dean Brett – July 23, 2009
Supports RR2, RR3 and R2 to be replaced by R5A and R10A.	Diane Smith – July 22, 2009
Supports RR2, RR3 and R2 to be replaced by R5A and R10A. Lack of infrastructure, environmental impacts, and general hazards does not make this area suitable for urbanization.	Robert Kimsey – July 20, 2009
Chuckanut Bay is one of the few remaining less-developed shorelines. Supports the continuing and renewed measures to protect Chuckanut area.	Michael Gropp – July 22, 2009

Supports RR2, RR3 and R2 to be replaced by R5A and R10A. Does not want to loose Chuckanut to sprawl.	Sharon Schayes – July 21, 2009
Supports RR2, RR3 and R2 to be replaced by R5A and R10A. Does not want to loose Chuckanut to sprawl without proper infrastructure. Supports Rural element process.	Janet Wynne – July 21, 2009
Protect Governors Point because it is the largest single undeveloped piece of waterfront between Seattle and Vancouver, BC.	Susan Peterson – July 22, 2009
Chuckanut area has little to no suitable lots. Sever environmental and infrastructure restraints makes this area less than ideal for future development. Supports elimination of RR2, RR3, and R2A.	Phelps Mcilvaine – July 23, 2009
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	Tom Vowiler - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing
Fort Bellingham: 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
Sandy Point:	
Retain RR3 zoning. Does not support proposal	Ron Jepson - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing
4878 Bewachway Road. Currently RR1, proposed RR10. Surrounding property is built out & wants to retain the ability to subdivide.	Michael & Susie Burnett – July 17, 2009
South Bay:	
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
North Bellingham: RR1 existing zoning, doesn’t want to be in Ferndale’s UGA. Maintain existing character.	Janice Schuch - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing

GENERAL POLICY & ZONING COMMENTS	
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 rural lands	S. Gillfillin – July 4, 2009
Concerns with: haste in developing LAMIRDs before Gold Star case is heard by Supreme court, proposed LAMIRD boundaries, impacts of down zoning, 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).	Starkenburg-Kroontje – July 13, 2009
Proposal creates many non conforming uses, which is not good public policy & has 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	Dan Warner – July 10, 2009

Whatcom County show in polls how much they want to preserve rural lands.	
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 notification. Proposal does not reflect the current business.	Alan MacPhee – July 15, 2009
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 Starkenburg - 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	Bill Quern - July 9, 2009 @ Public Hearing

information too much, need more time on project.	
Concerned about 10 acre zoning applied to areas like Sudden Valley and Cain Lake and how does this affect use? Concerned about lot consolidation changing in the future.	Garry Reid - July 9, 2009 @ 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
Generally supports proposal and Rural Element process. County needs to reform its rural planning to achieve our shared vision for the county. Many of the county's high density rural zones include working farms & forestry, these undeveloped lands need to be removed to achieve the goals county residents want of protecting farms & forestry. There are planning tools the county can use to allow for existing residential & commercial uses in rural areas. We cannot wait longer. There are no changes to the existing nonconforming use section of the code. The problem will get worse in the future. Point Robert's & Kendall LAMIRDs are too big and include undeveloped lands. See letter for specific recommendations.	Futurewise – July 21, 2009
Properly adopted LAMIRDs can help accommodate Rural Businesses. Whatcom County has other tools to accommodate existing businesses. Whatcom County's Nonconforming use provisions can help accommodate existing businesses in a way that allows them to continue	Futurewise – July 22, 2009

operating. Adoption of the Rural Element Amendments will help working farms & forests, these businesses deserve protection & the GMA requires the county to protect these businesses. Please see letter for response to BIA of Whatcom County.	
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Rick Dunbrow – July 23, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Edwin Brown – July 20, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Lisa McShane – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Diane Lehman – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Walt Burkett – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Kim Ninnemann – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Kathrun Vestal – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Caprice Teske – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Mery Mele – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Brian Mulligan – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Nick Hartrich – July 22, 2009
BIA and realtors were represented at the public hearing these people did not represent all of Whatcom County. 150 people signed Futurewise ballot.	Mark Herrenkohl – July 20, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Max Morange – July 23, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Sue Parrott – July 23, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Laura Johanson – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Margaret Borgens – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Christoper Grannis – July 22, 2009

Supports process and Rural Element update.	Laura Pitts – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Pamela Jull – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Chris Lange – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Dr. Vince & Dianne Foster – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	George & Anne Zuk – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update. Few benefit from development and most suffer from the increase in costs associated with development.	Steven Harper, Ph.D. - July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Bob Aegerter – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Shirley Jacobson – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Dean Fearing – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update. Supports positive attitude towards farms/farming in Whatcom County.	Kathy Hopkins – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Jason Darling – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Shonie Schlotzhauer - July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Marian Larson – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Laura Rink – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Lucy Morse – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Steve Walker – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update. Limiting urban sprawl will encourage improvement of our existing neighborhoods and buildings and keep rural lands for farming and other appropriate uses.	Maggie Bates – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Shannon Maris – July 22, 2009

Supports process and Rural Element update.	Candice Warren – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Phil Printz – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Edie Norton – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Henery Lagergren – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Elizabeth Gross – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Suzanne Harris – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Mark Troupe – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Heather Devine – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Barry Mason – July 22, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Michael Chivario – July 21, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update.	Bruce Brown – July 23, 2009
Supports process and Rural Element update. There is a vocal minority and silent majority that supports.	Dave Werntz – July 20, 2009
Reviews Whatcom County's non-conforming code; responsibility of government to balance the rights of property owners and the rights/interests of the public. Whatcom County's nonconforming use statute balances these conflicting interests. Nonconforming use issues should not be part of the decision.	Wendy Haris – July 22, 2009
Supports elimination on non-complaint zoning. Environmental impacts hurt the economy of the county.	Robert P. Gibb M.D. –July 22, 2009
In order to save farms, we must downzone. The county has very little buildable land left, there is enough infrastructure and employment opportunities located in the existing 6 cities, majority of residents of the county want to save our farms.	Harold Macomber – July 20, 2009
Save the agricultural industry, we rely on farms and our current rate of rural growth is affecting the amount of land available for farming. Cities should take the growth and build up not out. Rural	Donna Macomber – July 18, 2009

should be 10 acres or greater, create strong impact fees.	
States rebuttals of contentions heard at public testimony including the mandates (non conforming status) protect property owners & offer opportunity for intelligent planning as well as that the council is not legally mandated to utilize LAMIRDs it has every opportunity to protect citizen's property rights and protect our rural lands. Wants to retain rural character of our community & respond rationally to growth by defending our rural lands.	Scott Pelton – July 22, 2009
Supports the process, the longer the process takes the more difficult and costly the process becomes. Must protect county taxpayers from subsidizing additional sprawl in rural areas.	Todd Donovan – July 22, 2009
Separate out LAMIRD changes that had little opposition & moving those on to Council; review other LAMIRDs that need more time so the entire proposal is not held up.	Dave Pros – July 23, 2009
Work to preserve farmers and farmland, not just farmland on behalf of interest groups.	Steve Mach – July 22, 2009
Growth Management Hearings Board did not call for complete redrafting of LAMIRDs & questions timing of proposal. Feels that a SEPS DNS is insufficient & an EIS is unnecessary. The LAMIRD boundaries of Point Roberts, Birch Bay Square area, & Laurel are illogical. The creation of such a large number of non conforming uses is detrimental.	Perry Eskridge, Whatcom County Association of Realtors – July 23, 2009
SEPA file SEP2009-00030 fails to comply with the SEPA requirements. Specifically: contains factual gaps & fails to define the issue under review; is non-responsive to mandatory questions; contains generalized commentary when specificity is required; fails to provide alternatives or analyze impacts of taking no action; fails to integrate the analysis across functional categories to show cumulative impacts & geographical distribution.	Bill Geyer – July 23, 2009
Owns R2A property & is proposed to go to R10A. Wishes to keep existing zoning.	John Eide – July 23, 2009
LAMIRD proposal will have grave negative impacts on the county.	Mike Gish – July 23, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal. Proposal should combine zoning allowances that allow the continuation of current uses with the opportunity to expand as allowable uses, while having conditions that encourage low impact growth, to comply with GMA. County should seek a land use attorney.	David Moody – July 23, 2009
Currently General Commercial zoning, wants to retain it. Poses to loose large sum of money if rezoned. Has secured health county permits, water shares, architectural drawing, & numerous expenses.	Patrick & Hanneke Timmins – July 23, 3009

Generally does not support the proposal.	Kris Halterman – July 23, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal.	Bryan Loney –July 23, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal.	Gregory Grant – July 23, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal.	Jim Strachila – July 23, 2009
Reasoning behind the decision to include, or exclude parcels is not readily apparent.	Public Policy Perspectives – July 17, 2009
Whatcom County is only mandated to show its choices for logical outer LAMIRD boundaries. It does not require the additional use restrictions & downzones.	Building Industry Association of Whatcom County – July 21, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal because people from Bellingham have the ability to comment on rural issues.	Larry Illman – July 18, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal.	Barry & Maureen Hofford – July 16, 2009
Feels that there has not been enough information/review of jobs created/lost in LAMIRD proposal.	Public Policy Perspectives – July 20, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal.	Bryan Loney – July 23, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal; believes it is a taking of property rights, taking of tax dollars, create non-conforming uses which affects the lending process, does not support a 10 acre min. lot size on the Guide, and opens the county up to lawsuits.	Karen Timmer – July 23, 2009
Community needs predictability and reasonable surety enumerated in the comprehensive plan and implementing documents. Any changes in these documents need to be slow and deliberate by taking time and resources to create dialogue. County must make clear distinction between agriculture resource lands and rural. Comp plan must define and protect rural. Bellingham Greenways project is a model that the County should use.	Wayne Schwandt – July 23, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal; the proposal will put many small business out of business initially and slowly force others to cease operation as well.	Ben Schouten – July 23, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal.	Doug & Joan Marr – July 21, 2009
Generally does not support the proposal, time line, or creating non conforming commercial uses.	Shari Draper – July 21, 2009

Generally does not support the proposal, feels the County should wait for a ruling from the courts, and creating non conforming commercial uses will have impacts that need to be studied.	Becki Taylor – July 21, 2009	
Generally does not support the proposal, feels that zoning should be a reasonable median that stimulates jobs.	KC Coonc – July 21, 2009	
The Goldstar decision requires the county to justify its current zoning & boundaries, not a major rezone. The current proposal may in effect create more sprawl by pushing development into the R5A zones. What actually defines rural character? Urges to wait until there is a court decision on case. Request public record to be held open until Commission send recommendation to Council.	Robert Tull, Langabeer & Tull – July 23, 2009	
MISCELLANEOUS NOTES		
ALL Commercial → Residential rezones: Consider policy to waive nonconforming use affidavit fee for legal uses (Council action)	STAFF – June 25, 2009	Recommend clear path to legal nonconforming use, due to county action (within time period?)
ALL existing legal Commercial in Residential areas: Consider policy to offer % relief from cost of type 3 designation (zoning & comp plan) if qualified based on criteria (Council action)	STAFF – June 25, 2009	Recommend clear option of change from current legal nonconforming use to Type 3 LAMIRD (within time period?)