

Adam Zack

From: Erika Shook
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Comp Plan Update
Subject: FW: Eastsound Land Use District Boundaries and SJCC 18.10.40.C.1

From: John Campbell [mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 21, 2017 12:00 PM
To: Erika Shook <erikas@sanjuanco.com>; 'Jeffrey Otis' <jeffo@rockisland.com>
Subject: Eastsound Land Use District Boundaries and SJCC 18.10.40.C.1

John M. Campbell, AIA
P.O. Box 250
Orcas, WA 98280
(360) 376-2035
jmc779@rockisland.com

October 17, 2017

Dept. of Community Development

Attn: Director Erika Shook
Subject: Eastsound land use boundaries and SJCC 18.10.040.C.1

Dear Erika,

Urban Eastsound is, I believe poorly guided by 18.10.040.C.1 which states:

*"1. Land use designation boundaries, unless otherwise indicated by natural land forms, **shall** follow lot lines or the centerlines of streets and alleys as shown on the official maps. Where....."*

In urban areas like Eastsound, it is I believe, good general policy to draw land use boundaries, in so far as possible, so that like uses face like or similar uses across a street. Retail facing retail, residential facing residential.

In Eastsound, where that has not happened (North Beach Road where SLI faces Residential) the result has been unfortunate. Similarly the Seaview propane tank issue. There a couple of ways to improve the situation:

1. Change 18.10.40 to read **SHOULD** instead of the imperative SHALL.
2. Or, to localize the discussion, add a paragraph to the Eastsound Plan under Land Use Districts (pg. 27) such as:

5.13 **Land Use District Boundaries.** Land use designation boundaries, unless otherwise indicated by natural land forms, **should** follow side or rear lot lines or the centerlines of alleys as shown on the official maps. In general, like uses should face each other, i.e. commercial facing commercial, residential facing residential across streets.

In all events, getting a Policy to read SHOULD is most helpful. Similarly, a Policy about like uses facing each other would provide additional good planning guidance.

It appears to me that 18.10.40 is a Policy that has been inadvertently cast into a mandatory Regulation.

Yours truly,

John M. Campbell