

Page 10-6 Line 21

Consider rewording item A.4 to read:

4. If a non-conforming single-family residential development sustains major structural damage, it may be reconstructed over its original site and to the configuration existing immediately prior to the damage provided: a) the site is geologically stable, b) the applications for permits necessary to restore the development are begun within six (6) months of the damage and c) the reconstruction is completed within two (2) years of the issuance of permits.

Consider rewording item B to read:

B If a non-conforming development other than a single family residence sustains damages to an extent exceeding seventy-five (75) percent of the cost it would take to replace/return it to the configuration of the original development, barring geological or topographical constraints its reconstruction shall be in a location and fashion that complies with this Program.

Or consider “switching the two above items A.4 as B and thus B as A.4

A submission for your review and consideration – Bill Miller (page 2/3)

Page 10-7 Line 2

Consider replacing the words “bulk and dimension requirements” with “regulations”
Or cite the “bulk and dimension” requirements section.

Line 4

Consider deleting this item “E.”

Seems only expansion or enlargement permitted “within existing building footprint” would be for an increase in height up to the 35 foot limit – unless that would that require a CUP.

Line 7

Item F

Consider replacing the word “may” with “shall”

Lines 9 and 10

After all, these are non-conforming lots -

Consider inserting “only landward of the ordinary high water mark (not waterward of or lateral to)” after the word “appurtenances” and deleting the words “and provided the structure is located” and use the colon after the word “following.

Line 13

Consider rewording as:

1. Enlargements or expansions of existing structures that increase total footprint area or the height shall be allowed if they do not threaten critical areas or significantly impair the public's opportunity to view the shoreline

Or

Combine F and F.1 as

“The Administrator shall allow enlargement or expansion of single family residences by the addition of space to the exterior of the main structure or appurtenances only when a) those enlargements or expansions are located landward of the ordinary high water mark (not water ward of or lateral to) b) the increase/expansion in total footprint area does not threaten critical areas and c) the increase in height does not significantly impair the public's view of the shoreline.”

Line 25

Item G.

Consider deleting item “G” by deleting it and “G.1”. and use “G.2.” reworded to read:

“G. Enlargement or expansion of single family residences that would pose a threat to critical areas or is likely to significantly obstruct the public's view of the shoreline shall require a conditional use permit.”

A submission for your review and consideration – Bill Miller (page 3/3)

Page 10-8

Line 1

Consider deleting H

Line 10

Consider deleting this item – where is criteria for consistency?

Line 13

Consider deleting this item

enlarged, intensified increased, altered do not address a “different non-conforming use”

Line 22

Consider deleting this item

A prohibited use is a prohibited use even if it is a different non-conforming use.

Line 34

Consider moving the word “applicable” between the words “the” and “review”

Line 35

Consider ending the sentence with a period “.” in place of the comma “,”

Page 10-9

Line 6 item D.

Consider deleting this item – what are the “threshold” criteria for the applicant to meet?

JCPCpdsmpArt10Sec6