

Heather Finnell

From: Rick Paarfus <rpaarfus@ec.rr.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 18, 2023 11:39 PM
To: Brian Murdock; arnold.geraldnc@me.com; Rick Smith; Page Dyer
Subject: 6-20 Agenda Item 10, Bulkheads and Docks

I live on a canal lot in Harbor Acres and I am generally in favor of a clear navigation channel of appropriate width for the canals. However, the proposed change is just PLAIN WRONG!. I listened to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting and they simply did not apply any rigor to this at all. It was casually considered and sent forward without any real analysis. Basically, the change in red provided by Mr. Evans I believe is just a copy of another Island's ordinance and has not received any serious analysis for our canals (we do not have concrete canals). In the recorded meeting, Mr. Evans also did not have a clear path on how to enforce compliance with the ordinance.

Here's the problem. For my canal, and per the Town's own master plan, the channel bottom is 30 feet wide with a 3:1 side slopes, and a 5 ft. depth at mean low water. These are the project design parameters, which is what a freshly dredged canal would ideally have. These parameters will change with siltation, reducing both depth and width of the channel. So, for a 90 foot wide canal, with a 20 foot clear channel, that leaves 35 ft on either side for the pier, floating dock and boat. To reach the full depth of the channel, you have to be 30 ft. out. That leaves you 5 ft. for a boat beam (Also note that an 18 degree dead rise roughly equates to a 3:1 slope, so you can't put the keel right at the channel edge for shallower dead rise boats). A 10 ft. wide clear channel in these canals is more appropriate. A similar analysis should be done for the wider canals, balancing clear channel width vs. boat beam.

I also believe I know how to solve the compliance problem (even if there has been erosion) using the original lot survey/deed, but I will need to consult with a surveyor on this.

I understand that there may have been a couple of complaints that triggered this action. I don't consider this enough of a problem to actually warrant an ordinance change at this time. I suggest you find a way to survey other canal lot owners to see if there is really a problem to fix before you jump into a new ordinance.

In summary, I think the Planning and Zoning Board and Mr. Evans did an inadequate technical assessment of this ordinance before bringing it to the BOC. In the off chance that the Town would accept some help, I could help develop suitable language for a change providing that the other canal property owners think there is even a problem to be fixed.

Rick Paarfus
140 Tarpon