

EX. 1035

(Oral comment at SMP Public Hearing)	3/6/2019	Josh	Nop		<p>* Concerned that thru-flow decking currently in use to be consistent with the existing SMP standard regarding light transmittance for docks is difficult on bare feet.</p> <p>* Complaint about requirement in existing SMP regarding required dock width when more than 50% of decking or structural elements are being replaced.</p>	<p>* Planning Commission opted to not make substantive changes to pier/dock dimensional standards. Standard remains unchanged, located in Public Hearing Draft in MICC 19.13.025 (F)(2)</p>
(Oral comment at SMP Public Hearing)	3/6/2019	Alexandra	Boyle		<p>* Would like more time to understand how the code will affect a project in development</p>	<p>* Comment noted</p>
(Oral comment at CAO Public Hearing)	3/6/2019	Ira	Appelman		<p>* Concerned about number of references to the "code official" and that this may give too much discretion to staff</p> <p>* Concerned the critical areas code will not be significantly strict</p>	<p>* Amendment made in response to comments: Removed references to the code official where possible</p>
(Oral comment at CAO Public Hearing)	3/6/2019	Alexandra	Boyle		<p>* Would like more time to understand how the code will affect a project in development</p>	<p>* Comment noted</p>
(Oral comment at CAO Public Hearing)	3/6/2019	Dan	Thompson		<p>* Light transmittance standard makes good sense.</p> <p>* Dock widths have been a contentious issue.</p>	<p>* Comment noted</p>