

**From:** [webmaster@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:webmaster@shorelinewa.gov)  
**To:** [agenda comments](#)  
**Subject:** City of Shoreline Agenda Comments  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2015 4:44:15 PM

---

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

**Form Name:** Comment on Agenda Items  
**Date & Time:** 03/21/2015 4:44 PM  
**Response #:** 93  
**Submitter ID:** 2698  
**IP address:** 97.126.93.208  
**Time to complete:** 2 min. , 23 sec.

---

### Survey Details: Answers Only

---

#### Page 1

---

1. Cathy Aldrich
2. Shoreline
3. (o) Ridgecrest
4. acathycicloud.com
5. 03/23/2015
6. 145th Street Station Subarea Plan
7. I am writing the council again, hoping for my voice to be heard, along with the many others that are raised against the council moving forward quickly (and given the decision on the 185th rezone), to some degree blindly. To ignore the advice of the City's own planning commission seems to me a council intent on pushing through their own agenda at the expense of common sense.

So, with that in mind, I urge the council to take their own planning commissions' advice and go for a phased option on the 145th rezone if such a decision is imminent. Decisions do not have to be made NOW. There truly is no way to know what the future holds and to build believing the future behavior of the transient oriented kind of development high rise apartments will bring would be rushing into the future with blinders on.

I truly do not approve this option either, but I also understand that to do nothing (which is my preferred option) is not on the table.

That said: I believe the best interest for the whole community would be to put off a vote on any option until December of 2015 to allow time for the full analysis to be completed. It would be the wisest option to go this route.

I do believe that 65 feet is far too high for the area and the amount of space devoted to these high rise apartments is too much. People will still have their cars. People will still go off to do their

shopping elsewhere, get their entertainment, visit friends, go to a coffee shop that might be preferred over any offered closer in. Apartments do not bring in tax paying citizens, apartments do not bring in long term residents. Apartments do not add revenue to support the parks and schools. Apartments do not add green space, do not add trees.

Given how random so many of Shoreline's requirements are regarding so many things to NOT require developers to adhere to the requirements citizens, who vote and live here, are required to adhere too will just create resentment among those citizens whose lives will be put into upheaval by the council's decisions.

To rely on renderings that give the most positive and cohesive look to redevelopment ignores the harsh reality of how areas truly develop. They are not so neat, so cohesive, not so filled with smiling people; they are filled with cars parked and empty streets. The parks, as shown, are rendered as they are now used ... adding residents without adding parks would make using the local parks a nightmare and the likely abuse of the parks would be a more logical interpretation.

I have driven through neighborhoods with the density Shoreline is proposing and not one even remotely resembles the story that has been woven on how things would look, how people would use the neighborhood. Indeed, most are void of humanity ... including apartments still sitting empty after six months.

Of course Ballard in Seattle is thriving, but it was already well established for years and years, once its own city in its own right. But look to what is not thriving: light is not, it is dark because the apartments block the sun and air that used to be, and the cars parked on the streets block access in general.

Indeed, many planners who once thought such density as is now being considered good now also advise caution, moving slowly into the future, carefully. Theory does not always work in practice, best use care when applying theory to humanity.

I find it sad that records seem to indicate developers helped elect several of the council members with campaign donations. Again, one would wish that even if money was accepted, that any council member would be listening to the citizens whom they are supposed to represent, not dollars from individuals who are only interested in the profit they can make from developing with no care for who they may harm. It has also been heard that other cities are looking at Shoreline and shaking their heads, wondering what is the matter here.

As a citizen who helped MAKE Shoreline into a city I too shake my head. The ideals that created this city seem to have fled.

I hope the council will choose the wise path, the slow path, not what seems the most expedient in the moment. Put any decision off until December when a full analysis can be presented. Only then can a truly INFORMED decision be rendered. Once a choice is made it sets wheels in motion that will affect many; better to move slow when there are so many variables, both human and with property, at risk.

Thank you for your time.

Cathy Aldrich  
Shoreline citizen since 1981

---

Thank you,  
**City of Shoreline**

---

**This is an automated message generated by the Vision Content Management System™. Please do not reply directly to this email.**