

From: webmaster@shorelinewa.gov
To: [agenda comments](#)
Subject: City of Shoreline Agenda Comments
Date: Monday, August 08, 2016 2:42:45 PM

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

Form Name: Comment on Agenda Items
Date & Time: 08/08/2016 2:42 PM
Response #: 138
Submitter ID: 8236
IP address: 24.22.136.132
Time to complete: 10 min. , 35 sec.

Survey Details: Answers Only

Page 1

1. Joe Ferguson
2. Shoreline
3. (O) Innis Arden
4. joe@lakeunionpartners.com
5. 08/08/2016
6. Ordinance 754
7. Dear Councilmembers,

I left you all voice messages, but I wanted to follow up with a written comment as well. I am writing in regard to the proposed moratorium on self-storage facilities, and I request that you do not pass Ordinance 754 or that you pass "Alternative 2" as outlined in the staff report, which would allow some self-storage projects to move forward.

My colleagues and I are the applicant team for a proposed self-storage facility project at 19237 Aurora Avenue N. We received months of assurance from the City of Shoreline that a self-storage facility would be allowed at our site as a "general retail, trade and services use." This assurance came in the form of direct feedback from planners at the Department of Planning and Community Development. We also held a pre-application meeting, and there was never any indication that a self-storage facility would not be allowed at our site.

We relied on these assurances and have committed significant resources to this proposal. We have been working on this project from the beginning of January and in addition to the significant number of hours spent by our team, we have invested over \$2,000,000 in the property acquisition, architecture, engineering and municipal fees.

In early July 2016, we were blindsided by feedback that the City had changed its mind, and self-storage facilities would only be allowed if the use was reviewed and approved through the City's

code interpretation process. At that time, the City told us our site would not be a problem and encouraged us to submit the code interpretation request. Reneging on its prior direct assurance was completely improper, but we went ahead and submitted the interpretation request. We received a formal determination on July 20, 2016 that the self-storage use was indeed compatible in physical appearance and intensity at 19237 Aurora Avenue N. Our project was the first to submit and receive approval under the City's new unlisted code interpretation approach. We understand and encourage the City's goals for place-making, but it made sense to us that we would receive formal approval for self-storage on this property given its significant slope, its location outside the Town Center, and the fact that it is not on a hard corner. We've continued to move forward with preparing our application materials based on that most recent assurance.

However, we were blindsided once again by this proposed moratorium on self-storage facilities. After months of direct assurance and feedback, it would be completely unfair and inappropriate to change course yet again. Such flip-flopping does not encourage development and growth in the City of Shoreline. As a resident of Shoreline and a local developer, I am disappointed and frustrated by this unreasonable behavior. The City should be treating each application on its own merit and there is no reason to impede the significant property tax revenue that will be created from our investment into the improvements which also stems the blight of what is currently a vacant property that went through bank foreclosure.

I request that you do not pass the moratorium contained in Ordinance No. 754. The case-by-case code interpretation that's already in place allows the City to evaluate each proposal in the context of urban planning goals and zoning compatibility. If you do pass a moratorium, then I request that you use the language provided in "Alternative 2," as outlined in the staff report. This would exempt the projects that received favorable code interpretations, and allow those projects to move forward. Finally, if you do not pass "Alternative 2," and you want to narrow the exemption even further, then I request that you consider an alternative amendment that would only allow self-storage facilities on sites that are uniquely suited to that use – sites located on Aurora Avenue N in the Mixed Business zone outside of Town Center.

A complete moratorium would be fundamentally unfair and contrary to the months of direct assurance provided by the City of Shoreline.

8. Oppose

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.