

From: [City Council](#)
To: [Chris Roberts](#); [Debbie Tarry](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Heidi Costello](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [John Norris](#); [Keith McGlashan](#); [Keith Scully](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Will Hall](#)
Cc: [Rachael Markle](#); [Miranda Redinger](#)
Subject: FW: public comment in support of Ordinances 750, 751, 752 and 756
Date: Friday, September 09, 2016 3:14:55 PM

9/12 meeting - Comments for Item 8(a) – This will be added as a green folder item.

cw

From: Megan Kogut [mailto:mbkogut@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 11:01 AM
To: Chris Roberts; Shari Winstead; Keith McGlashan; Will Hall; Doris McConnell; Jesse Salomon; Keith Scully
Cc: City Council
Subject: public comment in support of Ordinances 750, 751, 752 and 756

Dear Shoreline City Council,

As a homeowner and resident of the Ridgecrest neighborhood since 2003 and a small business owner in Ridgecrest since 2014, I write to express my strong general support of Ordinances 750, 751, 752 and 756, all related to the rezone of the subarea around the future 145th Sound Transit light rail station.

My husband I live and work just outside of the area considered for rezoning, so our home and business are not affected directly by the rezone. And I do sympathize with those people who invested in a property in the area being rezoned and assumed that nothing would ever change in Ridgecrest because nothing much tangible changed in Shoreline for decades, and Seattle has been absorbing all the growth until recently.

However, as a former resident of Ballard, I have already seen lot of change, and I understand that change is inevitable. The light rail station is on its way, as it should be. We need to now focus on creating the best change possible for everyone considering the circumstances. The pressures on the Seattle area housing market and transportation system are immense, due to Seattle's popularity, several major Seattle employers, and many other reasons. Seattle is changing rapidly, for better and for worse. The City of Shoreline, which shares a long border with Seattle and is home for many people working and recreating in Seattle, is part of the solution to absorbing Seattle's population growth, stabilizing the housing market, and maintaining diversity of age, culture, and socioeconomic status. And the City of Shoreline can learn and borrow from the best lessons from the City of Seattle's change.

I also spent five years in Boston, MA, for graduate school. There, I saw dozens of walkable and thriving neighborhood centers serviced by light rail and with very limited parking. I lived in four different areas in five years: Brighton and Jamaica Plain in Boston and Harvard Square and Kendall Square in Cambridge. I've seen what a dense city can be. As a young adult, I really enjoyed my time there and lived car-free easily.

I have been quiet on the issue of the rezone so far, with the exception of a specific comment letter to the Shoreline Planning Commission regarding the Paramount Open Space wetland study. As a frequent visitor to that park, and with a PhD in environmental engineering, I had

to write a letter in support of the study's results and implications. I also felt I had a personal issue at stake with the decisions related to that study, since my mother lives right outside of Gold Bar, WA, near a salmon bearing stream that is prone to flooding and across the street from a large wooded lot that contains a very large and high quality wetland. Since 2002, that lot has at least twice been at immediate risk of development into multiple 1 acre single family homes. I asked the Planning Commission to consider the Growth Management Act's goal of protecting larger, higher quality wetlands outside of Growth Management Areas from development, which means adding more density within city boundaries, even if that density is near existing urban wetlands. Also I agreed with the study's point that the wetlands in the Paramount Open Space could be enhanced and access to them could be greatly improved, which would be of significant personal benefit to me as someone who lives about five blocks north of the park and loves wetlands. But otherwise, I've felt reluctant to speak out in support of the rezone because it seems like it's a very bitter issue for some, and as a local business open I feel particularly vulnerable to backlash.

But I write this letter anyway because I have significant interest in the rezone for several reasons:

- My husband and I, both in our early 40s, plan to live in Ridgecrest for another 50 years, and we would love our neighborhood to be a great place to live, with character, walkability, diversity, and affordability. We would love to see it have a sense of place and pride, and we would love for people to react positively when we say "we live in Ridgecrest". We don't want Ridgecrest to be compromised unfairly in the long term by controversy over relatively short term impacts.

- My husband and I recently invested a lot of time and money in creating Ridgecrest Public House, and we intend to keep it going for the foreseeable future. We are located in "downtown Ridgecrest" at 165th and 5th, halfway between the two future light rail stations. It was not ever our personal dream to own a bar, but we went for it anyway in the best way we could. And the pub has turned out to be the collective dream amongst hundreds of Ridgecrest residents. Even after almost a year in business, we get thanked several times a week for creating a gathering space for neighbors, with many patrons independently expressing a strong desire for neighborhood character and a sense of place and community in a sea of single family houses. Further, dozens of people have expressed interest in a family-friendly restaurant or two in downtown Ridgecrest, plus active retail and so on. However – and here I arrive at the main point of this bullet point - it is not easy owning a business in Ridgecrest. We might make it look straightforward, but as I've written before, one of us has a full time job with benefits as a Senior Scientist/Engineer at University of Washington, we don't have kids, we had external financial and other resources, we had an extraordinary ability to do the buildout on a small budget, and I have worked 50-80 hour weeks for over a year now. And, we kept the business simple, sticking to a non-family-friendly "tavern" designation and partnering with food trucks. Based on the pub and food truck sales, we don't think the area could support a full restaurant anytime soon, especially with no existing space that could be easily converted to a commercial kitchen and of a viable size for a restaurant. In short, we are in a unique position to see that Ridgecrest is currently unable to support a viable, much less vibrant, commercial area, for a number of reasons, including lack of population density. And we feel that commercial viability should be a strong consideration for the rezone, both for

downtown Ridgecrest indirectly and for the future commercial property in the rezone area. Obviously, any rezone will bring additional commercial tenants, which means competition for business in downtown Ridgecrest. But the rezone also brings population density, which creates a bigger customer base. And the rezone can retain and attract population diversity, which can support more diverse businesses, both in terms of supplying employees and customers. And so as both Ridgecrest business owner and resident, I hope that the rezone increases as much as possible the overall commercial viability and diversity of Ridgecrest.

· Third, I am terrified of climate change - I personally think we're almost all doomed in the long run - but I think it is our moral obligation as individuals, a community and a city to reduce our carbon footprint as much as we can for current and future generations of people around the world. I have been involved directly in climate change research since 1994 and I've taught freshman and senior level several classes about it at UW Tacoma. I understand the causes and mechanisms of climate change and I know what's at stake around the world. Well-designed mass transit, walkable full-service communities, energy efficient housing, and population density all reduce climate change, and the rezone can grow all four.

So, for personal, community, and global reasons, I broadly support the 145th Street station subarea rezone and related ordinances. In other words, I support maximizing density with reasonable short term accommodations and adjustments for existing residents in and near the rezoned area. I think that this balance should be the measuring stick for any remaining decisions related to the rezone.

I have not had the time, nor do I have the deep expertise, to understand all the details of the rezone, so I do not comment on any specific issues remaining to be decided. I do understand that it's not going to be easy to section off a portion of an existing neighborhood built to the standards of another era, to shoehorn in a light rail station, and expand allowable development to include infrastructure that is somewhat incompatible with existing character. I know that compromises must be made.

And I admit I am somewhat terrified too that we'll get a cookie cutter neighborhood like Ballard turned out to be in places.

But, I do want to emphasize my three big long term issues - long term neighborhood livability, commercial viability, and climate change – and ask that you consider them along with other long and short term interests as you vote on the ordinances related to the rezone. I hope my points are helpful for your decision-making.

I appreciate all the work and thought you will have put into this issue. This rezone a big deal for current and future residents and businesses of Ridgecrest, and it is a small but necessary piece of a global effort to slow climate change.

As always, thank you for your time.

Megan Kogut PhD