

Rocky Willson
Phone: (206) 542-226, Cell: (206) 898-8000
e-address: rockywillson@gmail.com (please note the double L's)

October 20, 2016

Here is a summary of my thoughts about Shoreline City's Planning Commission's hearing about revising rules regarding "Homeless Encampments"

- (1) Allowing "Homeless Encampments" is an extremely complex issue. Streamlining and fast-tracking an issue with as many facets as this one may not be prudent.
- (2) The ruling is unprecedented. It's unique to Shoreline. Why are we the Guinea Pigs for the nation? This is big-city foolishness. People move to Shoreline to get away from rulings like this.
- (3) The R-6 Zoning's overall purpose is to limit the use of land to six "single family residences" per acre. There are a number of statutes which allow residents variances to this overall purpose (guest provisions, room rentals to college students, RV usage, building and use of ADU's, nuisance ordinances, rules about businesses in the home, etc.). This proposed change far exceed any previous variances, and is more a violation of the R-6 Zoning than an amendment or variance to it—to a point of making it virtually non-existent. Any new ruling needs to be complimentary to other codes and rulings and not merely an attempt to circumvent them.
- (4) If the homeless issue is removed from the equation, we wouldn't and probably shouldn't allow variances from prior statutes.
- (5) When you bring homelessness back into the mix why should it get larger priority over non-homeless encampments when homeless camps are even less safe.
- (6) Homelessness is not a stand alone condition, it *normally* comes with a suite of other conditions and root causes (substance abuse, criminality, mental issues, lack of sanitation, etc.) which a normal homeowner would not have the resources to address. Even our local church had a problem with all their resources.
- (7) There could be extreme liability from allowing such encampments. The city needs to protect itself from potential liability for its complicity in allowing such encampments. An application fee is reasonable to allow the city to vet the applicants and protect itself. The city should make sure the applicant has adequate insurance to cover such contingent liabilities.
- (8) It should be noted that such encampments will add a drain on the city's budget without a compensating increase in tax revenue.
- (9) While the people wishing for such provisions feel it is the right thing to do. Many neighbors feel it is the wrong thing to enable certain lifestyles and the overall benefit of such a project may actually be negative because it keeps the camp residents from proper help.

For the reasons above, I urge the planning division to not accept the proposed changes and also urge them and the city council to revisit the statute/ruling that even allows homeless camps at all—whether it be on residential OR church properties.

Thank you.....Rocky Willson