From: Plancom

To: Rachael Markle; Steve Szafran; Easton Craft; David Maul; William Montero; Paul Cohen; Lisa Basher; Jack Malek;

Laura Mork; Miranda Redinger; Julie Ainsworth-Taylor; Susan Chang; Donna M. Moss

Subject: FW: HOMELESS ENCAMPMENTS

Date: Wednesday, December 07, 2016 1:05:04 AM

From: Pamela Cross[SMTP:PCROSS3001@GMAIL.COM]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2016 1:04:55 AM

To: Plancom Cc: City Council

Subject: HOMELESS ENCAMPMENTS

Auto forwarded by a Rule

The City of Seattle has encouraged homeless encampments. Apparently the mayor and everyone else involved never heard of Hooverville.

Seattle played nice with i<u>llegal</u> encampments, until rats and other vermin as well as trash and "bathroom" odors got so bad that all of the taxpaying neighbors complained. Then the city would do a "cleanup" and be criticized by other other taxpayers who found this cruel and disrespectful.

Then there was the Jungle. City played nice, people got killed, city spent months working with social services to relocate and otherwise assist before cleaning out this large encampment. A small minority of the homeless accepted assistance. Same unhappy taxpayers both pro and con.

The City of Portland had their failed attempt at camping in designated areas but only at night. However, campers appeared everywhere and stayed there. Portland had to cancel this test program practically before it started.

Seattle decided they would give it a try.

Seattle gave it a try by playing nice with all illegal encampments (driven down Interstate 5 in the last 18 months?)

So Seattle has illegal encampments, legal encampments, unhappy citizens and unhappy downtown workers, and Seattle can't maintain any of it.

Shoreline's proposal to allow encampments in the backyard of any homeowner is one of the worst lose-lose ideas I have heard.

The neighborhood will no longer have its single family feel, home sales will be difficult resulting in lowered property values, and with zero setback requirements only a portable cyclone fence and black tarp will separate you from the sights, sounds and smells (portable toilets) of your neighbor's encampment. You lose.

The hosting family will incur costs of increased utilities, portable toilets, and loss of privacy. Additionally their homeowners policy will be cancelled because their property is no longer a single family dwelling. Their cost of auto insurance will increase by the number and driving records of *all licensed drivers* staying on the premises. It doesn't matter if they drive - just if they are licensed. You lose.

The homeless are still in a wet and cold tent. Another location but no more private than the encampment they left. Now in multiple smaller encampments dispersed throughout the city of Shoreline, the likelihood of meaningful social services is reduced. If the next-door neighbor has a two story house, the encampment will be in full view of prying eyes. And in a few months the encampment will be moving again. You lose, too.

I hope that the decision has been made: No Backyard Encampments for the good of all.

Regards, Pam Cross Shoreline