

2017 Development Code Amendment Comments - Attachment 2

From: [Plancom](#)
To: [Rachael Markle](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Easton Craft](#); [David Maul](#); [William Montero](#); [Paul Cohen](#); [Jack Malek](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Miranda Redinger](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Susan Chang](#); [Donna Moss](#); [Carla Hoekzema](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Proposal to modify Development code 20.40.210
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 12:42:01 PM

From: Michael Clayton[SMTP:MICHAELC@CEI-GROUP.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 12:41:50 PM
To: Plancom; City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposal to modify Development code 20.40.210
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To whom it may concern –

I am opposed to the modification of the Development Code Section 20.40.210 proposed by applicant Cindy Dittbrenner requesting the elimination of owner occupancy as a requirement for developing an ADU on the property.

The applicant has cited, as evidence to consider this change, other cities which have allowed such changes such as Portland, Vancouver, BC and Los Angeles. The applicant also states that Seattle is considering such a change. I submit that Shoreline is much smaller than any of these comparable Cities and possesses a more suburban character. Shoreline is not comparable to any of the cited examples in population or economy size or character thus the examples are not in any way comparable. Research these cities may have done may have failed to consider factors relevant to a much smaller community.

Shoreline is a mostly family-oriented residential community that still maintains a broad mix of development densities. By removing the requirement for owner occupancy of properties with ADUs, Shoreline will increasingly become a target for developers intent on developing additional rental capacity on properties that otherwise would not be suitable for further development due to their otherwise lower permitted density. Expect developers to push the limits of existing codes to maximize size, heights and impermeable area to maximize rental revenue. This would have a detrimental effect on the character of the City as a whole, adding noise, additional runoff and loss of tree canopy as well as adding traffic to otherwise quiet residential neighborhoods. Moreover, removing the owner-occupied requirement, amounts to a defacto stealth increase in zoning density across Shoreline.

Goal H II of the Comprehensive plan, as cited by the applicant, includes the statement, “increased residential density along arterials” as a desirable characteristic of the plan. ADUs do not, in general meet that requirement since most, if not all would appear in areas currently zoned R6 on less developed streets with insufficient traffic controls. By maintaining the requirement that owners occupy the property containing an ADU, it assures that owners, not just neighbors will bear the burden of additional density in the neighborhoods where they are built This will require the owner developing an ADU or the purchaser of such a property to consider the impact on their lifestyle and

2017 Development Code Amendment Comments - Attachment 2

neighborhood. Further, the requirement that owners occupy the property on which an ADU is built is a reasonable protection that both structures will be maintained and suitable for residential areas.

As a 60+ year resident of Shoreline, I have seen many changes occur. I accept that growth is necessary to accommodate a thriving region yet I believe that growth should be concentrated in those areas best suited to accommodate growth, not overbuilding the established residential areas and certainly not by way of a stealth up zone that that would result from this proposal. I am not opposed to ADUs, but I am strongly opposed to removing the owner occupancy requirement.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Michael Clayton
18044 Wallingford Ave N
michaelc@cei-group.com
(206) 264-5335