

From: webmaster@shorelinewa.gov
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Contact the City Council
Date: Thursday, August 09, 2018 2:11:56 AM

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

Form Name: Contact the City Council
Date & Time: 08/09/2018 2:11 am
Response #: 301
Submitter ID: 24089
IP address: 172.24.96.111
Time to complete: 18 min. , 40 sec.

Survey Details: Answers Only

Page 1

1. Hillwood
2. No Response Needed
3. Pam Cross
4. 19303 1st Ave NW
5. 2064191415
6. pcross3001@gmail.com
7. RE: Council Meeting July 30, 2018 Discussing Ordinance No. 833 - Planning Commission Recommendation for Tree Retention Requirements in MUR-70

Trees. I just have a couple of comments regarding the Council's discussion.

There is a recognized affordable housing shortage and, because of light rail and current buses available, multifamily housing along Aurora is a good solution for this area. But a requirement that developers save established trees is seen as another potential roadblock to further development of an area already up-zoned for such expansion.

In order to minimize the impact of this roadblock, it was suggested the City provide an incentive to developers for leaving existing mature trees. This could possibly turn a negative into a positive for both the City and developers.

However, this suggestion is disingenuous. It is based on the (false) assumption that developers design multifamily buildings to "fit the lot" when, in fact, the lot is purchased to put an "already designed building." This is a design frequently used by the developer, and may vary only in color of siding. Especially if we are talking about affordable housing, it does not make economic sense for a developer to incur the cost of designing a new structure based on the peculiar features of a specific lot. The developer needs to clear the lot so they can put in place the "tried and true" building. All you have to do is look around Shoreline and you will see the same building, often the same color and with the same uninspired minimal landscaping, just blocks away from an identical building by

the same developer.

Neighbors have posted on social media that developers sometimes agree to leave "as many trees as possible" and leave them at the perimeter of the lot. These trees are now susceptible to falling during a windstorm because they are shallow rooted and no longer have a wind block of other trees. Or a solitary tree may be left without regard to the drip-line as mentioned during the Council Meeting. Any experienced developer must know that this is a risk to the survival of the trees but, not being a certified arborist, "cannot speak with authority to the required location or current health of the trees." They could hire one of course.

Frequently the mature trees fail to survive. The cost of removal and replacement of dead or dying trees will undoubtedly move from the developer to the building owner. because Existing greenery is not covered by a developer/contractor's insurance policy. And many developers form LLC's for each project, so if the building owner thinks he/she can proceed against the assets of the developer, they are sadly mistaken. The LLC will be dissolved at the completion of the building and the individual developer/contractor is not a party to the contract.

Another problem with leaving trees and putting the "usual" multifamily building, is the building has been designed to take up the entire lot. Minimum parking will be provided - only enough to meet the City's requirements. And the City's plan is to require less and less parking with the assumption that tenants will not need cars if they take public transit. The last proposal I saw had two front to back parking spaces per unit, but NO (temporary or other) parking for delivery trucks or service vehicles. When I brought this up at a meeting with the developer, it was suggested the very small patch of bushes and bark could be eliminated and paved over to satisfy "my need." Please note that this location on 200th has no street parking and many people order on-line with delivery. And even apartment dwellers occasionally need services, if even to have a carpet professionally cleaned.

In summary, the Council should recognize that residents do not want to sacrifice our tree canopy, and they should NOT be misled by focusing on an unworkable, " tree-friendly" option for cookie cutter multifamily housing . On a similar note there was a comment regarding the number of stories allowed. If we want to keep the City looking attractive and welcoming, we need to keep our sunlight and vegetation. 7 stories next to a 10 story building? The 10 story building will block light to the 7 story building and give the "Seattle ambiance" to Aurora development. No trees and no light. Residents are still upset over the up-zoning. To make the citizenry happy, we need to building with people in mind - not just profits.

And remember: Shoreline is a Tree City USA. Let's keep it that way.

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.