

Archived: Monday, September 9, 2019 12:24:28 PM
From: [Sara Betnel](#)
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 5:37:58 AM
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: MGP Developer's Agreement Concerns
Sensitivity: Normal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Shoreline. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City Council,

In rereading this, I noticed I left out an important word in the following paragraph - the updated version is as follows:

With the stated 1,358 units, 20% are anticipated to be 2BR - which is approximately 272 units. Assuming these are the only units which would have children (which it is unlikely these would be the only ones), that would add approximately 272-410 children (if half the units had one child and half had two), and possibly more. Depending on age of child, this would require 12-17 classrooms to serve this increase in students. That is close to a full additional elementary school in facility capacity, let alone staff and support services.

Thanks,
Sara

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sara Betnel** <sarabetnel@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 8, 2019 at 11:54 PM
Subject: MGP Developer's Agreement Concerns
To: City Council <council@shorelinewa.gov>

Dear City Council,

Following the August 5th Council meeting during which Merlone Geyer Partners presented about their proposed development at Shoreline Place and requesting a Developer's Agreement with the City, I had the following concerns which I hope you will take into consideration before approving the proposed agreement:

Impact on Schools

Going back through public records as best as possible, I cannot find mention of analysis on what impact this development will have on Shoreline Schools in regards to increase of student population and capacity to support that potential increase.

Just as this development should be considered for its impact on parks and the surrounding neighborhood; it's impact on our schools, and the potential cost that Shoreline School District and its taxpayers would be required to absorb, should also be considered.

With the stated 1,358 units, 20% are anticipated to be 2BR - which is approximately 272 units. Assuming these are the only units which would have children (which it is unlikely these would be the only ones), that would add approximately 272-410 children (if half the units had one child and half had two), and possibly more. Depending on age of child, this would require 12-17 to serve this increase in students. That is close to a full additional elementary school in facility capacity, let alone staff and support services.

At current enrollment, there is not that amount of additional classroom space available and, should an increase of this kind happen, it would require the District to consider how to support this increase in facility needs. Any additional building would require putting a school bond in front of the voters, further increasing tax rates in Shoreline and Lake Forest Park, which are already feeling a tax strain from existing levies and bonds from both District and city ballot measures. Other additional support (e.g. teachers, support staff, more buses, etc) would also have to be accommodated in the District budget with this increase of students. Some of that is funded by the state under basic education based on enrollment, but some is not (e.g. nurses, librarians, counselors, family advocates, etc).

At what point is the developer responsible for helping offset this potential increase in cost to our public schools and the taxpayers that support them?

What analysis has been done to consider the impact this development (and, cumulatively, the one being considered at Town Center in LFP by the same developer, which would also impact capacity needs for the District as a whole) on Shoreline Schools?

If the Council has not yet asked these questions nor had discussion with the School Board on what impact this might have on our schools, I request and

encourage that you do so and consider postponing your approval of the developer agreement until this aspect of the development has been fully considered, and possibly included in the agreement.

Attracting more families to our city will be a benefit of this development. Many will come because of the reputation of the quality of our schools, which is well earned. MGP will profit from that. Our school district should receive support for the added capacity and services it will need to provide to welcome those families into our schools. It seems worth asking to what level the company that will profit from that outcome should help provide support to absorb that increase in addition to the taxpayers.

If this analysis has been done and a determination has been made in this regard, please let me know where I can find that. Many thanks for your consideration of this point.

Accessibility

In the development renderings shared at the August 5th City Council meeting, it appears that accessing the walkways of the development from several sides will require two steps up from the sidewalk. In these renderings there is no depiction of a ramp/slope or accessible access along these steps; requiring those who need a ramp to have to travel farther around in order to gain entry to the walkways and common spaces.

It is my understanding the developer will be required to comply with existing accessibility requirements due to federal and state law. Beyond that, I would like the City to consider what standards it would like to see any developer adhere to that may be beyond minimum accessibility standards; making developments in our city be models of universal access others will seek to emulate now and into the future.

Thank you for considering this as well as the key concern shared above.

I look forward to your response.

Thanks,
Sara Betnel