**Archived:** Tuesday, April 2, 2019 12:47:14 PM

From: Kristi Rettmann

Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 12:27:05 PM

To: City Council

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposing Comment for the Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone of 1510 and 1517 NE 170th St.

**Sensitivity:** Normal **Attachments:** 

Kristi Rettmann\_NE 170th St Rezone Comments\_4-1-2019.docx;mannequin.pdf;

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.

Good afternoon,

Attached are my comments opposing the rezone request at 1510 and 1517 NE 170th St. I have included one photo, and I have other photos related to the comments I'm submitting. These are available upon request.

Thank you, Kristi Rettmann

## **April 2, 2019**

## Comments regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Rezone of the residentially zoned parcels at 1510 and 1517 NE 170<sup>th</sup> St.

My name is Kristi Rettmann and I've lived in Shoreline at 1523 NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street for 11 years and counting. I'm a member of the Save Shoreline Neighborhoods group and live immediately adjacent to one of the residential properties (1517 NE 170<sup>th</sup> St.) of the proposed spot rezone for only two parcels on NE 170<sup>th</sup> St. I refer to it as a "spot rezone" because there is no other way to accurately describe this. A business grew too big for the residential lot they've occupied for years (out of compliance with residential use), they bought the residential lot across the street and started using it for their business, and then got caught by the City in 2014. No violation was given by the City for either property and so they think they can now just ask for a rezone as that's the most convenient solution for them. Based on no violation, the City appears to be obliging and is allowing this to continue.

Since Irons Brothers Company (IBC) purchased the 1517 NE 170<sup>th</sup> St. property in December 2017, there has been a steady increase in what I interpret to be harassing our quiet neighborhood life. We have bright lights and glare issues, we had car alarms going off several times, we had their property alarm going off several time, we now have a clear view of NE 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue since they took down the fence and large cedar tree, we have increased business traffic, and increased parking issues.

After the IBC neighborhood meeting on January 23, 2019, we received harassing text messages from Joseph Irons claiming that we got the neighbors all riled up and mad at IBC even though the neighbors are the ones that requested to join us in this opposition. No one is coercing the neighborhood, we have provided factual information based on potential uses that are allowable under Shoreline Municipal Code if the properties were to become Community Business. The facts are clear. The violation not complying with allowable use on two residential parcels is clear.

We've never had complaints against us in the 11 years we've lived here. Never. We have friendships with our neighbors and look out for each other. Since our repeated public opposition to this rezone, the harassment my family has been living includes, but is not limited to the following:

- **January 30, 2019** an alleged "anonymous" complaint on Click Fix saying that we removed multiple trees, had many rounds stacked up everywhere, and wondering if we needed a permit to sell wood. This is a false claim. After a winter windstorm damaged a tree making it hazardous, we had it removed to prevent any further hazard.
- **Feb 2, 2019** another "anonymous" complaint on Click Fix that we were using our snowmobile up and down the street. This is also false and have multiple neighbors to back up the fact that we never moved our snowmobile. We have pictures showing the

- trailer that it is parked showing it on had not been moved and was still surrounded by untouched snow.
- **Feb 9, 2019** yet another anonymous complaint on Click Fix saying we have multiple abandoned, unregistered vehicles, an abandoned boat, and claimed we drive our truck dangerously. The complaint told us "to move to the country". Rudeness is not a quality of a good neighbor. All of our vehicles are registered and operational. I wonder how a registered, covered boat could be considered abandoned?

Further harassment continued in March 2019. A short retaining wall separates our property from their 1517 property (pictures attached), with our property being above the wall. We now have had the repeated removal of the property line rope, fence post, and no trespassing sign that we put up between <u>2 survey</u> pins that currently mark the property boundary. IBC insists that they want to put a new fence along and above that retaining wall, which is <u>on our property</u>. We do not want that and told them to put up any fence they want on their side of the property, below the wall. Please note that they had the survey done, not us. They then had the survey done again (looks like April 1, 2019) for all utilities and what looks like the boundary line is now marked with a giant white spray-painted arrow on the street. The boundary is clearly below the retaining wall for most of the property line, and gradually becomes the retaining wall as you move from the NE corner to the SE corner of the property line. That property line is showing on IBC's site plan that they submitted with their application for rezone.

As I stood on my own backyard deck on Sunday night (March 31, 2019), I saw IBC had put a mannequin in the window of the unoccupied above-garage apartment of their 1517 property (with back lighting to show a silhouette). It looks creepy to say the least. Are they now resorting to creepy, disturbing intimidation tactics to our opposition? It looks like a person is staring into our backyard and windows. Never mind the multiple surveillance cameras pointed at us and our children in our backyard. I moved next to a residential lot, not a business with cameras, and expect that while I'm in my own back yard that I can enjoy some privacy. Cameras to watch their business while they are not there after business hours is a perfect example of why rezoning a residential lot to a commercial lot is incompatible with a neighborhood and is incompatible with residential life.

I presented some of my comments (above) during the public comment portion of the City Council's April 1, 2019. I left early because I needed to get home to my children and relieve the babysitter. Within the time it took me to leave the meeting, chat with neighbor in the City Hall lobby, and get home to hug my kids, IBC had sent one of their employees over to their 1517 property to not only remove the mannequin but to install mini-blinds. The Council meeting on April 1, 2019 had not even ended yet. This swift action to correct this creepy, odd behavior is commendable. Clearly, it's possible that they were watching the live video feed of the Council meeting and heard my comments in real time. All that said, it calls into question that if I had not brought this up during the Council meeting, would they have left the mannequin in the window? Most importantly, why did they put that mannequin in the window in the first place?

They could have put it in the front window where it didn't overlook our backyard. Is it only when they get called out publicly that they make a change?

What is next? I only see these issues escalating if they are allowed to continue to commit land use violations at 1517 NE 170<sup>th</sup> St. by staying there as a business. What more will my family and my kids have to put up with, all to keep a business on, now, two residential lots?

Why was moving to an already commercially zoned lot not something IBC considered knowing they have grown so much in the last 20 years, and clearly are continuing to need more space to grow? How many more residential lots will IBC to try and ask to rezone in the future? Wouldn't it have been more cost-effective and compliant with City code to just find a community-business zoned lot within Shoreline to move to, and sell their existing 1510 property?

No one is even remotely suggesting that they leave Shoreline or have to move. To suggest this is an all or nothing situation is ridiculous. That's not what our opposition is about. Our opposition is about not wanting the permanent rezone of two residential lots, because not a soul can guarantee that IBC will retire and sell their properties to another business owner or that those lots won't someday have an undesirable business use allowable under the code for CB-zone properties. I'm sure IBC is a great company and do many good things in the community. However, they created this problem. The community didn't force them to expand onto another residential lot. We are not to blame simply because we don't want a rezone. Sadly, it is their burden based on their choice to run a business on two residential lots, out of compliance with the code. Period.

Finally, IBC can make changes for all of these issues I've noted above. They can shut off all their lights or put them on motion sensors, they can leave the property boundary where it legally is, they can remove the creepy mannequin, but it doesn't change the glaring fact that this is a land use violation issue on two lots. Plain and simple. A rezone of only two lots is simply not the appropriate answer for this conundrum they have put themselves into, and I'm boggled to understand how City staff (as noted in public record) thought a rezone request was a viable, legal option for this situation. If this spot rezone is allowed to go through, this will set a precedent of no return where any small business (operating in compliance with land use code or not) can use when wanting to apply for rezone of residential lots in other neighborhoods of Shoreline. Is this the kind of precedent that the City wants to set?

I'm tired of losing sleep over this and stressing about this situation. I oppose this rezone and ask that on April 15<sup>th</sup> the Council votes NO to studying this rezone and does not allow this to move forward. There must be a better solution other than a permanent rezone/permanent loss of residential property.

Respectfully,

Kristi Rettmann

