

Carla Hoekzema

From: Ann Jackson <annycabanny@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 3:19 PM
To: Plancom; Rachael Markle
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: February 4th Meeting Agenda Item 6b
Attachments: King County iMap Erosion Designation of parcels.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.

A few additions to my previous email.

In this map provided by Mr. Szafran, the property south of the parcel in questions is highlighted. Was this an error?



King County GIS map showing parcel in question a designated Erosion hazard:

On Feb 6, 2021, at 3:13 PM, Ann Jackson <annycabanny@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for your service to the City of Shoreline. I appreciate your efforts and thoughtful consideration.

I was unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting Thursday night but watched the video this morning.

I am writing in regards to the Commissioners response to Amendment 1:
Amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Designation from Public Facility to High Density Residential for one Parcel (7283900532) and change the Zoning from Residential, 18 units/acre (R-18) to Residential, 48 units/acre (R-48) of two Parcels (7283900532 and 7283900524).

I live on Firlands Way, learned about this proposal Tuesday night, and quickly wrote an email which you should have received.

It is very disappointing that the commissioners approved evaluation of this amendment! Many of the residents of the neighborhood are very concerned about the impact this will have and with very short notice, a significant number of us notified you of our concerns and the problems with this proposal before your meeting. Yet, when the city planner, Steve Szafran, who didn't sufficiently review the proposal recommended advancement of the amendment because he thinks its an interesting proposal which may set a precedent for future development decision making, the Commissioners approved it.

This is a proposal to allow a high density development (up to 26 units) on a very small property, in a designated Erosion hazard, which is surrounded on three sides by single family residences. In recent years there has been enormous commercial housing developments built, under construction, and proposed within 500' of that property. The change and effect that has had on the neighborhood is staggering.

How does this qualify as worthy of consideration, study, or the investment of our tax dollars?
Is Mr. Szafran, the City Planning office, and the Planning Commission biased in favor of Developers?
What are Mr. Szafran's qualifications?
What is the process citizens can follow to address bias?

Your response is respectfully requested.

Ann Jackson
18851 Firlands Way N

King County iMap



King County, EagleView Technologies, Inc.

The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a survey product. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.

Date: 2/6/2021

Notes:



King County