

Archived: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:30:22 AM

From: webmaster@shorelinewa.gov

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:37:07 AM

To: [agenda comments](#)

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Comments

Sensitivity: Normal

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

Form Name: Comment on Agenda Items
Date & Time: 03/15/2021 8:37 am
Response #: 847
Submitter ID: 41325
IP address: 50.34.79.156
Time to complete: 1 min., 19 sec.

Survey Details: Answers Only

Page 1

1. Jodi Dixit
2. Shoreline
3. (o) Hillwood
4. jodilynnprice@gmail.com
5. 03/15/2021
6. 9b-3
7. Members of the Shoreline Planning Commission and City Council,

I am writing as a concerned resident of the City of Shoreline. I attended the Planning Commission Meeting on 2/4/2021 and I was very disappointed in the approval to review the private initiative request rezoning from R-18 to R-48 on parcel 7283900532.

As a resident of the area, I am very familiar with the property in question and the surrounding areas. I was very surprised at the selection of pictures and incomplete information provided by city planner Steve Szafran. As an observer of the meeting, I found myself confused why a Senior Planner would not provide full and accurate information to his fellow planning commissioners. The pictures/maps provided and inability to answer commissioner Mork's questions regarding the current number of residential rental units under development in the area, displayed a lack of preparation and a false depiction of the current condition of the properties surrounding the parcel in question. There were comments made describing the surrounding properties as "abandoned" and references to residences being "sheds". None of this of course is true, nor would it be possible for tires to "fly in from Aurora" and land on the property, as stated by Commissioner Malek. It is because of comments like these, along with critical information being omitted, that I feel the following needs to be brought to your attention:

The parcel is a designated erosion hazard.

There is a 10 story, 315 unit apartment building currently being built within 500 feet (57 trees were removed in 2020 for this project, only 6 remain) at 18815 Aurora.

There currently is a permit available directly across the street at 19220 Aurora for a 7 story 241 unit to place high density housing.(the former home of the rat city roller girls)

There is currently a permit application submitted by Shea properties on January 8, 2021 for a 7 story 161 unit apartment building at 18851 Aurora.

There is a 33 unit apartment building located at 18557 Firlands, High Hill Apartments, completed in 2020.

There is a 164 unit building located at 17990 Midvale, The GEO, construction completed in 2021.

There are several other apartment buildings within blocks, Echo Lake Apartments and the Blakely to name just a few.

There also was the lack of a comprehensive photograph of the overall view of the entire area impacted. We expected to see the proximity to the current residences, and surrounding high density housing projects completed and permitted before the commission. For full transparency, as well as lack of due diligence from city planners, several maps have been provided by the residents to ensure it is on record.

I would like to point out that parcel 7283900532 was purchased in 2014. The owner was aware of the existing zoning. I have seen for sale signs on property displayed many times over the past 6 years. They have been posted for 6 months at a time on the temporary fence on the north side of the property. This raises additional concern because the current zone R-18 allows a total of 10 units on this parcel. Importantly, even though the plan submitted by the owner is for 17 attached townhomes on a R-48 site, the owner would then have the right and the opportunity to revise the plans and increase the design to 26 units, or sell to another developer for a larger and more dense development.

There were many residents that made written public comments that addressed their concerns about the surrounding trees and land slope that

would be impacted. They seem to have been disregarded by the planning commissioners as well. This is most concerning, considering that the property in question is an erosion hazard. The old growth trees that would be in jeopardy cannot be replaced. These 100 year old trees provide stability to the slope of the land and are critical for it to maintain its integrity. There is a wetland area within 100 feet that will also be impacted. The current green space needs to be protected so it can continue to protect the humans, wildlife and environment surrounding it that depend on it. It is an essential part of our neighborhood that provides a sound barrier, a habitat for countless species, keeps the soil stable, provides mental well being, creates clean air and prevents climate change.

Please note there is direction in the Shoreline Municipal Code that should be considered before making this decision. According to SMC 20.50.290(C): "Promotion of building and site planning practices that are consistent with the City's natural topography and vegetative cover." There will be a remarkable impact to the Hillwood neighborhood including increased noise from ingress and egress activity if this is rezoned from the existing R-18 zoning to R-48 zoning.

I am respectfully asking why increase the density when the community overwhelmingly disagrees? Isn't there more than enough high density land actively being developed on commercially zoned parcels? Why develop one of the last green spaces in the area? Why would the city favor one developer over the citizens that currently live here? How is this not a gross display of bias to one entity that stands to profit at the loss of all the others that have taken the time to write in and voice their opinion and concerns? How does this align with the city's mission to be in the best interest of the property owners of the City of Shoreline?

For the above reasons, I stand against rezoning the parcel from an R-18 to an R-48 and ask the City of Shoreline to do the same. Let it be known on record, I am a party of interest in this matter.

Jodi Dixit

8. Oppose

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.