

**From:** [dlrbjg@aol.com](mailto:dlrbjg@aol.com)  
**To:** [Keith Scully](#); [Betsy Robertson](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Eben Pobee](#); [John Ramsdell](#); [Chris Roberts](#)  
**Cc:** [Debbie Tarry](#); [Margaret King](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] May 23, 2022 Council Meeting - Item 9(c) - Ordinance No. 967  
**Date:** Monday, May 23, 2022 8:22:30 AM

---

**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.

Councilmembers,

I am writing you regarding Ordinance No. 967 (agenda item 9(c) for the May 23, 2022, council meeting).

Although I have not seen the appraisal for Property Tax Parcel: 727810-0905, and neither has the property owner, it appears the appraised value may not represent the ultimate purchase price to be paid from the condemnation process. I have included in this email links to two Seattle Times articles and one from King 5 news.

[Sell or we'll use eminent domain, Seattle mayor tells owners of beach lot | The Seattle Times](#)

[After 7-year battle, Lake City neighbors rejoice as Lake Washington dead end becomes a public beach | The Seattle Times](#)

[City of Seattle buys small Lake Washington plot for \\$800,000 to allow public beach access | king5.com](#)

The articles are about the condemnation of a street end at NE 130<sup>th</sup> Street and Riviera Place in Seattle.

A brief history:

- There was a dispute between the City of Seattle and the adjacent property owners of the ownership of a 60ft wide waterfront parcel

After two years, the Apelet Court rules unanimously in the adjacent property owners' favor

- City of Seattle offers \$400,000 to settle or will begin the condemnation process
- In 2019, the City of Seattle prevails in court and pays the adjacent property owners \$800,000

The Seattle Times article noted the purchased lot is identified as 13,763 sq ft.

However as clarified in the King 5 article, only 3,653 sq ft is usable uplands or land - the rest is aquatic land (aka underwater and unusable).

Rushing the approval of Ordinance 967 without a property survey to determine uplands and tidelands could cost the city substantially more than anticipated or budgeted.

Accordingly, I urge the City Council to table a vote on Ordinance No. 967 so that the parcel boundaries can be accurately determined and City and the affected stakeholders can address the variety of issues with the City acquiring the beach. In the alternative, we urge the City Council to reject the Ordinance outright.

Thank you,  
Richard Kink  
Shoreline, WA