

From: [RANDY STIME](#)
To: [Keith Scully](#); [Betsy Robertson](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Eben Pobee](#); [John Ramsdell](#); [Chris Roberts](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Council Mtg. Agenda Item 9(c)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2022 4:44:28 PM

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.

Sorry I didn't make the 4pm deadline, but hope this gets to you before tonight's meeting.

Dear Mayor Scully and City Council Members,

RE: Agenda Item 9(c), "Apple Tree Lane, Beach Eminent Domain.

Thank you for this opportunity to address this body concerning a serious infringement you are about to impose on one group of Shoreline residents. Shoreline residents have a traditional right to live in quiet enjoyment of our home. If Eminent Domain is exercised in this case, local residents will be effected...and quiet enjoyment of our homes will no longer be present.

For the following reasons, my wife and I encourage you to at least delay this vote, if not withdraw it completely.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->We already have two excellent public parks less than a mile of this proposed beach accusation: Kayu Kayu Au Park on Richmond Beach Dr. NW, and Richmond Beach Saltwater Park.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->The City has spent a lot of energy trying to prevent Wells Point from adding new housing, because of the massive influence it would be to our local streets and neighborhoods...now you are encouraging more traffic down one local street.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->The City had an option to purchase this property a year ago, and passed. Now the City can be accused of accessory to theft. Legally, you can take (steal) private property and get away with it. If you say it's in the public's interest, then how much beach (park land) is needed until it becomes toooooo much? Logically, isn't the City of Shoreline at that stage now? Might this be called greedy or an accessory to theft? Might the City Council be called "bullies" in exerting their power to take private property when it's not a vital need adding to both owning and maintaining it's present **34** city parks.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->The Shoreline "CURRENTS" newsletter (Vol. 24, No. 4) suggests that the City is looking at new/better "strategies" for ensuring that revenues keep pace with costs. Thus, the question arises, why spend new monies to purchase unnecessary new park space, with added maintenance costs.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->Local residents are presently walking their dogs along this street to the beach, some respectfully pick up after their pets when they defecate on the street in front of our homes, but others don't. And, along with this poop, visitors also discard cigarettes, pop cans, lunch sacks, and other garbage in front of our properties. Opening this aa a park will only increase this visitation.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->6. <!--[endif]-->Often visitors will not park on the street across the bridge,

and will instead use space reserved for our 27th Avenue residents in front of our respective homes.
<!--[if !supportLists]-->7. <!--[endif]-->Young folks use this beach for parties and all the negatives
which are often related when kids need entertainment and beach fires.

Thank you for serving Shoreline in this capacity as City Council Members. We trust you will seriously take our concerns to heart as you debate and decide on this excessive use of Eminent Domain.

Sincerely,

Randy and Christine Stime
19517 27th Avenue, NW
Shoreline, WA. 98177