

From: [Jerry Patterson](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [agenda comments](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Acquiring beach property does not create a new park--restrooms etc not needed. Agenda Action Item 8(a).
Date: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 7:26:19 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.

Councilmembers,
Opponents of Ordinance 967 seem to believe that the acquisition of the beach property will create a new park that requires new restrooms, etc. Here is a sampling:

"I believe the people living in the City of Shoreline should be asked if they want the City Council to spend \$110,000 on a piece of land with no suitable access for public use when there are already nine public parks within the Richmond Beach area and two of them have beach access. ... [Amenities such as] picnic areas, playground, public art, [and] public restrooms would have to be developed to make the land at the bottom of 27th AVE NW a safe and viable park. ... It would need ... garbage pick up. It would need car parking."

To the point, Ordinance 967 does not create a new park. It merely would extend Saltwater Park to the bulkhead. The public already uses the beach property. The City is just taking action to retain what the public already uses. By passing Ordinance 967, the City makes sure that no one can ever deny the public access to this open space. By passing Ordinance 967, the City makes sure that the public's de facto extension of Saltwater Park to the bulkhead becomes official.

Thanks for considering my points.

Jerry Patterson

Richmond Beach Drive, Shoreline