

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

**AGENDA TITLE:** Public Hearing on Cottage Housing  
**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Development Services  
**PRESENTED BY:** Joe Tovar, FAICP, Director of Planning and Development Services  
Paul Cohen, Project Manager

**PROBLEM / ISSUE STATEMENT:**

In August 2004 the City Council directed staff to review the provisions for cottage housing in the Development Code, conduct a public process, hold a public hearing, and receive Planning Commission recommendations (Attachment A) for Council review and action. The moratorium on cottage housing expires February 16, 2006.

**Background**

History

- 1998 - City adopts Comprehensive Plan Policy LU27 which conditionally supports cottage housing in R4 and R6 zones.
- 1999 – Shoreline Planning Academy recommends cottage housing to offset larger minimum lots sizes and provide alternative to mega-houses for first development code.
- 2000 – Council adopts first development code including provisions for cottage housing.
- 2003 – Council adopts amendments to cottage housing provisions of development code.

More Recent

- August 23, 2004 - Council adopts 6-month moratorium.
- December 6, 2004 – Staff outlined amendment process to City Council in memorandum.
- January 4, 2005 – Council discussed the program to revisit cottage housing provisions. Recommends a joint Planning Commission / City Council tour of cottage housing.
- January 24, 2005 – Council accepts staff amendment process outline with goals, objectives, and phasing.
- February 5 and 12, 2005 – Joint Planning Commission City Council Tours of Cottage Housing.
- February 2005 – Council extends moratorium 6 months.
- April 7, 2005 – Letter from staff to community, Planning Commission, and City Council presenting the issues, possible amendments or repeal alternatives.
- May 11, 2005 – Cottage Housing Community Meeting

- June 2, 2005 - Planning Commission Public Hearing
- June 13, 2005 – City Council adopts Comprehensive Plan Update and Policy LU9.
- June 16, 2005 - Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation to extend process.
- July 18, 2005 - City Council Public Hearing and Action to extend moratorium and adds discussion of an alternative process to the August 22, 2005 agenda.
- August 22, 2005 - City Council directs Planning Commission to finish recommendations and staff to organize a community dialogue meeting.
- September 1, 2005 – Planning Commission scheduled to continue deliberations.
- September 15, 2005 – Planning Commission scheduled to make recommendations to the City Council.
- October 20, 2005 - Planning Commission completed deliberations and recommendations for cottage housing.
- November 29, 2005 – City Council holds a Community Dialogue with the public and Planning Commission.

To date staff has completed the following public process steps.

- Solicited the involvement and comments of cottage housing activists, developers, neighbors, and residents.
- Recapped history of cottage housing including the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, 1999 Planning Academy, 2000 adoption of the Development Code, and the 2002 amendments presented to the Planning Commission on June 2, 2005 and at May 11, 2005 community meeting.
- Summarized and recorded all public comments from cottage housing developed since 2002 and comments received since August 2004 when the first moratorium was adopted. The comments have been presented to the Planning Commission and used to extract, analyze, and highlight issues in the April 7, 2005 memorandum to the City Council, Planning Commission and interested citizens.
- Analyzed and addressed the issues of property values, zoning, density, parking/traffic, GMA requirements, and design quality of the different developments in April 7, 2005 letter.
- Scheduled two tours of Shoreline cottages March 5 and 12, 2005 with the Planning Commission, City Council, and the general public.
- Sent draft amendments and repeal alternatives to parties of record April 7, 2005.
- Held an open community meeting on May 11, 2005 to present the history, issues, alternatives, receive comments, and work in small groups for solutions that included both amendments and alternatives to repeal cottage housing regulations. The meeting included neighbor opponents and proponents, residents of cottage housing, developers, city council members and planning commissioners.
- Presented the outcome of the May 11<sup>th</sup> meeting and draft amendments to the Planning Commission public hearing June 2, 2005.
- Notified the public through the Currents newsletter, the Enterprise newspaper, and public notice in the Seattle Times, parties of record, and presented to the Highland Terrace neighborhood group at their request.
- Held separate public hearings for the Planning Commission on June 2, 2005 and for the City Council on July 18, 2005.
- Received Planning Commission recommendations.

- Helped facilitate the Council's Community Dialogue meeting November 29, 2005.

### **Legal Process for Amendment of the Development Code**

The Shoreline Municipal Code allows for amendments to the Development Code with a specific process. First, any person may request that the City Council, Planning Commission, or Director may initiate amendments to the text of the Development Code (SMC 20.30.100). On December 6, 2004 staff initiated the amendment process to the City Council. Second, the State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development must be noticed to consider amendments that may affect GMA goals and targets (RCW 36.70A.035 section 2). The public notice was sent to the State May 26, 2005. Third, the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing (SMC 20.30.070), which was held June 2, 2005. On June 16, 2005, the Planning Commission recommended an extension of the moratorium in order to continue their deliberations for final recommendations to the Council. On October 20, 2005, the Planning Commission made final recommendations to the City Council. Fourth, the City Council needs to hold a public hearing and make a decision on those recommendations (SMC 20.30.070).

### **Comprehensive Plan**

In 1998 the City adopted Policy LU27 in 1998 to read:

*Allow cottage housing in residential areas of 6 units per acre and up, if they go through design review and adhere to the following: common open space, reduced parking areas, detached homes' common amenities.*

In 2005 the City repealed Policy LU27 and adopted Policy LU9 in 2005 to read:

*The Low Density residential land use designation is intended for areas currently developed with predominantly single family detached dwellings. Single Family dwellings will be allowed and other dwelling types, such as duplexes, single family attached, cottage housing and accessory dwellings, may be allowed under certain circumstances.*

*Appropriate zoning for this designation is R-4 or R-6 Residential, unless a neighborhood plan, subarea plan or special district overlay plan/zone has been approved.*

Policy LU9 leaves the option for the City to either allow or not allow cottage housing in R-4 or R-6 zones.

### **Community Involvement**

Since 2000 there have been 7 cottage housing projects with 55 units built. There have been a handful of comments to upwards of 50+ comments associated with these projects. The majority of comments were generally opposed or concerned about the prospect of the development next door. After they were built some neighbors approved, some accepted, and some continue to oppose cottages.

Ever since a developer held a neighborhood meeting in the summer of 2004 for a 16 unit cottage development (not city approved) at NW 192<sup>nd</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> NW the public concern for cottage development escalated. As a result the Council adopted moratoriums that totaled 1.5 years. In January 2005 the process to review cottage development in Shoreline began with a compilation mailing list which initially included parties of record from previous cottage development neighborhood comments, residents of cottages, cottage developers, and more recent cottage activists - which grew to about 120 people. About 60 people attended each of the May 11, 2005 Community Meeting and the November 29, 2005 Community Dialogue.

Over the past 1.5 years we received comments and testimony from citizens (Attachments B and C), which are summarized below:

- 73 comment letters and 56 testimonies at the Planning Commission public hearing and deliberations and the Council's Community Dialogue.
- Of those 129 comment letters and testimonies there were 58 different people of which 65.5% opposed cottages, 19% supported cottages, and 15.5% only had concerns.

Based on the reading of all comments, some cottage housing issues were commented on more than others. Including both opposing and supportive comments, issues of highest importance to lower importance cottage issues were ranked:

1. Compatibility with the Neighborhood
2. Density Increase
3. Property Value Impacts
4. Public Process
5. GMA Targets
6. Design Quality
7. Traffic / Environmental Impacts
8. Development Review Process
9. Ownership

#### **COUNCIL OPTIONS:**

**Option 1: Do Not Adopt Planning Commission Recommended Amendments and Let the Existing Moratorium Lapse** – This option means reverting back to the existing cottage code. Staff does not recommend this alternative because it would likely result in cottage housing projects that would be objectionable as several past projects of the existing code have raised strong community concerns.

**Option 2: Adopt Planning Commission Recommendations** – These amendments, proposed by the Planning Commission, assure greater separation between projects, allow less density bonus, keep developments smaller, require more parking, and have higher design standards. These amendments could only be met by the Greenwood Cottages.

**Option 3: Adopt Planning Commission Recommendations with Additional Conditions** – If the Council considers Option 2, the staff believes that the Council could further assure quality projects by adding: (1.) A requirement that all cottage developments be separated from each other by 2,000 feet (about 6 blocks) and (2.) Elevate the review process for design review with improved design criteria to address issues such as compatibility. This can be achieved either by staff administratively, by a Planning Commission design committee, or a newly created design board as a pilot program for innovative housing.

If the Council were interested in more specific design details beyond the amendments it could direct staff to draft language to address items such as architectural style, window and entryway orientation, location of property, car access, and building trim.

**Option 4: Restrict Cottage Development to R-8 and R-12 Zones** – Restrict the code's land use chart to allow cottages only in these low-density, multifamily zones without a Conditional Use Permit and amend the design standards as recommended by the Planning Commission. Staff does not recommend this option, because it will create the illusion of accommodating cottage development without creating any realistic opportunity for it to actually be built. More fundamentally, even if such single family housing (though small) were practical to finance, this option will place detached housing in a zone intended for and largely developed with attached unit housing.

The City does not have much R-8 and R-12 zones and the zones tend to be located between commercial or major arterials and single family neighborhoods. Staff experience indicates that cottage development in these zones is unlikely. Meridian Park Cottages on Stone Ave N and N 184<sup>th</sup> is the only project in R-8 and which could not be built under today's standards. There have been several attempts by developers in the past 5 years to develop in these zones but all had left frustrated because of the more stringent dimensional/design standards prevented them from reaching the density bonus.

**Option 5: Extend Moratorium 2 Years** – This action would allow the City to reexamine the need for cottage housing when it develops a city-wide housing strategy. In the meantime, the City would look for other strategies to meet GMA targets with 150 additional units. Staff does not recommend this option only because it will not satisfy the community – either those opposed or those in support of cottage housing.

A city-wide housing strategy could address ways to capture the housing market of older couples and single women that cottages have drawn. The State GMA target for years 2001 to 2022 is 2,618 units of all types in Shoreline. Of that, cottage housing is targeted for 350 units. When the existing 55 cottage units are subtracted and the remaining 295 units (double density) are replaced with single family development then the target has a shortfall of about 150 units.

**Option 6: Repeal Cottage Housing Code** – This action would end the issue for now. It would allow the City to reintroducing cottage housing through the

amendment process some time in the future. In the meantime, the City would look for other strategies to meet GMA targets with 150 additional units.

The State GMA target for years 2001 to 2022 is 2,618 units of all types in Shoreline. Of that, cottage housing is targeted for 350 units. When the existing 55 cottage units are subtracted and the remaining 295 units (double density) are replaced with single family development then the target has a shortfall of about 150 units.

### **Staff Conclusions and Recommendations**

The compatibility of cottage housing within Shoreline neighborhoods is the most prevalent and difficult issue to grasp. Compatibility is a difficult value to define and articulate. However, most people know compatibility when they see it. There are different styles of houses surrounding each of the cottage projects to make architectural compatibility difficult to determine. The current code does not define compatibility therefore cottage projects were evaluated on measurable factors such as lot coverage, open space, building bulk, and traffic.

Comparing the impacts of cottage development to conventional single family homes showed the impacts of building size, lot coverage, parking, setbacks, and number of inhabitants to be similar. The potential of doubling the number of cottages per acre is a measurable factor that was not similar to traditional single family housing. Still, less tangible aspects were debated. Supporters of cottages viewed them as smaller communities of single family homes while opponents viewed them as another form of higher density, multifamily housing that was being allowed into low density residential neighborhoods. Some people were concerned that a different type of housing would attract a different type of resident that would neglect their property.

After presenting this information over the past year most people opposed to cottages remained unsatisfied and most people who supported cottages thought their design standards needed improvement. Though compatibility is difficult to define, citizens on both sides of the issue liked the Greenwood Cottages. However, incompatibility emerged to include the combination of housing that looks different, is denser, and has the possibility of new, negligent residents. This combination created uneasiness with many citizens who expressed their reasons to move to a less urban Shoreline where their property values would be protected.

Staff recommends that the Council adopt either Option 3 or Option 6. Option 3 gives cottages the best design standards and review to assure higher quality homes. Option 6 is the best option if the Council believes that the community is not ready for cottages at this time or does not want cottage homes in Shoreline ever.

The remaining options are not recommended.

Option 1 revert the City back to the existing code which allowed projects with mixed results.

Option 2 is a great improvement for cottages but without several conditions that provide more quality assurance.

Option 4 effectively eliminates cottage housing because the R8 and R12 zones are few and not viable zones for cottage development especially with the higher design standards.

Option 5 will not provide the City with clarity and only antagonize both sides of the issue.

Since many options are presented we are not presenting ordinances for each of these options at this meeting until we get direction which ones seem viable to the Council. The only ordinance that would have specific detail worth reviewing in advance is the one that involves code amendments, which are presented in Attachment A.

**Attachments:**

A: Planning Commission Comments and Recommendations

B: Matrix Summary of Public Comments

C: Public Comment Letters

Approved By:      City Manager  City Attorney \_\_\_\_

# ATTACHMENT A



Shoreline  
Planning  
Commission

David Harris  
Chair

Rocky Piro  
Vice Chair

Michael Broili

Will Hall

Sid Kuboi

Bill MacCully

Robin  
McClelland

Chakorn  
Phisuthikul

Don Sands

November 4, 2005

Dear Mayor Hansen and Members of the City Council:

On October 20th the Planning Commission completed its current round of work on the Cottage Housing Ordinance. The staff report, with its findings and conclusions, are now in final draft for the City Council to review. It would be routine for that report to conclude the Commission's review and recommendation process. However, the Commission's discussions, recommendation, reconsideration, and final vote on the amendments to the Cottage Housing Ordinance have been anything but routine.

At its September 15th meeting, the Commission finished working through several amendments to the current ordinance, and approved the set of proposed changes by a seven-to-one vote. However, on October 20th the issue was revisited and a motion was made to recommend that the City Council repeal the Cottage Housing Ordinance. Some Commissioners favored a repeal of the existing ordinance to give the staff and the Planning Commission an opportunity to start afresh. Other Commissioners feared that if the ordinance were repealed, it might be years before we reconsidered such an ordinance again. The vote failed on a four-to-four tie. Immediately thereafter, the Commission voted unanimously to include a Letter of Transmittal to accompany the staff report, the recommendation to adopt the amended ordinance, and the supplementary materials that Council will receive for its review of the Cottage Housing Ordinance.

Members of the Planning Commission are in agreement that there is a role for cottage housing in the City of Shoreline. At the same time, most Commissioners – including those who favored and those who opposed repealing the ordinance – question whether the recommended amendments will fully resolve the concerns that the public and the Commission have about cottage housing. During the deliberations on the 20th, the Commission also reviewed and took into account, Comprehensive Plan Policy LU27, which states:

Allow cottage housing in residential areas of 6 dwelling units per acre and up, if they go through design review and adhere to the following characteristics:

- common open space
- reduced parking areas
- detached homes
- common amenities (e.g., garden plots, play areas, storage buildings, orchard)



Two key points are at the heart of the matter: First, although there are several cottage housing developments in the City that meet the spirit and intent of the ordinance and are excellent examples of how such housing fits into an established single-family neighborhood, other developments have not met that spirit or intent. They have drawn criticism from neighboring residents, from the community at-large, from respected builders, and the Planning Commission itself.

The Commission has sought to recommend an ordinance designed to ensure that all future cottage housing be quality development and make the most positive contribution possible to our City. The Commission's recommendations on the recent amendments were developed in that spirit. However, some Commissioners continue to wonder if the ordinance can be further improved or even replaced to guarantee quality projects.

Second, during the discussions, Commissioners expressed frustration about working on cottage housing in isolation. Commission members agree that the City would benefit from a comprehensive housing strategy with cottage housing as one component. The Commission believes that better decisions could be made if cottage housing were understood in the context of an overall housing strategy. Without such a strategy, the City is left with incremental decision-making one housing development at a time – meaning that the long-term implications or impacts of any single development of a few housing units cannot be evaluated as part of a comprehensive whole.

The four-to-four vote at the October 20th meeting should not be interpreted that the Commissioners are strongly divided on whether or not the City should continue to have cottage housing. Rather the discussion that lead up to the vote reveals that the Commission has truly wrestled with finding the best course for going forward with cottage housing in Shoreline. A better read of the vote is that members of the Commission struggled with what is the best course for going forward – that is, whether it is best to try to continue to improve the existing ordinance, or whether a fresh start involving the crafting a new ordinance for cottage housing would be appropriate. Since cottage housing by itself is not critical for the City's efforts to meet its overall growth management targets, some Commissioners felt that that lessens the urgency regarding fixing the existing ordinance versus starting over.

Commission members are available for any questions or other follow-up the City Council may have about specific issues discussed or about the recommendations in general.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Harris", with a stylized, flowing script.

David Harris  
Planning Commission Chair

**FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION  
OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION  
Cottage Housing Code Amendments**

**Summary** - The cottage housing regulations have existed since year 2000 when the City developed its first Development Code. Since then seven projects totaling 55 cottage homes have been built. Cottage housing helps meet the City's needs for consistency with the State Growth Management targets, the Comprehensive Plan, and community stated preference for smaller and alternative housing choices. However, most cottage housing projects have been somewhat controversial in the surrounding neighborhood. This culminated in a moratorium in August 2004 in order to study the concept of cottage housing further. The moratorium has been extended twice by Council to February 19, 2006.

**I. FINDINGS OF FACT**

**1. Project Description**

Recommended Section 20.40.300 Cottage Housing Amendments.

A. For the definition of cottage housing see SMC 20.20.014. The intent of cottage housing is to:

- Place the burden on the developer for the highest quality development rather than the minimum standards and for the City to deny proposals that do not meet this intent.
- Support the growth management goal of more efficient use of urban residential land;
- Support development of diverse housing in accordance with Framework Goal 3 of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan;
- Increase the variety of housing types available for smaller households;
- Provide opportunities for small, detached dwelling units within an existing neighborhood;
- Provide opportunities for creative, diverse, and high quality infill development;
- Provide development compatible with existing neighborhoods with less overall bulk and scale than standard sized single-family detached dwellings; and

- Encourage the creation of usable open space for residents through flexibility density and design.

B. No more than 8 cottage housing units shall be located within 1,000 feet from any single point in the City. A proposed cottage development application shall meet this requirement from the property of a previously vested application, issued permit, or built cottage development under the SMC.

C. The total floor area of each cottage unit shall not exceed 1,000 square feet. Total floor area is the area included within the surrounding exterior walls, but excluding any space where the floor to ceiling height is less than six feet. The maximum minimum main floor area for an individual cottage housing unit shall be 700 square feet as follows:

~~For at least 50 percent of the units in a cluster, total floor area shall not exceed 650 square feet;~~

~~For no more than 50 percent of the units in a cluster, the floor area may be up to 800 square feet.~~

D. Up to 1.75 The following number of cottage housing units may shall be allowed in place of each single-family home allowed by the base density of the zone.

~~If all units do not exceed 650 square feet on main floor: 2.00~~

~~If any unit is between 651 and 800 square feet on main floor: 1.75~~

E. Cottage housing developments shall have units shall be developed in clusters of a minimum of four units and a maximum of 12 8 units not including community buildings.

F. The height limit for all cottages structures shall not exceed 18 feet. Cottages or amenity buildings having pitched roofs with a minimum slope of six and 12 may extend up to 25 feet at the ridge of the roof. All parts of the roof above 18 feet shall be pitched. Parking structures and community buildings shall not exceed 18 feet.

G. Each Cottages unit shall be oriented around a common open space using covered porches and entries. Cottages fronting on streets shall have an additional entry facing those streets. The common open space shall be at least 250 square feet per cottage housing unit and landscaped primarily with ground cover. Open space with a

dimension of less than 20 feet shall not be included in the calculated common open space. Cottages and community building shall be separated at least 40 feet when separated by required open space.

H.G. Each Cottage housing unit shall be provided with a minimum private open space of 250 square feet. Private open space that is less than 10 feet wide shall not be included in the area calculation. Private open space should be contiguous to each cottage, directly accessed from the porch or private walk, for the exclusive use of the cottage resident, and oriented toward the common open space. Fencing or hedges bordering private open space shall not exceed 2 feet in height.




Figure 20.40.300(G): Private use open space should be contiguous to each cottage, for the exclusive use of the cottage resident, and oriented towards the common open space.

I.H Cottage housing units shall have a covered porch or entry at least 60 square feet in size with a minimum dimension of six feet on any side.

J.I All structures shall maintain no less than 10 feet of separation within the cluster.  
Projections may extend into the required separation as follows:

- Eaves may extend up to 12 inches;
- Gutters may extend up to four inches;
- Fixtures not exceeding three square feet in area (e.g., overflow pipes for sprinkler and hot water tanks, gas and electric meters, alarm systems, and air duct termination; i.e., dryer, bathroom, and kitchens); or
- On-site drainage systems.

K.J Parking for each cottage housing unit shall be provided as follows:

- Two parking stalls for each cottage housing unit and 1 guest stall for every 2 units shall be provided. Tandem parking is allowed. Units that do not exceed 650 square feet on main floor: 1.5. Units that exceed 650 square feet on the main floor: 2.0

Parking shall be:

- K. Clustered and separated from the private and common area and cottages by landscaping and architectural screen under 4 feet in height with trellis above 6 feet in height. Screened from public streets and adjacent residential uses by landscaping and/or architectural screen. ~~No solid board fencing allowed as architectural screen.~~
- Set back a minimum of 40 feet from a public street, except for an area which is a maximum of (1) 50 feet wide; or (2) 50 percent of the lot width along the public street frontage, whichever is less, where parking shall have a minimum setback of 15 feet from a public street.
- Located in clusters of not more than five abutting spaces.
- A minimum of 50% of the parking space shall be enclosed.

L. Setbacks for all structures from the abutting property lines shall be an average of 10 feet, but not less than five feet, except 15 feet from a public ~~street~~ Right-of-Way or public sidewalk, whichever is greater.

M. ~~All fences on the interior of a lot shall be no more than 3 feet in height.~~  
Architectural screens along the property line may be up to six feet in height subject to the sight clearance provisions of SMC 20.70.170, 20.70.180 and 20.70.190(C).  
No chain link or solid board fences are allowed.

(Ord. 321 § 1, 2003; Ord. 299 § 1, 2002; Ord. 238 Ch. IV § 3(B), 2000).

## **2. Procedural History**

- 2.1 1998 - City adopts the Comprehensive Plan with Policy LU27 allowing cottage housing in R-6 zones of the City.
- 2.2 1999 - City forms the Shoreline Planning Academy to receive citizen guidance for the City's first Development Code.
- 2.3 2000 - City adopts the Development Code with provisions for cottage housing (SMC 20.40.300).
- 2.4 2003 - City adopts refinements to the cottage housing regulations.
- 2.5 August 2004 - City adopted a six month moratorium on cottage housing.
- 2.6 February 22, 2005 - City Council amended the moratorium ordinance to be extended another 6 months until August 19, 2005.
- 2.7 March 5 and 12, 2005 - City conducts a bus tour of Shoreline's cottage housing.
- 2.8 April 2005 – Council readopts cottage housing Policy LU27 with minor modifications.
- 2.9 May 11, 2005 - Staff holds a community meeting to discuss and make recommendations on cottage housing.
- 2.10 May 26, 2005 – SEPA Determination of Non-Significance issued for proposed amendments.
- 2.11 June 2 and 16, 2005 - Planning Commission holds public hearing and deliberations.
- 2.12 July 18, 2005 – City Council adopts latest moratorium
- 2.13 August 22, 2005 - City Council adds joint City Council and Planning Commission forum to cottage housing public process.
- 2.14 September 1 and 15, 2005 – Planning Commission continues deliberation and directs staff to draft recommendations.

## **3. Public Comment**

A great deal of public comment has been received for this project. The City has received many public comment letters over the past year primarily opposed to cottage housing. This group seems divided between those who want to repeal the provisions because cottages are an inappropriate density increase in traditional single family neighborhoods and those who believe many of the projects are poorly designed. However, during several public comment periods the sides of the issue have been even. There is a contingent of citizens who support cottage housing either because they live in a cottage, they believe the city needs more alternative housing, or they believe that the regulations need improvement to produce more projects like the Greenwood Cottages. There has not been a city-wide survey of citizen opinions.

## **4. SEPA Determination**

The City issued a SEPA determination of non-significance May 26, 2005 for the proposed amendments.

## 5. Consistency

### Shoreline Development Code 20.30.350 Criteria for Amendment to the Development Code

#### 1. The amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Comprehensive Plan - In 1998 Shoreline adopted its Comprehensive Plan. In the plan there are policies that support cottage housing as well as alternative housing choices.

Housing Element Goal HI: Provide sufficient development capacity to accommodate the 20 year growth forecast in appropriate mix of housing types by promoting the creative and innovative use of land designated for residential and commercial use.

Policy HI1: Encourage a variety of residential design alternatives that increase housing opportunities in a manner that is compatible with the character of existing residential and commercial development throughout the city.

Goal LU III: To have adequate residential land and encourage a variety of quality residential buildings and infrastructure suitable for the needs of Shoreline's present and future residents.

Policy LU27: Allow cottage housing in residential areas if they go through design review and adhere to the following characteristics:

Common open space

Reduced parking areas

Detached homes

Common amenities (e.g. garden plots, play areas, storage buildings, orchard)

Policy LU27 was recently re-adopted with by the Council in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan update. In the adoption the Council removed language that allowed cottage housing specifically in "R6 zones and up".

#### 2. The amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.

The recommended code amendments will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare because they will have the same or similar impacts of conventional single family housing and the amendments will be more restrictive and further limit the growth potential over the current cottage housing provisions of the development code.

#### 3. The amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.

The recommended code amendments are not contrary to the interest of the citizens and property owners of the City because they will help meet the state GMA targets, and provide alternative housing for a changing housing market.


## II. CONCLUSIONS

The Planning Commission concluded that these amendments met the criteria for amending the development code. They believed that their recommendations needed more deliberation in regard to the city's housing strategy and other alternatives to meet the State GMA targets, however, the recommendations were also needed to begin discussion with the City Council in the upcoming cottage housing community dialogue meeting in November.

## III. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the Findings, the Planning Commission recommends adoption of the amended cottage housing code.

City of Shoreline Planning Commission

  
Chairperson: David Harris

Date: NOVEMBER 9, 2005



# Cottage Housing Opinion Matrix

\* These numbers are based on staff interpretations of letters and meeting minutes. Please read letters and minutes to verify.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Total 129 comment letters and testimonies.</b></li> <li>• <b>58 different people</b></li> <li>• <b>65.5% opposed cottages</b></li> <li>• <b>19% supported cottages</b></li> <li>• <b>15.5% only had concerns.</b></li> </ul>	<p>73 comment letters sent by 41 people during 2 years.</p> <p>27 people oppose cottages 8 people support cottages 6 people only with concerns</p>	<p>56 testimonies at Planning Commission and Council Dialogue by 17 additional different people who did not also send letters.</p> <p>11 people oppose cottages 3 people support cottages 3 people only with concerns (60+ people testified in support and opposition to cottages at May 11 community meeting but no minutes were taken to determine how many.)</p>
	<b>ISSUES</b>	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT RECIEVED</b>	<b>PLANNING COMMISSION MOTIONS and VOTES</b>
	<p>Highest Priority</p> <p>To</p> <p>Lowest Priority</p>	<p>Compatibility w/ Neighborh'd Density Increase</p> <p>Property Values Impacts</p> <p>Public Process</p> <p>Design GMA targets</p> <p>Design Quality</p> <p>Traffic / Environ Impacts</p> <p>Develop. Review Process</p> <p>Ownership</p>	<p>June 1 – Repeal of Cottage Code Motion / Failed 1-6</p> <p>June 16 –Create Cottage Review Board / Failed 4-4</p> <p>June 16 –Require Staff at Neighborhood Meetings and Minutes / Failed</p> <p>June 16 –Extend Moratorium 6 months / Passed 7-1</p> <p>Sept 1 - Cottages on Arterials Only / Failed 1-5</p> <p>Sept 1 - More information on Design Review Process / Passed Unan.</p> <p>Sept 1 – Require ProForma of Single Family with Cottage / Failed 1-5</p> <p>Sept 15 –Require Enclosed not Covered Garages / Passed 8-0</p> <p>Sept 15 - Require Cottages 10 foot setbacks / Failed 1-7</p> <p>Sept 15 – Limit Cottages to 6 Units / Failed 2-6</p> <p>Sept 15 - Discourage Cottages Unless Highest Standards / Passed Unan.</p> <p>Sept 15 – Recommended Staff Amends as Amended / Passed 7-1</p> <p>Sept 15 – Develop a Design Review Process / Failed 4-4</p> <p>Oct 6 - Reconsider Repeal Vote of June 1 / Passed 5-1</p> <p>Oct 20 - Repeal Cottage Housing Code / Failed 4-4</p>

1.	<b>Compatibility of cottages within Shoreline single family neighborhoods.</b>		The Planning Commission could not define compatibility but had strong opinions about which built projects they liked or disliked. They did not comment on property values. Some commissioners felt that cottages should be allowed in higher density zones while others thought that they could be designed to fit well in single family. Commissioners considered creating a design review board to approve cottage projects but decided against the idea. They all felt it was a viable alternative housing but were concerned with how it fits into the City's housing strategy. Overall, Commissioners were supportive of cottages in concept but did not want the current code and were uneasy about the amended cottage code.
		Comment Letters Only	
	Cottages increase density, lower property values, and look odd in traditional single family areas.	16 people	
	If cottages could be developed at a higher quality, provide some predictability, reduce traffic impacts. Wide support for cottages if at the Greenwood quality.	6 People	
	Cottages provide great, secure communities and an alternative for those want to downsize.	9 People	
2.	<b>Strength of cottage housing market.</b>		
	No Market for Cottages.	4 People	

	Great market for cottages.	1 Person	
3.	<b>Affect of cottages on surrounding property values.</b>		
	Cottages devalue their property.	10 People	
	Cottages increase property value.	2 People	
4.	<b>Growth Management Act Targets.</b>		
	Cottages are unimportant to GMA targets.	8 People	
	Cottages help the city meet GMA targets.	1 Person	
5.	<b>Cottage design quality in traditional single family neighborhoods.</b>		
	Cottages are unattractive.	4 People	
	Cottages are attractive.	5 People	

6.	<b>Added density in R4 and R6 zones.</b>		
	Added density is incompatible.	15 People	
	Added density can work well.	4 People	
7.	<b>Review process needs to be improved to ensure better projects</b>	5 People	
8.	<b>More impacts than SF homes.</b>	9 People	
9.	<b>Cottage public process inadequate.</b>	10 People	
10.	<b>Attracts poor ownership and maintenance.</b>	1 Person	

City of Shoreline  
17544 Midvale Ave. No.  
Shoreline, Wash. 98133-4921

DECEMBER 2, 2005

Subj: Cottage Housing

DEAR SIR,

Thank you for your meeting of November 29<sup>th</sup>, and for all the meetings you have so conscientiously held. You and all your staff must be commended for your efforts to make Cottage Housing work.

Someone complained the City was not keeping the citizens informed on Cottage Housing. Anyone who has attended a meeting, left their name and address, or made a telephone call, has received follow letters advising them of the projects status. In addition, you have advised Community Papers who have done a good job with their Articles and Editorials. The city's communication skills rates an excellence.

Almost EVERYONE who spoke at the Nov. 29<sup>th</sup> meeting brought up the subject of compatibility, but as you analyze it, single family residential housing is naturally incompatible with Cottage Housing. Cottage Housing is an in between step that doesn't fit. People bought homes in areas zoned single family residential because that is exactly what they wanted. They don't want

multiple housing next to or across the street from their single family residences. Today, planners are recognizing that many people do not want large lots. Shoreline has seen that trend, and has adjusted to it very well. They have allowed 3 or 4 homes to be built where normally 2 would qualify, and this has been well received. However, placing 6 or 8 cottages in a single family residential area violates a very special trust owners have placed in government to protect their way of life and their investment. While the building codes allow planners some adjustment, this variation from the norm goes too far to be acceptable, and was never intended.

The cost of larger land parcels today that can be used for cottage housing is so great, along with the cost of construction, the developer places himself at odds with the planners.

The planners are interested in the highest quality, but the builder is interested in building with profit in mind, hoping to negotiate any differences with the officials involved. Architectural sketches can be so deceiving. The result turns out to be housing totally incompatible with the surrounding residences.

The intent of the Cottage Housing Amendments, as noble as they sound, are just

not practical. The contractors and developers are the only ones who benefit. The resentment of the people against this type of development is so much stronger than I ever imagined. They don't want it because it doesn't fit. There is too much "bulk" and it can't be overcome.

Everyone in the city has made a noble effort to try to solve the problem. I marvel at your patience and very honest effort to make this concept work. Universally the people don't want it. Basically it is incompatible, and you can't overcome that incompatibility. Please, let it go.

Look at areas where the zoning can be changed. In those areas spell out very specifically the types of multiple housing that would qualify. I.E. Cottage Housing, Court apartments/condos, Four-plexes, etc. This is the best way to make small dwelling units available, and attain the high quality you wish.

Sincerely,  
John T. Bulman  
1452 - N.W. 202<sup>nd</sup> Lane  
Shoreline, Wash 98147

cc Paul Cohen  
cc Scott Jepson  
cc David Harris 77  
cc Keith McGloshan

19009 Ninth Place N. W.  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
January 11, 2005

Paul Cohen  
Planning and Development Services  
17544 Midvale Avenue N.  
Shoreline, WA 98133

Subject: Your letter of December 23, 2004, on the subject of cottage housing in Shoreline, addressed to Dear Interested Party, asking for comments on the accompanying proposed process to review cottage housing code provisions and asking if we want to participate in the process

Yes, I have comments, and yes, I would like to participate in the process.

My comments:

As I read the proposed process to review cottage housing code provisions I kept thinking, Why not stick to standard, familiar, established forms of punctuation, capitalization, format, and diction, so that we amateurs can focus on the meaning.

I'm not sniping at small stuff, like little accidents that happen when time is short. What I'm asking about is basic, like for example what copy editors call "Series Out of Control," or "Name a Thing Once."



Elspeth Alexander  
(206) 542-3052

P.S: I'm available as a volunteer, if my background qualifies me to help in any way.



RECEIVED

MAR 28 2005

City Manager's Office

19009 Ninth Place N. W.  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
March 25, 2005

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to Councilmember Carolyn Edmonds in response to the form she sent (copy enclosed) inviting people to comment.

My comments pertain to cottage housing. If that topic is germane, can you please make copies for Mayor Jepsen and Councilmembers.



Elspeth Alexander  
(206) 542-3052

19009 Ninth Place N. W.  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
March 22, 2005

Councilmember Carolyn Edmonds  
516 Third Avenue, Room 1200  
Seattle, WA 98104

Subject:: Responding to your survey, enclosed

Of course, providing essentials such as Human Services  
and Police and EMS Service comes first.

Then, please do all you can to

1. Preserve what's left of the natural  
environment
2. Prevent land use that reduces the value  
of surrounding property

A case in point: the Cottage Development proposed at  
19141 - 8th Avenue N. W.

It would take down established trees, including, most  
conspicuously, a row of tall firs, and would "replace"  
the firs with shrubs. Bird life, natural vegetation,  
microclimate would be gone.

It would introduce new runoff problems and aggravate  
those already evident in properties downhill.

It would increase noise and traffic congestion, and--if  
the prospective builder has his way--it would allow  
population density heretofore impermissible.

Typically it would reduce property values in the vicinity  
by \$20,000 to \$40,000 or more (citations by professional  
realtors are available).

I don't think that these objections are a case of NIMBY--  
Not In My Back Yard. I would cheerfully provide tax  
dollars for publicly-financed low-cost housing as part  
of a coherent plan, but cottage housing units at \$300,000  
in isolated, nonconforming plats doesn't look like  
the answer.

Among the valid, objective reasons that are marshalled  
in opposition to this kind of development there is one  
that is often advanced but probably can't be defended:

Councilmember Carolyn Edmonds    March 22, 2005    -2-

"This is opportunistic profit making on the part of the builder."

But profit making is not illegal, and calling it opportunistic seems like begging the question.

Let's consider whether just maybe we are at the end of an era and it's time to enter a different one, where not just nominal conformity with building regulations governs, but an era where the community's interest is realistically factored in.

It certainly wasn't, for example, at any of the community meetings in the Richmond Beach Library that I attended. At those meetings, whenever a community member asked the speaker, builder's representative Robert Nehring, to address the possibility of putting up three, maybe four houses resembling others in the neighborhood (instead of multiple cottage units), it was as if no one had spoken. The question, as far as I know, was never acknowledged or addressed.

Thank you for inviting us to comment.

As for a guide in arriving at what's fair all around, how about this little aphorism:

"I have a right to swing my fist  
but  
my right ends where your nose begins."



Elspeth Alexander  
(206) 542-3052



## Shoreline Planning Commission

September 1, 2005

Written Comment

As I've said in letters to City of Shoreline officials,  
I object to cottage housing:

- It reduces the value of adjacent or nearby properties
- It almost inevitably brings
  - ✓ increased population density
  - ✓ traffic congestion
  - ✓ runoff problems
  - ✓ further destruction of the dwindling number of trees that remain

(Apropos of trees: I think it's time we valued them as a community asset and revised the law accordingly so that a property owner does not have an unqualified right to destroy them.)

Cottage housing is at war with the Shoreline Development Code, Title 20, attached. I suggest that whoever favors setting aside the Code so as to produce more tax revenue can go to 191st and 8th N.W. View the destruction — the site denuded of trees...scraped bare... the ambience destroyed. Let's live within

Please leave this form with the clerk at the end of the meeting.

This is a public record  
our means and preserve what makes Shoreline a  
favorite place.

Shoreline Planning Commission  
Written Comment Form

Elsbeth Alexander  
19009 Ninth Place N.W.  
82 Shoreline, WA 98148  
COTTAGE HOUSING PC 64  
(206) 542-3052

SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT CODE, TITLE 20  
Land Use Regulations, Development Within the City

The Shoreline Development Code implements Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan, 1998, as required by the State Growth Management Act (GMA).

The Code includes the following:

- \* Prevent overcrowding of land
- \* Avoid excessive concentration of population
- \* Promote efforts which will prevent damage to the environment
- \* Provide regulations and standards that lessen congestion on the streets
- \* Encourage attractive, quality construction to enhance City beautification

**Paul Cohen**

---

**To:** JEBWA52@aol.com  
**Subject:** RE: Cottage Housing

Dear Mr. Behrens - Thank you for your letter regarding cottage housing. Your comments have been voiced by other citizens as well. I will give a copy of your letter for the City Councilmembers to review. We are schedule to discuss the issue with the City Council January 23 and February 6 in the Raineir Room in the Shoreline Conference Center at 7:30 PM, lovcated at N 187th St and 1st Ave NE. You are invited to attend and comment.

Sincerely, Paul Cohen

-----Original Message-----

**From:** JEBWA52@aol.com [mailto:JEBWA52@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 20, 2005 8:09 PM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** Cottage Housing

Dear Mr. Cohen:

As a long time shoreline resident and participant in the many meetings concerning cottage housing in our city, I would like to take a moment of your time to speak to several issues:

(1) Any time I have been present at a meeting you personally speak in favor of the concept of cottage housing. I do not believe it is appropriate for a city official to act as an advocate for developers. At the minimum it points to the appearance of conflict of interest.

(2) The placement of these developments inside all ready crowded residential areas causes traffic and safety issues. There is an elderly lady who lives in the 195th st block of Meridian who has been approached by a developer who owns two adjacent houses to her property and told her she had better sell now or her house will be surrounded by cottage homes.

(3) Once a method for construction of these projects is put into the city building codes there is no longer any control over how many or where they will be built. At one of the city planning meetings a developer who has built cottage homes found this hard to understand. His feeling was that putting them amongst existing single family homes was a bad idea.

(4) The two of these projects near my house were built in conflict with even the ordinance allowing cottage homes, but approved anyway. I am referring to the project at 185th and the project that is currently empty at 183rd and Ashworth. The drainage is such at the ashworth site that these homes may never be able to be sold. The trees are too small. There is insufficient on site parking. The fencing doesn't meet code. How do you plan to stop these from being sold, What have you learned by the process.


(5) I want my city officials to provide facts and not be advocates for a particular plan. My decision making process should be based on facts.

Thank you

John Behrens  
18332 Meridian Ave N  
Shoreline Wa, 98133

RECEIVED

JUL 13 2005



Page 1

Heidi Costello


City Manager's Office

From: Robert Barta [bbarta@fivestarteacher.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2005 9:45 AM

To: City Council

Subject: HOLD: R-4 & R-6 Neighborhoods Should not be used for Cottage Housing



Dear City Council members

There are three vital legs that support the strength and appeal of a city. I learned about these principles from an article in the spring 2005 issue of the Wilsonian Quarterly.

#1. A city works when the citizens feel it is a safe place to live.

Certainly our police department is working diligently on that.

#2. A city must be a place of ongoing economic development.

Tom Boydell seems to have some fresh ideas going on that.

#3. "Sacredness". A city must have a sacred foundation of codes that preserve the character and appeal of neighborhood living.

I feel that this third leg is being weakened by the continued possibility that "Cottage Housing Villages" many continue to be inserted in the R-4 and R-6 neighborhoods. Cottage Housing seems to basically be condominium-like housing but the units set on separate foundations.

Condominium-like housing threatens the sacredness of the codes for R-4 and R-6 neighborhoods. Who wants to buy properties in Shoreline if there is a possibility for this "social experiment" to pop up next door.

I encourage the Shoreline City Council to not allow "Cottage Housing Villages" to be inserted in R-4 and R-6 neighborhoods.

I encourage the City Council to honor the sacredness of current R-4 and R-6 codes.

Sincerely yours,

Bob Barta  
Shoreline Citizen  
bbarta@appleisp.net


P.S. Cottage Villages were experimental in Seattle, then they were experimental in Vashon, and now they are experimental in Shoreline.

Experiments need to be evaluated and it appears that the evaluation step is being skipped in Shoreline.

CITY MEMBER	
CITY COUNCIL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CITY MANAGER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
STAFF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Paul Cohen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bob O.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Joyce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tom	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FILE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Distribution Only per Barta

Mr. Paul L. Cohen  
Senior Planner  
Planning and Development Services  
City of Shoreline, Washington



**RE: Cottage Housing Amendment Process**

Paul:

I received your letter "Cottage Housing in Shoreline" over the Holiday, and I provide the following response to support the process City staff is taking to evaluate the Cottage Housing Ordinance currently under moratorium.

First, I do wish to participate in this process and attend any workshop events that may occur. I look forward to receiving sufficient notice to work it into my schedule.

**Comments:**

- I think the "problems" you have identified are consistent with the feedback I have heard. However, I would add that some have expressed that the CUP review process for Cottage Housing is either flawed and/or inadequately staffed. One individual expressed to me that "only one planner" has authority to review and approve these projects. As Staff and we developers know, this is not the case. The nature of the process needs to not only be scrutinized internally by Staff, but better expressed to the general public.

Citizens need to understand the real alternatives to a CUP-dependent form of infill development. I see the choice as a simple one between cottage or other type of housing where public scrutiny and comment on all aspects of the project is welcomed, and traditional short-platting where only the lot configuration is in question. In other words, single lot SF development (what most neighboring homeowners seem to prefer) is ultimately able to build to a lower standard.

- In the "review of projects" section you list three projects including my own, The Reserve Cottages, which have been permitted under the current regulations. I would like to know how you intend to present these projects, and feel it reasonable to ask for the opportunity to review these materials ahead of time and comment. Given it is important to see these projects in their 'best light,' I would be happy to participate in any way I can.
- Finally, I hope that you will include more projects in the presentation, to better inform the public of the precedent for the Ordinance, and what it has aspired to accomplish. I would like citizens to understand the trajectory of the Ordinance in terms of control, and the increasing quality of the projects over time. It would be a benefit to show the starting point of the product type (Meridian Cottages) and what was learned, and what I feel is a milestone in quality housing development beyond category, The Greenwood Avenue Cottages.

Shoreline:  
19202 20th Ave. NW  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
p: 206-533-9112  
f: 206-542-0259


Kirkland:  
10836 NE 108th St.  
Kirkland, WA 98033  
p: 425-827-5226  
f: 425-827-3199

surfoidarchitecture.com



Thanks again Paul - feel free to contact me as needed.

Regards,  
FOURFOLD ARCHITECTURE, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Scott M. Becker', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Scott M. Becker AIA  
Principal

**Paul Cohen**

---

**To:** JEBWA52@aol.com  
**Subject:** RE: Cottage Housing

Dear Mr. Behrens - Thank you for your letter regarding cottage housing. Your comments have been voiced by other citizens as well. I will give a copy of your letter for the City Councilmembers to review. We are schedule to discuss the issue with the City Council January 23 and February 6 in the Raineir Room in the Shoreline Conference Center at 7:30 PM, lovcated at N 187th St and 1st Ave NE. You are invited to attend and comment.

Sincerely, Paul Cohen

-----Original Message-----

**From:** JEBWA52@aol.com [mailto:JEBWA52@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 20, 2005 8:09 PM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** Cottage Housing

Dear Mr. Cohen:

As a long time shoreline resident and participant in the many meetings concerning cottage housing in our city, I would like to take a moment of your time to speak to several issues:

(1) Any time I have been present at a meeting you personally speak in favor of the concept of cottage housing. I do not believe it is appropriate for a city official to act as an advocate for developers. At the minimum it points to the appearance of conflict of interest.

(2) The placement of these developments inside all ready crowded residential areas causes traffic and safety issues. There is an elderly lady who lives in the 195th st block of Meridian who has been approached by a developer who owns two adjacent houses to her property and told her she had better sell now or her house will be surrounded by cottage homes.

(3) Once a method for construction of these projects is put into the city building codes there is no longer any control over how many or where they will be built. At one of the city planning meetings a developer who has built cottage homes found this hard to understand. His feeling was that putting them amongst existing single family homes was a bad idea.

(4) The two of these projects near my house were built in conflict with even the ordinance allowing cottage homes, but approved anyway. I am referring to the project at 185th and the project that is currently empty at 183rd and Ashworth. The drainage is such at the ashworth site that these homes may never be able to be sold. The trees are too small. There is insufficient on site parking. The fencing doesn't meet code. How do you plan to stop these from being sold, What have you learned by the process.

(5) I want my city officials to provide facts and not be advocates for a particular plan. My decision making process should be based on facts.

Thank you

John Behrens  
18332 Meridian Ave N  
Shoreline Wa, 98133

RECEIVED

@\* March 2005

MAR 29 2005

City Manager's Office

Dear Mayor Hansen:

The enclosed article from the 24 March 2005 Seattle Times gives a good indication of why we are so opposed to cottage housing in some neighborhoods.

For a city that prides itself on community, neighborhoods and urban sensibilities, it seems as if we are rushing ahead on the concept of density without considering responsible neighborhood design. As realtors phrase it: location, location, location.

My home is on 8th Avenue Northwest. We already have one cottage housing complex being built on the corner of 8th and 195th, five homes (originally to be six homes) on a single family lot. And how many more along 8th? Eleven to fifteen just north of 190th and more on the corner of 8th and Richmond Beach Road. That is too much in one neighborhood.

I urge the Council to decide to allow cottage housing only in multifamily zones. I do not understand why doing so, as the article states, would defeat the purpose of cottage housing. In addition, these homes in a multifamily zone can contribute to more of a neighborhood feel, create a community.

Consider locating cottage housing closer to either side of Aurora Avenue where future transit and business growth will take place. We have the new Gateway Plaza, the Interurban trail, police services. And let's get a contract post office again at Gateway. The new City Hall could be built where it now is. Think of it: Shopping, Trail, parks, City Hall, police -- all within the area.

A few years ago I donated a book on urban design to the Shoreline Planning Department (Was Tim Stewart there then?) giving ideas for pocket parks, landscaping, creating a village small enough to be comprehensible, fitting in the old with the new. The name of the book: CITY COMFORTS: HOW TO BUILD AN URBAN VILLAGE, by David Sucher, published by City Comforts Press, 1995. I urge the Council to read it.

Sincerely,


*Betty Bostrom*

Betty Bostrom  
19538 - 8 Avenue NW  
Shoreline WA 98177-2554



Thursday, March 24, 2005, 12:00 a.m. Pacific

Permission to reprint or copy this article/photo **must** be obtained by e-mail [resale@seattletimes.com](mailto:resale@seattletimes.com) with your request.



## Shoreline cottages: Too close for comfort?

By Stuart Eskenazi  
*Seattle Times staff reporter*

From where Shoreline homeowner Terry Barham sits, which very well could be in the hot tub in his back yard, the skinny little house going up next door is too close for him to feel relaxed.

Barham is one of several Shoreline neighbors feeling cramped by cottage housing, an experiment in high-density housing. To them, allowing six houses on a lot that otherwise could accommodate two is seen as a sneaky way to shoehorn multifamily density into neighborhoods with single-family zoning.

"I've got essentially a six-unit apartment building next to me," said Barham, who bought in Shoreline's Richmond Beach neighborhood in 1998. "I moved my family from a house in Wallingford because we wanted to escape the density of Seattle and experience an established residential neighborhood with room to breathe. Now I don't have that anymore."

The Shoreline City Council, which adopted its cottage-housing ordinance in 2000 with great hopes, has heard the community outcry. It responded last summer by imposing a moratorium on future developments, giving the council time to re-examine the law, which has allowed seven developments, with a total of 55 small new homes.

Cottage housing, which also has been built on a limited basis in Seattle and on Whidbey Island, has been touted as an innovative approach to reduce suburban sprawl by putting more houses closer to the urban core. An alternative to condominiums and townhouses, cottage housing is different from cluster housing, another form of high-density housing that is causing a controversy in Seattle's Magnolia neighborhood.

Shoreline Mayor Ron Hansen said he wouldn't be surprised if the council decides to allow cottage housing only in multifamily zones. Doing so, though, would defeat the purpose of cottage housing and essentially render the experiment a failure.

If Shoreline revokes its cottage-housing ordinance, that would be a shame, said Scott Becker, the architect-developer of Reserve Cottages, the development being built next to Barham. The six cottages will be ready to occupy next month.

"Let's tweak the ordinance, if we must, to address inappropriate developments, but let's not eliminate cottage housing that is built sensitive to neighbors' concerns," he said.

Cottage houses are required to meet specific design criteria, including landscaping, and therefore

undergo more city scrutiny than typical single-family houses. Becker said he is preserving more trees on the lot than a single-family-house developer likely would have bothered to save. He also said he's not making more money by developing six cottages instead of two large houses.

Paul Cohen, Shoreline's senior planner, said cottage housing also grew out of a public concern that a construction boom was resulting in too many large houses where there had been small houses. Shoreline officials saw the cottage-housing ordinance as a way to encourage more modest-size housing.

Cottage developments also carried the promise of providing single-family houses at affordable prices, but that no longer applies.

Each of the Reserve Cottages, with two bedrooms and 1-½ baths, is selling for between \$300,000 and \$350,000, a price similar to what one would pay for a larger, less-modern house in the same neighborhood.

"It's like with anything new," Hansen said. "People have a feeling it might be a good idea as long as it's over there, not here."

Concerns over cottage housing vary, with homeowners who live next door worried that their property values will drop as a result.

"I am a Realtor and I've been showing houses for 16 years," Barham said. "Right or wrong, people don't want to live next to cottages — and that leads to a loss in property value."

Others neighbors fear that the selling of several new houses on the block will result in higher appraisals for their homes.

"The development will increase the value of my house, and at age 83, I'm not anxious to have my taxes increased," said Paul Robben, who lives across the northern boundary of the Reserve Cottages.

Robben said he originally was impressed with the development plans and thought having six small houses on the property was better than the alternative of a couple of mega-houses.

"But when they first started framing the roof, I thought, 'What did I get myself into?'"

The maximum footprint for a cottage house under the ordinance is 800 square feet, and the entire home, counting the second floor, cannot exceed 1,000 square feet.

"The developments tend to occur on lots that had small houses built in the '50s or '60s and are somewhat wooded," said Cohen, the Shoreline senior planner. "When people are used to a semirural lot and that lot is being proposed for intensive cottage housing, that comes as a big shock."

Cohen said the city adopted its cottage-housing ordinance as a way to reach state growth-management targets for housing without having to rely solely on new multifamily developments. The city amended the code after the first cottage-housing development — the brightly painted 16-house Meridian Park Cottages near North 185th Street and Stone Avenue North — had been skewered by neighbors over its street appeal, particularly its Skittles color scheme.

The amended ordinance required cottage-housing developers to meet several guidelines designed to make the developments more compatible with their surroundings in terms of scale, design and external colors.

Cottage developments built under the amended ordinance were received more warmly, but neighborhood concern over the concentration of a proposed 16-cottage development on Eighth Avenue Northeast led council members to pass the moratorium.

"I think it's fair to say that all of the council members still have an interest in cottage housing, but all of us have reservations whether our current ordinance is restrictive enough," Hansen said.

Seattle has no cottage-housing ordinance but recently allowed two developments to be built in the city as an experiment. One, at 16th Avenue and East Jefferson Street, has four houses, and the other is nine units at Northeast 65th Street and Latona Avenue Northeast.

"The planning commission has members who support cottage housing, but it is not on our priority list of issues we are moving forward on," said Alan Justad, spokesman for Seattle's Department of Planning and Development.

The controversial development of 39 houses in Magnolia, on a vacant 4.5-acre tract where Briarcliff Elementary School once stood, is not cottage housing but cluster housing.


Cluster housing lets developers build homes, under certain conditions, on lots as small as 3,600 square feet instead of the usual 5,000 square feet. Unlike cottage housing, a minimum 2-acre plot is required for the larger cluster of homes, and because lots that large are rare in Seattle, there are few such developments.

Ground has not been broken in Magnolia, and neighbors who don't want the development built have hired an attorney.

*Stuart Eskenazi: 206-464-2293*

Copyright © 2005 The Seattle Times Company

City of Shoreline  
17544 - Midvale Ave. No.  
Shoreline, Wash. 98133-4291



Attn: Paul Cohen  
Planning & Development  
Subj: THE RESERVE Cottages  
202nd & 15th N.W.

Dear Sir,

Before the Cottages got underway I was one who voiced my concerns, and you have been kind in keeping the citizens up to date on the "Cottage Conflict." When I originally talked to you before the construction got underway you assured me the development (RESERVE Cottages) would install side walks and curbs along 15th N.W. in front of their property. I notice they <sup>have</sup> done their landscaping, blacktopped their entrance, but have made no allowance for the side walks and curbs. Can you advise me if the developer is planning on doing that work as is required by code?

Thank you for your response.

John T. Dulman  
1452 - N. W. 202nd Lane  
Shoreline, Wash. 98177

## Paul Cohen

---

**From:** Tim Carroll [tcarroll@msiscales.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 23, 2004 5:09 PM  
**To:** CMO  
**Cc:** Paul Grace; John Chang; Paul Cohen; Robert Ransom; City Council; Ronald Hansen; Scott Jepsen; Tim Stewart; SWA85401@allstate.com; Leighlincoln@msn.com; miskanen@comcast.net; brent-smith@teknologic.net; David Bannister  
**Subject:** Cottage Housing

Dear Mr. Burkett,

It has been a while since we have spoke on the referenced subject and I am disappointed that I find myself addressing concerns that are seemingly redundant to those expressed prior to the Cottage Housing Moratorium and contrary to its objectives. Specifically, my concerns are with Shoreline's Recommended Comp Plan's Update and would appreciate your input. Meaning, in the first section of Shoreline's Goals and Policies Matrices, please explain the intent of passages from page 10, item 28, and on page 12, item 32, an why the Planning Commission added specific reference to Cottage Housing into both low density and medium density land use designations? To my understanding this verbiage is new and/or it was not specifically called out in the City's prior existing goals and policies. I and a fair number of Shoreline's citizens were under the impression that the Cottage Housing Emergency Moratorium was enacted to "provide time for our City to sincerely study the Cottage Housing concept and its impacts to our neighborhoods."? To include this to our City's Goals & Policies with no actual study or organized recommendations from the public could, and has been, construed as the Cottage Home Concept moving forward without one. In order to keep my and other citizens' concerns to a manageable level, please provide an explanation by no later than 12/1/04. If no response is provided by then, I will make the assumption that the stated goals of the Cottage Moratorium have changed or perhaps were disingenuous to begin with. If such were to occur, I think you will be duly impressed with the energy that I and fellow citizens will employ to make sure that this City's commitment to its citizens are followed through on this matter.

Thank you in advance for your timely response.

Kind Regards,  
Tim Carroll  
WRK:800-874-4320  
RES: 206-546-8753



RECEIVED

SEP - 7 2005

City Manager's Office

1547-NW 20th

Shoreline WA

Aug 31, 2008

Act. Councilman Bob Pearson:

On Sept 12th I understand we're  
back to the same old drawing board  
Cottage Housing!!

- 1- I've lived in Richmond Beach for  
over 52 years. My husband was a  
Quality Builder.
- 2- The Price of these Cottage Houses  
are not inexpensive, \$300,000.00?
- 3 Architecture of them is anything but  
attractive, some look like over built  
Bird Houses!
- 4- As for the Elderly - Not very safe  
with all the steps required. A big  
Hazard for old People!
- 5- The Planning Department & Council  
must find some other means  
away from Residential Homes -
- 6 - After World War II we were  
required by law to build FHA &  
Public Economy Homes. Today you  
can see the end result, after years  
The Conditions - Unkept, some not

2-

to bad, but come not an asset  
to the Neighborhood. See these on  
10th & 185th - North & South!!!

7- What guarantee does the Community  
have that these Homes would be  
kept up & maintained after the  
year go by? Also yards if any!  
8- How many Council Members want  
them in their Neighborhood or left  
door to them, including the Planning  
Commission??

9- I'm opposed to all of them, they  
belong out of residential all together.

10- The best way to settle the  
question of College Housing  
Put it on the Ballot & Let the  
People of Shoreline Vote!!!  
Yes or No!

11- I feel this is Political & we all  
like to know if anyone Anonymously  
is involved, has interest in them  
or are silent Partners?!?!?

12- Put a stop to this once  
for all.

-3-

We do not want any more  
Cottage Housing!!

Put it up for Vote + Settle  
This Quarter

Let the People Speak for  
Themselves.

Enough! Enough! Enough!  
Moratorium for ever.

Respectfully  
Mrs Donald Chapman

P.S. Please excuse my hand writing - but  
I have Arthritis in my fingers - hands.  
Along with Neuropathy.

## Paul Cohen

---

**From:** Brian Ducey [BDucey@approachms.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 14, 2005 9:39 AM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** Shoreline CHD code "cottage moratorium"

Hi Paul, I would like to participate if you need input on the "cottage" code. I live in the Greenwood Ave Cottages at 160th Pl & Greenwood and I am also the co-president of our association. I believe we are proof the cottage concept can be a successful integration of higher density into single family neighborhoods. We have worked very hard to become an integral part of our neighborhood and made friends of all our immediate neighbors. If some of the parameters of the code are tightened up I believe cottage planning could begin successfully again. The Cottage Company did set the bar very high with our development, and unfortunately the followers appear to have exploited rather than embraced the vision of the code allowances.

Thanks

Brian Ducey  
206-812-3819 (work)  
206-542-2102 (home)

**Paul Cohen**

---

**From:** Brian Ducey [BDucey@approachms.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 15, 2005 8:56 AM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** co-housing on Vashon

Paul, this is sort of a followup to the woman who liked the idea of co-housing. My wife Colleen works with a resident.

Brian Ducey  
Greenwood Ave Cottages

I forgot to tell you - I spoke with Randy yesterday about the co-housing on Vashon. We determined that the main difference is that a co-housing group is formed, planned, and sold ahead of time, whereas cottage housing is built first then sold. They also each build their own houses. They don't get any special grants or money from the government. It was stipulated when they all bought in that 5 houses would be built as low income homes. I'll bet that's how that lady got in. Their commons is an actual house that seats up to 50 for dinner and has 3 bedrooms.....! Their rules and regs sound just like ours.

To:

Cottage Housing;  
Planning Commission;  
City Council and  
Paul Cohen; of Shoreline, WA.

MY SON OWNS HIS OWN  
Home at 16749 - WHITMAN Ave. N.  
Shoreline, WA. - Paul N. ERlien.

I Reside with my SON; my  
Name is SHIRLEY L. ERlien. I was  
only able to attend one meeting on  
Cottage Housing because of Personal  
Reasons:

MY SON & I wish to tell you that  
we like and believe Cottage Housing  
is AN Asset and improvement to any  
Neighborhood. They ARE clean and  
Nice in Appearance, A break away  
from looking at big Huge Buildings.  
We Hope that they can continue  
being built in the area.

Thank you for your time

Paul N. Erlien  
Shirley L. Erlien

**Heidi Costello**

---

**From:** David Fagerstrom [fager1@gte.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 05, 2004 3:51 PM  
**To:** Kimberly Lehmberg; City Council  
**Subject:** 04 - 326091 - theft[s]

**RECEIVED**

NOV - 8 2004

City Manager's Office

Council members & Ms. Kim Lehmberg [City SL, Project Mgr, 19141 8th NW proj]

E-mail snips below refer to two thefts in Shoreline. After police confronted the first theft's perpetrator, some property went back to its owners. That same property was stolen a second time. Ergo, the first action was no prank; intent to harm was present.  
 Please start action to penalize such behavior by builder.

This is about a builder stealing posted signs that oppose a certain type of construction. Theft occurred at night, the perpetrator confessed. When many of the signs were returned, re-posted, and then stolen a second time, I chose to write this note. Some folks just seem to do business on their own set of rules.

Why does this kind of thing go on in Shoreline? Doubtless this builder has had complaints filed with the city against him, so there must be a file on him. Please advise how I may view it.

The first theft incident starts the subject line: 04-326091.  
 Chief perpetrator was Simon Evers, apparently son of Tom Evers, TomCat Construction and Chrysalis...LLC.

Detail in a snips from e-mails between concerned citizens:

=====

04 - 326091

>Officer Kyle McCutchen just dropped off the signs he picked up from St.  
 > Lukes. Here is the story-  
 >  
 > The truck is co-registered to Evers (spelling?) and a Spanish name like  
 > Rojas or something.... The St. Lukes janitor said the guys that were dumping  
 > the signs were young but not necessarily juveniles. After taking my report  
 > the officer went to ST. Lukes to talk to the janitor and get the signs for  
 > me but the janitor had already left. But Officer McCutchen did bring me back  
 > the signs. Some of the signs no longer have the wood stakes but I think I  
 > have about 15 that can be reposted if your people want to come get them.  
 > Feel free to give out our phone number... 546-6353  
 >  
 > Officer McCutchen is on his way over to the address of the truck now to tell  
 > the people to knock it off. He hopes that St. Lukes will prosecute for  
 > illegal dumping - and I will FOR SURE try to push for prosecution for theft  
 > of signs.... tell all your group to do the same. Officer McCutchen can be  
 > reached at 546-6730 or cell phone 391-0030. But he said it would be minor  
 > charges at best, probably the Prosecutor will deem it a civil matter because  
 > of the builder vs. neighborhood issues....  
 >  
 > I think your group should all bring this theft to the attention of Maggie  
 > Fimmia, Mr. Chang, Cindy Ryu, Bob Ransom and Paul Cohen (the City Planner  
 > guy). Maybe they can impose some more penalties or make it tougher on TOMCAT  
 > or maybe even suspend the permit process for a while....

A LATER E-MAIL

Brent-

it's now 3 am.... I just signed a statement so that Officer McCutchen can send this off to the prosecutor for a decision....

The kid that took the signs and admitted it to the officer is Simon Evers. Son of Tommy Evers..... is this the Tommy of TOMCAT?

I am sure that the prosecutor will not do anything just on my statement alone because the value of my 3 signs (two of yours and 1 of mine) only total about \$ 11 .... you need to get all of your people who lost signs and yourself to call the officer and report similar losses - there may be a chance the prosecutor might do something if a lot of people call in and report losses....

and here is the total of the signs I have gotten returned by Officer McCutchen from St. Luke's - 13 signs with posts and 13 signs with no posts..... they are ready to go back out now.

I am now going to send an e-mail to Maggie Fimmia asking her to push the prosecutor to do something with the kid (Simon) and to do something about not allowing TOMCAT to build in Shoreline anymore based on these actions. Hopefully your e-mail list will send the same type letters to her (if you could suggest it in an e-mail).

ok - see ya when ya get back-

Randy





Paul Cohen,  
Project Manager

**City of Shoreline**

17544 Midvale Avenue North

Shoreline, WA 98133-4921

(206) 546-1700 ♦ Fax (206) 546-2200

December 23, 2004

RE: Cottage Housing in Shoreline

Dear Interested Party:

*Page 1 @ gte.net*  
*DAVID FAGERSTROM*  
*807 NW 191 LN, 98177*

The City of Shoreline has had provisions for the development of cottage housing since the year 2000. The City's development code was amended in 2003 to further refine cottage housing regulations. Since 2000 there have been 7 cottage housing projects approved. Based on neighbor concerns, the City Council passed a 6-month moratorium in August 2004 to prohibit new applications for cottage housing. The Council is likely to extend that moratorium so that we can adequately study the cottage housing issues that have emerged.

You have either written us about your concerns regarding these projects, are a developer, or live in cottage housing. Since you have shown interest we would like to involve you to help us articulate the preferences of the community. Your preferences will eventually be presented to the Planning Commission who in turn will make recommendations to the City Council on the future of cottage housing.

We are asking for two things from you by January 14<sup>th</sup> 2005. First, do you have any comments regarding the attached proposed process to review the cottage housing code provisions? Second, do you want to participate in the process, which may include workshops? You may send me a letter to Paul Cohen, Planning and Development Services Department, 17544 Midvale Ave. N, Shoreline, WA 98133 or e-mail me at [pcohen@ci.shoreline.wa.us](mailto:pcohen@ci.shoreline.wa.us).

Sincerely,

*Paul Cohen*

Paul Cohen, Project Manager

Cc: Steve Burkett, City Manager  
Robert Olander, Deputy City Manager  
Tim Stewart, Director of Planning and Development Department

- Yes clean up error in Comp Plan, especially LU 27*
- Give notice of neighbor meetings via accountable mail from + controlled by the city*
- Use zoning changes not Conditional Use Permits*
- Consider "Stable Property Values" language, as in Edmonds 2001 Comp Plan, p. 31.*

G:\PADS\Cottage Housing\Workshop Interest Letter.doc

- Stop promoting 250,000 Cottages as "starter" homes*
- Make Cottage House, at least in part, ADA compliant.*  
*→ then, not before, refer to Cottages as suitable for empty nests.*

- C. City Park
- D. Pine Ridge Park
- E. Southwest County Park

## Residential Development

- A. The City of Edmonds is unique among cities in Washington state. Located on the shores of Puget Sound, it has been able to retain (largely through citizen input) a small town, quality atmosphere rare for cities so close to major urban centers. The people of Edmonds value these amenities and have spoken often in surveys and meetings over the years. The geographical location also influences potential growth of Edmonds. Tucked between Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace and Puget Sound, the land available for annexation and development is limited.

Living standards in Edmonds are high, and this combined with the limited development potential, provides the opportunity for constructive policy options to govern future development. This will ensure an even better quality of life for its citizens.

Edmonds consists of a mixture of people of all ages, incomes and living styles. It becomes a more humane and interesting city as it makes room for and improves conditions for all citizens.

- B. Goal. High quality residential development which is appropriate to the diverse lifestyle of Edmonds residents should be maintained and promoted. The options available to the City to influence the quality of housing for all citizens should be approached realistically in balancing economic and aesthetic consideration, in accordance with the following policies:
  - B.1. Encourage those building custom homes to design and construct homes with architectural lines which enable them to harmonize with the surroundings, adding to the community identity and desirability.
  - B.2. Protect neighborhoods from incompatible additions to existing buildings that do not harmonize with existing structures in the area.
  - B.3. Minimize encroachment on view of existing homes by new construction or additions to existing structures.
  - B.4. Support retention and rehabilitation of older housing within Edmonds whenever it is economically feasible.

B.5. Protect residential areas from incompatible land uses through the careful control of other types of development and expansion based upon the following principles:

*B.5.a. Residential privacy is a fundamental protection to be upheld by local government.*

*B.5.b. Traffic not directly accessing residences in a neighborhood must be discouraged.*

*B.5.c. Stable property values must not be threatened by view, traffic or land use encroachments.*

*B.5.d. Private property must be protected from adverse environmental impacts of development including noise, drainage, traffic, slides, etc.*

B.6. Require that new residential development be compatible with the natural constraints of slopes, soils, geology, vegetation and drainage.

C. Goal. A broad range of housing types and densities should be encouraged in order that a choice of housing will be available to all Edmonds residents, in accordance with the following policies:

C.1. Planned Residential Development. Consider planned residential development solutions for residential subdivisions.

*C.1.a. Consider single-family homes in a PRD configuration where significant benefits for owner and area can be demonstrated (trees, view, open space, etc.).*

*C.1.b. Consider attached single-family dwelling units in PRD's near downtown and shopping centers as an alternative to multiple-family zoning.*

C.2. Multiple. The City's development policies encourage high quality site and building design to promote coordinated development and to preserve the trees, topography and other natural features of the site. Stereotyped, boxy multiple unit residential (RM) buildings are to be avoided.

*C.2.a. Location Policies.*

*C.2.a.i. RM uses should be located near arterial or collector streets.*

*C.2.b. Compatibility Policies.*

*C.2.b.i. RM developments should preserve the privacy and view of surrounding buildings, wherever feasible.*

*C.2.b.ii. The height of RM buildings that abut single family residential (RS) zones shall be similar to the height permitted in the abutting RS zone except where the existing vegetation and/or change in topography can substantially screen one use from another.*

- B.3. Adequate buffers of landscaping, compatible transitional land uses and open space should be utilized to protect surrounding land areas from the adverse effects of industrial land use. Particular attention should be given to protecting residential areas, parks and other public-institutional land uses.
- B.4. All industrial areas should be located where direct access can be provided to regional ground transportation systems (major State Highways and/or railroad lines).

## Open Space

- A. Generally in urban areas a lack of open space has been one of the major causes of residential blight. This lack has contributed to the movement of people from older densely developed neighborhoods to peripheral areas still possessing open areas.

Open space must be reserved now for assurance that future settled areas are relieved by significant open land, providing recreational opportunities as well as visual appeal.


Not all vacant land in the City should be considered desirable or valuable for open space classification. Therefore, the following set of criteria-standards have been developed for determining those areas most important for this classification.

- B. Goal. Open space must be seen as an essential element determining the character and quality of the urban and suburban environment, in accordance with the following policies.
  - B.1. Undeveloped public property should be studied to determine its suitability and appropriate areas designed as open space.
    - B.1.a. *No city-owned property should be relinquished until all possible community uses have been explored.*
  - B.2. All feasible means should be used to preserve the following open spaces:
    - B.2.a. *Lands which have unique scientific or educational values.*
    - B.2.b. *Areas which have an abundance of wildlife particularly where there are habitats of rare or endangered species.*
    - B.2.c. *Natural and green belt areas adjacent to highways and arterials with the priority to highways classified as scenic.*
    - B.2.d. *Areas which have steep slopes or are in major stream drainage ways, particularly those areas which have significance to Edmonds residents as water sheds.*
    - B.2.e. *Land which can serve as buffers between residential and commercial or industrial development.*
    - B.2.f. *Bogs and wetlands.*

Paul Cohen



Steve Burkett  
City Manager



DATE: 4-12

TO: ☐ Assistant City Manager  
☐ City Attorney  
☐ Communications & Intergovernmental Relations Director  
☐ Deputy City Manager  
☐ Finance Director  
☐ Human Resources Director  
☐ Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Director  
☒ Planning & Development Services Director  
☐ Police Chief  
☐ Public Works Director

☐ Please draft a response  
☐ for my signature  
☐ for your signature  
☐ for \_\_\_\_\_'s signature

☐ See me

☒ FYI

☐ Please handle

Return to City Manager's Office by \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: from 4-11  
council meeting  
MR. Fogelstrom -  
[Signature]

Cottage2005apr11

Tim S.  
Paul C.


Cottages\_GM

1. IMPACTED PARTIES PARTICIPATION--ACCOUNTABLE MAIL
  1. 19141 8th -NW project neighbor meeting ,Aug 2004-only about half of 500' circle neighbors got notice
  2. Comp Plan should adopt "Accountable\_Communication Notice" everywhere in it
  3. Affected parties' mailing can simply be discarded, if even ever prepared
    1. Most likely not to receive--neighbors who will oppose
2. MANAGE GROWTH BY COORDINATING WITH TRANSPORTATION
  1. Coordinate with Transportation, relating density to mass transit service access
    1. Putting HD density in neighborhoods away from transit adds trips/carscongestion
    2. HD in toward transit addresses congestion in a positive way, as in Mercer Island
3. AESTHETICS--NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER --VISUAL RESPECTS--offended
  1. Easter basket colors, lack of tree preservation, crunched look, stark contrast, have been allowed
  2. IF Cottages are to be allowed, force design to be tasteful, sight-specific
4. ECONOMICS--NEIGHBORHOOD VALUE Site Cottages only in Medium-Density and up
  1. Relative value prinple, consider Emonds Comp Plan 2001 language page 31
    1. B.5.c Stable property values must not be threatened by view, traffic or land use encroachments.
    2. C.1.b Consider attached single-family dwelling units in PRD's near downtown and shopping centers as an alternative to multiple-family zoning.
5. STOP CLAIMING COTTAGES AS "AFFORDABLE HOUSING"
  1. EX: Single new Shoreline schools teacher, wants \$270,000 home
    1. Using a 30 year fixed loan--needs \$110k--\$120k down payment to loan-qualify
  2. Cottages, even in lower cost neighborhoods, are offered far above what 80% -of-median-income person can buy
    1. See N 183rd St. & Ashworth Ave N. project, \$335,995-for junky build
  3. Property tax on "STARTER" home will be \$250/month
    1. Add homeowner's insurance
    2. Then let city take charge of Utilities--it's called ASSUMPTION--and watch fees skyrocket
  4. T\_I\_U---tax/insurance/utility costs could be \$350
  5. CONSIDER CONDOS
    1. Shoreline Village, \$150k pricing,
  6. AFFORDABLE OWNERSHIP
    1. Explore a different way--trust funds, int-free loans paid back by equity growth, etc
6. SOME COTTAGES INSPECTED, SOME ???
  1. Again, see N 183 and Ashworth N- cheap materials
7. IF COTTAGES ALLOWED, SHOULD NOT BE CONCENTRATED GEOGRAPHICALLY
  1. Disperse them, both sides of I-5
  2. Adopt a lottery, use it to sell on objective/equitable basis, Cottage rights
  3. Objective / systematic allocation of building rights
8. Do not allow equity grab--make Cottages up-value the neighborhood, not the reverse
9. IF COTTAGES, CONSIDER FOR SOLAR ASSISTANCE
10. IF COTTAGES, REQUIRE SENIOR FRIENDLY FEATURES
11. IF COTTAGES, CONSIDER FOR -0- IMPACT SURFACE WATER
12. IF COTTAGES, PROTECT THE CONSUMER
  1. DISCLOSURE form required
  2. --YOU CANNOT IMPROVE YOUR HOME
  3. YOU WILL HAVE COMMUNITY ASSESSMENTS
    1. A common area expense will be shared among you and the few others in your Association. Because there are so few of you, the cost per house could be extremely high
    2. Establish reserve fund for failed condo associations
  4. DID YOU KNOW YOU ARE BUYING ULTRA-HIGH COST PER SQUARE FOOT
  5. HAVE YOU READ YOUR CONVENANTS-YOU WILL NEVER ADD ON TO YOUR DWELLING
  6. DO YOU UNDERSTAND YOU WILL HAVE LESS PRIVACY THAN
    1. you would have on larger lot sizes
  7. DO YOU UNDERSTAND YOUR COMMITMENT INTERRELATES YOU
    1. with next door neighbors--ALL of them
13. SAFETY--DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT A FIRE AT A NEIGHBOR'S HOUSE COULD QUICKLY OVERTAKE YOURS
  1. Sprinkling is built into your Cottage, but there's virtually no access for a fire truck to enter your village. A neighbor's fire could leave you homeless before help arrives
14. SAFETY--DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT A 911 VEHICLE MAY BE UNABLE TO ACCESS YOUR VILLAGE
15. FINANCE/UPKEEP insurance-Cottages make the most money when built fast/cheap
  1. Set aside reserves for results of early failures
16. DOES ZONING IN SHORELINE MEAN NOTHING?
  1. I bought R6 as an environment, but now I get R12 or more, next to me?

Bessie C. Francis  
1633 N. 180<sup>th</sup>  
Shoreline, WA 98133

January 7, 2005

City of Shoreline  
Planning and Development Services  
17544 Midvale Ave. N  
Shoreline, WA 98133



Dear Sir:

My parents and grandparents moved to the Shoreline area over 86 years ago to have room to raise a family and enjoy the open space and large tracts of land available. It was this "spaciousness" that continued to and still continues to be attractive and an important part of the nature and quality of this area.

Now, having lived here for those 86 years, I have seen many changes since Shoreline became "incorporated" that have made me "ill." In particular the inclusion of "Cottage Homes and Lots" are not desirable. They are not a positive addition or complement to this area and I am greatly disheartened by their being allowed. They do not represent the basic standard and lifestyle that it is important for Shoreline to maintain in order to continue the nature of their community as it should be.

Why has this been done? For the extra taxes they will bring the city? If motivated by this kind of greed, it does not go far with me. In fact, the small amount gained, may well be lost in the higher costs to "supervise" more dense population areas with lower economic means. I am not alone in my feelings. Petitions have informed the Council, but to no avail.

"Politics" is not a favored subject of mine. I won't at my age (88) be attending any meetings, because they seem to have "answers" before they begin the hearings; defending their positions rather than objectively hearing the citizens they represent. But I am writing to strongly object to any further inclusion of this type of housing density in the Shoreline Community where the general "existing" housing is standard lot size, single-family dwellings.

Sincerely,

*Bessie C. Francis*

Bessie C. Francis

## Paul Cohen

---

**From:** Brian Geppert [geppert47@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 11, 2005 2:29 PM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** Cottage Housing feedback

Hi Paul!

Thanks for the meeting notice, minutes, etc. about the cottage housing rule changes. I'd like to pass along my official comments for the record:

I am a strong believer in cottage housing and see it as a positive addition to any neighborhood. The benefit is strongest for those within the development since it builds a sense of community being in a similar situation within close proximity to each other. The example of successful cottage housing that stands out in my mind is the first (?) implementation near the Shoreline Community College (just North of it). The landscaping, layout, and styles of houses are very well done. The architecture makes just visiting the area more pleasant. Much more appealing than typical traditional construction.

I think the City of Shoreline has been too cautious with cottage housing developments, as evidenced by the moratorium. We only need look at the City of Seattle and their experience with cottage housing - which seems to have done very well. I don't recall Seattle ever imposing a moratorium. If anything, the City should lean towards allowing such developments while simultaneously looking to improve the building codes/restrictions instead of barring developments until all the kinks are worked out. We have a housing crunch - creative solutions are needed.

Thank you!

-Brian Geppert



-----Original Message-----

From: Michelle\_Griffith@interep.com

[mailto:Michelle\_Griffith@interep.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2005 6:55 PM

To: Jessica Simulcik

Subject: Fw: Audubon & Displacement Coalition Host Forum on Density,  
This Wed. April 27th, 7:00PM Does it prevent sprawl or create  
affordability? You are invited!

Please pass this on to our City Council members as well as the Cities  
planning department for the realities of some of the suggestions and  
decisions they are imposing upon on the tax paying citizens of our  
City.

Michelle Griffith-Olivera

VP/Director of Sales

McGavren Guild Radio/Freedom Radio Group

phone: (206) 441-3401 Seattle / (503) 243-4200 Portland

cell: (206) 931-2065 fax: (206) 443-1872

<http://archives.seattletimes.nwsource.com/cgi-bin/texis/cgi/bush/bushday/2-1-00.1>



solely on new multifamily developments. The city amended the code after the first **cottage-housing** development — the brightly painted 16-house Meridian Park Cottages near North 185th Street and Stone Avenue North — had been skewered by neighbors over its street appeal, particularly its Skittles color scheme.

The amended ordinance required **cottage-housing** developers to meet several guidelines designed to make the developments more compatible with their surroundings in terms of scale, design and external colors.

**Cottage** developments built under the amended ordinance were received more warmly, but neighborhood concern over the concentration of a proposed 16-**cottage** development on Eighth Avenue Northeast led council members to pass the moratorium.

"I think it's fair to say that all of the council members still have an interest in **cottage housing**, but all of us have reservations whether our current ordinance is restrictive enough," Hansen said.

Seattle has no **cottage-housing** ordinance but recently allowed two developments to be built in the city as an experiment. One, at 16th Avenue and East Jefferson Street, has four houses, and the other is nine units at Northeast 65th Street and Latona Avenue Northeast.

"The planning commission has members who support **cottage housing**, but it is not on our priority list of issues we are moving forward on," said Alan Justad, spokesman for Seattle's Department of Planning and Development.

The controversial development of 39 houses in Magnolia, on a vacant 4.5-acre tract where Briarcliff Elementary School once stood, is not **cottage housing** but **cluster housing**.

**Cluster housing** lets developers build homes, under certain conditions, on lots as small as 3,600 square feet instead of the usual 5,000 square feet. Unlike **cottage housing**, a minimum 2-acre plot is required for the larger cluster of homes, and because lots that large are rare in Seattle, there are few such developments.

Ground has not been broken in Magnolia, and neighbors who don't want the development built have hired an attorney.


Stuart Eskenazi: 206-464-2293

FAX 546 8761

813 NW. 191st Lane  
Shoreline, WA 98177

February 18, 2005

RE: Project 106837 - 19141 8th Ave. NW.



Ms. Kim Lehmberg, Project Manager  
City of Shoreline, WA


Dear Ms. Lehmberg:

I understand you are accepting comment until today, and perhaps after. Please note that I have a deep concern that goes beyond the soils environment.


With the City's Comprehensive Plan under review, and the possibility that its changes in respect to Cottage Housing may liberalize the rules, I have fears that an ultimate outcome at our site is the original 16-house project.

That is, if Comp Plan gets changed as proposed, and if moratorium is lifted, I'll be staring at 16 small houses that are totally out of character with my neighborhood. There are dozens of voting neighbors who feel this way, too.

Best regards,

  
Lyle & Sally Gustafson  
206-542-4422

January 4, 2005



Paul Cohen, Project Manager  
City of Shoreline  
17544 Midvale Ave. North  
Shoreline, WA 98133

RE: Cottage Housing in Shoreline

Thank you for including us on your list of interested parties. Your memo of December 23, 2004 asks us for some information:

*1. Do you have any comments regarding the attached proposed process to review the cottage housing workshops?*

Yes, we do have comments. Please see the attachment to this letter.

*2. Do you want to participate in the process, which may include workshops?*

Yes, if that participation takes the form of submitting additional written input. (Unfortunately, our personal schedules for the month of February will preclude our being able to attend workshops.)

Thanks very much for all the cottage housing information you have shared with us over the last several months. We view this issue as extremely critical in its impact to the single-family neighborhoods of Shoreline. You have been so helpful and we appreciate it.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leslie Addis".

Leslie Addis

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Randy Hughes".

Randy Hughes

19802 - 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.W.  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
206-546-6353

Attachment

**Paul Cohen**

---

**From:** randyandlesie@att.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 28, 2004 5:40 PM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** Two Concerns

Dear Mr. Cohen:

On Monday, October 25, 2004, we attended a meeting at the Richmond Beach Library. The meeting was regarding the 8-home project at 19141 - 8th Avenue N.W. The meeting was conducted by Robert Nehring, a 50% owner of the project. Because of all the concerns of the neighbors regarding the drainage system and its possible effect on the properties west of the proposed development, Mr. Nehring promised a second meeting. This meeting is to take place after the City approves the drainage system but prior to the start of the construction phase of the project. We would appreciate your help to ensure this meeting does take place as promised.

On this note, and because you are working to formulate draft recommendations regarding cottage housing (and this would apply to other projects also) we would like the following concern addressed:

At the meeting we attended on October 25th, we asked Mr. Nehring "who relays to the City all of the citizens' concerns presented at the meeting." He answered that he would do so. We feel this is a definite ethical conflict of interest. Not only could Mr. Nehring "forget" some of the issues raised, but also he might feel some are "too small" to mention. We feel the City planners should have an unbiased person present at all such meetings regardless of the type of housing being built. That would ensure all concerns are presented to the City in a fair and unbiased manner. Or at the very least, the meeting should be video taped so the City can watch the video tape.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Randy Hughes and Leslie Addis  
19802 - 8th Ave. N.W., Shoreline  
206-546-6353

A LATER E-MAIL  
Brent-

it's now 3 am.... I just signed a statement so that Officer McCutchen can send this off to the prosecutor for a decision....

The kid that took the signs and admitted it to the officer is Simon Evers. Son of Tommy Evers..... is this the Tommy of TOMCAT?

I am sure that the prosecutor will not do anything just on my statement alone because the value of my 3 signs (two of yours and 1 of mine) only total about \$ 11 .... you need to get all of your people who lost signs and yourself to call the officer and report similar losses - there may be a chance the prosecutor might do something if a lot of people call in and report losses....

and here is the total of the signs I have gotten returned by Officer McCutchen from St. Luke's - 13 signs with posts and 13 signs with no posts.... they are ready to go back out now.

I am now going to send an e-mail to Maggie Fimmia asking her to push the prosecutor to do something with the kid (Simon) and to do something about not allowing TOMCAT to build in Shoreline anymore based on these actions. Hopefully your e-mail list will send the same type letters to her (if you could suggest it in an e-mail).


ok - see ya when ya get back-

Randy



November 11, 2004

Paul Cohen, Senior Planner  
City of Shoreline  
Dept. of Planning and Development Services  
17544 Midvale Avenue North  
Shoreline, WA 98133



RE: Public Process on Cottage Housing Issue

Dear Mr. Cohen:

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with my comments regarding the public process being developed in preparation for Planning Commission and City Council action on the cottage housing issue. Thank you for the voice mail you left me on November 9<sup>th</sup> in response to my phone call to Ms. Markle. I understand you are in charge of developing the program and timing for public input on the cottage housing issue. I further understand that City Council has directed staff to evaluate public comment to potentially draft amendments to current cottage housing regulations to address issues and concerns.

Since the current temporary emergency moratorium will expire in late-February, 2005, and since it is already mid-November, I am very concerned about the timeline. Apparently a plan for gathering public input is still being developed. For a quality process to succeed, sufficient time needs to be allowed to not only gather public comments, but also for staff to evaluate those comments, develop objective draft recommendations to address the concerns and submit those drafts back to the public for further comment. All this needs to happen prior to City staff finalizing their recommendations to the Planning Commission and to the City Council.

Without such a process as I have described above, thorough review of the cottage housing regulations will not be possible and the emergency moratorium will not have served its purpose. I feel we are rapidly running out of time to ensure that an adequate public process does occur.

On a related item which I had requested earlier, I am hoping to receive the names of the members of the 1999 Shoreline Planning Academy and a copy of their final report. I first requested this information on October 14, 2004. Although I believe my phone call request was sufficient, please let me know if you prefer that I submit a Request for Disclosure of Public Records Form.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leslie Addis".

Leslie Addis  
19802 - 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W., Shoreline, WA 98177  
Phone: 206-546-6353 E-Mail: randyandleslie@att.net

Scott Jepsen

11/08/2004 07:05 AM

To: sburkett@ci.shoreline.wa.us

cc:

Subject: Concern About Tomcat Construction Co.

Steve,

Looks like this only went to John and I. Can you please also share it with the rest of the council and let us know what the city knows?

Scott Jepsen

Principal Associate

Abt Associates Inc.

20201 21st Place NW

Shoreline, WA 98177

(206) 546-0635

(206) 546-7745 fax

scott\_jepsen@abtassoc.com

----- Forwarded by Scott Jepsen/bet/Abtassoc on 11/08/2004 07:04 AM -----



randyandleslie@att.net

11/07/2004 06:48 PM

To: johnchang1@comcast.net, scott\_jepsen@abtassoc.com

cc:

Subject: Concern About Tomcat Construction Co.

Dear Councilmembers:

On October 28, 2004, Simon Evers stole about 30 "No Cottage Housing" signs along 8th Ave. N.W. and adjoining streets. Simon Evers is the son of Tommy Evers, owner of Tomcat Construction Company. Tomcat Construction is the builder who had hoped to build 16 cottage homes at 19141 - 8th Ave. N.W. but who was affected by the emergency moratorium. The police case number is 04-326091. The responding officer's name is Kyle McCutchen. Officer McCutchen's cell phone number is 206-391-0030.


It is our own personal opinion that, very possibly, the son was put up to this by his father. Even if that is not the case, Simon is 17 years old and definitely should know right from wrong. We believe Simon did this to help his father's construction business and never dreamed he would get caught. We also believe that because Simon is living with his father, that his father should be held responsible for his child's actions. And if anybody had been "busted" destroying any Tomcat Construction "For Sale" signs, Tomcat would have not only charged the thief, but also probably would have sued him for "hindering a sale." Evers is a citizen of Shoreline. We do not feel it is appropriate for a citizen of Shoreline to commit a crime or abuse other people's rights and still expect the City to grant him "permits" that enable him to make money within the City limits. A "permit" is simply that--permission to make money within the City.&! nbsp;

We are requesting you ban Tomcat Construction and/or the Evers family from ever building in Shoreline again. Or, at the very least, issue a three-year ban. It is unacceptable that the City recognizes this crime happened and would still allow this company and family to continue obtaining City "permits."

Sincerely,

Randy Hughes and Leslie Addis  
206-546-6353

January 4, 2005



Paul Cohen, Project Manager  
City of Shoreline  
17544 Midvale Ave. North  
Shoreline, WA 98133

RE: Cottage Housing in Shoreline

Thank you for including us on your list of interested parties. Your memo of December 23, 2004 asks us for some information:

*1. Do you have any comments regarding the attached proposed process to review the cottage housing workshops?*

Yes, we do have comments. Please see the attachment to this letter.

*2. Do you want to participate in the process, which may include workshops?*

Yes, if that participation takes the form of submitting additional written input. (Unfortunately, our personal schedules for the month of February will preclude our being able to attend workshops.)

Thanks very much for all the cottage housing information you have shared with us over the last several months. We view this issue as extremely critical in its impact to the single-family neighborhoods of Shoreline. You have been so helpful and we appreciate it.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leslie Addis".

Leslie Addis

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Randy Hughes".

Randy Hughes

19802 - 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.W.  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
206-546-6353

Attachment

January 4, 2005

Page 1 of 2

Comments from Leslie Addis and Randy Hughes regarding the "Outline of Cottage Housing Amendment Process" as presented in a December 13, 2004 memorandum from Tim Stewart and Paul Cohen to the Mayor and Council:

Problem Statement Section:

This section states that cottage housing was suggested as an alternative housing type in 1998. However, it has never been clear to us exactly who suggested it. Our review of Planning Academy records seems to indicate that the idea was introduced to the Planning Academy by City staff. Is that the case? We believe it is important to distinguish between ideas that come spontaneously from grass-roots citizens as opposed to ideas introduced to those citizens by staff.

Program Goal and Objectives:

The GOAL as stated in this memo is to "review and evaluate the City's cottage housing regulations by 'checking in' with the community..." It is very important that the larger community be involved—not just current parties of record, developers and owners. We have been active on this issue for a long time and continue to find that many, many Shoreline citizens are simply not aware of the ability of the City to allow what basically is condominium housing in single-family neighborhoods. Uniformly, the reaction we get from these citizens is one of concern once they are made aware.

Of equal concern to us is the last objective listed, "To have cottage housing regulations that produce projects on the ground that capture the community vision." Once you do involve the larger community, you may very well find that the "community vision" is not to allow cottage housing at all in single-family zoned neighborhoods. However, your objective is phrased in such a way as to avoid that possibility and should be re-worded.

Program Phasing:

Section I – C makes reference to staff researching King County property assessments. Such assessments have a time lag. You need to include real estate appraisals (before and after cottage housing has been introduced into a neighborhood) to give you a better "real time" comparison of value.

Section I – D, Report of Current Issues omits one of the problems articulated by the public: *change in neighborhood character*. Please add this to the list of Current Issues. This is a very important concern to those of us who bought into what we thought was a stable, single-family residential neighborhood and which now may very well become, in fact if not in actual zoning, a multi-family neighborhood. It feels like "bait and switch."

The following also need to be added to the list of Current Issues:

- Location – cottage housing, if permitted at all, should only be permitted in areas presently zoned as multi-family. No existing single-family neighborhoods should be re-zoned in order to allow them.

January 4, 2005

Page 2 of 2

- **Spacing about the City** – although the list does have an item called “distance between developments” that does not cover the concern about what is happening west of Aurora where an over-concentration of cottage housing has occurred.

**Section II - A, Workshop** proposes to involve developers, owners and parties of record – neighbors. As stated previously, this is not a broad enough cross-section of the community at large to get fresh perspective. These workshops will apparently only include the very people who have been active about this issue to-date, either pro or con and who are already quite polarized about the topic.

**Section III – B, Planning Commission Hearing** is unclear. We believe it addresses the notice that developers are required to give to the neighbors who will be affected by a proposed cottage housing development. The present required notice is completely inadequate. Such developments impact a broad area (quality and conformity of the neighborhood at large, overflow parking, increased traffic, etc.) We would urge the City to require developers to notify everyone in the affected Neighborhood—where “neighborhood” equals the broad area as defined by your Council of Neighborhoods. (Of course, neighbors across the street from a proposed development should also be notified, even if they are in a different Neighborhood.) This would require that if a cottage housing development is proposed in Hillwood or Richmond Beach or any other of the formally-designated Neighborhoods, the entire Neighborhood will be made aware since the character and harmony of the entire Neighborhood is at risk.


**Extension of the Moratorium:**

The proposed two-month extension until May 1, 2005 is not adequate. It is very unfortunate the City chose to wait until December to even begin to address the review process. Allowing only two months for detailed and objective review of the cottage housing is not realistic and will result in insufficient review and study. We urge the City to extend to moratorium through the end of 2005 (past the election) to ensure this issue will be adequately addressed and can be reviewed by the incoming Council.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments, which we request be made available to all of the Cottage Housing Workshop participants. Please contact us if we have not been clear or if you have questions.



Leslie Addis  
19802 – 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.W.  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
206-546-6353




Randy Hughes

cc: Paul Cohen

April 21, 2005

Ronald B. Hansen, Mayor and All Councilmembers  
City of Shoreline  
17544 Midvale Avenue North  
Shoreline, WA 98133



RE: Cottage Housing

Dear Mayor Hansen and Shoreline Councilmembers:

We recently received from Tim Stewart and Paul Cohen a memorandum dated April 7, 2005 addressing cottage housing problems and suggesting proposals for consideration. As citizens and voters of Shoreline, we want to share our concerns about these suggested proposals.


It appears to us these changes proposed by City staff do not address the real problem. For the past year the vast majority of residents have been expressing opposition to the cottage housing concept. For whatever reason, the Council and staff just keep returning with variations. It is almost as if this is a concept the City feels it needs to force upon the citizens. To reiterate our concern, cottage homes are condos and should only be allowed in areas zoned for condos.

Second, at a recent Council meeting, even a member of your own Council admitted he would not want cottage housing next door to his property. If Mr. Chang would not want such units built next to his R-4 zoned property, why in the world would anyone think those of us with smaller properties in R-6 zoned areas would feel any different?

Third, in the staff's April 7<sup>th</sup> memorandum, the City planners express concern that restricting "cottage housing to medium or high density residential (multifamily) areas" would "have the effect of eliminating Cottage Housing in Shoreline." We feel the planning staff should be doing just that—planning. Surely they are very capable of developing other housing alternatives to enable the City to meet its Growth Management goals without reliance on cottage housing. If your planners aren't flexible enough to do that, then perhaps changes should be made in the Planning Department to broaden that agency's perspective.

Of course as you are all aware, we can expect this cottage housing issue to be a major influence on voters in this year's upcoming election. Hopefully by then it will be resolved appropriately to contain cottage housing condos to condo-zoned areas only.

Sincerely,

  
Randy Hughes and Leslie Addis

19802 - 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.W., Shoreline, WA 98177 206-546-6353

cc: Tim Stewart, Director of Planning and Development Services  
✓ Attn: Paul Cohen, Project Manager  
Shoreline Enterprise



## Shoreline Planning Commission

September 1, 2005

Written Comment

So For THE LAST TWO HOURS, ALL of YOU  
HAVE EXPRESSED DIFFERENT REASONS WHY YOU  
THINK COTTAGE HOMES, AS THEY ARE NOW, ARE  
NOT GOOD. AND ALL of THEM ARE VALID.

SO IF THESE UNITS MAKE NO DIFFERENCE  
(AS STEWART STATED) TO THE CMA, THEN  
WHY CONTINUE WITH IT?

ROBIN IS RIGHT. TOO MUCH TIME AND EFFORT  
FOR SUCH A SMALL THING. MORE TO FIND  
A MORE ACCEPTED HOUSING OPTION IN SPACE  
FAMILY ZONED NEIGHBORHOODS.

Randy Nichols  
19802 8<sup>TH</sup> AVE NW  
206 546 6353

Please leave this form with the clerk at the end of the meeting.

This is a public record





## Shoreline Planning Commission

September 1, 2005

Written Comment

①

Don't "Back-door" your way  
into a "city-wide strategy"  
by trying to "tweak" the  
existing cottage housing ordinance.  
Design review with a bad ordinance in place is

really  
no  
design  
review  
at  
all.

\* Kill this concept & begin again.  
\* Develop the strategy first &  
then develop the specifics.

(Don't become over-fixated on  
the "goal" of 350 cottage  
homes. Even Tim Stewart  
states that without Rem,  
the GMA target can be met.)

\* Once you have a strategy, then  
you can consider such ideas as  
a Design Review Process.

SUBMITTED BY: LESLIE ADDIS

19802- 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NW, Shoreline

Please leave this form with the clerk at the end of the meeting.

This is a public record

② How will you reach out to the general public so you get a good cross section of citizens to attend the joint workshop on Cottage Housing?

③ The existing requirement that neighbors within 500' of a proposed Cottage housing development is inadequate. A minimum of a 1,000' notification should be required. These developments have a very wide impact to the neighborhood at large.

J. Cobb

August 7, 2005

All Members of the Shoreline City Planning Commission  
17544 Midvale Avenue North  
Shoreline, WA 98133

RE: Cottage Homes

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Enclosed you will find a copy of a recent "Currents" article (a City of Shoreline publication.) This article references Shoreline's "ranches, split-levels and mid-century homes for affordable median prices of about \$272,000." Mayor Ron Hansen is quoted—ending his comments with, "After all, those qualities are what brought many of us here in the first place."

For the past two years, the residents of Shoreline have voiced major opposition to the cottage home concept. Many citizens have voiced many valid reasons for abandoning this concept in single-family neighborhoods. And yet the City of Shoreline continues to promote cottage homes.

It is amazing to us that just because someone is elected or appointed to a position, they feel their ideas and "visions" are either more intelligent or superior to the ideas of the citizens they represent. It seems to us the elected or appointed officials should represent the majority of citizens. Otherwise, we are no longer a democracy, but a tyranny.

If you feel that your "vision" of cottage homes should have a higher priority than representing your citizens, then we challenge your concept of a democratic government. We also challenge your belief that cottage homes are needed. Perhaps you should find a city where the majority favors cottage home-style development and go to work there. The citizens of Shoreline clearly do not want that kind of city. The City of Shoreline government is destroying and eroding just exactly those qualities that brought many of us here in the first place.



Randy Hughes  
19802 – 8th Avenue. N.W., Shoreline, WA 98177



Leslie Addis

Attachment – "Currents" article

## Seattle magazine ranks Shoreline the region's number one neighborhood to live

Shoreline is number one according to *Seattle* magazine.

In its July issue, *Seattle* magazine ranked 84 Seattle area "neighborhoods" and Shoreline topped the list of the best places to live.

Areas were ranked on quality of life features such as parks, commute time to major work areas and housing affordability. Here is an excerpt from what they had to say about Shoreline:

"This enclave of ranches, split-levels and mid-century homes has for years been

underappreciated for its affordable prices (median price is \$272,000), great freeway access and good schools. No longer. Buyers have rediscovered the neighborhood, with its not-so-bad drive times to downtown Seattle or Redmond; as a result, homes are sitting on the market only 28 days. Shoreline tops the *Seattle* magazine list of best neighborhoods."

"The city has plenty of parks, including, naturally, those on the water (it comes by its name honestly) overlooking Puget Sound and the Olympics. There's plenty

of retail in these parts, and plenty of restaurants of every stripe."

"Shoreline has long been known for its abundant parks, respected school district, and strong neighborhoods. We have a great quality of life here and it is getting better every year," says Shoreline Mayor Ron Hansen.

"It is an honor for Shoreline to be recognized as the best place to live even if it was not too much of a surprise to those of us who live here. After all, those qualities are what brought many of us here in the first place."

## Shoreline celebrates 10 year anniversary

"Community spirit and a 'we can do it' attitude are what built Shoreline," said Mayor Hansen. "I couldn't be more proud of our community and what we've been able to accomplish together in just 10 years."

Shoreline's 10th Anniversary Celebration was held July 16 at the Shoreline Historical Museum and also included music, refreshments, the opening of a time capsule created in 1995 and the opening of a special museum exhibit featuring 10 years of Shoreline history.

Mayor Hansen's toast to the City topped off the event: "Here's to our first 10 years and the many accomplishments we've achieved. Our history is great but our best years are yet to come. The future is even brighter, full of hope with limitless possibilities. To 10 years!"



As part of the City's 10th Anniversary Celebration, Shoreline Mayor Ron Hansen was joined by Shoreline's first mayor, Connie King and Shoreline Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director Dick Deal, to open a time capsule created when the City incorporated in 1995.

## Paul Cohen

---

**From:** ranandles@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2005 6:43 PM  
**To:** entopinion@heraldnet.com  
**Cc:** gmauer0231@msn.com; Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** [Fwd: A Few Questions re Aug. 22nd Mtg.]

Attention Brooke Fisher:  
Forwarding to you a copy of an e-mail to the Shoreline City Council--  
From: ranandles@verizon.net  
Date: Wed Aug 24 20:36:58 CDT 2005  
To: council@ci.shoreline.wa.us  
Subject: A Few Questions re Aug. 22nd Mtg.

Dear Entire City Council:

I just spent another three hours watching the broadcast of your Aug. 22nd meeting. Here are my questions:

On Aug. 22nd, you opted not to pass the Code Enforcement ordinance. This ordinance has the support of citizens, planners, staff, Planning Commissioners and probably the whole world... It tries to control garbage, junk vehicles, living conditions, etc. And yet, years ago, you DID pass the cottage home ordinance. The cottage home ordinance has been contested from the start. Yet in all your glory, you feel you can ignore your citizens and their concerns and just "tweak" the ordinance. Why did you not pass the Code Enforcement ordinance and then just work for years doing your magic by "tweaks"? That is question # one--explain to me the difference, should any of you want to respond.

Another issue is Mayor Hansen's comment. Mayor Hansen said there was only one person who spoke on the cottage home issue on Aug. 22nd. He stated he feels he knows all the "players" on the cottage home issue and knows what their concerns are. My second question is--does the Council believe in their hearts that they can actually anticipate the citizens' of Shoreline's views after a three-minute limitation over a few meetings? If so, then the arrogance of the Council and inattention to your citizens amazes me time after time. Here is the answer: your citizens, meaning the minority who are actually able to put in the time to express their views, have learned time after time that, in fact, the old saying is true, "It won't make a difference." Need we remind the Council that a few months ago at a Cottage Housing Workshop at the Fire Department, there was a large attendance. It was a far larger attendance than the 70 people you are glorifying as being at the Aurora Corridor open house. You, as a Council, have proven that public involvement means nothing. Probably what you want is to stall us out until you can decide what YOU want. It's not exactly what I think representative government should be all about.

I know you won't, but if any of you want to discuss this with me, my phone number and e-mail address are listed below.

Randy Hughes  
206-546-6353  
ranandles@verizon.net  
cc:  
Shoreline Enterprise  
George Mauer  
Paul Cohen

## Proposal to Resolve Cottage Housing Ordinance Issue

August 26, 2005

### Background:

The City of Shoreline has been attempting to determine the future of Cottage Housing. Much time and many resources have been spent by Council, Planning Commission members and city staff attempting to learn what the citizens of Shoreline really want done with cottage housing. These efforts have resulted in confusion. Activist citizens opposed to cottage housing firmly believe the majority of citizens don't want them in their neighborhoods. At the other extreme are developers and occupants of cottage homes who have testified in favor of such developments. An impasse has been reached.

### Issue:

In order to bring clarity and reach beyond the current state of polarization, the City must find a way to hear from the majority of its citizens who can not or will not attend public workshops, Council and Planning Commission meetings. The cost for such an effort needs to be kept to a minimum.

### Proposed Resolution:

The City has an important, untapped resource available for this effort: The Council of Neighborhoods. This Council "was formed in 1996 as a result of Shoreline City Council's belief in the value of citizen participation through formal neighborhood organizations....The Council of Neighborhoods...provides a forum for raising issues, exploring potential solutions, and, when appropriate, recommending possible action to the City."<sup>(1)</sup>

By utilizing the Council of Neighborhoods and its various Neighborhood Associations, the City and the Planning Commission will be able to reach those citizens who have not yet been heard from on the issue of cottage housing.

- **Direct the City to authorize a survey.** This survey should be a simple, one-question document requesting a simple "yes" or "no" answer. The question should be: "Do you feel that Cottage Housing should be allowed in your neighborhood?"
- **This survey should be mailed at random** to 500 homes per Neighborhood Association. In order to make the survey as unbiased as possible, omit from the survey the following: citizen activists on both sides of this issue from whom you have already heard, developers who have built cottage housing and cottage homeowners or renters. The pre-paid return envelope should be addressed to the presidents of the individual Neighborhood Associations. (For the few inactive Neighborhood Associations, volunteers from those areas can be solicited to receive the completed surveys.)
- Upon a specified deadline, the presidents can respectively count their ballots and, if needed, a volunteer or volunteer group can oversee the count. The result would be a total tally of the "yes" or "no" votes per neighborhood. **The Council of Neighborhoods can then officially present the results to the Planning Commission and the Council.**

### Conclusion:

If the results are overwhelmingly in favor of cottage housing then allow the ordinance to stand, with whatever tweaks the Planning Commission and Council see fit, based on citizen input received to-date. If the results are overwhelmingly against, then kill the ordinance based on the wishes of your citizens.

<sup>(1)</sup> From City of Shoreline Web Site as of August 26, 2005

A third outcome from this survey may be to find there are differing responses from different neighborhoods. Some may overwhelmingly oppose cottage housing and some may overwhelmingly accept it. In those cases, it would only be fair to all parties to allow or disallow cottage homes in those neighborhoods, based on the survey, if that is possible. At a minimum, this information would help forwarn developers about those neighborhoods where cottage housing is vigorously opposed. This could be a tool for City Planners as they help guide developers through the process.

Cost for this survey is estimated to be \$2,800 in postage plus approx. \$1,000 in printing. For an estimated \$4,000, this City can get the necessary input from its citizens to learn how the general population stands on the Cottage Housing issue. This cost pales in comparison to what has already been spent on this issue over the last several years.

This proposal will resolve the current state of confusion and gridlock over Cottage Housing. The only other real alternative to find out what your general population really wants is to put this issue on the ballot and allow citizens to vote on it.

**Submitted by:**

Randy Hughes

Leslie Addis

19802 – 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W., Shoreline, WA 98177  
206-546-6353

cc: City Council Members  
Planning Commission Members  
Steve Burkett, City Manager  
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Planning Dept.  
Bonnie Mackey, President, Council of Neighborhoods

---

October 2, 2005


Shoreline City Council Members

Dear Council Members:

After reading the draft minutes of the Sept. 15<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting, we want to address a few issues regarding cottage homes.

1. On page 59, Item 10.A, number 3 regarding Public Comment: It is stated that "there has not been a city-wide survey of citizens' opinion." We do not understand why, after sending a letter to all of you and to Steve Burkett, City Manager, that this issue has not been addressed. Apparently only some of you read your citizen input.
2. It is interesting to note that out of eight Planning Commissioners who attended the Sept. 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, three were willing to kill cottage homes altogether. That represents 37% of the Planning Commission who were present. AND, this is simply based on neighborhood opposition that has occurred up until now. As noted above, "there had not been a city-wide survey of citizens' opinion." Before this City Council spends time and money with workshops or whatever, we feel it would be more prudent to just find out what the entire city (not just the impacted neighborhoods) wants to do with cottage homes.
3. As questioned in previous Planning Commission meetings, why are these cottage home developments being approved as they are? Attached is a letter we just sent to Paul Cohen regarding our thoughts. We believe, based on prior Planning Commission meetings, that some Commissioners share the same concern. Why are these developments being approved as they are?
4. Save the taxpayers the cost of mailing out your standard post card stating how the City appreciates this letter and will contact us at a later date. This City Council has proven time after time they do not want citizen input and you will certainly not follow up later.

Something is wrong here--no city-wide survey, and yet cottage homes keep getting approved. And yet, even your City's Planning Commission has major concerns with it. What's wrong with this picture?



Randy Hughes and Leslie Addis  
19802 - 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W., Shoreline, WA 98177  
206-546-6353



October 2, 2005

Mr. Paul Cohen  
Senior Planner, Dept. of Planning and Development  
City of Shoreline

Mr. Cohen:

There are a few issues regarding Cottage Homes that I want to address with you. I have just finished reading the draft minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on Sept. 15<sup>th</sup>.

Number one: About a month ago I had a telephone conversation with you regarding cottage homes. You expressed a concern that the City of Shoreline felt cottage home support vs. cottage home opposition may be, in the City's view, evenly split. AND YET Commissioner Hall stated that he would, "vote to eliminate the cottage housing ordinance altogether based on feedback the Commission received from the community." How could you possibly tell me the City thought it was evenly divided pro vs. con.?

Number two: After reviewing my notes, a couple of months ago you told me and my wife that as long as a builder/developer met all the technical criteria required for cottage housing and dotted all the i's and crossed all the t's then the City would have no option but to approve the cottage housing application, other than to face a law-suit. This turns out to appear untrue, based on the draft minutes of the Sept. 15<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Sands pointed out that staff used its discretion to approve these projects. In a Planning Commission meeting some weeks ago, the question was raised regarding how did these projects get approved.

We thought staff had the option of turning down these projects. That's what the Planning Commission minutes say AND YET YOU just keep approving them.

I feel it is unfortunate that you are apparently influenced by these cottage home builders. BUT BECAUSE YOU ARE SO INFLUENCED, I feel you should be removed from your position as approver of cottage home applications. The citizens of Shoreline deserve better.

Randy Hughes  
19802 -- 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W.  
Shoreline, WA  
206-546-6353

cc: Shoreline City Council  
Shoreline Planning Commission  
Steve Burkett, City Manager

# **EVICTIION NOTICE**

## **CAUSE FOR EVICTION:**

The refusal of the Shoreline City Planners to respect citizens' wishes regarding cottage housing. The Planning Dept. continues to support cottage housing in single-family neighborhoods despite being told otherwise by the citizens.

## **CURE:**

In the upcoming election, vote out of office those City Council Members who continue to push for cottage housing condos in single-family areas.

**Do not settle for less! Cottage housing condos should only be allowed in R-12 or higher zones.**

# **KEEP COTTAGE HOUSING OUT OF SINGLE-FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS**

## **“COTTAGE HOME CONDOS” DO NOT BELONG HERE**



### **Cottage Housing: Can it fit in Shoreline?**

Please join City staff and your neighbors for a presentation  
and discussion on cottage housing.

**Wednesday, May 11 from 7:00 to 9:30 p.m.  
Shoreline Fire Dept. Headquarters Meeting Room  
17525 Aurora Avenue N.**

The purpose of the meeting is to have the community help the City  
answer these questions:


- “What’s wrong with cottage housing?”
- “Can cottage housing be designed to be compatible with  
single-family neighborhoods?”

**Please attend this meeting on May 11, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. at the  
Shoreline Fire Dept.**

**TELL THE CITY:**

**“NO COTTAGE HOUSING IN SINGLE-FAMILY ZONED  
NEIGHBORHOODS!”**

**If the City allows cottage housing in single-  
family neighborhoods, then in the next election,  
vote the City Council incumbents out. New  
voices will mean new options.**



4-18-05  
20065-10<sup>th</sup> AVENUE  
SHORELINE, WA 98177

CITY OF SHORELINE  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
17544 MIDVALE AVENUE  
SHORELINE, WA 98133

DEAR SIR,

I AM VERY CONCERNED WITH THE COTTAGE HOUSING PROJECTS THAT ARE BEING BUILT THROUGHOUT THIS AREA.

MANY PEOPLE LEFT THE SEATTLE URBAN LIVING FOR A LESS CONGESTED, QUIETER NEIGHBORHOOD.

THIS IS NOW LOWERING PROPERTY VALUE WITH CHEAP HOUSING ALSO TRAFFIC IS GREATLY INCREASING.

PLEASE STOP THIS TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION.

A RESIDENT SINCE 1958

MILDRED CHAPMAN JONES

RECEIVED

Page 1 of 1

JUL 18 2005

Heidi Costello City Manager's Office

---

**From:** Jennifer Kifer [kifercj77@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 15, 2005 6:18 PM  
**To:** City Council  
**Subject:** re cottage housing opinion

I really think that allowing cottage housing in single family neighborhoods, is downgrading to these neighborhoods.

Single family neighborhoods are just that. I realize that this area is growing but it is sure nice to move to Shoreline to get away from the hustle and bustle, cramped style of a metro area. That should be the number one selling point of living in Shoreline.

My area in Shoreline has some tall trees that are just beautiful. I think that allowing the cottage housing to continue, would obviously lead to more cutting of trees.


I like my neighborhood BECAUSE of the trees, and if I ever live in another metro area again, I will look for a neighborhood just like it.

Is unchecked urban growth something we as a city desire? Maybe this is one of the checks on urban growth we can use to buy more time in which to reexamine, reimagine, the planning of housing for the future. I'd like to see a future that places more emphasis on the beauty side to housing.

Home is a castle, a place to hang your hat, where your heart is... So to be a great place why shouldn't home look like a place where YOU WANT to LIVE ?!

Jennifer Kifer [kifercj77@earthlink.net](mailto:kifercj77@earthlink.net)

January 14, 2005  
Bronston Kenney  
1007 NW 190<sup>th</sup> St.  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
[bronston@seanet.com](mailto:bronston@seanet.com)  
206 546 3596



Paul Cohen  
City of Shoreline  
Shoreline, WA 98133

Dear Mr. Cohen:

This is in response to your letter of December 23, 2004.

I would very much like to participate in the process of reexamination of the Cottage Housing issue. I am retired and will be available to attend workshops, meetings, tours, etc.

As to the proposed process I have two concerns. First I find the inclusion of developers in the process somewhat troubling. It is my belief as well as the belief others that developers have too much sway in the Planning Dept. Further, they are not all residents of Shoreline and thus should not have standing in this process.

My second concern is that this process will be symbolic only, that Cottage Housing will be imposed upon the residents of Shoreline over their objections. I further note that the GMA does not specifically require Cottage Housing and that there exist ample, proven avenues to meet increased density requirements. Why is there so much pressure to impose that which is experimental upon unwilling residents?

Should I be included in this process I will strive to be as open and fair-minded as possible.

Yours truly,

Bronston Kenney

Cc: Steve Burkett

RECEIVED

FEB - 1 2005

January, 31 2005

City Manager's Office

My name is Bronston Kenney and I live a 1007 NW 190<sup>th</sup> St.

Read into the record  
at 1/31/05 Council meeting  
Council  
Steve  
Bob O

Tim S  
Paul Cohen  
File

I am concerned with the process of review of Cottage Housing. Last August the City Council responded to overwhelming objections by enacting a six month moratorium. At this meeting we were asked to withhold our comments and prepared remarks as the City Council was going to re-examine the issue. We complied.

Distribution  
only per  
Bernard

It was our anticipation that the process of gathering public input through workshops and meetings would begin in a timely manner. Constituents suspended their planned action believing that the case for re-examination had been made, and that our concerns were being addressed.

The first moratorium has been extended with little being done. At the last meeting several spoke in favor of Cottage Housing, although it was unclear as to whether those speaking had any financial or commercial interest. Sympathy for the developers was expressed and some wrongly took the absence of opponents as a sign of softening opposition. This is not the case. We have not been active because we believed that the Council intended to address our concerns. The trust we placed in the City appears unwarranted. There have been no meetings or workshops. My attempts at discussion with Planning have been unproductive. The time-frame for public input has been pushed out to March-April with, as yet, no date set.

The moratorium increasingly appears as a device to ward off public participation. That is, the process is not a mechanism to identify and solve constituent problems but rather a contrivance for constituent management.

The current process leap-frogs over the primary question; is Cottage Housing in any form necessary in Shoreline? Are there specific problems that are uniquely solved by Cottage Housing and are these problems of sufficient magnitude to warrant action? Does Cottage Housing create more problems than solved? Finally, in the face of substantial constituent opposition should Cottage Housing be abandoned regardless of merit?

There seem to be shadow constituencies in Shoreline advancing their arguments to the City privately, shielded from public scrutiny and debate. There are those who stand to make huge windfalls from drastic subdivision in low density neighborhoods, for example. There may be over-mighty City employees who genuinely believe their judgment superior to that of the citizens. I don't know the identities. They are like gravity, unseen, but like gravity, known by their effects. I believe that the North City merchants, the Aurora business, and those questioning the wisdom of other City policies would agree with my view in this.

The City should respond to those making their arguments openly, not to those in the shadows

Re-examination of Cottage Housing should begin promptly. The first determination should be the most basic; is this necessary? If it is decided that some form of Cottage Housing is the best and/or only method of resolving an important and serious problem, the protection of the interests of existing homeowners is primary. If we must have Cottage Housing in Shoreline it should do no harm to existing homes and neighborhoods. To this end, constituent participation from the beginning is fundamental.



My name is Bronston Kenney and I live at 1007 NW 190<sup>th</sup> St.

Saturday I joined the City sponsored Cottage Home tour. We visited selected Cottage developments and met with the residents. The occupied homes we visited were quite charming as were their owners. Additionally Mr. Jim Soules, a quality builder and owner of The Cottage Company, which specializes in Cottage developments, joined us.

Missed, however, were visits to the development on 185<sup>th</sup> and Stone and meetings with nearby homeowners. Mr. Soules answered questions; the most telling was about the history of Cottage Homes. In short, with the exception of a project near downtown nearly 100 years ago, all of the experience is from 1998 onward. We do not know if the Cottage concept is a fad or not. Referring to the City zoning map the large majority of Shoreline is R-4 and R-6. Shoreline is primarily a low density residential community. Most living here, are here for that reason, enduring the commute in exchange for quality of living.

During the tour staff and Council were questioned extensively. Mr. Cohen explained some of the changes made to improve Cottage Housing but all were essentially cosmetic. The most important question, that of the fundamental incompatibility of high density development within low density neighborhoods, to date is unanswered. Last week I suggested that the issue of Cottages be re-examined from the starting point. What problem does it solve and is it the only or best solution? Staff and Council have given no clear answer as to how the investment and interests of surrounding homeowners will be protected. Assurances that it will be all right, are insufficient.

The tour was essentially a sales pitch. It is clear that Council and Planning would like to proceed if possible, against the interests of constituents. The most basic questions are unanswered, again, leapfrogging over the first and basic issue, is Cottage Housing desired and/or needed in Shoreline. I still believe there are those advancing their own interests with the City over those of constituents privately, away from public debate.

Everyone present expressed the desire to somehow encourage quality construction and keep the fast-buck-artists out, yet there seems to be no way to legally do that. It is my conviction that Cottage Housing creates more problems than it solves. More importantly it is nothing if not experimental, an experiment in which today's homeowners are unwilling subjects. Builders stand to make much money and planners might get a glow seeing their vision realized. Homeowners however, assume all of the risk and no share of the rewards. If this fails the problems will be ours alone.

I request that Council put on the Agenda a proposal to re-examine Cottage Housing from square-one, including, from the beginning, constituents. It is my concern that the way in which the City is proceeding is designed to gain momentum towards more Cottage Housing while avoiding thorough review of the issue.

In the final analysis Cottage Housing is simply an end-run around existing zoning and seems to be a train heading for a destination opposed by constituents. City and Planning

want to talk about the quality of food in the dining car, while our concern is where we are heading.

Again, to the Council, can we have an agenda item for this proposal?

April 6 2005

Bronston Kenney resident of Shoreline.

I have several observations on The Planning Commission's Cottage Housing meeting last week. Although the large majority of citizens attending were against Cottage Housing, the meeting was largely devoted to its advocates, developers and representatives of the Planning Department. Citizens were allowed their three-minutes-only to speak, while Mr. Cohen and Mr. Stewart were not similarly limited. Mr. Soules, a developer, was allowed unlimited time to elaborate and respond to Commission questions as were Mr. Cohen and Stewart. I and others felt several of their responses should be challenged. I raised my hand to be recognized but was ignored without explanation. Another raised his voice instead and was ruled out of order.

This meeting was similar to the May 11<sup>th</sup> Cottage Housing meeting as the deck was stacked against the constituents in opposition. In both cases the meeting was dominated by advocates of Cottage Housing, most importantly the Planning Dept. By controlling the process Planning has relegated the citizens of Shoreline to a second-class status, while granting first-class status to developers and builders.

The moratorium enacted to re-examine Cottage Housing was to include citizen participation. The City has avoided genuine workshop meetings wherein representatives of both sides sit down and make their cases with each other advancing and defending their cases to the other and seeking resolution. While citizens have made and defended their case, Planning and the City have not.

Homeowners still have no explanation from the City as to why Cottage Housing is being pursued in spite of overwhelming citizen opposition. The GMA is used as an all-encompassing justification. We are simply told the City "has to... because of GMA".

The City's posture as our representative with the GMA should be like that of a tax accountant representing a client with the IRS. That is, they should keep us out of trouble, but yield as little as possible, working diligently to protect our community and our desires as homeowners.

RECEIVED

MAY 26 2005

City Manager's Office  
May 23, 2005

for Councilmember  
Gustafson -  
read into the  
record.

My name is Bronston Kenney I reside in Shoreline.

The Cottage Housing moratorium was passed last August to provide time for re-examination. What has occurred since then has fallen far short of the expectations.

Nothing was done for nearly six months. First order questions about the desirability of Cottage Housing have never been addressed.

First of these: as there is overwhelming opposition by homeowners, should it not be dropped upon that basis?

Second, what is the nature and magnitude of the problem, and is Cottage Housing the best or unique solution? Is the solution worse than the problem?

Months passed while these first priority questions were unaddressed. The subsequent Cottage Housing tour was essentially a sales pitch. A public meeting was held. The two fundamental unanswered questions should have been resolved prior to expending citizen's money on meetings and tours.

The entire process has been closely controlled by the very people who created the problem. In the months between the Tour and the recent meeting I was repeatedly told by staff "nothing was happening on Cottage Housing". The meeting belied that assertion. Much time and effort had been spent "setting the table" for discussion, controlling the outcome by controlling the process. Further, the meeting report was controlled by staff.


This has been constituent management rather than constituent inclusion. Further, it is clear that staff is not neutral, but rather an advocate for Cottage Housing. Their silence on reasons invites speculation, feeding egos or feeding pockets, probably both.

Councilwoman Fimia's recent discovery of three first-order documents on the North City project which had been withheld from her, suggests that at least some on staff are no longer entitled to a presumption of trustworthiness

While citizens have been open and forthcoming, the City and Planning have not. What is so important to them about Cottage Housing? What justifies this assault on our property values and neighborhoods? Should we trust those responsible for the withholding of important documents, and the Echo Lake and North City fiascos, with this issue?


• COUNCILMEMBER	_____
•	_____
•	_____
• FULL COUNCIL	_____
• CITY MANAGER	_____
• STAFF	B. B. O.
•	T. S.
•	_____
•	_____
• FILE	_____

Distribution Only - read into record at the May 23 Council Meeting



M. 49

## Cottage Housing: a Betrayal of Trust



Zoning has two fundamental elements; use and density. The "Conditional Use Permit" for doubling density for Cottage Housing is a scam and a gimmick. The cosmetic and trivial "conditions" imposed upon developers are insufficient to what is an impossible task, to somehow make this doubled density compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. "Conditional Use" used in this fashion could be invoked for anything from carwashes to strip clubs. It is a fundamental violation of purpose of the existing zoning.

When we purchase a home we do so with the anticipation that existing zoning is both enforced and durable, ensuring that our substantial and long term investment is secure. That is, we depend upon our government to keep its word with us, that the underlying zoning will be enforced and remain unchanged absent compelling need.

The City has betrayed the trust of homeowners. An attendee at the recent Cottage Housing meeting experienced a 10-15 percent loss to her property value as an immediate result of an adjacent Cottage project, this at a time when unaffected properties were experienced substantial gains. Property value is bled from surrounding homeowners into the pockets of developers. In effect the City has enabled stealing from its citizens by developers. Affected homeowners should consider legal action against the City for the serious damage done to them.

Planning's tortured explanations and rationalizations for doing this are trivial compared to the damage to neighborhoods and individuals. The seven "reasons" set forth at the top of the page on Amendments are merely a set of feel-good notions, not a clear, specific definition of problems and their corresponding solutions. Planning makes much of their imposition of "conditions" on these projects, impressing no one but themselves. Consider a prospective buyer shopping for a home in an R-4 or R-6 neighborhood viewing a home adjacent to a Cottage project. Does anyone seriously believe this buyer would be impressed by the rationalizations of those in Planning, that the Cottages are really different from other high-density development? Of course not, he would simply walk away and look elsewhere. Shoreline is primarily a low density residential community, which is why we live here.

The City apparently believes that if it talks enough some sort of magic will occur, that Cottages will become compatible with the lower density surroundings. Their conditions and amendments suggest otherwise. They propose to solve the problems by building a fence here, moving a garage there, imposing height restrictions, planting trees, a minor reduction of the "Bonus Density", etc, all trying unsuccessfully to disguise the doubled density. A Yugo with a Mercedes hood ornament is still a Yugo

The moratorium was enacted for the re-examination of Cottage Housing. The re-examination, if it can be seriously call such, has been controlled by Planning, concealed within the same offices that created the problem in the first place. Planning is not neutral

but an advocate, and should not be in control of this process. Public participation has been kept at arms length, with Planning simply accepting verbal and written submissions, reserving to themselves the process of evaluation to the exclusion of those most affected, homeowners.

The City has yet to give good justification for Cottage Housing and has failed to address adequately the serious concerns of property owners about neighborhood character and property values. Mr. Stewart was dumb-struck when asked by the previously cited homeowner if the City was going to compensate her for loss of property value and quality of life caused by the adjacent Cottage project. Further, they have ignored the lack of long-term experience with Cottages. Cottage housing has all of the earmarks of an urban planning fad; the rush to build it before experience accumulates and the questionable economics. In this case adjacent property owners endure all of the risk with no prospect of benefit.

Why has the City put itself and its constituents through this? To what end? "Follow the money" is a best guess, with "follow the egos" and close second. At every public meeting on this subject, public opposition is overwhelming. Staff members from Planning invoke the "What about those who like Cottage Housing?" argument. A city the size of Shoreline will always have a few backers for almost any idea (no matter how loopy). Developers speak through surrogates, concealing their interest. One individual who has spoken favorably has a home on a generous lot with potential for Cottage development, but conceals this publicly. A few others just seem to think Cottages are "nice".

#### In Summary:

1. Cottage Housing is a fundamental violation of the residential zoning depended upon by homeowners.
2. The "conditions" of the "Conditional Use Permit" are essentially trivial relative to the doubling of density and other consequences.
3. Cottage Housing steals property value from surrounding homeowners, bleeding money from them into the pockets of developers.
4. There is no long-term experience with Cottages. Further, it is uncertain that Cottage developments will be well maintained long term. One persistent and disagreeable resident, because of the close proximity of cottages, could easily precipitate a decline, with other owners moving out and turning the units into rentals. There is a well established history of such quarrelsomeness within condo associations.
5. As it will take some time for deterioration to occur, advocates for Cottages in Planning will likely escape being held to account.
6. The beneficiaries of Cottage Housing assume none of the risk but impose it on surrounding homeowners, who are compelled to assume all of the risk and loss of property value, for no benefit.

7. The City has failed to identify any specific problem(s) to which Cottage is the best or unique solution and seemingly has ignored other approaches to create additional units.
8. The City has apparently given inordinate consideration to the interests of developers who seem to have successfully made their case privately in City Hall rather than in public.
9. Although the City gives great weight to the interests of advocates of Cottage Housing, their identity has been scrupulously concealed.
10. Planning has cited Kirkland as an example of another city trying Cottage Housing; however they have failed to note that Kirkland has only two developments, both of which are only demonstration projects.
11. The City has forgotten its constituents, betraying their trust by advancing the interests of others against the interests and desires of citizens.
12. The end goal of Cottage Housing, according to planning, is to have 350 cottage units in the next twenty years or so. As this is to be accomplished by (approximately) doubling density for these developments, the maximum net gain is 175 units. For this small increase in housing units, which could easily be accomplished by other more conventional and acceptable means, Planning and the City seek to drastically change the character of our neighborhoods. Our property values are threatened, and there is very real potential for a wide array of unintended and disagreeable consequences.
13. Finally, what is the hurry? Shoreline has many years to meet the goals of GMA which may change in the future. If Shoreline stops Cottage housing now it can be revisited in the future. Five years or more from now, we will have the now existing developments to evaluate and if still needed and/or desired more can be allowed. However if we proceed and only a few of the fears of opponents materialize, Shoreline will be stuck with deteriorating eyesores, adjacent homeowners will have lost substantial value and irreparable damage will have been done.
14. The City and Planning have ignored the interests of those whom they represent. There is little support for Cottage Housing and great opposition yet the City has pressed ahead. The recent fiascos of North City, Echo Lake and the withholding of important documents from some Council members, demonstrate Planning's poor judgment and dishonesty. Simply put, in the absence convincing explanation for Planning's actions, citizens have come to believe that there is something seriously wrong in City Hall.

Bronston Kenney  
1007 NW 190<sup>th</sup> St.  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
206 546 3596  
bronston@seanet.com

July 18, 2005  
Bronston Kenney 1007 NW 190<sup>th</sup> St.

It has been nearly a year since the moratorium on Cottage Housing was enacted in response to overwhelming constituent objections. The stated purposed was for re-examination of this issue.

No re-examination has occurred, but rather there has been an effort by Planning to "sell" the constituents on Cottage Housing. This has been done using the tax money of those same constituents. Today Cottage Housing is no more welcome than before. The large majority of homeowners in Shoreline recognize Cottage Housing for what it is..... a crude gimmick to violate one of the two most fundamental elements of zoning, density.

I support the extension only as the alterative to letting the moratorium expire. I would rather Cottage Housing be eliminated, but that alterative is not currently before the Council. Should the moratorium be extended once again, genuine re-examination should be undertaken, beginning with the most basic question, to what problem is Cottage Housing the best or unique solution? If this one question cannot be clearly answered Cottage Housing should be simply dropped. The City has spent too much time and money on this already.

The opposition to Cottages has been nearly universal on the part of the citizens of Shoreline. This is not only just and sufficient reason for it to be abandoned, but moreover a mandate to do so. There are occasions when a local government must act in direct opposition to constituents, but not in this case. The City has not even attempted to make this case, simply ignoring the question as it has one stated above. If the City had good answers to these two questions they would have been offered by now.

If Cottage Housing is permitted in Shoreline the zoning upon which we based our home purchases becomes nearly meaningless. Planning projects about 350 Cottage units. (I don't know where they get that figure, it has not been offered as an upper limit, and it could be more.) At roughly 6 units per development, that amounts to nearly 60 projects within Shoreline, nearly a tenfold increase over what we have now. Were this blight to occur, further encroachment into the zoning code would be both difficult and pointless to restrain as density restrictions would have already been rendered meaningless.

The overwhelming majority of the citizens of Shoreline are strongly opposed to Cottages. Extend the moratorium now. Invest no further resources <sup>in</sup> futile attempts to sell it to constituents. If no better justification for Cottages can be found than that advanced so far, drop it for good!



November 7, 2005  
Bronston Kenney, Shoreline

Cottage Housing, a gimmick to exceed zoned density in single family neighborhoods, drew me into Shoreline politics. I began, expecting that the City Council would be responsive to the clear and overwhelming objections of its citizens. I was wrong. The Council responded with the moratorium, now on its third extension and with the Cottage tour and meeting, both stage-managed sales pitches, all exercises in constituent management. It is apparent that the current majority of the Council responds not to those it represents but to others who make their case from shadows. This shadow constituency is composed of two synergistic elements, builders and developers whose motives are obvious and another group best described in this quote from T.S. Elliot.

"Half the harm that is done in this world is due to people who want to feel important. They don't mean to do harm -- but the harm does not interest them. Or they do not see it, or they justify it because they are absorbed in the endless struggle to think well of themselves."

These people are found in our Planning Department and Commission. In addition to Cottage Housing they have given us the disastrous 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. re-striping, the grandiose and horribly expensive Aurora renovation and the failed City Hall Palace at Echo Lake to name a few.

Planners are hired through Mr. Burkett, who serves at the pleasure of the majority. Similarly, members of the Commission are appointed by the majority. Members of the nine-person Planning Commission include three who work as planners for other agencies, and at least three who are builders or developers. For citizens wanting to know how the Planning Commission represents their interests I offer this quote from Donald Sands, a developer sitting on the Commission.

"Density is not a right. Zoning is not a right. It is not something someone should rely upon when you purchase a home..... If a developer can meet the requirements.....then the 'not in my backyard group' should not be able to stop the development."

This was issued by Mr. Sands from behind the gates of the Highlands.

The dividing line in Shoreline is not between Republicans and Democrats but rather between those who live and work here, and the developers and their allies on City staff and on the City Council. Simply put, this latter faction seeks to govern Shoreline to benefit developer's wallets and staff egos. Much of the contention in recent years reflects this. Cottage Housing is the most conspicuous example. It should have been repealed simply because the overwhelming majority of the residents are strongly opposed to it, and the City has not even tried to make the case that it is a best or only solution to an existing problem. Cottage Housing enriches developers at the expense of homeowners, period.

It is my hope that we will shortly have a Council majority that serves those who elect it, not their friends or City Staff. More importantly, I hope to have a City Council which doesn't have to be monitored continuously, one which will govern for the best interests of all in Shoreline not just for a favored few.

January 3, 2006 Bronston Kenney, Shoreline.

That was quite a show the old guard put on last meeting. The puffery and cries of outrage were plentiful but substance was not, a tempest in a teapot. Once the majority changed, Mr. Burkett's departure was inevitable. Further, with City manager governments, change of leadership usually results in change of the City Manager. The complaints about alleged secret meetings were conjecture, nothing more. Did Hanson or Jeppsen consult with the others about moving up Burkett's performance review? Of course not. As noted by Councilman Ransom, the December 12 call for Burkett's resignation was prompted by this last minute action of the old guard.

The old majority has been losing about one seat per election and finally lost control. As to the nonsensical, over-the-top rhetoric about a "coup", there was no coup, there was an election. The old guard lost for one simple reason, they ignored constituents and local businesses, putting their "vision" and their friends ahead of constituents. To hear the old guard supporters talk last week, one would have thought that there were no significant problems in Shoreline; of course that was not the case.

Cottage Housing was the issue that drew me into Shoreline politics. The City decided to use the Conditional Use Permit to a novel purpose, to increase density in residential neighborhoods. In the past the CUP had been used only to allow small stores, churches, funeral homes and schools to be located in neighborhoods, never to increase density. Cottage Housing was nothing more than a give-away to developers, bleeding property value from adjacent home owners into the pockets of developers. When community outrage could no longer be ignored, the old Council gave us a moratorium, during which we were promised a re-evaluation of Cottage Housing. No such re-evaluation occurred, but rather an elaborate series of stage-managed meetings which were never more than further sales pitches for Cottages. The City expended thousands of our dollars trying to force Cottages on us.

I posed two fundamental questions to the City:

- 1) Cottage Housing is overwhelmingly opposed by the citizens of Shoreline, should it not be abandoned on that basis alone?
- 2) To what problem is Cottage Housing the answer and is it the best or only solution?

The City's would never engage on these questions. Instead, we got meeting after meeting all with the same result; Cottages were overwhelmingly opposed. It seems that the City hoped that if they kept having meetings, opponents would simply tire of attending and being ignored, and the City could eventually proceed. Mr. Burkett was active in this ruse.

Where do we go from here? If last week's meeting was any indication, the old majority seems committed to mindless opposition, damaging the City of Shoreline, in what I presume to be the hope of future political gain. The same elitist crowd which lost City leadership by not listening to the rest of us now seeks to shout us down. The City should be run for the best interests of those living and working here, not for a special, self appointed few.




Planning & Services Dept.

I am protesting the  
building of "Cottage Houses"  
in the Shoreline Area.

Elsa K. Kolve

Tax payer since 1942



**Martin Král**  
**1317 N 183<sup>rd</sup> St**  
**Shoreline, WA 98133**

May 31, 2005

City of Shoreline  
Planning & Devpt. Svcs.  
(Attn Paul Cohen)  
17544 Midvale Ave N  
Shoreline, WA 98133


Subject: Amendments to the Cottage Housing provisions

The proposed Development Code amendments to Cottage Housing regulations make an effort to address some of the major shortcomings of the current provisions, now under moratorium. At a well-attended meeting several weeks ago, the public expressed concern over the lengths to which developers and City staff have gone to allow cottage housing. While the first such project met with public and critical acclaim, all others since then have illustrated how the Development Code can be interpreted to permit dense townhouse projects to be created within single family and medium density areas.


With some of the most egregious examples of this pursuit in my immediate neighborhood, I have become well acquainted with the consequences: increased traffic, on-street parking, transient residency, noise and light impacts, and the loss of native habitat due to intensive development. The promised benefits of cottage housing - offering a variety of affordable housing options to a broader spectrum of home owners while fitting such developments harmoniously within the existing neighborhood - all have been subordinated to profit maximization. These cottage homes are constructed to permit greatest lot coverage, thus depriving the area of significant trees and adequate landscape barriers. The developer is forced to build up, making these 2-story cottages unattractive to elderly or infirm home seekers. The code requirements do not compel developers to insist on owner-occupied housing, thus opening the project to absentee landlords and rentals with high turn-over. Property appreciation in the newest developments has been much lower than in surrounding neighborhoods.

It must be remembered that cottage housing was offered as an experiment, a model to permit higher density within a residential area - one of the options to meet our GMA goals. There is no compelling argument to be made that this option must be retained.

Until the City has addressed the issues of affordability, adherence to true cottage style construction, integration within existing neighborhoods, and traffic or parking mitigation, the Planning Commission should recommend elimination of cottage housing as an optional use in the Development Code.

Very sincerely,  
  
Martin Král

Paul Cohen  
Planning and Development Services Department  
17544 Midvale Ave. North  
Shoreline, WA 98133




I am responding to a letter, dated December 23, 2004, that I received from the City of Shoreline. I am a property owner and am interested in the review of the cottage housing code provisions. I was part of a citizen group that strongly objected to the construction of the Ashworth Cottages. I found that the response of the city of Shoreline was less than sensitive to the neighborhood concerns. Nevertheless, I would like to follow the Cottage Housing Amendment Process and would like to be included in the workshops that are part of the process.

I assume that you will follow this project for the duration of the process. I also wonder if you live in the Shoreline area and will act as a responsible member of the community and not just set up a process.

Sincerely,

 1/3/05  
Mary J. Lara  
18030 Ashworth Avenue North  
Shoreline, WA 98133

City of Shoreline Master Plans & Comp Plan Update  
17544 Midvale Ave. N.  
Shoreline, WA 98133



6/10/04

Planning Department,

After looking at the approximately 1000 pages of material provided I have a few opinions on where it looks like we are headed.

Before I go to that, I feel it important to register a complaint as to the format in which this information is dispersed. Most citizens, of whom I am one, do not have the time or patience to go through all of this documentation. It has been suggested to me that the format is designed to intimidate and overwhelm citizens to the point they are unwilling to commit to the process of gaining the information they need to offer an informed opinion. I have been told some items are "buried" in the documents in the hopes people won't discover them and when they are implemented sometime in the future someone can say "It's right here in book #4, page 148, appendix B, subsection 2, paragraph 4 (I may have embellished a bit, but you get the point!). I hope this is not the case, but clearly, if you want citizen input you need to make this more user friendly. A list of **major changes**, and their effect in plain language, would be far more fruitful. The information should be distributed through many vehicles such as direct mail, newspapers etc.

Now on to my observations.

1. Traffic. I can understand the desire (not necessarily a need) to "beautify" the Aurora corridor. It seems we have lost touch with the main goal of state highways, which is to allow vehicles to pass from point A to point B as safely and swiftly as possible. Neighborhood streets on the other hand are designed to provide residents and visitors access to their homes, not a method to bypass state highways or main arterials in order to save time. We should never do anything to compromise the safety of our neighborhood streets by creating less efficient situations on our highway and arterials.

Over the years some of our arterials have changed to serve fewer cars at the expense of neighborhoods. This has happened in spite of the fact we have

more cars passing through and into our city. When the freeways need to handle more cars, does the state cut their capacity by ½? No, they expand the roads if possible or they provide incentives to carpool. Not only have we reduced the capacity on 185<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> we have provided many drivers with no alternative routes. This has led to more, faster traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods at the expense of safety to people in those neighborhoods.

Since the plans to reduce capacity on 15<sup>th</sup> is a done deal, another north south arterial is needed during high commute periods. Hopefully, Aurora will not be changed to the point more people will seek alternatives but an alternative would be Meridian. It seems as though many commuters already use this from 145<sup>th</sup> to SR99 and the expansion from 1 to 2 lanes during the commute could keep many vehicles out of neighborhoods.

I've heard that Stone from 175<sup>th</sup> to 185<sup>th</sup> was suggested as a street designated for arterial status. This makes no sense since Ashworth (one block east) is already a through street, except at 175<sup>th</sup> and an arterial. If the problem is because of the light at 175<sup>th</sup> and Midvale, why not try synchronizing it with the light at 175<sup>th</sup> and Aurora

2. Trees. If you look at the City of Shoreline logo, you will see three apparently large trees. As part of our identity we need to do more to protect our trees and/or replace the ones that are removed. Too many times to count, I have seen developers cut down 100+ year old trees only to replace them with saplings or small bushes. Many developers clear cut lots as well as homeowners. I don't have a problem with that but because of the detrimental effect (visual, air and water) this has on the city they should be required to replace them with trees of substance. For example, if a 100-foot tree were cut down, a number of trees with a minimum height of 10 feet which will mature to a total 100 feet in 5-10 years would be a fair and logical requirement.


3. Zoning/Building Codes. Large houses on small lots=bad idea! When I moved to Shoreline 20+ years ago, this was "the country" to me. The distance from Seattle and the size of the lots made this place I now call home very appealing. Now, Seattle seems very close and I can hear my neighbors brushing their teeth (5' rear yard setback)! I know change and infill development is here to stay but there seems to be a problem affecting the level of privacy homeowners has come to expect. It seems we don't

have codes protecting the adjoining property owner with adequate setbacks. If a new structure abuts the front or rear yard of an existing structure it should have more than a 5' setback.

Also on the subject of zoning, cottage housing has produced many heated debates. Clearly an example of how **not** to do things, that is by trial and error. Neighborhoods, where the "experiment" failed will pay the price for the next 50-100 years.

On the other hand, there are several positive examples of cottage housing of which I am in full support. I believe this concept fills a void in the housing supply except one. As I read the code, 800 sq. ft. is the maximum 1<sup>st</sup> floor dimension with an additional 200 sq ft on the second floor. Many people whose children have left or have physical limitations are looking to downsize but don't want a 2 floor home. A 1000 sq ft rambler in a condo form of ownership would work very well. I don't believe the extra 200 sq ft would be a detriment to the code if all other conditions could be met.

Sincerely,



Brian J. Lee  
18018 Stone Ave N.  
Shoreline, Wa 98133  
206.920.4686  
Brianlee56@hotmail.com





**City of Shoreline**

17544 Midvale Avenue North


Shoreline, WA 98133-4921

(206) 546-1700 ♦ Fax (206) 546-2200

December 23, 2004

RE: Cottage Housing in Shoreline

Dear Interested Party:



The City of Shoreline has had provisions for the development of cottage housing since the year 2000. The City's development code was amended in 2003 to further refine cottage housing regulations. Since 2000 there have been 7 cottage housing projects approved. Based on neighbor concerns, the City Council passed a 6-month moratorium in August 2004 to prohibit new applications for cottage housing. The Council is likely to extend that moratorium so that we can adequately study the cottage housing issues that have emerged.

You have either written us about your concerns regarding these projects, are a developer, or live in cottage housing. Since you have shown interest we would like to involve you to help us articulate the preferences of the community. Your preferences will eventually be presented to the Planning Commission who in turn will make recommendations to the City Council on the future of cottage housing.

We are asking for two things from you by January 14<sup>th</sup> 2005. First, do you have any comments regarding the attached proposed process to review the cottage housing code provisions? Second, do you want to participate in the process, which may include workshops? You may send me a letter to Paul Cohen, Planning and Development Services Department, 17544 Midvale Ave. N, Shoreline, WA 98133 or e-mail me at [pcohen@ci.shoreline.wa.us](mailto:pcohen@ci.shoreline.wa.us).

Sincerely,


Paul Cohen, Project Manager

Cc: Steve Burkett, City Manager  
Robert Olander, Deputy City Manager  
Tim Stewart, Director of Planning and Development Department

*\* Please view the  
2 homes on  
Hallingford  
1803. Need its  
companion home  
to the north  
built on what  
formerly was  
18045.*

*\* \* No, thank you.  
Patticia how*

**Tom Mellor**  
**15725 Dayton Ave N**  
**Shoreline, WA 98133**  
**Phone: 206-784-3190**



December 30, 2004

RE: Cottage Housing in Shoreline

Paul Cohen, Project Manager  
Planning and Development Services Department  
17544 Midvale Ave N  
Shoreline, WA 98133

Dear Paul:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the moratorium of Cottage Housing in Shoreline. As an owner of a Cottage, I would like to see the moratorium lifted and more developments created.

I purchased my unit about two years ago. For me it has been the right choice. I consider the layout and use of land better than the traditional house or a traditional condominium.

From your letter you site seven issues with Cottage Housing:

1. Change in neighborhood character, including property values – Cottage Housing does change the character of the neighborhood but I believe for the better. It provides quality, affordable housing for a price that is above the 2003 medium housing price. This increases the taxes collected from a parcel of land for the City of Shoreline and King County.
2. Size of Development – Cottage House seems to be to be a nice compromise between traditional housing (one house per lot) to a four story 60 unit condominium.
3. Density – see number 2 above.
4. Distance between development – I believe Cottage Housing can be mixed with tradition housing and provide a good mix.
5. Off-Site Parking – my cottage development has six unassigned parking spaces and rarely has there been off-site parking. I see more street parking on the traditional housing streets in my neighborhood.
6. Traffic – Cottage Housing should probably be sited on main aerals so residents access directly to main streets.

7. Growth Management Requirements – Cottage Housing provides a way to control the growth of a community. Cottage Housing provides a more efficient use of the available land.

I would encourage you and the City Council to lift the moratorium and allow Cottage Housing.

Sincerely,

  
Tom Mellor

W. PAT Moyer  
1121 N W 200<sup>th</sup>  
SHORELINE, WA. 98177  
206 542 5306

May 30 2005

Planning Commission  
City of Shoreline  
17544 Midvale Ave. North  
Shoreline, WA. 98133-4921

RE: Repeal of Shoreline Development Code 20.40.300 Cottage Housing.

Shoreline is a city of residential neighborhoods. Its citizen's social and economic values center about their residences and their schools. Zoning classifications provide a comfort factor in expecting stability of the neighborhood land use policy. The Cottage Housing Code 20.40.300., in creating multi-family housing, destroys this trust in Shoreline's land use planning *as the ordinance depends on spot zoning in Shoreline single family housing neighborhoods*. Spot zoning by the Planning Director omits the public and due diligence process review by the Planning Commission and City Council. Spot zoning in this case rewards the cottage housing land owner while economically and socially punishing the neighborhood.

The current forecast of approximately 360 cottage houses by 2022 could create over 60 separate cottage housing locations thru-out Shoreline neighborhoods. (excluding Innis Arden and the Highlands) These multi-family units would destroy the present nature of Shoreline neighborhoods. The pride in the City of Shoreline that now exists as a city of residential neighborhoods would be damaged. Individual citizens would suffer economic loss as neighborhood property values decrease.

The City has committed to creation of 2,651 new household units by 2022 as their share of growth under the Growth Management Act. Cottage units would not be a significant contribution at 12% of the total GMA goal. The City of Shoreline most likely will be required to increase zoning for multi-family units to meet the GMA goal. Whether cottage units would be included in this re-zoning is another issue not relevant to this current discussion.

Minor amendments to the current code do not address the basic public issues of spot zoning and harm to Shoreline residential neighborhoods. These amendments only serve to divert attention from the real issue: a basic review by the Planning Commission and City Council. These public bodies will determine repeal or continued implementation of the Cottage Housing Code taking into consideration the unfavorable impact on single family residences and community opposition.

**RECOMMENDATION: Repeal Development Code section 20.40.300 and reconsider the issue of cottage housing when the City next rezones for increased multi-family housing.**



**Paul Cohen**

---

**From:** rniskanen@comcast.net

**Sent:** Thursday, June 02, 2005 6:40 AM

**To:** Paul Tychsen; Tim Stewart; Brent Smith; City Council; Leigh Lincoln; City Council; Brooke Fisher; Paul Cohen; John Chang; City Council; Maggie Fimia; City Council; City Council; Paul Grace; City Council; Tim Carroll; Steve Burkett

All,

I will attend the Shoreline Planning Commission this evening. A few thought come to mind!

The majority of comments about cottage housing have been negative.

Most of us work on our normal jobs.

Keeping track of political activities on this one issue takes a lot of time.

The current moritorium is in place because of a proposed cottage housing project in my neighborhood. The community was poorly informed. The developer did not care. He claimed we could complain all we wanted but it was "legal" he would do what he wanted.

The politicians and city staff did not initiate the cottage housing moritorium.

This is more of a matter of trust then facts.

If the only cottage housing that would pass the proposed changes to the code are the ones on Greenwood what does that tell you of the public's attitudes on this subject??

Many of the questions asked during the many meetings on this subject have not been answered.


Make zoning in this city mean something!

Thank you, Bob Niskanen

**Fremont Cottages LLC**  
**C/o Samaras Associates, Inc**  
**5017 196<sup>th</sup> SW Suite 103wish to participate**  
**Lynnwood WA 98036**

**January 2, 2005**

Paul Cohen  
Project Manager  
Planning & Development Department  
City of Shoreline  
17544 Midvale Ave. North  
Shoreline WA98133-4921



Dear Mr. Cohen:


Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Shoreline cottages. I definitely wish to participate in your planning process, including the workshops. Unfortunately, I shall not be able to attend the Council meeting on January 24, 2005, as I will be out of town.

You are aware of my concern for the issues discussed in your letter. I believe that the Fremont Cottages have met your most stringent concerns. The neighbors who vigorously opposed this project now admit that we have developed a neighborhood asset. As good as this project is, I believe that we can utilize the lessons learned to build even better housing. The following are a number of ideas that you might consider in your future ordinances.


1. The housing should retain the bonus of double the single-family density. The maximum size of each unit should not exceed 1250 square feet with a maximum interior footprint of 850 square feet. Any space less than six feet high should not count in this calculation. Basements should be encouraged and not count toward the square measurements of the individual units. This would help eliminate the use of the garages for storage thus forcing cars to park outside the garages. A maximum height of eight feet should be permitted for the basements if a secondary exit is provided.
2. The units should be allowed to have up to ten percent allowance for bump-outs that do not count against the total square footage.
3. Each house must have at least one bedroom and at least a three quarters bath on the main floor. This will allow the units to attract seniors who do not want to live with stairs. The advantage to the City is the seniors do not put as much financial burden on Shoreline as families with school-aged children.
4. Porches should have no dimension less than 10 feet and be under cover. The porches should be oriented toward the common courtyard so as to help create a sense of community.

5. Each unit should have a small fenced inner yard to provide for a private gardening and or a pet. The landscaping in these yards should be compatible with the landscaping of the entire project.
6. Each cottage project should have no less than 4 units or more than 12 units. All units should have architectural continuity. However not more than any two units should be identical in external appearance.
7. The separation between units should be set at five feet if the following requirements are met:
  - a. All exterior surfaces except for the deck and trim are non-combustible.
  - b. All units have smoke detectors, monitored alarms and fire sprinklers.
8. All units built should have an R value of R-24 or greater.
9. Each unit must have at least on garage parking space and at least one half parking space, either covered or uncovered on site to allow for visitors and extra cars.
10. All exterior colors must be compatible with colors of the neighborhood.
11. The cottages should be a fenced community with gates being highly desirable.
12. All parking should be clustered to eliminate driveways through the project.
13. Any cottage project with more than six units should have a club-house or community space.
14. The project should have a unified exterior lighting plan to provide for resident security.
15. Attention should be paid to meeting the standards set by the Federal, State and local governments for handicapped units. If necessary, special bonus footage might be awarded for exceeding minimum disability guidelines.

I propose that I be authorized to submit an application for a demonstration project meeting these requirements as soon as possible. This would give you the opportunity to review the final outcome and get neighborhood reaction. Waiting until May 1, 2005 or longer will present me with a severe financial hardship. As you know, I am currently holding a seven-unit site at 192<sup>nd</sup> and Meridian Ave N. that was bought in anticipation of building seven cottages under your existing ordinances.

Sincerely,  
  
Harry E. Obedin  
President

City of Shoreline Planning and Development



17544 Midvale Avenue North

Shoreline, WA 98133 (Attention: Paul Cohen)

June 1, 2005

Subject: Comments on the proposed amendments to the Cottage Housing provisions of the Shoreline Development Code including repealing the provisions.

I would like to say that I think the idea of cottage housing sounds great - less maintenance, common open space to share with neighbors, cottages clustered around the open space, and automobiles parked separately and away from the cottages. An "ideal" living community, kind of like Hobbits in "The Shire." So in that regard, I think that cottage housing could be a viable alternative. What I am against is the allowing of the density bonus for cottage housing. This creates many of the problems that are listed in the City of Shoreline

Memorandum regarding Cottage Housing

Problems and Proposals, dated April 7, 2005.



**Paul Cohen**

---


**From:** sallish@earthlink.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 11, 2005 8:11 AM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** cottage housing/currents newsletter

As per our phone discussion on May 10, I was curious why the apparent objection to the "cottage housing" concept. The only cottage development I am familiar with is the one north of 160 and Greenwood Ave N. The cottages are attractive, the grounds beautifully kept up, the occupants very friendly (we have walked through the development and they are always eager to visit), and the occupants seem like conscious-living type folks. They have a sense of community that most of us in standard single family housing do not seem to have. If property value changes are an issue I would be interested in knowing this. This may be an upscale example of cottage housing and maybe other areas are not so nice as this one is the only one I am personally familiar with.

I am not sure whether I will make it to the 7pm meeting on May 11, but wanted to express some interest and opinion in the issue.

Sally Pfeiffer  
15536 Greenwood ave N  
206-363-6978

Planning and Development Services  
17544 Midvale Ave North  
Shoreline, WA 98133



Attn. Tim Stewart

We attended the Cottage Housing Meeting held May 11 held to explain and answer questions regarding cottage housing in Shoreline. We have watched as these properties (Cottage Housing) have been built near our home and cringed at the prospect of even more of these units being built in R-6 neighborhoods. What we see is developers coming in and buying properties and developing cheap buildings on minimal sites without regard to adjacent environment. We have asked several times why can't the city have more control over this matter and have never received an answer.

We have no objection to cottage housing being built adjacent to commercially zoned or mixed zoning areas and that have quality construction and that work well with the neighborhood. The city seems so concerned with the GMA that it has lost sight of what happens ten years and more into the future. Why can't we look at apartments and businesses coexisting if we need to develop more housing units? Business zoned areas have existing traffic controls and roadways to maximize ingress and egress. Residential areas do not have this option and traffic in these areas is already a major problem.

Cottage housing is a great concept; however we need to consider the impact it has on a neighborhood. Pollution, traffic density, high noise levels, water runoff, increased costs for improving roadways and traffic controls are just a few of the problems created by cottage housing. Increased density has not been kind to the environment or the esthetic values of Shoreline neighborhoods

Please consider what is happening in Shoreline. At the meeting of May 11, we listened to many people who are very unhappy with the path Shoreline is taking to comply with the GMA. In fact most of those in attendance were opposed to Cottage housing. While you may think you are doing the correct and best for Shoreline, it is obvious by the complaints at that meeting you are showing a total disregard of Shoreline taxpayers. Step back, take a hard close look at the community and think about what the citizens want. Please stop listening to the "pie in the Sky" developers and hear what we as citizens are trying so hard to get you to hear.

And in conclusion, I still don't have the answer to my question regarding the number of housing units that have been built in Shoreline since the GMA went into affect. That is being researched now but it seems like a question so important should have had a ready answer.

Joe and Eve Phillips  
20090 10<sup>th</sup> NW  
Shoreline WA 98177  
5/17/05

206-546-2739

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Joe and Eve Phillips".

Lola Piske  
708 NW 191ST PLACE  
SHORELINE, WA 98177  
206 542-1508

RECEIVED

AUG - 8 2005

City Manager's Office

RE: ~~Asphalting of 8<sup>th</sup>~~ AVENUE NW  
HOUSES AT 195<sup>TH</sup> AND 8<sup>TH</sup> AVE NW

(following was taken from laws of the city council of Shoreline)

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE,  
WASHINGTON, DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

**Section 1. Definitions.** The following terms contained herein, unless otherwise indicated, shall be defined as follows:

- 1.1 **City:** The City of Shoreline, a municipal corporation of the State of Washington, specifically including all areas incorporated therein as of the effective date of this ordinance and any other areas latter added thereto by annexation or other means.
- 1.2 **Days:** Calendar days.
- 1.3 **ELI:** Electric Lightwave, Inc. a Delaware corporation, and its respective successors and assigns.
- 1.4 **Facilities:** All wires, lines, cables, conduits, equipment, and supporting structures, located in the City's right-of-way, utilized by the grantee in the operation of activities authorized by this Ordinance. The abandonment by grantee of any facilities as defined herein shall not act to remove the same from this definition.
- 1.5 **Grantee:** As incorporated or used herein shall refer to ELI.
- 1.6 **Permittee:** A person who has been granted a permit by the Permitting Authority.
- 1.7 **Permitting Authority:** The head of the City department authorized to process and grant permits required to perform work in the City's right-of-way, or the head of any agency authorized to perform this function on the City's behalf. Unless otherwise indicated, all references to Permitting Authority shall include the designee of the department or agency head.
- 1.8 **Person:** An entity or natural person.
- 1.9 **Public Works Director:** The head of the Public Works department of the City, or in the absence thereof, the head of the Development Services Group of the City, or the designee of either of these individuals.
- 1.10 **Right-of-way:** As used herein shall refer to the surface of and the space along, above, and below any street, road, highway, freeway, lane, sidewalk, alley, court, boulevard, parkway, drive, utility easement, and/or road right-of-way now or hereafter held or administered by the City of Shoreline.

**Section 2. Franchise Granted.**

I wish to complain about how horrible the asphalt job on 8<sup>th</sup> avenue NW is. It is so shabby and down right unacceptable. There are no walkways, uneven dips onto existing driveways...swerving of this and that to miss some grassy spots, and no continuity to it what so ever. Why in the world did you not just fill in the remaining culverts and asphalt evenly along side the street on each side. It is very disgusting to see such degrading work.

**If the city of Shoreline is going to do something major, they should do it Right and do it so it shows some long range planning, not something just on the spur of the moment, as the asphalt job on 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NW looks like something done on a moments notice!**

**Then here we are again with the Planning commission Okaying something that is so inferior to our neighborhood that it is almost inconceivable!!! How in heavens name could that project of "crappy" so called houses be allowed to be built on one lot!!!!!! At 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 195<sup>th</sup>, in Shoreline. They are like government housing, they are trashy and certainly do not enhance our neighborhood. What goes on in Shoreline City Hall? I am very appalled that something like this is allowed to happen.**

From: Juboju@cs.com  
Sent: Thursday, September 09, 2004 10:38 AM  
To: City Council; PDS  
Subject: COTTAGE HOUSING PROPOSED AT 1849 N 203RD

**RECEIVED**

SEP - 9 2004

City Manager's Office

Re: PROPOSED COTTAGE HOUSING AT 1849 N 203RD ST  
NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTICE

Date: Tuesday, September 7, 2004 -- 6:30 PM

Place: Shoreline Library, 345 NE 175th St

Prior to the Cottage Housing Moratorium effective August 23, 2004, a Neighborhood Meeting Notice was mailed to property-owners in our vicinity. There was no return address on the envelope or any indication in the Notice of who the "presenter" would be; only the Shoreline Library phone number.

At 6:30 PM Tuesday, September 7, ten concerned neighbors gathered at the library for the meeting. No "presenter" showed up, and the library staff said no meeting room had been reserved. By 6:45 PM the staff offered the use of a meeting room, which Mike Smith signed for and was given the room key. It was an "open meeting" -- the door was left open.

Some of those attending were not aware of the moratorium.  
Five of us have properties adjoining the proposed cottage homes.  
Four others have property in full view of the proposed homes.  
We all would be severely impacted should the proposed eight cottage homes be allowed on this 3/4 acre site.


After 1-1/2 hours of discussion regarding increased density, dangerous traffic, parking, trees, fences, utilities, drainage, and the negative impact to our 1950s-established family homes and community --- the unanimous consensus by a show of hands was:

**WE DO NOT WANT ANY COTTAGE HOMES ON THIS PROPERTY. NOT EIGHT -- NOT SIX  
-- NOT FOUR -- NOT ANY.**

An alternative to this consensus was that four regular family homes on this property might be acceptable, should it be appropriately zoned.

**CONCERNED NEIGHBORS ATTENDING:**

- Mike and Sonia Smith--20320 Burke Ave N
- Dick Sugiyama and Jan Steadman--20055 Meridian Ave N



808 NW 193<sup>rd</sup>  
Shoreline WA 98177  
May 9, 2005

City of Shoreline  
17544 Midvale Ave No  
Shoreline WA 98133

Dear Mr. Cohen,

We are unable to attend the Community meeting on May 11, 2005 on Cottage Housing. We consider this matter of utmost importance, in fact the most serious assault against the quality of life in Shoreline. We appreciate the scheduled meeting and would like to voice our opinion since we are unable to attend.

Our residence is within 500 feet of the 5 Cottage homes that went in on 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NW. We were not notified of this before it was too late, thus had no opportunity to voice our concerns. This notification was supposed to happen but never did! The Cottage homes are supposed to be compatible and consistent with the neighborhood. This obviously is not true. Neighboring homes far exceed the value of these cottages, in particular a home across the street sold for over 1.1 million.

Money hungry developers are snapping up property in prosperous neighborhoods and putting up tiny, chicken-coop like structures that they can sell at enormous profits. You notice that they seek out nicer neighborhoods to pull up their profit margins while pulling down property values of areas they infiltrate. For most people, their home represents their largest investment. Anything that is a detriment to property values (like Cottage homes) is a very serious matter.

Less than 500 feet to the other side of our property is the formerly proposed Chysallis 16 Cottages development on 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NW. If it had not been for the Moratorium we would have found ourselves between a total of 21 Cottages! We are gratified that the City Council listened to its Citizens and imposed the Moratorium which at least temporarily will block this travesty.

We have been Shoreline residents for 33 years. We have raised our family in Shoreline, have lived in the same beautiful home and dearly love this area. We own and operate a business in Shoreline. If the additional 16 Cottages had gone in on 8<sup>th</sup> NW it would have had a horrendous impact on us. This is not the Shoreline we know and love or want to live in. We were truly considering moving out of Shoreline as well as relocating our business to another city.

Shoreline leaders need to protect the beautiful neighborhoods we do have and prohibit Cottage Housing except in medium or high density residential areas only. Citizens are organized and watching how you handle this issue and will vote accordingly in upcoming elections. Leaders please hear us!

Sincerely,

Brad and Christina Spencer

808 NW 193 St  
Shoreline, WA. 98177  
June 1, 2005

Shoreline Planning Commission  
Shoreline, WA.

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

We would like to voice our vehement opposition to Cottage Housing in Shoreline. It is our opinion that it should not be allowed in Shoreline under any circumstances.

We have been residents of the Richmond Beach area for over 30 years. We have raised our family here, own, and operate a Shoreline business as well as employ Shoreline residents. We consider cottage housing to be the greatest threat and assault to the quality of life in our beloved neighborhood. For most people, their home is their greatest lifetime investment. It is a known fact that the presence of cottages in neighborhoods leads to drop in value of existing housing.

We live close to the previously proposed 16 cottages on 8<sup>th</sup> NW that were not built due to the moratorium. They would have been wildly out of place among other homes valued at \$600,000 and up. There were several meetings related to this previous proposal and the numerous attendees unanimously opposed cottage housing. Please listen to Shoreline residents ... No Cottage Housing!

Sincerely,

Brad and Christina Spencer



I believe that Problems #5, #6, and #7 are caused by the density of the existing experimental cottages. Cottages are too tall (Problem #5), appear crammed together (Problem #6), and don't have enough parking (Problem #7). These problems could all be alleviated by sticking to the existing zoning regulations. I would also like to comment on Problem #1 - over concentration. I think that 1000 feet separation is inadequate and suggest that 3000 feet might better disburse the concentrations. After hearing some testimonials, it appears that some people really enjoy what cottage housing has to offer. Although your memorandum states that Developers would likely not build smaller units without a density bonus, the cottages and the surrounding property would certainly be more desirable and welcome in neighborhoods if they were in line with the current zoning (my opinion!) There would definitely be more space for creativity in landscaping and gardens. I'll be there at the June 2nd meeting to see what happens.

Maureen J. O'Neill  
839 N.W. 190<sup>th</sup> Street  
Shoreline, WA 98177

**Jessica Simulcik Smith**

---

**From:** Elaine Solberg [elaine@catalinacompany.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2005 10:14 AM  
**To:** Jessica Simulcik Smith  
**Subject:** I support cottage housing.

Dear Mr. Cohen,

I support cottage housing as a realtor, 10-year resident, home and rental property owner in Shoreline. My husband is a builder. We don't do cottage housing ourselves but I believe it is a way to buy a home for those who can't afford a larger mortgage or don't need a large house with a lot of yard maintenance. It also is less in taxes and heating costs for those individuals. I would not approve every street in Shoreline having a cottage development, but the Planning Commission and City Council could allow them here and there where they would work.

Regards,

Elaine Solberg  
cc: Planning Commission

## Paul Cohen

---

**From:** Juboju@cs.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2005 3:23 PM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** Cottage Housing Questions

Hi, Paul --

Follow-up questions I thought of after the May 11 meeting.

- 1) Why 1000' sq. ft. max. established? By whom?
- 2) Why limit building to 1000' radius? Why not 1 mile? Spread them around more IF they become a reality.  
I think the Meridian Park and Ashworth units are TOO NEAR, even if properly located. (Drove by Ashworth after meeting--yeah, they do look like milk cartons piled on top of each other--at least Meridian Park look like small homes--and if they hadn't been painted such ridiculous colors, they'd not look so much like a Disneyland--is there any governance of paint choices?)
- 3) Shoreline's "quota" established commenced when? (date)
- 4) How many cottage housing units completed since that date?
- 5) How many new (standard) family homes completed since that date? Are they being included in the total count for quota purposes?
- 6) What do you consider "new" if one old house comes down, and two new ones replace it? Is that one "new"; two "new?"
- 7) 189th & Meridian, east side dead-end -- old houses came down and six very attractive new home went up (closely built, but very nice). Are they included in the "new house" count? I'd find more of those totally acceptable.
- 8) To reach the approx. 2650 new housing units--how has the development plan been divided among a) condos, b) apartments, c) "regular" homes, and 4) cottage homes? What criteria went into this? Can it be rearranged over the years as deemed appropriate to suit our needs?
- 9) Does the Shoreline Planning Academy still exist? Status? Or are the members incognito so they won't be "run out of town on a rail?"

June Foster Stinson  
20317 Burke Ave N  
(206) 546-1097



## Cottage Housing Reform Community Meeting

May 11, 2005

Written Comment

If we must have them —

8 per 1000 sq ft. of neighborhood


4 per lot

Figure out how to make them like  
Greenwood Cottages but only 4  
in one place!

Dick Sugiyama

Please leave completed forms on the "sign in" table.

650 NW 195<sup>th</sup> Street  
Shoreline, WA 98177



May 18, 2005

Mr. Paul Cohen  
City of Shoreline Planning and Development  
17544 Midvale Avenue North  
Shoreline, WA 98133-4921

Dear Mr. Cohen,

Thank you for your invitation to provide input on the landscaping process at Hopper Cottages, located at the intersection of 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. NW and 195<sup>th</sup> St. NW in Shoreline. As you know we are neighbors immediately east of this development and will share a fence line with them on their eastern boundary. As such, we feel we have a vested interest in the landscaping plan and wish to offer you our thoughts on the landscaping plan since it will greatly impact our privacy and that of the homeowner a mere 16 feet away according to the setback requirements of the development.

Moving from south to north along the fence line, we suggest the following:

According to the landscape plan provided to us by you, there will be nine vine maples planted on the cottage side of the fence that borders our driveway and garage. We ask that vine maples be replaced with an evergreen variety such as Leyland Cypress or Pyramid Cedar. As a deciduous tree the maples will create a great deal of leaf fall in the autumn months and cause unwanted labor for us. This lot previously had a great many maples on it, which were cut down to make way for the construction. We were pleased to see less leaf fall and do not wish to see the same scenario repeated.

Approximately 40 feet along the fence line, we estimate the cottages' driveway will end and the common area and one home will be directly across the fence from the living area of our home, which features two large sliding glass doors and two large picture windows on the west-facing side of the house. Our privacy (and that of the other homeowner) will be significantly impacted. Therefore, we strongly request that a hedge material be planted for approximately 60 feet, ending at the rear of our house. For this purpose, we suggest English Laurel or Portuguese Laurel, both of which grow quickly and can be trained into an excellent privacy hedge. The existing fence is 5' 7" tall. We further request that the Laurel planting be mature, at least 7 – 8 feet tall in order to provide immediate screening properties. According to the site plan, the new home appears to be set back to the rear of our home and bordering our backyard. To our dismay, we discovered that our house was not drawn to scale and the new construction is actually at

**Paul Cohen**

---

**From:** RAWacker@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 08, 2005 4:30 PM  
**To:** Paul Cohen  
**Subject:** Cottage Housing please copy to addressed parties

January 8, 2005

Attn: Paul Cohen, Project Manager  
 Members of the Shoreline City Council  
 Steve Burkett, City Manager  
 Robert Olander, Deputy City Manager  
 Tim Stewart, Director of Planning and Development

As an interested party I would like to go on record as favoring Cottage Housing as a viable alternative for our residents housing needs in the City of Shoreline.

I will be happy to participate in any workshops or forums to discuss the issues or to refine the regulations. My ability to participate may be limited by my role as primary care-taker to my 95 year old father. My interest is no less because of these personal duties.

I live at 19839 8th NW near the Hopper proposal at 195th and 8th NW.

I oppose an extension of the moratorium. I opposed the original moratorium.

Delaying the window of opportunity for Spring and Summer construction would be detrimental to the city's economic interests. The interest rates are low and are excellent for developing projects as well as for buyer's purchases.

Cottage houses, "miniature houses", meet the needs of many home buyers. Single professionals who want the benefits of home ownership. 50% of married couples end in divorce and 75% of 2nd marriages end in divorce. These single persons benefit from home ownership and may have experienced reductions in their income yet desire to live in residential areas where they may have had their family. Women outlive their husbands by about 10 years so that many will be unable to keep up the large family home and are at a stage in life to down-size yet have a connection with community. Last, are retired couples known as "snowbirds" who maintain a home in the Pacific Northwest near original neighbors or families yet spend 6 months of the year in Arizona or Hawaii or other warm climates. These people also desire down-sizing.

Cottage housing is self limiting because of the square footage. Because of the height restrictions they fit best in R-4 and R-6 and if any modification to the ordinance is necessary I would recommend ONLY those zones exclusively for cottage housing. Further I would eliminate the conditional use permit and make it an outright permitted use providing the cottage housing guidelines are fulfilled. R-12 is not compatible because of the bulk and height. High density multi-storied housing serves a totally different market than the single family residential market. Townhouses that are multi-level with common walls or secure buildings with elevator access meet the needs of some buyers, but this does not meet the needs of private home ownership with a yard and the "pride of ownership" displayed in the residential zones of R-4 and R-6. Miniature houses meet those needs for "miniature households."

The Magic Kingdom of Walt Disney was designed at 3/4 scale. Millions have thronged to Anaheim to experience the magic. The scale of cottage housing creates an aesthetically pleasing passage through a city filled with homes of three stories and triple car garages.

**Affordability:** where an area commands \$500, 000 to one million dollar homes a \$300,000 dollar home is "affordable". The cost per square foot is actually higher to build a cottage house because of the core components. Kitchen, baths (plumbing, electrical, heating). Because appraisals are based on LIKE FOR LIKE there should be no comparison between a 3000 sq. ft home and a 600 sq ft cottage. There would be no deleterious effect against larger homes but if cost of construction were compared the cottage house has higher per square foot cost.

I was a real estate broker for 25 years. Included in my studies were courses in appraisal and I was called on to do Market Appraisals every time I listed a home.

**Traffic:** Large homes with a family of two teenage drivers create a greater impact on the neighborhood than do single or double occupancy homes.

**Parking:** it is my understanding that all the residences must have on-site parking in the existing ordinance. Some modification for guest parking or visitors may be necessary so that there is no negative impact on the

neighborhood.

I have tried to be succinct, but in so doing may have left out some important points.

Best Regards,  
La Nita Jordan Wacker  
19839 8th Ave NW  
Shoreline, WA 98177-2555  
206-542-3906

RECEIVED  
FEB - 1 2005  
City Manager's Office

January 29, 2005

Council  
Steve  
Bob O.  
Tim S.

Paul Cohen

File

Distribute Only per Bernard

FILED

FEB 01 2005

CITY CLERK  
CITY OF SHORELINE

To: Shoreline City Council, City Manager, City Planning Department

From: La Nita Jordan Wacker, 19839 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NW, Shoreline, WA 98177-2555  
206-542-3906

Subject: Cottage Housing

Prior to my remarks on the subject I will note my background. I am a retired real estate broker of 25 years. I was among the first 500 persons to complete the Graduate Realtors Institute earning the designation of GRI. I was the first female owner/broker member of North End Brokers multiple listing service. This MLS was the first in the United States and was a forerunner to the current Puget Sound Multiple listing Service. As an Associate Broker at Northwest Realty in North City we were charter members of the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce and I was the voting delegate. In the late 70's I participated in the King County Comprehensive Plan. The results were a new concept of Planned Unit Development (PUD) which can be seen at Ballinger Commons located at 205<sup>th</sup> between 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.E. and Meridian. [This is taking a residential density and allowing "stacking" or common walls in order to leave open space.] Later, I worked in the Seattle King County Board of Realtors (SKCBR) where I was elected the chair of the Political Affairs Committee. During my participation in the Realtors association I worked with Jim Albright whose father had conceived and developed the concept of condominiums. This concept was first introduced here in Seattle--the ownership (title) of "air space" with shared ownership of common spaces. Before this concept was introduced it was common to own apartments in a Co-operative which were shares in a corporation which held title to the building. In Seattle the historic Anshalt apartments are examples of Co-operatives.

This is a brief description of my background and expertise in speaking to this subject. I am a resident of Shoreline since 1964.

Cottage housing is by definition single family residential housing. They are detached homes. Because we limit the size and height of the structure the size of the "family unit" is limited. Single family ownership brings with it attendant "Pride of OWNERSHIP" which is not exhibited in multi-family housing where transient renters are the occupants. Renters may be responsible tenants, however pride of ownership comes when title is held. Equity build up and all the attendant benefits of home ownership such as tax savings accrue to the owner.

Because Cottage housing is single family ownership there are only two zones where SFR applies and that is in the R-4 and R-6 zones. These are single family detached homes. In R-12; R-24 or higher the area is multi-family. This is an area for attached housing with common walls. They may be townhouse style condominiums or a single ownership of apartments for investment purposes. The size and bulk of the buildings make them incompatible with the miniaturized cottage houses.

Multi-million dollar estates have historically had a carriage house, a gardener's



cottage, or a guest cottage on the grounds. These cottages have had no deleterious effect on the value of the estate.

Cottage housing actually costs more per square foot than the larger homes because of the essential core components of electrical, heating, plumbing. Kitchens and bathrooms are the most expensive units of the home. Of course, roofing and siding and other materials would be reduced because of the reduced square footage.

Speaking of square footage let us look at foot prints. Using the limits of our code the cottage houses are limited to 600 sf or 800 sf with corresponding formulas for the number of units per acre. In R-6 zone there could be 6 homes. Using the formula there could be 9 homes of 800 sf or 12 homes of 600 sf. This means that the Cottage house Development would create 7200sf of impervious surface at the maximum. If the six homes were 1500 sf footprint that would be 9000 sf impervious surface. The larger homes could have a 2000 sf footprint which would be even greater. The homes could be as much as three stories high and therefore could be anywhere from 1500 sf rambler to up to 6000 sf home.

Impact on surrounding homes. I have spoken briefly about the cost per square foot. Because the cottage homes are more expensive per sf they would not have a deleterious effect. However, in terms of appraisal it is necessary to compare like for like. Market appraisals and comparables are based on similar homes. An appraiser is required to compare like for like. A rambler is compared to a rambler. A mansion is compared to a mansion. So a cottage home would be compared to the sale of another cottage home not a 6000 sf mansion.

Impact of people. In our current code we allow up to 8 non-related persons to occupy a home. This means that in R-6 up to 48 persons could dwell in one acre of ground. (If they were all adults that could mean 48 cars!) However, it is more likely that it would be a family. Let us say it is a family of husband, wife, four children and grandma. This seven person household would then mean that 42 persons live on the same acre. The likelihood is that only three or four would be drivers so that is 18 to 24 cars. The smallest unit expected in a 2000+ sf house would be two adults and two children. Therefore the impact would be 12 to 24 cars depending on if the children were driving age. (plus visitors) Compare this with cottage housing impact. A 600 sf home would probably be only one person or possibly two persons. This means that at maximum (based on the formula) the total drivers would be 12 to 24. This is exactly the same as the two adult two children household. At 800 sf maximum (based on the formula) there would be 9 homes with the probability of 18 persons. It could be as few as 9 or if it was a single mother with two children the maximum would be 27 per acre living in a two bedroom home with one or two drivers (9 to 18 total)

In summation the cottage houses would create less impervious surface, more value per square foot and less traffic impact than developing R-6 to its maximum. The benefits would be more individual single family home owners who exhibit pride of ownership.

Affordability has been an issue. It is important to define what affordable is and to differentiate low income housing from affordable housing. When looking at the whole city as a market it is possible to find a median home price. That means that half the homes sold above the median and half sold below the median. The statisticians can then

do the same statistics for median wage. The income of the citizens half above and half below. Here is where the crunch comes. For my discussion I will take the bottom quarter of the house prices as being affordable. The problem is that in order to afford these homes it may require a person to be at the median income. That means that persons in the bottom quarter of income cannot afford to purchase homes at all. This places them in the rental market. But, we have a dilemma here, too. Rental prices are based on the cost of housing. Rental prices are based on the cost of land, the cost of construction. If a person's income is in the bottom quarter and even if the rental property is in the bottom quarter of the values it may be that a person is not qualified even to rent an apartment in Shoreline.


Because our land is 95% built and because construction materials and labor have risen it may be impossible to create rental housing without subsidies. Before I leave rental housing I will use an example of Low Income. At \$8 per hour working 30 hours a week (because employers want to avoid paying benefits to a full time employee) a worker could earn about \$240 per week or just about \$12,000 per year. Some people live on SSI or other benefits which may be as low as \$600-\$700 per month. To my knowledge there is nothing in the rental market that meets these needs. I believe that a one bedroom unit costs about \$500 per month and a 2 bedroom unit about \$750-\$800 per month in the Shoreline market. Therefore, it requires at least two people working or collecting some disability payment to qualify for the barest minimum shelter.


I have digressed, but it was necessary before discussing the goals of Cottage Housing for affordability. When a builder is able to put up NEW CONSTRUCTION below the median price of houses then that falls into the category of affordable. It is in the bottom half of sales. All persons do not qualify for NEW homes because of high land costs and materials and labor. Just as persons do not qualify for NEW CARS there is a market for USED cars and a market for USED houses. Small USED houses may be in the bottom quarter of the housing values. SMALL NEW houses may fall in the bottom half of the housing values.

Cottage houses have achieved the goal set out by the city to provide more affordable new construction. Taking Richmond Beach/Innis Arden area as the example it is possible that the median price of home sales is \$450,000. You would have to check the current market statistics. Some homes have sold near the one million dollar mark. But, remember the median is half have sold above and half have sold below. In this area then a \$275-\$325 thousand dollar NEW home would be below the median and considered affordable even though the price is high and may be above the median income of residents. Remember that all persons are not qualified to buy new construction. The person buying this home would probably be ABOVE the median income in order to qualify. The reasons for purchasing would probably be based on demographics. Single divorced parent, single unmarried professional, retired couple down-sizing or widow also downsizing all of whom would be above the median income and therefore compatible with the affluence of the neighborhood. All of these persons would be buying because they desire a single detached family residence with yard space. Therefore the appropriate zone would be R-4 or R-6 single family residential zoning for detached homes.


Low income housing for the bottom quarter of the incomes must be subsidized housing. It must be a partnership of municipal, county, state, federal governments.

Sincerely, La Nita Wacker

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "La Nita Wacker". The signature is fluid and stylized, with a small "84" written near the end of the name.



March 14, 2005



Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,  
The following flyer came in  
Richmond Beach newspaper. Debbie Allison  
provides a clear comparison of prices.

I believe that these support  
the need for more affordable  
housing in this area. Singles, couples  
need to have an option and I  
believe the best option is  
cottage housing.


Clearly affordability is a  
relative term.

I have presented more  
thorough comments in previous  
correspondence. I hope you  
will include these remarks and  
the data sheet for your  
consideration.

Sincerely (sic)  
Linda Wacker

Council  
Steve  
Bob O.  
Julie  
Tim S.  
Paul Cohen  
File

Distribution  
only per Julie



← 30 → 660 SF




Not to Scale  
Tower effect




25 foot height may  
be turned toward common  
area or side yard.

COTTAGE

HOUSING



dormers



rooftop balcony

One and half story with steeper roof  
allows cottage like feel rather than  
tower effect.

submitted by Loretta Wacker

## Debbie Allison's

FILED

MAR 14 2005

Windermere  
Real Estate

CITY CLERK



www.myseattlehome.net

Real Estate News

Direct: 206-349-5351

Office: 206-527-5250

## MARKET HIGHLIGHTS

We are still in a *Seller's Market*, with more people seeking to buy homes there are homes available on the market. As a result, prices are rising in our area. In addition, *Mortgage Interest Rates* nationally are at their lowest levels since the first week of April, 2004. Locally, 30 year fixed rates can be found in the high 4's to low 5's.

*Location* is always named a key factor in market prices. Primary contributing factors to property values in Richmond Beach include proximity to Puget Sound and the Beach, proximity to Downtown Seattle for commuters, our excellent public schools, low crime rates, and "Neighborhood Ambience."

## MARKET ACTIVITY

### *Homes Sold: 1/01 - 2/14/05*

<u>Address</u>	<u>Features</u>	<u>Sale Price</u>
1810 NW 197th	3/2.75 Updated	\$359,000
18450 3rd Pl NW	4/2.75 1998	\$362,500
1611 NW 198th	4/2.5 Landscp	\$375,000
1425 NW 204th Pl	4/2 Rambler	\$399,950
321 NW 201st Pl	5/2.75 Remod.	\$405,000
980 NW 198th Pl	4/3.25 Luxury	\$667,500
19005 22nd NW	4/3.5 Views	\$1,220,000

### *New Listings - 2/05*

<u>Address</u>	<u>Features</u>	<u>Sale Price</u>
19814 8th NW	4/2.5 New Kitch	\$419,000
20102 24th NW	2/1 Views	\$499,950
19704 23rd NW	4/2.5 Views, MIL	\$559,000
1511 NW 188th	4/3.0 Rambler	\$579,000*
2132 NW 204th	4/2.75 Views	\$599,000
1408 NW 186th	3/5.0 Custom	\$749,000*
20412 12th NW	4/3.25 New	\$795,000
2429 NW 197th	4/5.0 5k SF, Vws	\$825,000
2650 NW 204th	4/2.5 A+ Views	\$975,000

\*Homes in Innis Arden

"Homes Sold" are in Richmond Beach & Highlands. Price reflects final closing price. "New Listings" includes a selection of homes in our area recently listed with realtors. Are you curious about the price your home could command in our fast paced market? Contact me anytime for a complimentary market analysis.

Page 67

**COTTAGE HOUSING PC 36**

## The Windermere Real Estate Difference

There are many good reasons to select a Windermere Realtor when you buy or sell a home, some that can be crucial to the success of your transaction.

The Windermere Bridge Loan is an innovative program designed to allow Windermere clients to buy their new home before selling their existing home. A Bridge Loan taps into the equity you have in your current home and applies that to your purchase. Fees and interest rates are low, in accordance with our desire to make the home buying process as simple as possible.

Windermere Newspaper Advertising is the best in the Seattle area. Our dominant position in the Sunday Seattle Times, the large font size of our ads, and easy to follow geographic layout all contribute to ads that are effective and widely noticed.

All Windermere agents are "Realtors." A "Realtor" is a member of the National Association of Realtors. All Realtors subscribe to a strict code of ethics that promote best practices throughout our industry.

## www.MySeattleHome.net

Do you Love to look at houses?  
You can look to your hearts' content  
at MySeattleHome.net, my interactive  
Web Site.

Click on "Properties" when you reach the opening page. There you will see a list of pre-set neighborhood searches, including Richmond Beach, Edmonds, Ballard, Green Lake, & more! All homes currently listed by a Real Estate Agent are shown for each neighborhood.

Check out my featured listings for homes that are currently active in our area.

Finally, you can search every area where Windermere has offices, including all of Washington & Oregon, parts of California, Idaho, Arizona, Nevada & Montana.

### *Buying or Selling? I Can Help!*

#### When you want to **SELL** a home, I can:

- ~Help you establish the optimum Market Price that will maximize your equity and attract buyers.
- ~Enthusiastically market your home to attract both real estate agents and buyers.
- ~Assist you in negotiating the contract and handling all contractual requirements during the sale.
- ~Ensure that your buyer is qualified, their loan is on schedule, and title & escrow are in order.

#### When you want to **BUY** a home, I can:

- ~Show you homes that meet your needs in every way —location, price, amenities, and more!
- ~Provide references for top-notch lenders and inspectors for your purchase.
- ~Negotiate on your behalf regarding price, terms, and other contractual issues.
- ~Follow through on all aspects of your purchase to ensure a smooth close.

**I am dedicated to giving you the best possible service. Call Me!**

206-349-5351 (cell) \* 206-527-5258 (office) \* [dallison@windermere.com](mailto:dallison@windermere.com)

**Debbie Allison, Your Richmond Beach Realtor**

**COTTAGE HOUSING PC 36**

May 29, 2005

Cottage Housing June 2, 2005 Public Testimony

Dear Planning Commission Members:

The following written testimony is to be included in the written record. I will additionally make oral comments at the hearing.

I have read all the comment letters which have been submitted on this matter. I attended the May 11 public meeting hearing both the staff presentation and the public comments.

I noted with great interest that there are fewer than a dozen persons who oppose cottage housing and some have written multiple letters. The persons dwelling in them like them. Even a neighbor of a cottage development took time to write a positive endorsement of the cottage house cluster near her.

I have a copy of a memorandum dated April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2005 from the Planning Department staff which will be the basis for this discussion. It first identifies 7 problems and then goes through the recommended amendments to 20.40.300.

Problem #1 is a misstatement of the problem. The actual problem is the Conditional Use Permit (SMC 20.30.300 B6) Cottage Houses are not in an of themselves a problem. They are a viable living alternative. They meet the intent of cottage housing as defined in SMC 20.20.014. Most particularly they are small detached homes. Approx. 90% of Shoreline is R 6 and R 4. Cottage Houses, once having met the rigid standards of the cottage housing code, should be allowed as an OUTRIGHT PERMITTED USE. The conditional use which prohibits "the detrimental over-concentration" is like saying the "detrimental over-concentration of detached homes" or the "detrimental over-concentration of people"

In the conditional use permit the use of the word DETRIMENT implies that there is a detriment. There is NO EMPIRICAL DATA to support that concept. If one is running an auto-body shop or other business in a residential neighborhood which creates noise or unsightly conditions that may be a DETRIMENT. NOISE: BLIGHT  
If a contractor/landscaper or other business operates out of his home where laborers trucks come in and out to pick up paychecks or get assignments that may be a DETRIMENT. TRAFFIC

Because the cottage housing code severely limit's the size of the dwelling the market will dictate (prevent) over-concentration. If there is no demand for small homes then there will be none built. Demograhics indicate that there are singles, divorced persons, widows and retired persons who spend half the year here and half elsewhere all of whom would desire smaller homes. There is a MARKET.

Going about one's daily life in a SMALL detached home is not a DETRIMENT to anyone.

Problem #2 I SUPPORT the existing code. I do not support the proposed amendment. I will address that when I get to the code amendments.

Problem #3 Double density is only allowed when the units are very small 650 sf which is a one bedroom unit. Generally that will be only one person and at the most two people. I SUPPORT the existing code.

Problem #4 & #5 I am unaware of a 650 sf house or even an 800sf house being too bulky I think that it is correctly stated as being too tall. SUGGESTED CORRECTION: a story and a half dwelling would reduce the height therefore the appearance of bulk. I would suggest that the maximum height of opposing walls be 12 feet plus two foot foundation for a total of 14 feet. The end (other opposing walls) could be 23 feet plus two foot foundation for a total of 25 feet. This pitch of the roof would allow living space on the second floor of full height a little less than half the area of the main floor. Dormers or roof balconies could be created with this restriction. The 25 foot end wall must have windows or other treatment to reduce the tower effect. I believe windows on the main floor and on the second story would break up the 25 foot height. OPPOSE; 2 story cottages. FAVOR: one and a half story cottages.

#6 No one living in the cottages complained. Since the lot coverage is the same as for other developments in the zone, (35%) I believe this is a red herring.

#7 To insure that surrounding neighborhoods are not impacted by off site parking I SUPPORT the new amendment. Most 650 sf homes will have a single occupant however even they have guests from time to time. I believe requiring a minimum of two parking spaces per dwelling is logical and the additional 1 for each two units insures that all parking can be done on site. SUGGESTION: all uncovered parking should be a pervious surface material. All covered parking and common buildings should have a pitched roof and be no more than 18 feet high as per the recommended amendment.

Since I support the original cottage housing I will point out again that with double density and 650 sf homes there would be a maximum of 12 homes per acre. This would most probably be 12 cars but could be 24 if each home has a couple. Further since some would be widows or retired the number of daily trips would be reduced.

If the same acre is developed at R6 the homes are larger and would most probably be occupied by a family. There would probably be 12 drivers, but if two teenagers were driving then there would be 24 cars, too. In these larger homes we allow up to 6 cars at the dwelling. Additionally, we allow up to 8 non-related occupants. Assuming a family of four in a 2000 sf or 3000sf house the traffic would most probably be greater than that of a single occupant home. Since these homes would be occupied by at least one working person and possibly two working persons it is most likely that daily trips would be greater due to the age and family configuration of the larger homes.

SUMMATION: Of the seven problems stated only two have any merit. The combined #5/#6 bulk and height but primarily height and #7 parking on site.



## CODE AMENDMENTS:

### 20.40.300

1. I do not support this amendment. Cottage housing should be on a site basis throughout the city. Providing the builder/developer meets the stringent guidelines of building the smaller homes it should be allowable. I do not believe that “vested” interests would hold up in court as in a “first come first serve basis”. The planning commission and/or the planning department is responsible for applying the codes fairly. This would be grossly unfair. In my 25 years of real estate I have never heard of anything worse.

I have heard of distance regulations of serving alcohol within a certain distance from a school or a church. There is a nexus between the activity of drinking/potential drunkenness and the area being protected.

In this case no protection is being afforded by the state which would justify such an onerous regulation.

If a site can accommodate 12 cottages then that is what should be built there. If another site 300 or 500 feet away also accommodates cottages then they should be allowed. The adjacent neighbors are residing in single family detached homes. Cottages are detached homes that are small.

Special Note: The attempt to disperse cottage housing from the west side to other places needs to be analyzed and understood. This NIMBY attitude is not appropriate for making good policy decisions.

Let's look at the reality of our city. The northeast section notably Ridgecrest and Briarcrest were developed after the second world war. The lot sizes were 6200-6900 and in a few instances 7200 sf. The houses in Ridgecrest are cement block 2 bedroom 800 sf or 3 bd 1000 sf. The largest may be 1200 sf. No family rooms existed. Only one bathroom and one garage/ carport. Near Shorecrest High School there are a group of homes between 25<sup>th</sup> NE and 28<sup>th</sup> NE from about 150<sup>th</sup> to 163<sup>rd</sup> which were built at the start of WWII. Those homes are 450sf, 550 sf, 750sf. They were a standard plan built all over the country.

There is a newer section of Briarcrest that was built after the Korean War. Those homes are 3 bedroom and some have a family room. Those will range from 1200 to 1500. Most have a single bath and a single garage, but half baths were beginning to be the mode. A few have double car garages or a garage and a half (for washer/dryer and workshop space) Carports were common during the fifties.

These areas mentioned were platted developments and catered to the zero down Veteran buyer back from the war with his GI benefits.

The bulk of the western side of the district did not develop in the same manner. There are lots that are 10,000, 20,000 or even larger.

The Highlands of course was developed as a gated community in the early 1900's for the socially elite.

Innis Arden developed in the 50's I believe although some may have begun in the late 40's. It was a “restricted” development. Included in their codes and restrictions was ¾ acre lots and no sub-division allowed. Owners of the lots became members in the

community club with its amenities. There is an additional fee, I believe, in addition to taxes.

The development in the western side of the district has been by lot subdivision or short plat. Rarely, has there been enough land for a full plat.

Because of the large lots and the soaring prices ranging from 300,000 to 1,000,000 cottage homes have more opportunity of being built west of I-5

East of I-5 the homes already have the footprint of a large cottage. Today those homes range in price from 200-250,000. In order to get enough land for a cottage cluster a builder/developer would have to buy several homes to demolish and put up the same size new. Doesn't make sense!!!!!!

2 B. I do not support this change. I believe that we should keep the 650 and 800 sf options.

I would support the following variation in a development of 5 or more cottages the builder shall make one ADA accessible and MAY have 1000 sf on the main floor. AND, this will not count against the double density if all the homes are 650.

3C Do not delete the double density option. Other suggestions regarding height will contribute to the visual aesthetics of the development. 651-800 sf 1.75 as per original code.

4D I do not support the maximum of 8 units. (ESPECIALLY not in 1000 feet)

5E. No cottage should be two story. The footprint being small makes the result a tower. By codifying the story and half concept there will be living space on the main floor and some living space of full height on the second story under dormer type circumstances. I have suggested the height be 8 feet for the main floor plus two foot foundation and begin a pitched roof. Or, an additional 4 feet on the second story and begin the pitched roof. By doing this the façade of the dwelling (depending on the choice of the builder) would be no greater than 14 feet. The end wall would remain at 25 feet total. To accommodate my suggestions the roof is steeper to accommodate living space on the second level.

Parking structures and community buildings should be no greater than 18 feet and SHALL have a pitched roof.

I think it is critical to have a pitched roof on these amenities so that they fit into the character of the neighborhood. Multiple parking stalls and a flat roof or a common building with a flat roof smacks of the townhouse/condo row houses that I believe is what some of the opponents actually object to.

^6F I support this amendment.

7G I support this amendment.

ADDITION: It has been suggested by Mr. Soules who develops cottage homes that one

step that we should be taking in the city in applying this code is to first look at the site and define how many residences can be built. I presume that is deducting sensitive areas and other points that would diminish the space allowed for development. Then, AFTER that step is taken the formula for cottage housing be applied to the resulting land. I believe that this step would be a good one to take. It may result in a reduction of allowable cottages on a given site.

Also, at the May 11 forum it was suggested that architects renderings of the cottage home development also include surrounding/abutting property to scale. That seems like a reasonable suggestion.

I have tried to address the height of a cottage which I believe also addresses bulk. I would suggest that in a cluster that some homes could have a 14 foot vista on the common area and some homes could have a 25 ft face to the common area. This would allow for additional diversity within the cluster. Because of the steeper pitched roof I believe either façade would be attractive to the common area.

There are those who do not wish to see cottage housing in the City of Shoreline. As Planning Commissioners I believe you have a duty to serve the needs of all the citizens. Some people will be satisfied with townhouses or condominium type housing but for others the cottage housing serves their needs best. We would be remiss if we do not include this option in our overall plan.

The code says nothing about basements that I can see. During the forum one of the cottage homes developers said he was restricted to a 6 foot maximum height. Since the code is silent where did that restriction come from? Perhaps that should be codified. Although it is not my intent to have people living in basements it does seem logical to have them tall enough to stand in. Perhaps this should be discussed.


I have addressed, but will repeat that if there are more than 5 houses in a cluster one should be ADA compliant. This then could be a Rambler in the cluster and have 1000 sf footprint. But, this should not negatively impact the developer. This would be an overall benefit to the city.

Finally, I do not see it in this code and perhaps it is elsewhere, but I think that all cottage housing should have fire sprinkler systems. I realize this is an added cost, but because we are locating dwellings around a common area and some are more distant from the street than others it seems that fire safety for the clusters as well as surrounding homes might be a reasonable regulation.

Respectfully submitted,

La Nita Jordan Wacker  
19839 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NW  
Shoreline, WA 98177-2555  
206-542-3906  
RAWacker@aol.com

August 25, 2005



Dear Planning Commission and Shoreline City Council,

Once again my subject is cottage housing. The opponents continue to use the phrase that there is an "OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OPPOSED TO COTTAGE HOUSING". That statement is simply not true and grates on my nerves every time I hear it. The truth is that the overwhelming majority of citizens have no opinion whatsoever. This truth is exhibited by the lack of participation at the polls and in public hearings. The truth is that the opposition can be counted on one hand but it is vociferous.

One issue that is asked. What is the problem that cottage housing is designed to solve? The answer to that question is quite simple. Planning and land use in a city is for the purpose of serving the needs of people for conducting business and providing shelter. The land mass within the political boundary is divided and parceled and we call that private ownership. This is the American way there have been other systems with other means of distributing and controlling land.

**ZONING IS NOT A PROPERTY RIGHT.** The opponents claim that people purchase their homes with an expectation of zoning however these are subject to change by the elected policy makers. The uses within a zone are in a constant state of flux. We have a residential zone, however since the advent of computers there are many people who conduct business on the inter-net (global) which is based in their residence. But, this business use in a residential zone is not new. There used to be Fuller Brush salesmen, Kirby salesmen, Watkins product salesmen who all conducted their business at the customer's residence. Then, we have the advent of Avon and Mary Kay Cosmetics neither of which have a retail location but the sales representative operates out of the residence. In addition to these examples, Tupperware and Discovery toys built their businesses on home based parties conducted in the customers homes depending on the hostess for marketing.

But, there are other businesses which have been conducted out of residential zones. Building contractors, repair and remodel contractors go to the site of their contract to do their work and only the paperwork is done at their residence. Landscape gardeners also do not necessarily, in fact rarely have a retail outlet. After all their business is conducted in residential yards.

Now we have other uses inside residential zones such as mother-in-law apartments. What is the difference between a parent having a son-in-law and daughter share their home or an extended family of a parent or renting a room to a non-relative or converting the basement to a self contained dwelling. These are not duplexes yet they meet a need in our society for shelter for a variety of persons.

Cottage housing fills a need. As I have testified the problem that it addresses is the changing demographics of our society. In the fifties and sixties we had couples, a husband and wife, with 3 or more children. Today we have reached a greater than 50% divorce rate. That means that we have one single person and we have one custodial parent if their are children This means that we need two dwellings! We also have people waiting longer to marry while they pursue their career path. It is not unheard of to have an unmarried son or daughter well into their thirties who are well employed and desirous of the benefits (tax benefits and appreciation) of home ownership. These singles, never married, are in the market place, well qualified for home ownership and paying taxes to the municipality in which they live.

Additionally, we have increased longevity. Widows generally outlive their husbands by about 10 years but they no longer need the large family home nor the huge yard to maintain. A cottage house with its smaller square footage reduces the utilities also. A new home reduces maintenance costs.

These widows and some of the busy career minded singles and the custodial parents all do not have the time nor inclination to buy a used home with its required maintenance and repairs. They are in the market for new construction.

These are some of the problems that cottage housing serves/solves. Regardless of GMA we as a city must serve these citizens with a variety of choices.

As far as condominium ownership these cottages are single family detached structures. From the naked eye it is impossible to tell whether a property is joint ownership, tenants-in-common or condominium ownership of the land. Not everyone desires an attached town home style of structure.

There is no statistical data to support an increase in traffic. To the contrary the mega houses have the potential of have greater number of drivers and causing greater traffic congestion.

There is no support for diminished value of surrounding property. This is baseless. Contrarily, a new construction project can have a positive effect on surrounding property.

*LaNita Jordan Wacker  
19839 8th Ave NW 194  
Shoreline, WA 98147-2555*

*206-542-3806  
RAWacker@aol.com*