



**Rocky Willson**

Richmond Beach • 1 day ago



Has anyone heard about the City of Shoreline trying to take a neighbor's property he recently bought using eminent domain?

One of my neighbors said that the City Council seems to be rushing this measure through to take adverse possession of this fellow's property. Two of the City Council are part of the neighborhood in which this fellow resides and one has recused herself from the issue.

I've heard a number of things about this issue, and I don't know where I stand, but I think it is an issue that should be discussed within the community.

I don't like our city council rushing things through. I find it difficult to follow things they do.

I sure would like to hear more about this issue from those that know something more concrete and factual than I know.

Posted in **General** to **25 neighborhoods**



13



Like



41 Comments



Share



**Alex White** • Hillwood



Is there any more context to this situation?

1 day ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



1



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Alex here's the Ordinance 967.

<http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/council/staffreports/2022/staffreport052322-9c.pdf>



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Thank you Rocky. I have wondered about this too. The first heard of this was through the city council notes in the Shoreline Area news last week. I'm wondering if other neighborhoods in Shoreline beyond lower Richmond Beach are aware. This proposal certainly hasn't been disseminated very well. Maybe the Shoreline Area News can report on it.

1 day ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Danny Mayhem** • Forest Glen



A few years ago the City used eminent domain to acquire the house my mom grew up in. They paid "fair market value" for a single story unit on a quarter acre in the prime of North City 2016 in to give the fire station room for their fancy upgrades (sure, important no doubt). But the price was laughably low, and bc apparently with eminent domain you can't factor in the prospective value, like if you were to remodel, subdivide, or develop (it is zoned as high density residential now bc of upcoming light rail), they only paid a third of what my mom could have sold it for. To make a long story short, they razed the house, the garage, the huge incense cedars and the hundred-year-old gravenstein apple tree. Felt like a total F√©×job for us, but especially for my mom who had so much history there. Years later, she still avoids driving past it, like a crime scene.

1 day ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Julie Schalka** • Richmond Beach



This is a TOTALLY different situation. This is an UNBUILDABLE piece of tideland I believe belongs to the DNR.

23 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



23 hr ago Like Reply Share



**Danny Mayhem** • Forest Glen



Julie I agree this is much different. Having got burned by eminent domain before, I can sympathize with anyone who feels hard done by it. I have long thought this entrance to Richmond Beach should be improved and official. Always thought the new sign that says "no beach access" was hilarious bc I'd access the beach and be like "hmmm that sign is incorrect" 😂.

22 hr ago Like Reply Share



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Julie this property does not belong to the DNR, whatever that means, it belongs to a private citizen.

11 hr ago Like Reply Share



**Donald Prewett** • Richmond Beach



The property the city wants to purchase gives Shoreline residents access to the Salt Water Beach from the North. It is a strip of land worth about \$100,000 and it appears to be a non build able lot. The people of Richmond Beach have been accessing the Park through that parcel of land for over fifty years. The city of Shoreline should purchase the property to keep the beach access for all the people of Shoreline.

23 hr ago Like Reply Share





**Donald Prewett** • Richmond Beach



I would also say the city has not been rushing this through. They discussed it at a previous Council Meeting and put a notice of the issue in the Seattle Times. The Council will take the issue up again next week. You should go to the meeting if you are concerned about the issue. To me it is a no brainer. Beach access for everyone.

23 hr ago

[Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Danny Mayhem** • Forest Glen



Donald Seems the only differences with city ownership will be people with mobility issues will hopefully have an easier time getting to the beach from that side, not having to hop down on logs and rocks. The city will also probably put up some sort of gate to further restrict night-time access, so the determined kids will just risk it on the tracks. So it's a question of whose access to the beach? And what will be the terms of that access? (edited)

22h

[Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Pam Wilson** • Esperance / Westgate



Donald you should not have to follow all of the Council Meetings, or the Seattle Times to learn about a project affecting your property. Edmonds does the same thing. They do not reach out to the property owners affected, at least in my case, I just happened to catch wind of it. And like noted above, they will never pay what the parcel is truly worth if you personally were to sell it. I am not agreeing or disagreeing regarding access to the park, it's just that most city councils need to have more communication with home owners affected by their plans.

17 hr ago

[Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



17 hr ago

[Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Danny Mayhem** • Forest Glen



Pam big time. Well said. Another time dealing with the city, a survey crew was poking around one corner of my Mom's yard and when I asked them what they were doing, they said "oh we're just expanding the sidewalk HERE" and pointed a line that would remove a significant corner of her property. It's like yeah it's good that ppl have more space to walk there, and that it's ADA accessible. Obviously important. But she shouldn't be finding out about it just because we happened to be home to ask the survey crew what they were doing poking around her yard. If we hadn'ta been home, then we'da found out when the backhoe showed up. Relationships are built on trust, and Communication is key.

15 hr ago

[Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)





**Cindy Ryu** • Richmond Beach



The parcel is privately owned Parcel [7278100905](#)

Present use:Vacant(Single-family)

Jurisdiction:SHORELINE

Taxpayer name:VITALIANO PETER

Address:N/A

Appraised value:\$107,000

Lot area:113,023

Levy code:2263

Property ReportDistricts Report

Source: King County Assessor

22 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



1



**Cindy Ryu** • Richmond Beach



Besides the impact on current owner, perhaps the highest impact will be the volume of traffic for residents along 27th Ave NW over the trestle bridge.

22 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



3



**Donald Prewett** • Richmond Beach



The City should just not allow people to park on that street and the traffic issue goes away. Make it so you just walk to the beach. I cannot believe a public figure would be against beach access.

22 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



1



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Donald it's not just beach access, it's taking someone else's beachfront property. I think eminent domain is important to use for "needed" property but maybe not for "wanted" property.

21 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



**Carol Hall Zemanek** • Richmond Beach



This parcel would add over 2 acres of beach front to the City of Shoreline's Saltwater Park.

18 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



**Donald Prewett** • Richmond Beach



This lot is a beach and should be part of the park. It will never be built on. It has been used as access to the park for at least 50 years. We are not changing anything.

18 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Donald I understand the City's desire to have this lot, but the city is taking property that belongs to someone else, who, I understand, would like to keep his own property. I don't think I would like it if it happened to me or if the city wanted waterfront somewhere else that was privately owned. It's worrisome.

17 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



**Donald Prewett** • Richmond Beach



This is about beach access and you and I feel different about that. I think all people should have beach access and not just people who happen to own property on the beach already.

17 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Donald we do have the wonderful saltwater park.

17 hr ago

[Like](#)

[Reply](#)

[Share](#)





**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Donald the city had an opportunity to buy this property and beach less than a year ago but declined, too expensive I guess. (edited)

17h [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Mary Macdonald** • Hillwood



Barbara how much did it sell for a year ago?

14 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Mary according to Zillow, in 7/2021 the house and lot at the end of 27th along with the adjacent beach property, sold for \$1.6M

14 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Donald Prewett** • Richmond Beach



We have a great Salt Water Park and this lets people walk to the park and they do not have to drive.

17 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Donald so kind of a private lower Richmond Beach access?

17 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Donald Prewett** • Richmond Beach



Barbara In Hawaii all beaches have public access. We should do the same.



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Donald yes I am very familiar with the fight and success to obtain beach access in Hawaii, but the biggest and most dangerous obstacle to beach access in Shoreline is not the very few private owners, it is the railway. Maybe Shoreline should try to vacate the railway using eminent domain rather than go for one private citizen. I'm wondering if the city will try to obtain property at the north end of 27th also, since they stated they wanted access all the way to Kayu Kayu Ak park.

1 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Alex Sargeant** • Hillwood



No one should own beaches other than the public. That's a legacy mistake that needs to be corrected and the city is trying to correct it.

17 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



2



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Alex are you referring to lake beaches also?

1 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Alex how about waterfront on Whidbey, Bainbridge, Vashon, and many other Puget sound waterfront properties? Should they all be confiscated for the public good?

29 min ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)





**Rocky Willson** • Richmond Beach Author



FWIW: I have edited the original post because someone brought it to my attention that the tone was a bit caustic. (I agree, BTW.)

My apologies to anyone I offended with the tone of the original post. I was tired when I wrote it and didn't do a very good job.

16 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Jeff Jones** • Richmond Beach



I wrote and supported the initiative. Makes sense to take worthless lane and give access to the residents.

16 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Jeff I have a question. I saw all the letters sent in to the council. Many, many of them supported this proposition and most were from residents of lower Richmond Beach. I consider myself fairly well informed but I wasn't aware of this proposal until after the council meeting. I'm wondering if there was a local meeting or mailing that encouraged many people to write all these letters. I wish I had known too.

16 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Donald Prewett** • Richmond Beach



Barbara The issue is not whether people should have the ability to stay informed. It is about beach access for all people wherever they live.

15 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)





**Jeff Jones** • Richmond Beach



Barbara it was brought to my attention by other neighbors that knew of the vote.

14 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Donald hmhhh

33 min ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)



**Pam Wilson** • Esperance / Westgate



I have to wonder if people would have such strong opinions if it were their property the city wanted to take. It's really easy when the city isn't taking from you, but when it's your property they want, it's a whole different ball game. I think the poster deserves a little compassion. I don't think anyone would really be okay with the city just taking over your property, and knowing there is basically nothing you can do about it. It is not a fun position to be in.

13 hr ago [Like](#) [Reply](#) [Share](#)





Rocky Willson • Richmond Beach Author



I have a few questions to ask:

First: Has anyone been denied the access to the beach by the new owner that they had under the old owner?

Second: My opinion is that the old system worked pretty good, and if there was a way that the new owner would take the same posture as the old owner, I think that might be the best solution. Does anyone share that opinion?

Third: I think a private owner might take better care of the area than the city could because the city has to follow due process, red tape, and budgetary constraints, use police resources, etc. If someone is doing something wrong on private property, the owner can just say, "Get off my property."

If the new owner were to say, "It is my intent to keep things as they were with the owner before me." Would others still want his land taken away by the city?

And finally, Fourth: Has anyone talked with the new owner of the property and heard his opinion?

I always try to follow the "do unto others" rule, and as a citizen of Shoreline, the city is doing this in my name, and I sure wouldn't like the city doing to me what I think they are doing to our new neighbor. I could be totally misinformed about the situation, but it sounds to me like there might not be a problem that needs to be solved.

If it ain't broken, maybe we shouldn't be trying to fix it.

Again, I could be totally misinformed. Please let me know if I am.



**Barbara T.** • Richmond Beach



Rocky this letter from the property owner's attorney gives a lot of information of what lead up to the city's decision to acquire this property.

<https://www.shorelinewa.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/55707>

1 hr ago   Like   Reply   Share



**Manny Dupper** • Richmond Beach



Once the city takes this property over, it will be public knowledge that it is public access to beach. As our population grows, this may be concerning to neighbors who struggle to find parking, and not want others taking up parking, and possibly using access for loud parties in front of their homes, etc. This is not a parcel of land that is a necessary eminent domain issue in my opinion. Keeping the property privately owned, and low key may prove best in the long term. If I was the owner, or one of the immediate neighbors, I would fight this city ambush!

2 hr ago   Like   Reply   Share

