

January 25, 2010

To: Burien Planning Commission

From: Carol Jacobson  
3324 SW 172<sup>nd</sup> St  
Burien, WA 98166

RECEIVED

JAN 26 2010

Re: Shoreline Management Program

CITY OF BURIEN

I live on SW 172<sup>nd</sup> St. and my major concerns about the proposed Shoreline Management Program relate to public access issues and the negative impact that would surely have on our community. No one disagrees with the overall concept of preserving the shoreline ecology, and no one cares more about that than the people who actually live on the shoreline. However, we all share the same concerns about the negative effects that increased public access would have on this area. I am sure that the residents of Lake Burien have the same concerns for their community.

We live here for a reason: we love the peace and quiet and the beauty of this area. We don't want to see our community turned into anything that even remotely resembles Alki or Redondo or Greenlake. If we wanted to live in an area like that we would not have moved here. We have worked hard all our lives to be able to purchase a house in the Three Tree Point community, and we continue to pay an ungodly amount of taxes for the privilege of living here. It is not OK for this shoreline program or any other plan to result in anything that destroys the character of our community, lowers our property values, increases property damage and other crime, or decreases the safety of the residents who live here.

Increasing public access is contradictory to the stated purpose of shoreline management, which is protection of the shoreline ecology. More people = more trampling of shoreline, more litter/garbage/ more crime, more private property trespass and damage, and less safety for residents of these communities. Look at Alki, where a constant police presence is required for safety and crime concerns. Consider the cost of maintenance of more public access sites as well as additional police protection needed for public safety, not to mention the negative impact hundreds or thousands of more people will have on the ecology of the beaches. And where would all of these people park? Parking is so limited now that even residents in the community barely have space to park our own cars – and having visitors at your own house requires negotiation with neighbors for parking.

Even with the existing public access, we have people parking on our property with their car radios blaring at high volume, eating lunch at our picnic table, changing their baby diapers on the picnic table, leaving their garbage, throwing our possessions on to the beach, sleeping in their cars overnight parked in our lot, and then urinating in our lot before leaving. Most of these things have happened in the last 2 months and many times before. We have in the past found syringes, needles, and discarded condoms on our property. I have no interest in seeing this type of behavior and activity multiplied hundreds of times over with additional public access. According

CFTR : 2-1-10

CC : Scott Greenberg

PC : 1-27-10

to the maps in this document there are already 4 public access points in the immediate Three Tree Point area, plus Seahurst Park and Eagle Landing Park – how many do we need?

In Chapter IV, page 8, items a, b and c need to be clarified so that existing property along SW 172<sup>nd</sup> (and anywhere else potentially affected by these items) is not impacted or disturbed in any way in order to provide physical or visual access to the water. Reference to “unused right of way” in item c should be removed from the document. Nothing in the SMP should be allowed to negatively impact property or existing structures that were present before this act is approved, and homes and structures that exist now need to be grandfathered into this document. The same is true regarding the building restrictions that could prevent our ability to rebuild our homes as they now exist if they were damaged or destroyed. Existing homes and their footprints need to be grandfathered in wherever the proposed restrictions would prevent rebuilding as the home now exists .

Finally, this proposed Shoreline Management Program is not a plan. It should serve as the guidelines for any plans that are ultimately developed related to shoreline areas. The City of Burien may have a “plan” for our community, but we have not seen any such plan in writing. There needs to be assurance in the SMP that residents of affected communities (in this case Lake Burien and the Three Tree Point area especially) are involved in the development of any plans that affect us. There needs to be assurance that there is sufficient funding for any such plans and for the ongoing maintenance of public access areas, as well as for additional police protection that may be necessary to maintain the safety of the community. In addition, there needs to be some language that assures that developers and the City of Burien have to live by the same rules, regulations, and restrictions that this program places on private citizens.



Carol Jacobson