

Lisa Clausen

From: Public Council Inbox
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 8:52 AM
To: 'Chestine Edgar'
Subject: RE: attached letter relating to the King County Housing Authority Report on Area Y

Thank you for your message. It will be included in the Correspondence for the Record for a future Council meeting.

L. Clausen
City Manager's Office

From: Chestine Edgar [mailto:c_edgar2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2011 11:11 AM
To: Monica Lusk; Public Council Inbox; Lucy Krakowiak; Joan McGilton; Gordon Shaw; Rose Clark; Brian Bennett; Jack Block Jr.; Jerry Robison
Subject: Fw: attached letter relating to the King County Housing Authority Report on Area Y

To the City Council Members
To Monica Lusk

Attached is a letter that I would like to have entered into the public record relating to the annexation of Area Y. I believe that it warrants looking at- the environmental assessment report that it is contained in. The description of Area Y contained in this KC report in no way describes the area as one that can support itself and that will be able to pay its own way-for a very long, long time.

I encourage you to look this KC report over. It was missed by Berk in their review of the historical data.

Sincerely,
Chestine Edgar

CFTR: 09/12/11

To the Burien City Council
August 28, 2011
Re Annexation of Area Y

To the City Council;

In February, 2009; the King County Housing Authority prepared an Environmental Assessment for the Park Lane Homes-Site II project-the low income housing development right behind Evergreen High School. The authority hired a consultant from Bellevue to help in the preparation of this report.

Here are the comments the county and the consultant made about the area-Area Y-the off site community that this housing project belongs to-

A community which suffers from physical decline and disinvestment, high levels of crime and gang activity, incomes well below King County(KC) averages, and an overconcentration of subsidized rental housing.

Though some private infill residential development and commercial improvements have occurred in White Center in recent years, as a whole, White Center has not experienced a significant amount of private investment in its residential and commercial properties. Throughout the White Center area, newly remodeled storefronts are adjacent to boarded-up commercial buildings and well-maintained homes are adjacent to dilapidated housing.

The White Center business district to the west along 16th Avenue SW has a larger number and wider variety of businesses that include professional services (such as insurance), personal services (such as hair salons), retail (such as a hardware store), and a wide variety of ethnic restaurants and shops. Approximately 30 percent of these businesses are minority-owned (KCHA 2003). However, White Center has signs of disinvestments as well. Though in smaller relative numbers than in Top Hat, White Center has undeveloped and underdeveloped parcels, as well as deteriorated and boarded-up buildings. The relatively high incidence of poverty in the area has historically discouraged new and diverse commercial activity and revitalization efforts (KCHA 2003). White Center also has a variety of buildings with little or no visibility between the sidewalk and the inside of the business. Some of these, such as adult businesses, intend to block views of the inside, while others were simply not designed with windows facing the street. This lack of visibility onto the street creates an unfriendly pedestrian environment and encourages nuisance or criminal activity.

White Center, a community of approximately 21,000 people bordering the Seattle city limits (Figure 1.1-1), which, for more than 50 years, has been one of the poorest neighborhoods in the region. Very low household income and lack of public or private investment has fostered a range of problems typical of such communities including a high crime rate, gang activity, unemployment, and physical deterioration. Additional investment over the long term will be necessary to turn back the effects of a half century of concentrated poverty.

Additionally, this KC report notes that there is a high need for social and economic support to a significant number of families (25%) in Area Y. The poverty levels exceeds that of most of King County. Berk missed this report in preparing its analysis and I believe that it warrants review before Burien considers the annexation of Area Y.

Sincerely, Chestine Edgar