

From: rkadeg@comcast.net
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [PED Public Comment](#); [Carl Cole](#); [Gwen Voelpel](#)
Subject: Adoption of King County Planning Policy
Date: Saturday, February 26, 2022 2:04:30 AM

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Council Members and Interested Residents:

It has come to my attention that the King County Planning Policies (CPPs) (Proposed No. 2021-0254.3 – ref.Ord.19384), currently before the Planning and Economic Development Committee (PED) is slated to come before a full vote of the council on March 8th,2022. **I urge the council in the strongest terms to NOT ratify and NOT adopt the county CPPs through passage of a council resolution (option #2 in PED memo).** In this policy document, certain interests of King County are radically divergent with those of the city i.e., the residents of SeaTac. In particular, those policies relating to low-income apartments/dwellings and homeless housing. Following are reasons:

1). As early as 2017, I put before the council documentation that **the City of SeaTac already bears a disproportionate, unfair burden of low-income housing within King County** and also in comparison with the City of Seattle. This is contrary to testimony that “the City of SeaTac needs more low-income housing”. Following is a portion of my testimony to the council from August 2018 regarding changes to the SMC. While values could be updated, the proportion has not dramatically changed. However, low-income housing continues to increase here. Note in particular the promises (broken?) concerning development near the light rail improvement district:

“The absolute last thing the city needs, if it is ever to develop in a positive direction, is more low-income housing! Consider the following facts

The recent U.S. Census data provides the following information for the city:

<i>city</i>	<i>SeaTac</i>	<i>Des Moines</i>	<i>Burien</i>	<i>Tukwila</i>	<i>Kent</i>	<i>Seattle</i>
<i>population</i>	<i>29,140</i>	<i>31,238</i>	<i>51,671</i>	<i>20,144</i>	<i>128,458</i>	<i>724,745</i>
<i>median income, \$</i>	<i>48,487</i>	<i>59,948</i>	<i>54,546</i>	<i>48,490</i>	<i>61,033</i>	<i>74,458</i>
<i>In poverty %</i>	<i>18.1</i>	<i>13.6</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>21.5</i>	<i>15.2</i>	<i>13.0</i>
<i>owner occupied %</i>	<i>48.7</i>	<i>59.2</i>	<i>52.6</i>	<i>37.7</i>	<i>55.1</i>	<i>46.2</i>
<i>Home value \$</i>	<i>246,100</i>	<i>266,500</i>	<i>290,500</i>	<i>248,600</i>	<i>262,800</i>	<i>484,600</i>

This[below] is a small sampling of the available data, but it clearly illustrates the present status.

*According to Affordable Housing On Line, there are 4 complexes with a total of 589 units dedicated to low income apartments in SeaTac (Angle Lake Court, Angle Lake Senior Housing, Windsor Heights and Pine Ridge Apartment Homes). However, this is not an accurate accounting. Reserve at SeaTac indicate 6 complexes but includes some in Tukwila near the border. In SeaTac, the Section 8 Corinthian Apartments owned by King County were not included, nor any of the complexes along Military Road from 150th north. Affordable Housing also indicates there are 993 other rental apartments in SeaTac without rental assistance that would be considered low-income housing. Thus, using a conservative estimate of 1,700 units, with 3 individuals per unit indicates there is already low-income housing available for 17 to 20 percent of the entire city population - just in apartments! This does NOT include the numerous single-family residences that have turned into "group" homes, rented out by the heirs of the original owners, or other privately owned rental dwellings. The data are not immediately available to estimate this number; two of six homes on my street alone fit this category and talking with my neighbors this is not exceptional. **It is realistic to suggest that 25 percent of the city's population currently lives in low-income housing!** **SeaTac falls at or near the worst status in every category in King County related to income and housing.** These statistics support the contention that SeaTac (and its neighbors) already support more than their fair share of low-income families and associated low-income housing in King County.*

As part of the light rail development, the city leaders and staff at that time made promises and commitments that the associated city improvement district and environs would target high wage, highly educated families employed in the associated downtown Seattle towers, together with new upscale businesses that service them (including destination businesses/restaurants). This is also what the Kingen family [original developer] was told and believed as well - as relayed to me in personal conversations with family members and their representatives at that time. It is incumbent upon the city to keep its promises to the tax-paying residents. Providing a partial solution to Seattle's low-income housing problem, once again at the expense of SeaTac residents, is neither visionary nor in keeping with the previously stated goals and objectives of economic development. Likes attract likes - build more low-income rental housing, and the city will get more low-income transitory residents, as those with more means continue to flee the city."

The above estimated low-income units do not include the estimated 385 units presently under construction by Inland at 154th and International Boulevard. **Thus, on a per capita basis SeaTac already has more low-income and subsidized housing than any other city in the county!** As

noted in the related PED memo, the proposed CPP fails to recognize or address the current uneven, disproportionate distribution of low-income housing within the county.

2). Housing prices continue to accelerate in King County. They are up 10.6 percent on average from last year. However, at the same time, prices in SeaTac were up only 7.2%. Median home prices in SeaTac are currently \$170,000 less than either Seattle or King County. SeaTac remains the most affordable city to live in the county (Source: Redfin reality stats).

Construction of even more low-income housing is not going to benefit the citizens of SeaTac. It will simply attract more low-income families or homeless people from Seattle and environs.

3). If such housing becomes policy, the tax burden is thus shifted disproportionately to long-time ageing residents at or approaching retirement, with developers gaining long-term deferred tax breaks. Why should SeaTac residents who through years of hard work own their homes, but now on fixed incomes (presently impacted by inflation) be expected to subsidize Seattle's/King County's housing problems? Adoption of the proposed county CPP thus penalizes our long-time residents.

4). The purpose of incorporation of the city was in a significant part to gain local control by the residents. Adopting the county CPP as presently proposed would yield precisely the opposite. Our local interests do not always coincide with those of the county, and there is no compelling basis to relinquish the control residents worked so hard to gain.

5). The related impacts of regional facilities (transfer stations, jails, mental health/behavior facilities, homeless accommodations, etc.) in South King County and within or adjacent to SeaTac are not considered in the proposed CPP, as noted in the PED memo. With the large Bow Lake Transfer Station and the Regional Jail alone, on a per capita basis SeaTac again leads the way in significant adverse facility impacts in comparison with the rest of the county. This of course does not even broach the subject of impacts associated with the 10th largest airport in the nation. The city's unique situation demands special carve-outs and considerations within the CPP to achieve some equitable balance of impacts. In short, it is far too easy for county planners to conclude "this area is already degraded, we can locate impactful facility "XYZ" or homeless temporary housing in SeaTac".

6). Again, as noted in the PED memo, the application in the proposed CPP of standards/terms like efficiency without further clarification and/or extensive rewrites can be easily misconstrued to perpetuate historical and current inequities as described above in SeaTac and South King County.

7). As I understand it, the city staff and council together with other South County cities have participated in discussions/comments with the county for an extended period regarding some of these concerns, with little or no response forthcoming. The city should continue to present its reasonable case, together with other South County cities, and not just adopt what the county provides due to pressure from it or the GMA stipulations. Again, the interests of

SeaTac residents should come before county bureaucrats or politicians.

8). Recognize there has been a deliberate, subtle effort by some King County Council members (past/present?) over the years to concentrate less desirable or impactful facilities and subsidized housing in South King County, preserving/protecting certain elite neighborhoods in other areas. Not acceptable! To adopt the proposed county CPP is to place SeaTac on a track towards the low-cost housing slum of the county forever.

9). The planning policies, especially for the city, should focus on economic development/improvement, not low-cost housing. The objective as suggested by some council members should be to increase the earning ability/wages and quality of life (e.g., available services/businesses) for existing SeaTac residents. **Improve the lot of extant residents, not encourage the influx of outside dependents.** Encourage education/training. Some programs already exist, but participation has been limited. Good wage jobs at the airport go unfulfilled.

10). Another objective not specifically addressed should be to keep the cost of home ownership as low as possible – an important distinction from low-income housing. Home ownership is a win-win for the resident and the city. In the recent past (now 8 years), the council has been able to support this objective by not raising local property taxes and negotiating good utility contracts, as well as offering such services as the free home repair program. Planning documents should encourage the permanence of home ownership as opposed to the transience that rental units (apartments or otherwise) bring. Rentals are an important piece, but are best viewed as transitional to home ownership, which brings personal economic enhancement/freedom, permanence, and encourages development of community. This fact often seems lost in the authoring of planning documents.

Again, please vote for PED memo option #2, a resolution to Not ratify the proposed King County Planning Policies. Thank-you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Roger Kadeg, SeaTac resident/homeowner

From: [A Liberty](#)
To: [PED Public Comment](#)
Subject: Low income housing
Date: Friday, February 25, 2022 1:50:08 PM

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

I own a home in Seatac, we don't need more low income housing, we have it all over king county. What you need to do is not defund our police officers, the government keeps wasting money on the homeless who in my opinion don't want to work and want everything given to them. The laborers union is located in DesMoines these people can get on the D list and get a job

Making a prevailing wage. If this keeps up people are not going to want to live her.

Concerned resident
Angelia Liberty

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)