

Camacho, Rudy

From: Irene Wall <iwall@serv.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2016 11:32 AM
To: Dorcy, Michael; PRC
Cc: Baker, Roberta
Subject: Electronic version of comments on 6726 Greenwood (#3020114) and a related question
Attachments: Irene Wall Comments on EDG for 6726 Greenwood.pdf

Michael,

I gave you a hard copy of my comments last evening at the EDG session and am following up with an electronic copy for posting on the website so you don't have to scan the document.

I also have a procedural question that you can perhaps answer. Assuming that this project receives a Master Use Permit, that permit is valid for 2 years or is extendable for some valid reason. Correct? If during that period of time when the MUP remains valid, legislation is passed creating the inclusionary zoning proposals now envisioned as the "Grand Bargain" allowing additional height, will the project be subject to any further design review if the developer chooses to add the extra height (and units) to the project?

Thank you,

Irene Wall

11/11/16

Comments on 6726 Phinney Development Project 3020114 2nd Early Design Guidance Phase
From Irene Wall, iwall@serv.net – 207 North 60th St., Seattle, WA 98103

The project has not sufficiently matured since the initial EDG and presents no alternatives that show any significance differences in approach to this site. The project should return for one more EDG that shows real alternatives in scale and layout, and more information about public aspects of the building.

No Real Differences

Alt	Units	Commercial Area	Height
Alt A	54	4,200sf	48' w/ clerestories
Alt B	55	3,800sf	48' w/ clerestories
Alt C	57	3,700 sf	48' w/clerestories

The lot is 8,000 SF and abuts SF homes. The concepts presented are not in scale with the homes to the east or the 2 existing multifamily apartments to the South. The lot is much smaller than the condo development sites to the north and across Greenwood to the West. An appropriate response to these conditions is a SMALLER BUILDING overall with more generous setbacks on the east side to create a real transition to the SF zone.

The fact that Isola has a 10-foot setback is not permission to have a similar inadequate setback. This project should have 15-foot setbacks from the property line at the 2nd level. Showing setbacks from the adjacent homes, i.e. appearing to count the neighboring back yard to give the illusion of generous setbacks is "cheating."

The preferred alternative C shows the least amount of commercial space. This is contrary to a neighborhood COMMERCIAL district. The amount of commercial space should be maximized even if this means building fewer residential units. However this comment is not an endorsement of Alternative A.

Property owners on the east needs a minimum of 5 feet to be able to paint or otherwise maintain their garages. Anything less than that is exceedingly rude if not illegal as they would "take" from the current property owner the right to maintain his/her property.

The response to the Board's questions about bike parking is addressed by inferring that other buildings store bikes in the residential lobby. This is hardly an appropriate place to store bikes and does not meet the intent of the design guidelines to create a transition from commercial to residential character. Bikes belong in garages or a separate utility spaces. Storing bikes in such a visible location is more likely to result in break-ins and theft.

Concept A with access to units from exterior walkways reads like a motel. Also this provides very little privacy for any unit since to get light they will be looking into their close neighbor's windows.

The Greenwood/Phinney design guidelines placed an emphasis on the views from the ridge. This building should be designed to maximize the public view down the 68th street view corridor not a solid mass at the corner.

The south façade is a total blank wall facing adjacent residential apartments. This needs much more explication as to an appropriate treatment.

The addition of the clerestories only increases the perception of height and bulk, reduces the sun exposure on the street and does not contribute to the appearance of the building. It does allow the owner to charge more rent and that appears to be the motive, not good design.

The tiny live/work units are not big enough to accommodate real work plus living space.

Any commercial tenants will suffer for lack of parking especially since 30% (by the developers estimate) of tenants will have cars and there is no extra street parking in the vicinity. This will create a hostile environment when competition for available street spaces gets worse.