## Camacho, Rudy

From: Laurie Ann Taylor < laurieanntaylor@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2016 9:20 PM

To: PRC

**Subject:** Ref: 6726 Greenwood Development Project --

Dear Mr. Dorcy,

I'm writing to voice my deep concern ask for your help regarding proposed development on Phinney Ridge.

My husband and I own a home at 418 N. 68<sup>th</sup> St. and have lived in the neighborhood with our kids for 20 years.

The proposed development of a micro housing building 59 units + is in no way an appropriate style of development for Phinney Ridge. We attended the meeting whereby design plans were presented and left feeling disgusted by the lack of attention given to the Phinney Neighborhood Development plan and the 75 neighbors who attended the meeting. There was NO discussion of traffic, parking or the Phinney Corridor development/design plans already in place.

The traffic up and down our street will drastically affect the safety of our neighborhood most of the single family homes have kids who walk to and from school. Almost everyone is out often walking dogs. Everyone walks, bikes and parks in the neighborhood. A building with a clearly stated business plan to maximize every inch of property with – 59 units slated openly to have "frequent turnover" plus commercial businesses is not in any way the style of development that aligns with the Phinney Development plan.

As I recall, units seem to be about 275 ft. The move-in access is all off of  $68^{th}$ , a neighborhood residential street. There is no parking (at all-for the restaurants, or for the 1-2 residents per unit) or any plan to manage integration with the neighborhood. We were explicitly told that It will be "handed" over to a management company so the owners will have very little to do with the project once it's built. They mentioned students, baristas, and others as typical tenants. That said, there is no proximity here to universities or for that matter direct bus service to universities. The owners Kelton Johnson and Tyler Carr seem to have NO familiarity with this area. They were asked about what else they've built and they quickly referenced their other "model" project which is above Safeway off of  $85^{th}$ ? North of  $85^{th}$  is clearly a different area (less single family -) and or other high density areas of the city.

I can't begin to express how concerned we are and for that matter hopeful that you can help us stop this process or modify what is allowed moving forward. Is there a way to amend the zone or building application process?

Sincerely,

**Laurie Taylor**