

From: [Lisa Dally Wilson](#)
To: [PRC](#)
Cc: [O'Brien, Mike](#); [Dorcy, Michael](#)
Subject: Project: 3020114 Phinney Flats_6726 GREENWOOD AVE N
Date: Monday, July 25, 2016 5:56:56 PM

I have a number of comments related to Project 3020114. I am a resident of the Phinney Neighborhood and reside three blocks directly downhill of the proposed development. Please add my comments to the project's SDCI documents list. There are many issues associated with this proposed development in its current state of application – many of which render the project inconsistent with the community planning efforts for the area. Growth should pay for growth, as stipulated in the Growth Management Act. Communities should not bear the burden. Currently there are a number of issues that, if not addressed, will result in the community bearing the financial and quality of life costs that should be addressed by the developer. There are a number of issues that have yet to be resolved, and that warrant additional study or a determination of environmental significance in the environmental review process.

Parking: Thank you for requiring a more robust parking study, and one that includes the 8 developments in the pipeline all within a few blocks of the subject project. Of all the developments in the pipeline, this single one comprises close to 50% of the total units in the pipeline. 52 parking spaces will be provided by the other projects and none will be provided by Phinney Flats which will consist of 60 residential units and commercial/retail parking needs. How is it possible that you are not requiring them to provide parking? The developers own consultant states that there is net parking demand of 36 units associated with the project (I've also seen 39, not sure which is most current). This is likely underestimated. I live 3 blocks from this location (and outside of the parking circles considered by the consultant) in a single family neighborhood and I have a very difficult time (at the present) finding parking in front of my home. The project will also remove the 6+spaces behind the current site. Lastly, the project is not providing space for load and unload on site, so more street parking spaces will be converted to loading zone in front of the building. All of these details result in significantly less project cost for the developer at the expense of the community.

Public Safety: It is extremely difficult to cross Greenwood Ave by foot from east to west at the intersection of 68th Street. One cannot see past all the cars parked on Greenwood (in front of the proposed project) and to the south where the arterial makes a significant curve. I have to walk half way out into Greenwood before I can determine whether I can cross the street to attend a yoga class. It is also very difficult to turn right or left in a vehicle from 68th to Greenwood for the same reasons. There is also a bike lane here. If you approve this development (along with the others in the pipeline), there must be some form of traffic signal or traffic calming device installed on Greenwood. The curving arterial combined with the footprint and parking situation posed by this project is a true public safety hazard.

Traffic: 68th Street is a direct access to HWY 99 south. Given the solid gridlock on I-5 south most times of the day, many more people are using HWY 99 and accessing it via 68th St. 68th St is underlain by a spring (groundwater table under pressure) that daylights at the base of the hill to the east and downhill of the proposed development. Seeps are constantly flowing onto 68th Street and

surrounding curbs and sidewalks (yes, even now, on July 25, 2016). Recently these springs have been marked (possibly by Seattle Public Utilities). As a result of the excess water that is present year-round in the street, the condition of the asphalt is exceedingly poor. The road is breaking up and more water is seeping out. The proposed project and all of the other projects predict that 95 additional cars will be using the neighborhood. They will use 68th as a secondary arterial (second only to Greenwood). Frankly, the steep slope and the water issues on this road are a huge problem and presently turning into a safety issue. Again, growth should pay for growth. Will the City repair the road before citing 8 more projects at the top of the hill?

Infrastructure:

- Transit – there will never be light rail in the area, the east-west bus routes are limited to 20 blocks away in either direction due the steep slopes of Phinney Ridge, there is no direct bus to the University of WA (one parking study says that 50% of the Phinney Flats commuters will be going to the UW), and there is one bus (#5) that regularly runs on Greenwood to downtown. Please see other comment letters regarding the commute times to Phinney Ridge from Northgate and the UW. Why on earth would a student live here and depend on bus transportation. If you are going to build apodments here and turn this into Ballard, provide transit alternatives first please.
- Drainage/Sewer – has there been a capacity study done that accounts for the additional sewer load on the system AND the additional “stormwater” (much of which is actually spring water discharging to a series of e-w streets below the subject development)?. I believe there are issues with combined sewer/stormwater systems in this area. Has this been addressed? If not, it needs to be.

Contamination Potential and Site Remediation: Soil contamination. The Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments indicate that there was a dry cleaner located on this site at one time. One report said that they were still waiting for the Dept of Health to report on whether there was a septic tank(s) affiliated with the dry cleaning site. Perchloroethylene contamination from septic systems associated with historic dry cleaning facilities is well documented in the literature. The sampling that was conducted by the developer’s consultants resulted in detection of those contaminants in soil vapor, yet there were very few samples taken site wide, and it is unknown whether the samples were actually taken in the vicinity of the discharge/septic release of the old drycleaner. Furthermore, the soil samples were relatively shallow. This information clearly calls for additional sampling and analysis. Also, they installed soil probes to a depth of 10 feet and reported they did not detect groundwater. Well, clearly!! Groundwater in this area is located 30-40 feet below ground surface (noted in the Phase I ESA) and daylights down the hill, 2 blocks away. There is currently one spring at the base of the hill that seeps water with a colorful sheen, likely from historic uses at the top of the hill at 68th Street. Potential groundwater contamination from the project site should also be explored. THIS ALONE QUALIFIES THIS PROPOSAL FOR A DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS.

-
-

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE SDCI TO MAKE A DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE ON THIS PROJECT.

The potential contamination issue in addition to the lack of compatibility with adjacent uses and previous community planning efforts and the comp plan call for a full EIS. Furthermore, lack of appropriate infrastructure (roads and drainage), parking and traffic call for additional consideration.

I'm ok with density, but please, do it thoughtfully. If the developer will not work with the community, please consider the true environmental and social impacts of this project.

THANK YOU for considering my comments.

Lisa Dally Wilson

547 North 68th Street
Seattle, 98103

-

PS. I would like to second the comments of Henry Brandis on both the Traffic Study and the MUP, submitted April 5th.