

Herbaugh, Melinda

From: Jill McGrath <jillmm@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 8:03 AM
To: PRC
Cc: O'Brien, Mike
Subject: Project:3020114 Phinney Flats_6726 Greenwood Ave N

To Whom it May Concern:
August 8, 2016

I am writing to comment on project 3020114 in Phinney. I am a long-term resident (23 years) of the Phinney Neighborhood, and I live just 1 block below the proposed development. Please add my comments to the SDCI documents list.

There are many issues and concerns about this proposal. I attended a recent neighborhood meeting where many residents expressed their concerns. I see the project as inconsistent with the community planning efforts for this area. Growth should pay for growth, as stipulated in the Growth Management Act. Communities should not bear the burden of growth, according to this Act. If these issues (below) aren't addressed by the developer, then the result in the community will mean we bear the financial and quality of life costs of this project. We can already see the burden that rapid development has placed on Ballard. No modifications to streets have been made in Ballard to accommodate the vast growth that has been pushed there rapidly. The buses there are overloaded already, without all of the new tenants moving in. The streets are narrow, and they can't now accommodate the traffic. The city has failed in that neighborhood to address the concerns of long-term residents and to require the developers to bear the costs of improving the roads, buses, and "light rail" to accommodate the growth. Of course, I laugh, because though Ballard used to be slated for the monorail, Ballard now has to wait the longest of any neighborhood to gain light rail -- even beyond supplying light rail to Redmond and other far-flung areas that have not had the rapid development. And there will never be light rail on Phinney itself.

I don't want this to also happen to Phinney Ridge.

Parking Concerns: I can speak for my immediate neighbors in stating that we don't mind grown along transit corridors like Phinney Greenwood if the growth is managed to maintain the neighborhood's unique characteristics and also to grow in a sensible manner. Of all of the developments now in the pipeline for our area, this single project comprises close to 50% of the total units to be built. No parking will be provided, however. We understand that the city wants to encourage use of mass transit etc. However, if the city continues to provide the limited buses and lack of light rail, not to mention adding to the narrow streets, it's still unrealistic to accommodate 60 new units (owners) with no parking provided. As a neighborhood, the parking spaces area already full. There have to be incentives for people to not own cars. There has to be basic things like congestion pricing so that the people who do drive during rush hour times have to pay more for the costs and air pollution etc. If you make driving more expensive FIRST, then more tenants would be motivated to bus it or bike etc. As it stands now, there are no incentives for using mass transit etc. This project also will eliminate 6 parking spaces which are currently behind the building, too. We also have concerns about no load or unload zones, so more current parking will be lost to accommodate that need. All of these things will result in significant less project costs for the developer (who is also providing NO low income housing), and it will be at the expense of the communities.

Traffic: 68th Street has direct access to HWY 99 south. A lot of traffic comes down 68th. This street is underlain by a spring (groundwater table under pressure) that daylight the at the base of the hill. Water seeps constantly from some cracks in the asphalt. The asphalt condition is thus poor. The proposed project would potentially bring many new cars, using this street. The steep slope and the water are a big problem for the city, and it could become a huge safety issue.

The steep slopes also mean that there will never be light rail on Phinney, and there is one bus that goes downtown -- the 5. There is not direct bus to the UW, though one parking study states that 50% of Phinney Flats commuters will be going to the UW. So having no parking, even while transit choices are limited, means that cars will be on the nearby streets, which are already full of cars. How can the city provide what is needed? Will the city repair the road before 8 more projects are put in on Phinney?

Environmental concerns: We know that there used to be a dry cleaner on the site. One report said that they are still waiting for a Dept. of Health report on whether there was a septic tank there. Perchloroethylene contaminates septic systems; it's well-documented. The sampling that was conducted by the developer's consultants resulted in detection of these contaminants in soil vapor, meter there were very few samples taken site wide, and it is unknown whether the soils were actually taken in the vicinity of the discharge/septic release of the old dry cleaner. Further, the soil samples were quite shallow. They installed soil probes to 10 feet and stated that they did not detect groundwater! Well, why is there so much water seepage, all the time, at the bottom of the street? And -- groundwater tests in this area are shown to be 3- or 40 feet underground, so of course they wouldn't find anything 10 feet under the top of the hill. Potential groundwater contamination NEEDS to be explored, and this alone qualifies this proposal for a determination of significance in the environmental review process. Tests need to be redone and more thorough.

I strongly encourage SDCI to make a determination of significance on this project. Density is coming to neighborhoods, but it can be done thoughtfully, where the developer works with the community and puts safety concerns first for the community.

Jill McGrath
6743 Palatine AVE N
Seattle, WA 98103

Safety: