

## Herbaugh, Melinda

---

**From:** Michael Richards <mikelrich@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2016 4:35 PM  
**To:** PRC  
**Cc:** O'Brien, Mike  
**Subject:** Project #: 3020114 / 6726 Greenwood Ave. N.

I'll first say that there should be little doubt that this project, and the self-absorbed developers pushing it through, are despised by the vast majority of residents in this neighborhood. That alone should be reason enough to put a halt to this building that simply does not fit in this neighborhood. Local residents clearly need more say in how our neighborhoods grow and develop in ways that enhance, rather than degrade, where we call home.

To highlight just a few of my many concerns about this project:

Parking: We've all heard repeatedly that the lack of parking in this neighborhood is already a major concern and source of stress. Adding 37 more vehicles to our residential streets takes it way over the top. The developer's own study shows the spillover from this project exceeds the capacity of legal street parking space available in the study area. There is good reason to believe that that estimate is even understated:

- Utilization counts were taken on weekdays. We who live and park here know well that Friday evenings and weekend evenings are truly the "peak" hours.
- The GTC analysis failed to include the 8 parking spaces currently used by the Kort Haus and Stumbling Goat behind the building. These spaces will be removed by this project.
- The GTC analysis reported there are "no natural or man-made barriers" throughout the 800 ft study area. Really? This is Phinney RIDGE, right? There happens to be very steep grades going both to the East and West from the building site - clearly in the study area. Just take a walk down 68th from Greenwood Ave to Fremont - and back. What about our elderly neighbors? Those with mobility impairments? Parents with young children, loads of groceries, home supplies? Inclement weather (ice and snow)? Those hills make a BIG difference.
- The GTC analysis included as available on-street parking all of the Restricted Parking throughout the business district along Greenwood Ave, Phinney Ave, and adjacent side streets. These 1 and 2 hour zones, and loading zones, are "time limited" throughout daytime hours. They are not suitable on any regular basis for residential use. Residents, including 6726 tenants, who ride the bus downtown to work cannot park in these areas. Those living here know well these areas offer very limited use for residential parking. They are for the Businesses along the Ave. The accepted "Guide" for conducting parking studies (DPD T9p #117) notes that these restricted zones are to be excluded from the study - along with driveways, fire hydrants, intersection areas, etc. There are well over 50 parking spaces captured in the GTC study that are "Restricted". This dramatically changes the results.
- The GTC study removed 3 spaces from the "Commercial" use counts based on an obscure statistic in an ITE manual stating that commercial use on "a non-December, non-Friday weekday" is limited - so they deducted 64% from the "commercial use" estimate, reducing it from 10 to 7 needed spaces! Really! A restaurant and bar will have reduced parking need on weekends - and throughout the Holidays? This cannot be justified in relation to residential on-street parking needs. They need to add those 3 spaces back into the count.

- In using the King County Right Size Parking Calculator, GTC entered the "Average Rent" as \$825. All indications are that market rate for studio apartments ranging in size from 230 to 325 sq ft, many with views, would be upwards and beyond \$1,000+/month. Increasing that average rent to a realistic number increases the parking demand ratio for that building.
- There is good reason to use "75%" of true legal capacity as the limit for "Full Capacity". This is the recommendation of DPD Tip 117. As parking utilization approaches closer to 100%, the difficulty of actually finding a parking space reasonably close to ones residence becomes increasingly more and more difficult. The incidence of illegal parking - relatively frequent throughout the neighborhood now - would increase sharply beyond 75%.

Expected New Neighbors: This project will be a building totally of small studios, some as tiny as 230 sq ft! These buildings are best described as "Glorified Dorm Rooms". They are known to have a tenant turnover of 12 to 14 months. Tenants are largely single, younger "workforce" individuals in transition - and NOT invested in the longer term neighborhood wellbeing. They would be expected to contribute little beyond purchasing food & drink locally. Just look up the reviews from other such projects built by Johnson and Carr. They deteriorate quickly, are poorly managed and poorly maintained. They do not attract a diversity of neighbors, families or elderly on a fixed income truly in need of affordable housing . Is this what would "Fit In" on Phiney Ridge? There are no building like this within 20 blocks (Ballard or N to 85th). This project does not promote diversity and can best be described as an "invasive downgrade" to our otherwise livable neighborhood!

Affordable Housing?: If 1/3 of income is going toward paying \$1,000/month in rent, these folks are earning over \$20/hour - and probably paying well over \$3.00 per sq ft! That is not "affordable" - even by the Mayor's definition.

Michael Richards,  
Longtime Phinney Neighbor