

Dela Cruz, Jeff

From: Colleen Pacheco <colleenpacheco@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:34 PM
To: PRC
Cc: O'Brien, Mike; Torgelson, Nathan; Colleen Pacheco
Subject: project #3020114 6726 Greenwood Ave N

Hello,

I'm writing regarding the proposed development at 6726 Greenwood Ave N. I am a Phinney Ridge resident whose property corner abuts this proposed development and I'm deeply concerned about various issues ranging from environmental and parking issues to height without adequate transition from single family to the documented history of the developers who allow their tenements to wither without any maintenance.

I'd like to say upfront that I am NOT anti-development or anti-mass transit. I've lived in several cities back East and overseas that have wonderful multi-modality transit systems that allow individuals to get where they need to efficiently. It's unfortunate that Seattle isn't yet a city that's able to afford that to its residents or give them real options beyond taking hours to go anywhere east or west on buses or to take a bike down and up long hills. I feel deeply that as a society we all have to adapt and evolve, and we need to ensure there is increased density rather than urban sprawl in every metropolitan area - including my beloved city of Seattle. I am however AGAINST development that goes against the character of the neighborhood or that ignores the existing capacity of the neighborhood to absorb new housing without parking or REAL transportation options that conform to people's daily lives so that parking wasn't needed.

Below are the issues I feel need to be taken in to consideration when considering approving this proposal - and ask that they be rectified before moving forward:

- 1) Developers did not test for some key toxins and chemicals which would have been likely used during the time the dentist office and lab were in the same location - between 1937-1953. Mercury and lead. It looks like that while they mentioned these two businesses in the original permit application, the environmental assessment did not even mention these.
- 2) Developers only tested for the chemicals they did test for right next to the building and door but conducted no perimeter testing. I live on the perimeter and i understand that migration of toxins and chemicals is a real issue. They need to test on the perimeter AND they need to test at the level of excavation. Since they will likely have to excavate further down to build the foundation, do demolition and install utilities, they need to test at the level in which they will be disrupting the soil.
- 3) The foundation for this 40 ft high building seems quite shallow and I'd like to ensure it is up to earthquake code. In fact, i'd like to know how such a high building with shallow foundation is allowed? This is especially concerning in the face of an inevitable large earthquake that i hear is headed our way any time. I cannot afford to have a large building fall on my house - especially one in which i or my family may be home at the time, or in which I am expected to pay for all damage.
- 4) There has been alot of talk regarding transition such as 3 ft, 13 ft, etc. However, I live in a one story building that will now live next to a 4 story building. Where's the transition in that? Is our goal to turn into NYC or a very uniquely NW densely populated city that allows air, circulation, sunlight and livable neighborhoods where there's a true sense of community? I hope it's the latter. It's why after living in 21 locations in my life (as a renter), I've stayed in seattle 20 years (and now am fortunate to be a home owner).

5) We need a detention tank for storm water. I understand the piping system isn't designed for storm water.

6) I recognize that the "no parking" issue is something we have to change at the ballot box versus with these developers. HOWEVER, I need you to clarify why you will allow a project to move forward with no parking when the recent parking study the developer did showed 105% parking capacity. Doesn't the city say that 75% is capacity? how can 105% be allowed? I would like an explanation on this.

7) the previous point leads me to the fact that the decision of non-significance was based on an old parking study. It needs to be re-evaluated using another parking study - not the one the developers did as they still left out some additional peak times, but a new one. This parking study or decision has to also consider the issue of increased smart car utilization, a trend myself and neighbors are already encountering.

8) Often discounted but EXTREMELY important to those of us who live in the immediate vicinity is the fact that the reputation of these developers is disheartening. You too can look through reviews and see pictures of what can only be described as "slum landlording". Would you want to live next to a location? Come on Seattle, development at any price is what we may expect to find in other locations - not a city known worldwide for its beauty and progressive social and cultural values.

9) Lastly, Seattle which has been recognized nationwide for its leading role in global climate change - as it even has an Office of Sustainability and Environment, seems to be well position to demand this developer incorporate at least some elements of green design into its proposal. If Seattle hopes to meet its 20% energy savings by 2020, it seems to be a lost opportunity if you do not work with the developers to ensure they implement something - perhaps solar panels, green roofs, etc. Development should not be at any cost.

thank you,

Colleen Pacheco
6717 Phinney Ave N
Seattle WA 98103
206 783 7534