

Camacho, Rudy

From: Laura Reymore <laurareymore@cbbain.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 10, 2016 10:42 PM
To: PRC
Subject: Project number 3020114 attention Michael Dorcy
Attachments: Laura's letter to Dorcy for 2nd design comments.docx

January 9, 2016

To: Mr. Michael Dorcy

From: Laura Parris Reymore

Re: Project # 3020114 at 6726 Greenwood Ave N, Seattle, WA 98103

I own the building immediately to the South of the proposed project. My building sits back 8 feet from the property line. The space between the shared property line and my building is green space and is used by my residents for open space, recreation and service activities.

My building was mislabeled in the applicants' proposals as a 3 story building. It is a 2.5 story 6-unit apartment building with the first level a basement level and has north facing windows that overlook my open space. This proposed project with no set back at the ground level and with no setbacks above does not respect my adjacent site per the design guidelines.

According to the City Design Guideline's, Section CS2 Urban Pattern and Form, Guideline D5, Respect for Adjacent Sites states, "the project should respect adjacent property with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy and outdoor activities in adjacent buildings."

The diagram on page 6 of the design guidelines, suggests the solution: a setback of 5 feet at the ground level and additional meaningful setbacks for the upper floors. (City Design Guideline's, Section CS2 Urban Pattern and Form, Guideline D5,)

Further, the preferred option by the applicants is a south facing 48 high wall that would allow little light for vegetation in my green space area. The proposed building will have grass on the roof top and my tenants will have a mud pit instead of grass.

Regarding the massing choices, the design guidelines suggest striving for a successful transition by lowering building heights and or matching the scale of adjacent properties. The Red Mill restaurant is a single story building, Starbucks is a single story building, the two multi-family buildings are both 2.5 stories and the proposed building at 4.5 stories is clearly not creating a successful transition. This proposed building is simply too large for the site.

The transitions as defined in DC2 #3 regarding height, bulk and scale to the single family homes on the east property line of the proposed building is still unacceptable. Any privacy these homeowners enjoyed in the past will be eliminated if any of these current proposals are allowed based on the 3 options submitted.

None of the new design proposals adequately addresses the suggestions of the design review board's request for different choices for their review. Each new design simply re-labels the previous design options and does not go far enough to eliminate the concerns of the adjacent property owners. The developers have not yet accommodated requests to meet with all adjacent owners and I hope that they will do so in a timely manner so that the input can be incorporated into a next round of design options.

It is clear that based on the design guidelines themselves, these options need to again be subjected to another design guidance meeting and to an environmental review. The State Environmental Protection Act was enacted to ensure that developments would meet the law's criteria. This proposal must be vetted to meet and support the intent of the law.

The developer has not offered any real options, has ignored the design guidelines and the board's specific guidance for what was required for this meeting. This project therefore requires another EDG meeting where real options are presented that all comply with the design guidelines and the board's guidance.

January 9, 2016

To: Mr. Michael Dorcy

From: Laura Parris Reymore

Re: Project # 3020114 at 6726 Greenwood Ave N, Seattle, WA 98103

I own the building immediately to the South of the proposed project. My building sits back 8 feet from the property line. The space between the shared property line and my building is green space and is used by my residents for open space, recreation and service activities.

My building was mislabeled in the applicants' proposals as a 3 story building. It is a 2.5 story 6-unit apartment building with the first level a basement level and has north facing windows that overlook my open space. This proposed project with no set back at the ground level and with no setbacks above does not respect my adjacent site per the design guidelines.

According to the City Design Guideline's, Section CS2 Urban Pattern and Form, Guideline D5, Respect for Adjacent Sites states, "the project should respect adjacent property with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy and outdoor activities in adjacent buildings."

The diagram on page 6 of the design guidelines, suggests the solution: a setback of 5 feet at the ground level and additional meaningful setbacks for the upper floors. (City Design Guideline's, Section CS2 Urban Pattern and Form, Guideline D5,)

Further, the preferred option by the applicants is a south facing 48 high wall that would allow little light for vegetation in my green space area. The proposed building will have grass on the roof top and my tenants will have a mud pit instead of grass.

Regarding the massing choices, the design guidelines suggest striving for a successful transition by lowering building heights and or matching the scale of adjacent properties. The Red Mill restaurant is a single story building, Starbucks is a single story building, the two multi-family buildings are both 2.5 stories and the

proposed building at 4.5 stories is clearly not creating a successful transition. This proposed building is simply too large for the site.

The transitions as defined in DC2 #3 regarding height, bulk and scale to the single family homes on the east property line of the proposed building is still unacceptable. Any privacy these homeowners enjoyed in the past will be eliminated if any of these current proposals are allowed based on the 3 options submitted.

None of the new design proposals adequately addresses the suggestions of the design review board's request for different choices for their review. Each new design simply re-labels the previous design options and does not go far enough to eliminate the concerns of the adjacent property owners. The developers have not yet accommodated requests to meet with all adjacent owners and I hope that they will do so in a timely manner so that the input can be incorporated into a next round of design options.

It is clear that based on the design guidelines themselves, these options need to again be subjected to another design guidance meeting and to an environmental review. The State Environmental Protection Act was enacted to ensure that developments would meet the law's criteria. This proposal must be vetted to meet and support the intent of the law.

The developer has not offered any real options, has ignored the design guidelines and the board's specific guidance for what was required for this meeting. This project therefore requires another EDG meeting where real options are presented that all comply with the design guidelines and the board's guidance.