

Herbaugh, Melinda

From: Esther Bartfeld <ebartfeld@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 2:18 PM
To: PRC
Cc: Dorcy, Michael; Swallow, Lori; Baker, Roberta
Subject: (#30201114) Comments for 6726 Greenwood Design Review mtg 9.26.16
Attachments: 6726 comments for 9.26.16 DR mtg.pdf

Please include the attached comments in the file for the 6726 Greenwood Project (#3020114) and provide a copy to the Design Review Board before tonite's meeting. I will not be able to attend the meeting due to family matters.

Thank you,

Esther Bartfeld

P.O. Box 31932
Seattle, WA 98103
September 26, 2016

COMMENTS on 6726 Greenwood, (#3020114) for 9.26.16 Design Review Mtg

Dear Design Review Board, Michael Dorcy, Lori Swallow, and other SDCI staff:

The “revised” design for 6726 Greenwood is virtually indistinguishable from the version presented at the August 1, 2016 Design Review meeting where the height, bulk, scale and setback from adjoining properties were robustly criticized by the Design Review Board and condemned by the dozens of people who spoke at that meeting. **The proposal in its current form should NOT be approved by the Design Review Board.**

The only noticeable change is the marginally greater first floor setback at the north and south ends of the eastern edge of the building to create a five foot separation from the adjoining single family parcels to the rear. Virtually nothing else has changed. The height, bulk, and scale continue to violate the design review guidelines, and the overall height violates the height limits of the Code.

These comments incorporate by reference all of my prior written and spoken comments at previous design review meetings. In addition, please specifically note the following flaws that should prevent approval of the proposal in its current form:

1. This is a 48 foot building, not a 44 foot building as repeatedly indicated in the drawings.

The developer claimed both the additional 4 feet allowed when the first floor is 13 ft, AND an additional 4 feet for the clerestories that span almost the entire western side. The code does not allow both of these height extensions, and therefore this building is at a minimum 4 feet too tall. See SMC 23.47A.012.

2. The elevations listed in the drawings remain inconsistent and deceptive.

Compare the Site Plan on p6 of the 8.1.16 material with p 8 on the 9.26.16 version and note that the current version omits the 325.5 feet elevation at the NW corner and the 322.75 elevation on the NE corner.

And then note that the alleged height calculations shown on p12-15 use a 326.41 elevation for the starting point (1 foot higher than the NW corner, and 3.5 ft higher than the NE corner) and calculate upwards from there (although it is unclear how the first floor height is calculated).

The effect is an eastern side of the building (adjoining the single family zone) that is almost 4 feet higher than stated on the drawings. See page 12, north elevations showing clearly sloped land and the starting elevation several feet above grade at the rear line. In other words, the side of the building facing the single family zone, where the height, bulk, and scale impacts have been a major concern, is 4 feet higher than would have been allowed by code if the starting elevation were

calculated based on the rear part of the parcel. This violates City design guidelines CS2.D.2 (site characteristics), and the overall height, bulk, and scale continue to violate CS2.D and Phinney Guidelines CS2.H

3. The developer has still not provided proof that the additional four feet allowed with a 13-foot first floor will not block the views of Mt. Rainier and the Cascades from adjacent buildings.

Despite numerous requests from SDCI, this information has not been provided as of the Corrections Notice dated 9/4/16. To the contrary, it appears from the “Adjacencies” drawings on p21 of the 9/26/16 Design Review material that such views will indeed be blocked with this additional height. The additional four feet should not be allowed until there is verifiable and independent proof of all calculations and viewing angles used to make this required determination.

4. The elevator shaft, at 60 feet high, violates code requirements.

The elevator shaft remains at 60 feet tall even though several Board members at the 8/1/16 meeting commented that it was too tall and was the tallest shaft they had seen.

5. The second floor deck area in the southern 2/3 of the building violates the Seattle design review guidelines for zone transitions, massing choices, and respect for adjacent sites.

See specifically the drawing accompanying Design Guideline CS2D (“Reducing windows and decks overlooking neighboring residential property ...”).

6. What does “coordinating with SDOT” on bike parking mean?

Do the developers intend to usurp the limited street parking for bicycles? Do they really have SDOT approval or are they merely hoping for it? The Design Review board was concerned with the adequacy of bike parking in the building and so it is critical that a clear response if provided.

7. The color palate is too dark.

The Board requested a lighter color palette to help offset the hulking nature of this building. Instead, the current drawings depict a dark and looming massive box. A lighter color palate should be used.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

/s/

Esther Bartfeld

Phinney Ridge resident and

former PRCC board member