

## Herbaugh, Melinda

---

**From:** Andrew Kirsh <andrewkirsh@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2017 4:40 PM  
**To:** PRC  
**Subject:** project 3020338 comments for 3rd EDG meeting

Comments on project 3020338 for EDG meeting on 1/25/17.

The East Design Review Board gave the following guidance after the prior DRB meeting for this project.

"1. Height, Bulk, Scale and Massing Options: The Board acknowledged the public's concern with the height, bulk and scale of the proposal and agreed that the massing needed to further transition along Dewey and the single family zone...The Board...also agreed more effort is needed to respond to the site topography and context. The Board directed the applicant to return with a modified, hybrid massing option based on the guidance provided.

a. The Board unanimously agreed with public comment that additional setbacks should be provided to respond to the site topography and transition to the single family zoning. While refining the massing at this location the Board also recommended studying if there is potential to save some of the existing trees. (CS1-C, CS1-D, CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-D, DC2-A, DC3-C-3)

In order to address concerns about how the building height is calculated, the Board requested more information and if possible, verification that the calculation is code compliant for the next meeting. (CS1-C-2, CS2-D, DC2-A-1)"

My comments:

Response to topography: the latest design is no more responsive to the topography than the prior design. The Board requested but I do not see a verification that the misleading slope calculation is Code-compliant. What is more important is that the use of that calculation is inappropriate in this context. The purpose of EGD in design review is not to challenge the applicant to mine the land use code for accounting tricks, but to ensure that a project is sensitive to its site and neighborhood context. That calculation minimizes the slope, while the applicant simultaneously argues that the trees must be removed in part because of the steep slope.

The proposed massing on Dewey is still non-responsive to the guidelines listed above.

Trees: The Board requested analysis to see if any trees could be preserved. Instead, the applicant has presented arguments for removal. The arborist's report shows a high proportion of the trees on the slope in good structural condition and health. The reason for removal is often related to the aims of the applicant: ROW issues, for example. Preservation of the existing slope would obviate them and allow for extensive tree preservation.

The bulk of the proposed building and its resulting insensitivity to its context seem to be driven by the size and layout of the proposed retail grocery. Reduction in the size of the main retail space and placement of it on two levels (such as in the QFC on Broadway Ave. E. and the QFC in Wallingford) should be explored as potential solutions.

Thank you.

Andrew Kirsh