

## Herbaugh, Melinda

---

**From:** Tony Hacker <tonyhackerphd@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 24, 2016 9:00 AM  
**To:** PRC  
**Subject:** Public comment on project #3020338

From: Tony Hacker, 515 30<sup>th</sup> Ave E, Seattle 98112

To: Magda Hogness

Subject: Public Comment on Project #3020338, 2925 E Madison St

Date: October 24, 2016

I have been a resident and small-business owner in Madison Valley for nearly 20 years. I had hoped that for this second design review, the applicant would have made positive and substantive changes to their proposal. Instead, the applicant has made mere cosmetic changes that appear to deceptively obscure their near-total non-responsiveness to the board's recommendations. The applicant's proposal is not a good-faith effort to respond to the DR board or community input.

A partial list of the problems in the current design is:

\* In accordance with Seattle Municipal Code 25.11.080 and Director's Rule 16-2008, the developer was asked to provide a viable option that retains the exceptional trees identified on the lot. No genuine attempt is made to preserve the present canopy, or replace it in kind

\* This proposal is again inconsistent with design guideline DC1.C1. The entirety of the two-story garage remains above ground and open on Dewey, sending fumes, light, and noise onto single-family homes 23 feet away and over the entire northern end of the valley

\* The Board asked for more information before indicating their preference about vehicular access. The developer supports split-access approach with a traffic study that an independent traffic engineer analyzed and concluded failed because the traffic study was not a "...credible analysis using methods and assumptions consistent with procedures embraced by the City of Seattle." Furthermore, the proposed Dewey entrance "seems implausible" and "the feasibility of access exclusively on Madison" is questionable

\* This proposal is again inconsistent with design guideline DC2.B2. First, the Dewey side retaining wall will be taller than pedestrians, the green wall (if it is successful) may take a decade to fill in, and the setbacks are inadequate to grow trees to their full size, the net result is that the eastern façade, and the southern façade, rather than being, as was described, a "lush layered landscaping greenbelt," remain blank walls

\* This proposal is again inconsistent with design guidelines CS2.B2, PL2, and PL3. There would be an extremely unfriendly pedestrian experience on the east side

\* This proposal is again inconsistent with guideline CS2.D3. The 320-foot long eastern façade is a 74-foot tall wall, situated in a 40-foot zone, and abutting 25-foot homes. The northeast half of the building, which the Board expressed concerns about at the first EDG is *nearly double* the maximum height allowed

\* This proposal is again inconsistent with design guideline PL1.C2. The board and community requested community space. There is no community space offered as the applicant has identified the entrance to a supermarket as a gathering space. An entryway and dining area of a supermarket is for customers, not a public space.

Even though the applicant has rendered a pretty, lush expanse for the eastern façade, this is a travesty of deception. As currently proposed, this is an “anti-green” building that is disrespectful of our entire community. It is misplaced in its scale and scope and will have a detrimental impact on the area stretching from Madison Park to Capitol Hill. It is an attempt to squeeze every possible dollar out of this lovely property on the backs of the surrounding neighbors and the larger Madison Valley community.

Thank you for your and the board’s consideration of these vital concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Hacker