

Herbaugh, Melinda

From: Hogness, Magda
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2016 2:55 PM
To: PRC
Subject: FW: Project #3020338 - E Madison PCC development

Please upload and add as a party of record to 3020338. Thanks!

From: James Pacyga [mailto:jimpacyga@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 10:04 AM
To: Hogness, Magda <Magda.Hogness@seattle.gov>
Subject: Ref: Project #3020338 - E Madison PCC development

Magda-

Thanks for hosting last night's EDG #2 for the E Madison St PCC project at Seattle U. It was well managed and well moderated.

I noted that most of the commentary and concern revolves around the facade as it faces E Dewey and the concern about "disruption" to the neighborhood by ingress/egress to the project from/to E Dewey. The city currently mandates (i.e., a design with NO DEPARTURES) that access to projects for services & parking be located off the main thoroughfare (E Madison in this case), however, the current preferred option includes access on both E Madison and E Dewey (commercial and residential, respectively).

I have two areas of concern regarding the design aspect of the building: (a) access planning and (b) the Dewey side facade.

Access Planning

While I understand that traffic is not a concern of the EDG function, the project plan of record for access is a responsibility. As such, I would urge the committee to respect and consider the commentary of the President of the Madison Park Association(?) at last night's meeting. E Madison is extremely congested during peak hours and adding additional traffic to it directly from this project would be hazardous to residents and those attempting to access Madison Park during these hours.

During the meeting, I noted that one of the EDG board members referenced the Greenlake PCC project in terms of access ways stating that in that all project traffic there was on the main thoroughfare. Assuming she was referencing the E 71st St PCC in Greenlake, this is NOT TRUE. The loading facility has access on both 5th Ave and E 71st Streets to avoid reversing and the parking is separated away from the loading area on E 71st Street. Unfortunately, this configuration is not an option with the extreme difference in grades for the E Madison project.

Furthermore, as a resident of the area since 2003 located two blocks off of Madison on 28th Ave E, we have a similar situation - commercial traffic for Luc, Araya and other businesses load/unload on 28th Ave E - a residential street. However, we don't have the option to locate this within a structure to help abate noise (imagine hundreds of wine bottles being dumped at 0530 from Luc). We have worked with the businesses to limit traffic to reasonable hours (e.g., moving recycle collection from pre-dawn to after 0730). The city's stance is that Madison is a commercially zoned district and within a block or two, commercial traffic is a reality. Dewey place residents face the same situation, and while I can empathize with them, I would rather see

the right choices made that keep Madison from choking on increased traffic and a new level of commercial loading that would paralyze it.

I intimately understand the concerns of the Dewey residents, however the fact is they reside within a block of E Madison and need to accept this fact and move on lest we have an even more unsavory project with even greater impact in the future given new zoning that will come into effect for this area in the near term.

While I would vote to have all access on Dewey in accordance to the city directives, I would agree to a compromise where it is split assuming appropriate traffic measures are tied to the project (perhaps funded by the developer) to eliminate the impact of any proposed traffic upticks that this project is bound to create.

Dewey facade

This problem seems to be holding up the board. I completely understand that a looming wall is an unkind way to treat the existing residents. I believe that the developer has given up quite a bit in terms of ultimate value (by shrinking residential and commercial footprints) and yet the residents and developer remain at loggerheads.

I might suggest that other cities have faced this same issue with radically different grades such as Edinburgh in Scotland. In many cases developments here chose to treat each side of the building as if it was important as the other. That is, instead of a blank wall on the level off the main street, the project had two separate “primary” facades with “value add” on both instead of treating one as a null space. While I believe, that having retail on E Dewey would not fare well, this side of the building could benefit from the mixed use aspect of the project. Perhaps small footprint townhouses could be included on this side to make it residential (like those that have been erected on E Madison & 26th Ave E).

The Dewey facade could benefit from additional stepping and green treatment of these steppes or from considering the addition of stand-alone residential (townhouses) to be more in sync with the residential environs while providing access for resident's parking.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jim Pacyga
601 28th Ave E