

Dela Cruz, Jeff

From: Tony Hacker <tonyhackerphd@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 11, 2017 2:08 PM
To: PRC
Subject: Project 3020338, 2925 E Madison St, 6-6-2017 MUP Public Meeting Comments

June 6, 2017 MUP Public Meeting Comments

Project #: 3020338, 2925 E. Madison St.

Attn: PRC

Magda Hogness, Planner

Dear Magda:

My name is Tony Hacker. I've been a resident and a small business owner in Madison Valley for almost 20 years. I want to thank you for taking the time and giving us, the community, a chance to share our comments with you this evening.

Trying to fit the proposed design into this site is like trying to shove a very large, square peg into a small, round hole. It won't work. However, all the major problems with this project *can* be resolved with significant reductions in the height, bulk, and scale.

The present design: flouts design review guidelines; ignores previous direction from the design board from EDG1, 2 and 3; contradicts the intent of multiple Seattle municipal codes; and disregards many of the goals and policies of the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

And, remarkably, after all the public comment to the contrary, this project is ***larger in bulk and scale*** than the first design, presented over a year ago!

Specifically, regarding buffers and zone transitions, the project site is adjacent to less intensive zones on three sides, and it is inconsistent with all five of the design guidelines that address the height, bulk, and scale of zone transitions (CS2.D.1-5). For instance:

- *Existing Development and Zoning (CS2.D.1)*: a 66-foot tall building does not belong across a narrow, alley-like street from SF-5000 zoned, single family homes; it would be 23 feet from *my* home;
- *Zone Transitions (CS2.D.3)*: there *is no* transition between zones – a 6-story building would be adjacent to (to the south) and across the street (to the east) from a single-family zone, resulting in the shading of an entire block on the east side and a blank wall to the south;
- *Massing Choices (CS2.D.4)*: clearly, the project does not, as the guideline states: “strive for a successful zone transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone”;
- *Respect for Adjacent Sites (CS2.D.5)*: this project does not respect adjacent sites to the north, east, or south.

Magda, you’ve encouraged the board in your guidance to address the height, bulk, and scale. A solution to the buffer and transition problems is at hand – by using the existing tree canopy or replacing it at least 1 for 1, the bulk and scale of the project would be reduced, and adequate buffers and appropriate zone transitions would be maintained.

I ask you and SDCI to require the applicant to take the necessary steps to address and mitigate a project that would have massive and destructive impacts for the entire Madison Valley.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Hacker