

From: Tony Hacker
To: [PRC](#)
Subject: Project # 3020338
Date: Monday, May 22, 2017 8:39:48 AM

I appreciate this opportunity to express my views about three aspects of the proposed project. I hope you'll consider them.

While the project has many challenges, all of them stem from the project being far too large – too tall (height) and too massive (bulk and scale). Prior design reviews were not compelled to, but did permit the applicant's method of calculating the allowable, buildable height. However, by selectively allowing 'legal' code loopholes for the height calculations, as well as permitting the removal of an urban forest canopy situated on a 30,000 cubic yard steep slope, this proposed project flies in the face of the spirit of several City codes and many Design Guidelines. I implore SDCI to have the applicant reduce the building height, based on Design Guidelines (CS2-B.1, CS2-C.2, CS2-D.11, CS2-D.4, CS1-C, CS2-B, CS2-D.3, and CS2-D.4)

Second, the proposed clearing and removal of so much vegetation, of so many significant trees, is inconsistent with Design Guideline CS1-D.1 and D.2. The 100 year-old urban tree canopy on this site provides an unbroken connection between the Arboretum, through the Mercer Madison Woods, and on to Harrison Ridge. It is clear there is at least one exceptional tree and an exceptional grove. Not just the Design Guidelines, but also the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan, address the necessity of preserving just this kind of green space, while also absorbing increased density. The current proposal does not respect City of Seattle policies on tree retention and protection of critical areas, nor the goal and policies of the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan. The applicant proposes a 5000 square foot small tree-and-container garden to replace a 14,000+ square foot urban forest. I urge SDCI to require that the entire canopy of 14,000 square feet be recognized as such and replaced. The final landscape must include some larger trees, with room for layers of vegetation and trees of different sizes to grow.

Finally, there is no data in the applicant's traffic study to support that the Dewey entrance would remove any significant traffic burden from Madison, while it would severely degrade Dewey Place, a narrow, non-conforming street, used mainly by pedestrians. Moreover, there is new data showing that the applicant does not have enough on-street loading capacity for the proposed supermarket that will require 25-35 large trucks to park and unload on Madison each day. Without appropriate mitigation, the Madison vehicle and pedestrian experience will become a hazardous, and at times impassable, chokepoint. Again, I urge SDCI

to 1) have a single entrance on Madison, none on Dewey Pl E, and 2) require the applicant to assuredly mitigate the impacts of increased traffic and loading resulting from the proposed retail tenant.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Hacker