

Dela Cruz, Jeff

From: Hogness, Magda
Sent: Friday, September 08, 2017 4:12 PM
To: PRC
Subject: FW: Project 3020338

Please upload, thanks!

From: melissa stoker [mailto:melissastoker1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 05, 2017 1:41 PM
To: Hogness, Magda <Magda.Hogness@seattle.gov>
Cc: Claudia M. Newman Henry <newman@bnd-law.com>
Subject: Project 3020338

Hello Magda –

A few of us in the neighborhood were going over the EDG Recommendation Package for the September 13th meeting and there are some things that are confusing or missing. We'd like to let you know what we've noticed and get clarification where possible prior to the meeting on the 13th.

Pages 8 and 9 (setbacks on Dewey) are confusing. EDG 1 and EDG 2 measure setbacks from property line to building; EDG 3 and EDG REC measure "setbacks" from the **garage** (inside the building) to the property line. Here it seems that the townhouses are being included as "setback" footage. Because of this the square footage of the "setbacks" appears to suddenly jump between EDG 2 and 3, with no actual increase in setback. No diagrams in earlier packages measured from inside the building.

On page 11 the setback of the retail level at the south end is 1'6"; whereas on page 13 in the Section it shows a setback of 5'6". This appears to be the same spot, with two different measurements.

The rendering of Dewey on pages 13 and 31 is misleading. The home with the driveway is at the very southernmost end of the development (not mid-development as shown here), and the development spans another five additional homes to the end at the north (six homes total). In this rendering it appears that the development on the left is shrunk and the homes on the right are elongated.

On page 52 it is not clear what the height of the new fence on Republican is. It is described as "residentially scaled" but appears to possibly be 15-20 feet tall.

We can't find a clear rendering (or plans) for the pedestrian stairway, how it will look, how it will be landscaped.

We can't find where the design of the layered landscaping is made clear.

The picture on page 9 of the draft package is missing from the REC package. We cannot find it, or any massing diagrams related to it, as asked for in your August 17th memo.

The rendering on page 50 (Dewey south end transition) looks inaccurate and misleading. This seems like a possibly serious omission. The drawing shows a green space next to the development. Actually the home there is atop approximately 12 feet of E co-block (put in place after the flood of 2006 – this is where the water came down from Madison). Will the incense cedars be planted on Dewey's street level? Will it be built up? This is a vulnerable spot and the planning of it would be good to see. Also, since the setback on Republican has decreased from 15 feet to 10 feet, and a tall fence has been added, has the City arborist confirmed that incense cedars will grow in that narrow, presumably shaded area?

Page 19 (Madison Streetscape) shows sample pictures from other PCCs. Is this the actual plan for Madison, or just suggestions? Is there somewhere we can see what the actual design is?

Pages 16 and 17 (the northeast corner) in the REC package are confusing. The Section compares EDG 2 and the REC. EDG 3 has no Section – only a drawing (although one could confuse the EDG 2 Section as belonging to the EDG 3 drawing).

We know you're very busy and appreciate your assistance.

Melissa Stoker

Pene Karovsky

Sarah Trethewey

Tony Hacker

