

Dela Cruz, Jeff

From: Laura Reymore <laurareymore@cbbain.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 3:45 PM
To: PRC
Subject: please post on the site of project #3020114 at 6726 Greenwood Ave N
Attachments: comments for 2nd EDG meeting.docx

To: Michael Dorcy, Senior Planner

From: Laura Parris Reymore, owner 6714 Greenwood North, Seattle, WA 98103

Re: Project # 3020114 at 6726 Greenwood North, Seattle, WA 98103

Please provide answers to my questions:

I want to state that I am very concerned about the construction of this building on the shared property line. I do not believe that they will be able to construct the building without access to my property. They do not have the legal authority to trespass on my property in order to construct this building. Building code reviewers must address this issue. **WHO DO I CONTACT TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE?**

In the second Design Review meeting minutes, they stated that option C provided for the best arrangement of uses on the site and allowed for desirable transitions: 1) to the new mixed-use structure across N 68th St, 2) to the multi-family structure to the south, and 3) to the single-family structures to the east. While allowing for suitable transitions, those transitions had not yet been adequately conveyed nor provided for in the design team's packet, however. **WHEN WILL THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OR YOUR OFFICE BE PROVIDED THE MATERIALS AND WHAT INFLUENCE DO THEY HAVE TO MODIFY OR THE DEVELOPERS' PROJECT DESIGN AND MATERIALS SPECIFICATIONS?**

Next, the Design Review committee stated that the "proposed clerestory cap with its added height along the south portion of the proposed structure contravened the clear need for some transition to the two and a half story residential building due south on Greenwood. Politeness and other massing considerations would seem to call

for a doffing of the clerestory cap along the south portion of the top of the compositional bar facing onto Greenwood Ave N”. From the south elevation drawings, there are still windows on a clerestory cap. The architect claimed in his response (see Attachment B to MUP application response to Design guidelines for #3020114) to have doffed the clerestory element by 14 + feet. They also moved the stairway to the edge of the south elevation and increased the height substantially (54 FEET). It is higher and more massive than the original proposal. **WHAT OPTIONS DO YOU HAVE MR. DORCY TO ASK THE DEVELOPERS TO REDUCE THE MASSIVE IMPACT TO THE MUCH SMALLER BUILDING TO THE SOUTH AS RECOMMENDED BY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD? IF YOU DO NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY, WHO DOES?**

More generally, “the south facade facing the neighboring structure was in need of significant design attention” and “acknowledgement of a transition that was not in keeping with a clerestory addition there”. There is nothing in the MUP package that addresses the “significant design attention” for the south facade. In fact, the first floor concrete block (13 feet or so) would not be a material that most people would find attractive and would significantly negatively impact my property. An option would be to move the wall away from the property line for access to maintain these less than desirable materials proposed. **THE MATERIALS THAT APPEAR IN THE SOUTH ELEVATION DRAWINGS ARE MOSTLY DARK HARDY BOARD AND CONCRETE BLOCK FOR THE ENTIRE FIRST AND HALF THE SECOND FLOOR OF THE ADJACENT BUILDING. WHAT OPTIONS DO YOU HAVE TO SPECIFY MATERIALS THAT ARE LIGHTER AND OR DIFFERENT THAN CURRENT SPECIFICATIONS?**

I don’t understand how a 40 foot height limit is now exceeding 54 feet or more with the elevator tower? The original proposal was for a 44 foot height. **Please provide an explanation to this concern.**

I appreciate your response and answers to my questions.

Sincerely,

Laura Parris Reymore

laurareymore@cbba.com

206-949-3270