

To: City of Redmond



From: Rosemarie Ivès, 16020 NE 98<sup>th</sup> Street, Redmond, 98052

RECEIVED  
CITY OF REDMOND  
MAY 06 2015  
OFFICE OF THE  
HEARING EXAMINER

RE: 162TEN Project

Please accept this document as an addition to my appeal filed on April 16, 2015.

The issuance of a transmittal letter revising and superseding the letter dated April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2015 raises questions about this occurring after appeals had been filed by the deadline on April 16, 2015. Reopening the appeal period with a May 6<sup>th</sup> deadline may be legal but doesn't pass the "sniff" test on a project that will demolish Redmond's FIRST library building and as a consequence is of great community interest with community awareness and opposition growing. There was no mention in the Redmond Reporter that the appeal period had been re-opened. Considering the extensive public comment to the City on the project, the lack of specific information in the approval letter is a serious omission and demonstrates a disregard for the people of Redmond.

With regard to Section II on Code Deviations Granted:

I object to all five deviations.

1. 162Ten is a project consisting of 96 apodment units. I could not find in the application materials any information about how many unrelated individuals are actually living in each unit. So at a minimum, there are at least 96 individuals who will be living in this building. Most likely there will more than 96 persons in residence some related and some not related. So in reality, the .50 parking ratio is already lower than what it appears to be if there are 97 or more residents. I believe that the ratio based on number of units is flawed and misleading in this case. Instead of 48 parking stalls as required, the City is accepting just 29/30 spaces. The parking study provides data from the applicant not from any independent data gathering and/or analysis. Although the applicant has two other apodment developments in Redmond, I do not believe that sufficient time has passed

to really assess adequately the adopted ratio which I believe was deviated from with Vision 5 project. The city has not independently of the applicant verified the data. The city has not gathered information about how many tenants in Vision 5 and in Tudor Manor have purchased on street parking permits from the city. To state that .30 stalls per unit will provide sufficient parking to serve the use is not substantiated. 29/30 is too great a deviation to be granted. The property is surrounded on three sides by one standard width street with sidewalk, curb and gutter and on street parking. The other two streets are substandard in width without full sidewalks and no parking spaces.

2. Again, the parking study provides a layout of the spaces that are simply unsafe and problematic for several reasons. The use of lifts for stacking cars over six of the spaces is not anything used in a suburban community. Comparisons to Seattle are not applicable and are inappropriate. The five comments regarding the vertical tandem parking space is ridiculous. The orchestration of cars being moved and available to renters when needed is impractical and makes assumptions that are not proven. In subtracting the 12 spaces associated with lifts, there are a remaining 17 spaces. The elevations are impossible to read but the approval letter suggests that the spaces are substandard in size as are the aisle dimensions. The code exists to assure safety. For code deviations, specific information should be spelled out in the approval. Again, there is reference to a "parking study prepared by a qualified expert" but there is absolutely no demonstration nor explanation how these substandard spaces are safe and are justified other than someone expressing an opinion that they are "current." I believe that the adopted codes of the city stand and that code deviations are serious matters that must be justified.
3. Setbacks: I object to the setbacks on both the front setback and on the east. A five foot overhang above the only sidewalk abutting the building makes the area dark and shaded and could at times be considered unsafe for several reasons. The purpose of wide sidewalks was to encourage people to walk together. Having columns totally discourages people walking side by side. Certainly it is unfriendly to anyone in a wheelchair.

Making them non-structural may be good for city maintenance, but this is just another example of uncontrolled development in our downtown. As it is this building is completely covering the site—extending the above street floors over the “public’s space” is an intrusion, claustrophobic, just to get more rental units for the developer. I believe that the Design Review Board was only thinking about the uniqueness of the woonerf and failed to really think about the impacts to the public. That certainly was the case with the lack of setback from the only abutting neighbors to the east who are residents. The SEPA DNS failed in stating that there was a residential development next door that is senior and disabled housing. In fact, the SEPA DNS only stated that to the east was the Cascade Office Building which is three parcels away. It may be the case that the Design Review Board was not reminded that people actually live next door.

4. Outdoor space: The statement about if what is proposed meeting the total usable open space required is confusing. It is not clear if the square footage of the woonerf and the area under the 5 foot overhang on the west side of the building is being added in to the total for required open space. Although I like the concept of the woonerf, this site is problematic for several reasons. The woonerf area is substandard in width for a street. Because there is only one standard width street to the south on 80<sup>th</sup> Street and 81<sup>st</sup> Street on the north is substandard, I fear that fire ladder trucks may not be able to get sufficiently close to the building in an emergency. Also I do not know if the woonerf presents any impediments to disabled persons.
5. There are six deviations regarding Construction Specifications and Design Standards. I object to all six. I reviewed both the TSI September 30, 2014 report and the illustration on the NBE plan dated January 7, 2015. Although there is an illustration, there is no explanation for any of these.

Lastly I want to comment extensively on the Transportation Management Plan. Although the TMP is comprehensive, simply put, the city does not have a sufficient track record for implementing and monitoring residential development with so many significant deviations from the city’s

established codes. A TMP as an instrument should not be used in the manner it is proposed on this particular project. There is a very long list of tasks to be implemented by a transportation coordinator. Is this a tenant or is this position held by someone with extensive experience for implementing these kinds of programs with low income tenants ? Measurements are the responsibility of the transportation coordinator. What is the city's plan for verifying the information received ? Annual reports are said to include the number of parking stalls that are leased and how many residents have vehicles. But how could anyone know how many residents may be parking on the street and/or have purchased onstreet parking permits from the city. I have requested information from the city. They have provided some numbers but they could not tell me if the permits were purchased by downtown residents or by workers in downtown. They could not tell me how many permits were one month in duration and how many were for a longer period of time up to a year. The city can tell me where some of the signed onstreet permit spaces are but they could not provide specific information about on street permits which is very simple. These TMP elements are extensive and more complex...a sure challenge for a transportation coordinator but cannot imagine that the city has the resources to verify the information received from the property owner. There is no track record for holding the property owner accountable. The program objective is admirable but the program goal is unenforceable and unrealistic and a case of wishful thinking. To state that the property owner "will use proactive good faith efforts" is ludicrous. The program elements are extensive but the implementation of some are improbable. The most outrageous section is the "Contingency Measures." "Secure parking to meet demand." How is that going to occur? "Contribute \$20,000 per stall for up to 19 stalls to achieve 0.5 parking spaces per unit?" So has the city ever collected any significant amount from an "offender?" If it was collected, where is the money going to be spent ? What is the mechanism for spending this money ? If the site is covered by the building so where are tenants going to park . \$20,000 per space is an insufficient amount over the life of a parking space. And the TMP can be modified.

Stating that the TMP can be modified by the very city that has granted many deviations to the code on issues that I consider unsafe or negatively impacting the Redmond community and its residents does not instill confidence that the community's interests are valued or will be protected.

The five significant deviations from code with a TMP that has no teeth and cannot be enforced plus the six deviations for construction specifications and design standards may present unsafe situations and cannot mitigate these numerous deviations and their negative impact and serious burdens on the Redmond community, on next door senior and disabled residential neighbors, nearby longtime property and business owners. The interests of these many people should not be sacrificed for the financial benefit of a few such as OneRedmond, Banner Bank, and the applicant.

This project as proposed in the approval letter by the City of Redmond Technical Committee should be denied/rejected.