

Attachment A – Summary of Scoping Comments

Background

This scoping report provides an overview of the comment letters, email and oral comments received during two separate scoping periods for the Roosevelt Development Rezone. The first scoping period occurred in 2009, prior to submittal of a rezone application for the proposal. During this comment period, which ended June 24, 2009, comments – in the form of letters, emails and verbal comments at a public meeting -- were received from more than 300 individuals or households and 4 organizations. These communications include thirty-four verbal comments provided at a scoping meeting held on June 9, 2009. Three petitions with multiple names were also submitted. No comments were received from public agencies or tribes. The majority of comments expressed opposition to the location, height, density or scale of proposed development, because of anticipated changes that would result to the neighborhood. The letters also expressed concern about potential impacts to erosion, air quality, ground water, plants and animals, noise, potential releases of hazardous substances, land use, aesthetics/light and glare, view blockage, traffic and parking, pedestrian safety, historic resources, and impacts on public services and utilities.

The City initiated a second scoping comment period in 2010, following submittal of a contract rezone application. During this comment period, which ended September 1, 2010, comments – in the form of letters, emails and verbal comments recorded at a public meeting -- were received from approximately 124 individuals or households and from 2 organizations/institutions. Thirty-nine speakers provided verbal comments at a public meeting held on July 21, 2010. A number of commenters submitted multiple comments and communications. No comments were received from public agencies or tribes. As in the 2009 scoping comment period, most comments expressed opposition to the location, height, density or scale of proposed development, because of anticipated changes that would result to the neighborhood. The letters also expressed concern about potential impacts to erosion, air quality, ground water, plants and animals, noise, potential releases of hazardous substances, land use, aesthetics/light and glare, view blockage, traffic and parking, pedestrian safety, historic resources, and impacts on public services and utilities. A transcript of the meeting is on file with DPD.

This portion of the report provides a summary of comments specific to the alternatives and elements of the environment to be performed in the EIS. A number of individual comments relating to procedural questions (notice), public meeting format, and non-SEPA related issues are also summarized, along with statements of opposition to the proposal. The summary is organized according to comments on alternatives, SEPA elements of the environment, and non-SEPA issues. Similar comments that addressed the same element of the environment have been combined.

1. 2009 Scoping Comments

Comments on Proposed Alternatives

- What are the proposal's objectives?
- Alternatives above 65 feet, outside of commercial core, are unreasonable and should not be studied.
- Rezoning of SF 5000 lots is contrary to Comprehensive Plan and should not be studied.
- Develop an alternative that incorporates transition areas (gradual increase, buffer single family) and gateways (NE 65th and 15th NE).
- Address alternatives for the station area and overall neighborhood planning area.
- Each alternative should evaluate full zoning potential, i.e., most dense and intensive scenario.
- Consider phasing of development.
- Evaluate reasonable worst case scenario for each alternative
- Study an alternative that designates/zones the block in front of the High School (i.e., the fruit stand block between 14th and 15th north of 65th) as a city park
- The No Action alternative should not confuse or conflate maintenance and management issues with land use issues to slant discussions of positive impacts
- Zone the fruit stand block to create green space and a gateway
- Alternatives should not consider heights greater than 65 feet.
- Evaluate No Action alternative.
- Evaluate the proposed 2006 Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan zoning changes.
- Consider an alternative that down-zones the property.
- The study area should include areas to the east and southeast outside the Roosevelt neighborhood.
- The study area should include commercial core from 12th between 68th and 63rd
- The study area should include the light rail station area.
- Create and evaluate a new "single family preservation" zoning designation.
- The alternatives should incorporate LEED principles.
- Is there a need for an upzone?

Comments on Elements of the Environment

Earth

- Evaluate the quantities of grade and fill.
- Conduct a Phase I ESA to identify presence of contaminants.
- Identify the amount of site covered with impervious surfaces.
- Evaluate earthquake hazards
- Study the impact of increased impervious surfaces and runoff volumes on stream bank erosion and sedimentation.
- Investigate the presence former underground storage tanks/contamination associated with the former gas station.

Air

- Evaluate dust and fumes associated with construction.
- Study the air quality effects to adjacent properties from truck loading, garage access, restaurant exhausts, waste disposal areas.
- What are the wind impacts associated with tall buildings?
- Is there potential for tall buildings to impede air flow and trap air emissions?
- Would site contaminants become air borne during construction?
- Identify existing non-attainment areas.
- Will urban canyons concentrate auto exhaust pollutants?
- Will additional impervious surfaces increase temperature and contribute to climate change?
- Study greenhouse gas emissions.

Water

Runoff

- How much new impervious surface would be created?
- How will stormwater be managed? Will water be retained on site and how would this affect excavation?
- Will runoff affect storm sewers/combined sewers?
- Will the proposal contribute to flooding on Ravenna Blvd under I-5, on 65th and at 12th?
- Identify the impact of increased impervious surfaces and runoff volumes on stream bank erosion and sedimentation of adjacent waterways. Will additional impervious surface affect groundwater recharge and the hydrology of Ravenna Creek?
- Will stormwater runoff affect natural drainage patterns?

Plants & Animals

- Identify the effects of removing green space in existing yards on the rezone parcels, including effects on local wildlife.
- How will the rezones affect the existing tree canopy, and what is its relationship to the City's urban forestry policies?
- Will tall buildings affect birds in flight?
- Will the rezones affect the health and biodiversity of adjacent waterways (Ravenna Creek, Green Lake, Lake Washington, Puget Sound)?
- Removal of existing mature trees conflicts with Urban Forestry Management Plan goal of 30% tree canopy coverage by 2037.
- Study the affect of the rezones on the natural area between Cowen Park to 25th Ave NE along Ravenna Creek
- Is there a significant frog population?
- Evaluate the removal of existing trees including "exceptional" or "heritage" trees.
- Is landscaping proposed?
- How will development affect instream flows in Ravenna Creek and effect salmon habitat?
- Conduct a landscape analysis of the Ravenna Creek sub-basin.

Energy & Natural Resources

- How will large buildings affect energy consumption?

Environmental Health

Noise

- Noise should be considered an adverse impact. Identify noise from increased traffic, construction, and operations (e.g., loading, HVAC). Evaluate construction noise and potential effects on the High School (disruption of classes).
- Is there potential for vibration?
- Would noise be reflected/amplified by tall buildings?
- What are the health effects of increased noise?

Contamination/Risk of Releases

- Identify the presence of hazardous materials from past uses (gas station) and potential releases of toxic substances to air and groundwater from demolition and construction.
- Evaluate potential releases from proximate uses (dry cleaner).
- Study the potential for asbestos and lead based paint in existing structures.

Land & Shoreline Use

Land Uses/ Patterns

- Proposed uses are uncertain. The EIS should consider “worst case” (most intensive) of potential uses allowed in the zone (including office uses, hotel, big box store).
- Uses in the NC3 zone are too intensive NC3 and inappropriate (e.g., a big box store).
- Would the proposal encourage a pedestrian-oriented community?
- The EIS should not assume or consider light rail station because it is uncertain and in the distant future.
- The rezone would set a precedent for all Urban Villages and could affect land use patterns and population growth.
- Are apartments/rental units consistent with single family character?
- Will commercial uses be neighborhood-oriented?
- Identify impacts to Ravenna-Bryant neighborhood

Displacement

- How many dwelling units and businesses would be displaced temporarily and permanently?
- How many retail jobs would be lost?

Density, Height, Bulk and Scale

- 16 story buildings are too high and out of character with the neighborhood. Maximum heights should be 4, stories, 6 stories, 4-7 stories.
- 8 story buildings will be adjacent to single family, without buffering or transition.
- Include 3D and renderings of potential buildings and mix of uses.
- What are proposed building material and the extent of glass?
- How would tall buildings affect the character of neighborhood?

- 16 story buildings would crowd the High School and interfere with students learning environment.
- Identify contrasts in density.
- Study whether height, bulk and scale consistent with maintaining connection between historic façade of High School and Residential Urban Village.
- Are setbacks required between any building >40 feet and adjacent single family residences?
- Greatest density should be in the neighborhood's commercial core.
- Evaluate transitions between zones, and lack of transition to single family neighborhoods.
- Compare the rezone proposal to the scale of buildings in other Urban Villages in the City.
- There is a need for open space, setbacks, public plazas and view corridors.
- Will there be a tunnel or canyon effect from tall buildings?
- Design should accommodate existing views.

Relationship to Plans & Policies

- Identify the relationship of the rezones to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning code, the Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan, and the proposed 2006 revisions to the RNP.
- Relationship to proposed 2006 RNP goals, zoning revisions and design guidelines (including R-LUP5 and design strategy R-LUG5)
- Identify conflicts with the Residential Urban Village designation.
- What is the relationship to Vision 2040?
- What are the criteria for a rezone?
- Undertake a comprehensive land use study of Roosevelt and Ravenna neighborhoods
- A station area plan should be prepared before the proposal is considered.
- Neighborhood plan should take precedence over individual proposals
- Use incentive zoning techniques.
- Evaluate how alternatives relate to goal to discourage auto-oriented development
- Numerous changes to Comprehensive Plan and zoning code are being proposed.
- Review and include all aspects of sustainability and climate change in Comp Plan.
- What is the relationship to the City's pedestrian plan?

Population & Housing

- How many units would be developed? What is planned mix of unit sizes?
- There would be huge influx of people to neighborhood.
- Identify the relationship to the Roosevelt neighborhood's population allocation in the Comprehensive Plan and the population allowed under existing zoning.
- Identify the relationship to potential population in the Northgate and University District Urban Centers.
- The rezones should include for sale as well as rental housing.
- Identify the demographics of renters. There will be a transient population.
- How would the rezones affect the existing amount of single family housing?

Light & Glare/Aesthetics

Views

- Proposed buildings will block views of school from 65th
- Proposed buildings will block views of the city and Olympics/Mt Rainier from 65th and from the school)
- Evaluate views from High School, Froula Park and Roosevelt Reservoir.
- Will views from any designated scenic routes be affected?
- Will views of Mt. Rainier from High School be affected?
- Review the findings of the North Link EIS re: viewer sensitivity.
- To preserve views of the High School, designate the block between 14th and 15th as a park/open space.
- Design buildings to preserve views of the High School.

Light & Glare, Shadows

- The buildings will cause shadows on and loom over the school/playfield and sidewalks. Model shadowing using 3D model.
- Shadows from tall buildings will reduce home values and preclude use of solar energy.
- Light and glare should be considered a significant impact.
- Identify the potential for different building types (e.g., townhouse, residential or office tower) to cause light and glare.
- Study the effect of retail sign lighting?
- Will buildings use reflective material?
- Will scattered light cause degradation of views of the night sky?

Historic/Cultural Resources

- Roosevelt High School is a designated landmark: how will tall buildings affect the landmark?
- How will construction activities (dust, noise) affect the High School?
- Cowen Park and Ravenna Blvd should be evaluated as landmarks (per North Link EIS).
- Identify any other historic resources that exist within study area or area of potential effect and would be affected.

Transportation

Study Area

- The study area for traffic, parking and pedestrian safety analysis should include the one-quarter mile around planned light rail station

Traffic/Congestion

- How much traffic will be generated? Include traffic associated with the High School
- Would congestion divert traffic to secondary streets and alleys?
- Turn 65th into an auto-free zone.
- Analyze bicycle traffic.
- How would traffic affect different street classifications?

- Consider employee-generated traffic.
- Evaluate construction truck traffic.
- Study the effect of cut-through traffic and speeding on the Roosevelt and Ravenna neighborhoods.
- Consider traffic calming and better signage
- Study the effects on non-motorized transportation.
- Study Portland, OR experience with TOD.
- Investigate incentives for transit use.
- Will there be an effect on peak spreading?

Pedestrian Safety

- Identify the impact of additional traffic on the safety of students (walking, waiting at bus stops). Bus stops/sidewalks area currently inadequate to accommodate waiting passengers and pedestrians.
- Pedestrian crossings are inadequate now.
- Study connections and pedestrian safety between the rezone site and the light rail station.

Parking

- Parking in the proposed rezones is absent or inadequate.
- Identify the need for parking relative to the site's proximity to the light rail station.
- Parking already constrained
- Include parking needed for school events/performances.
- Consider conclusions of Sound Transit EIS re: parking.
- Identify effects on loading zones from additional traffic/deliveries.
- Include employee parking demand in the analysis.
- Will parking be adequate for new commercial businesses?

Transit

Identify the effect of increased population on public transit use.

Public Services & Utilities

Parks

- What impacts would increased population cause to existing park and recreational facilities (High School, Cowen and Ravenna parks).
- Parks and open space are currently inadequate; how would the rezones affect this situation?
- Acquire a portion of property for a park.

Schools

- Identify the effect of additional population on nearby schools and school assignment districts.
- How would construction and the presence of apartment buildings affect the High School's learning environment?

Police & Fire

- Would the additional population create a burden on local services?
- Would there be an increase in crime rates from higher density/rental units? The properties currently place large demand on public services
- How would rental units/transients and higher density affects criminal activity and police service?
- Include a history of complaints, violations, service calls etc. relating to the rezone properties.

Communications

- Tall buildings could block cell phone, TV and WIMAX transmission.

Utilities

- Identify the adequacy and condition of neighborhood water, sewer and stormwater systems.

Solid Waste

- How much solid waste would be generated?

Construction Impacts

- Identify construction related impacts related to air quality, noise, traffic, potential releases of hazardous substances
- Identify the duration of construction.
- Address the safety of students during construction in view of construction equipment required for large-scale buildings.

Cumulative Impacts

- Study the cumulative effects of overlapping light rail station and project construction.
- Evaluate the entire Roosevelt commercial core.
- Would single family homes be destroyed?

General Comments/Non-SEPA Comments

Comments on Scoping Notice, Scoping Meeting and Consultant Selection

- Extend the comment period.
- There were obstacles to signing in at the scoping meeting.
- There was no recording of scoping meeting,
- The scoping meeting not legally “adequate.”
- No individual notice of DS/scoping to individual properties within rezone area
- EIS comment period should be minimum of 45 days.
- City’s Notice of SEPA determination was not adequate. The Scoping notice incorrectly identifies NE 64th Street as southern boundary of rezone (no such street between NE 63 and rezone area).
- Disagree with the process for choosing EIS consultant. Concerned about objectivity.

General Comments on Process

- No application has been submitted.
- Input from Ravenna neighborhood has been excluded.
- How does a contract rezone compare to a regular rezone?
- Requests for public records.
- Requests to be placed on mailing list.
- What is the relationship of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment to rezone proposal? Objections to Comprehensive Plan amendment, request that it be deferred
- The City should use variances instead of zoning changes.
- How will DPD address the 2006 RNP Update zoning report?
- Rezoning should not occur so far in advance of light rail opening.
- When is the project vested?

Comments on Socioeconomic Impacts and Other Asserted Impacts

- How will the rezones affect property values?
- Business/economic impacts should be studied. There will be negative economic impacts to current homeowners.
- How will the rezones affect taxes?
- The character of neighborhood will be changed and will have social impact.
- Evaluate quality of life impacts.
- There is a risk of friction between students and future tenants.
- Impacts on community cohesion, shared values.
- Risks of new residents having concealed weapons permits.
- How does land lease development compare to owner development?
- What is the financial capability of the developer?
- Will the increase in the tax base cover additional cost of governmental service associated with population increase?
- The neighborhood should be compensated for impacts.
- There is a potential for people to vacate the neighborhood in response to rezones.
- The urban canyon created by tall buildings would contribute to feelings of lack of well being.

Miscellaneous Comments

- The City should downzone the property first, then acquire it as a park.
- Distrust the property owner and developer.
- The property owner should not be unjustly enriched at the expense of the neighborhood.
- The properties are not maintained and are blighted, an eyesore.
- Concerned about future maintenance based on the property owner's history. How will existing buildings be maintained prior to construction?
- Ownership patterns should not influence zoning changes.
- Prior behavior of property owners should be considered.

2. 2010 Scoping Comments

Comments on Proposal & Alternatives

- Evaluate Alternative 2 only.
- Alternatives 3-5 are not appropriate.
- The alternatives are not well defined.
- Per the SEPA Rules, should analyze an off-site alternative.
- Evaluate only No Action and Alternative 2 (Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan rezone).
- What is the study area for the EIS?
- The study area should extend one block past the rezone properties and should include the light rail station.
- The rezone proposal includes properties not owned by applicant.
- Describe the objectives of the proposal.
- The stated objectives are too broad.
- DPD should state its own objectives for the proposal.
- Look at city-wide alternatives.
- Evaluate worst case scenarios for uses and building envelope.
- Consider an alternative that is consistent with Urban Village guidelines, with lower heights that transitions to single-family; with NC2 west of 15th, and multi-family east of 15th.
- Study the minimum square footage needed to support redevelopment.
- One alternative should include at least 10,000 square feet of open space adjacent to RHS
- Consider an alternative that transitions to single family east of 15th, that uses NC2 instead of NC3, and that starts development only after the light rail station is constructed.
- Consider an all residential mid-rise alternative (MR-60).
- Consider a reduced scale NC alternative that is between Alternative 2 and an all residential mid-rise alternative.
- Consider an alternative that phases development with construction of the light rail station (Alternative 2 rezones until the station is completed, then selected rezones to mid-rise).

Comments on Elements of the Environment

Earth

- Potential for building collapse during earthquake.
- Soil, topography and erosion.

Air

- Increase in dust and non-particulates.
- Effect of traffic on air quality.
- Effect of tall buildings on wind (particularly during stormy weather).
- Changes to microclimate.
- Greenhouse gas emissions.

- Emissions of particulates, ozone, nitrogen oxides, and sulfur dioxide.
- Odor from commercial uses.

Water

Runoff

- Amount of new impervious surface.
- Loss of permeable surface and increase in runoff.
- Effect of runoff on Ravenna Creek.
- Pollution in runoff.
- Contamination of groundwater.

Plants & Animals

- Impacts to mature trees.
- Loss of big trees/tree replacement.
- Effect on roots of big trees.
- Neighborhood as transitional zone and wildlife corridor between parks.
- Impacts to bird flight patterns, food sources and nesting.
- Effect on birds/nesting habitat in nearby parks.
- Effects of drainage/pollutants on Ravenna Creek and insect & bird populations.
- Effects on plant and animal diversity in neighborhood.

Energy & Natural Resources

- Increase in energy use.

Environmental Health

Noise

- Increase in noise levels.
- Noise from construction and construction traffic.
- Traffic noise.
- Noise from air conditioners.
- Noise of garbage pick-up.
- Noise from truck deliveries.

Contamination/Risk of Releases

- Pollution from construction debris.
- Evaluation/remediation of underground storage tanks from former gas station.

Land & Shoreline Use

Land Use/Patterns

- Strip development along 65th.
- Impact of “big box” store.
- Effect of proximity to light rail station.
- Location of large buildings outside of commercial core.
- Encroachment on single family neighborhoods.
- Rezoning as precedent for further upzones.

- Impact to existing commercial core.
- Impacts to adjacent properties.
- Effects on out-parcels.
- Effects on Ravenna-Bryant neighborhood.

Displacement

- Displacement of existing housing.

Density, Height, Bulk & Scale

- Appropriate density for Urban Villages.
- Height and Scale of buildings relative to Roosevelt and other Urban Villages
- Scale of buildings relative to adjacent single family homes.
- Lack of transition to single family neighborhoods.
- Looming effect of tall buildings, on adjacent residences and Cowen Park.
- Amount of landscaping and open space required
- Effect on privacy
- Mitigation for bulk, height and scale contrasts (SEPA policies)
- Relationship of density to transit ridership.

Relationship to Plans & Policies

- Relationship to Comprehensive Plan.
- Relationship to Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan (building and design guidelines).
- Relationship to rezone criteria.
- Relationship to SEPA bulk, height and scale policy.
- Relationship to land use policies that encourage greater density near light rail stations.
- Tree ordinance/protection of tree canopy.
- Absence of TOD guidelines.

Population & Housing

- Relationship to city-wide GMA targets.
- Relationship to Comprehensive Plan targets for Roosevelt Urban Village.
- Comparison of Roosevelt to other Urban Villages.
- Effect of increased population on the environment
- Maintenance of housing.
- Ratio of residents to open space.
- Effect of non-owner occupied rental units.
- Size of units.
- Rental by students.
- Effect of rental units on community cohesion.
- Affordability of rental units.
- Effects of low income housing units near high school

Light & Glare/Aesthetics

Views

- Blockage of neighborhood views.
- Degradation of neighborhood views.
- Effect on views to and from RHS.

Light & Glare, Shadows

Loss of light to adjacent residences and high school.
Shadows on RHS athletic field.

Historic/Cultural Resources

- Effect on visual integrity of RHS.
- Scale relative to RHS.
- Effect on nearby Craftsman homes.

Transportation

Study Area

- Effect of traffic on surrounding neighborhoods (Ravenna, Bryant).

Traffic Congestion

- Conduct a full traffic study.
- Increase in traffic volumes.
- Projected car ownership of new residents
- Trips associated with new businesses.
- Traffic flow on 65th and 15th.
- Design capacity of local streets (12th, 15th, 65th).
- Impact on travel time.
- Deliveries by truck.
- Cutting through alleys.
- Effect of traffic on neighborhood.
- Adequacy of east-west traffic flow.
- Ability of local streets to accommodate increased traffic.
- Increased traffic accidents.
- Cut-through traffic/diversions through neighborhoods.
- Increased pedestrian traffic.

Pedestrian Safety

- Effect of increased traffic on safety (pedestrians and students).

Parking

- Adequacy of existing parking.
- Effect on existing parking supply.
- Amount of parking planned.
- Parking plan, parking management.
- Potential to remove on-street parking on 65th.

- Parking demands of new businesses.

Transit

- Effects on public transit (bus).
- Effect of diversion of traffic from SR520.
- Effect of future light rail on traffic.
- Traffic during Husky games.

Public Services & Utilities

Parks

- Increased use of Froula, Cowen and Ravenna Parks.
- Need for additional community recreation space.
- Need for additional open space (Parks Department 2006 Gap Analysis).
- Quality and quantity of open space.

Schools

- Adequacy of schools to accommodate additional families with children.
- Effect on overcrowding of schools.

Police & Fire

- Effects on public safety.
- Increase in crime associated with increased population density.
- Effects of renters/rental units on public safety.
- Effects of high-rise buildings on crime.
- Mitigation for safety issues (security systems).

Communications

- Interference with TV reception.

Utilities

- Effect on utility infrastructure.
- Low impact development techniques.

Solid Waste

- Construction debris.

Construction Impacts

- Effects on traffic.
- Effect on learning environment of RHS.
- Construction noise.
- Dust.
- Erosion.
- Sedimentation.
- Disruption of quality of life.
- Use/safety of construction crane near high school.

Cumulative Impacts

- Identify cumulative impacts in programmatic environmental document before taking action.

General Comments & Non-SEPA Comments

Comments on Scoping Notice, Scoping Meeting & Consultant Selection

- Alternatives were not described in the scoping notice.
- The City should post the project description/alternatives on its website.
- Second scoping notice did not include sufficient information.
- Include list of project's objectives.
- Would like more information about proposal.
- Scoping meeting did not meet community expectations.
- Scoping meeting did not allow discussion.
- Scoping meeting stifled free speech and debate.
- Meeting format was frustrating.
- Staff and consultant showed bias and/or incompetence.
- No explanation of why a second meeting was held.
- What happened to prior scoping comments?
- Public meeting should have been held at RHS.
- Insufficient information about proposal.
- Supplemental EIS should be required later for more definite development proposal.
- Many people did not have notice of meeting; no posting; posting was inadequate.
- Should not hold meeting during summer.
- Request another meeting during the fall, when people are back from vacation.

General Comments on Process & Application

- Comprehensive Plan amendment should be considered in same EIS.
- What is relationship of rezone to Comprehensive Plan amendment?
- Is EIS programmatic or project-level?
- Need more certainty in environmental review process.
- Developer has not conducted outreach with neighborhood.
- Need more information about the rezone process.
- Who will prepare SEPA analysis for legislative rezone and Neighborhood Plan update?
- The public process is flawed.
- The process is biased towards the needs of the developer.
- DPD is advocating for the developer.

Comments on Socioeconomic Impacts and Other Asserted Impacts

- Proposal will result in deterioration of single family neighborhood and community spirit.
- Study the effect on property values.
- Study effects on quality of life.

- Study the effect on neighborhood “feel.”
- What are the sociological and physiological impacts of incongruous zoning patterns?
- Urban canyon will be created and will impact quality of life and sense of well-being.
- Study whether ill-conceived zoning patterns contribute to urban blight.
- Ignores traditional zoning pattern where lower densities radiate out from a central core.
- Effect of economic climate on ability to lease retail space.
- Proposal is out of character with buildings near other high schools in city.
- Consider track record of property owner.
- Determine economic need of transit oriented development.
- Is site economically viable?
- No homeowners’ tax base will be created.

Miscellaneous Comments

- There is no need for the project in view of current housing and commercial vacancies.
- Zoning beyond NC2-40 not consistent with neighborhood.
- Rezone should not be permitted because of negative impacts.
- Proposal is unacceptable.
- Support for No Action.
- Support for Alternative No. 2 (Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan rezoning).
- Follow the guidance of the Roosevelt neighborhood plan for locating taller buildings.
- Buildings are too tall.
- Buildings will overwhelm RHS.
- Buildings are out of scale with neighborhood.
- Oppose RDG’s Comprehensive Plan amendment.
- City/neighborhood should not be blackmailed to get rid of blighted properties.
- Designate an area east of Roosevelt as an urban village.
- Proposed population density is excessive.
- Increased density will increase crime.
- Quality of life will suffer.
- Neighborhood character will be degraded.
- History of property stewardship indicates that development will have little regard for neighborhood.
- No need for transformative urban renewal.
- What rights does the neighborhood have in determining the character of their neighborhood?
- 6-story buildings are claustrophobic; maximum should be NC2-40.
- Proximity of transit not sufficient justification for proposal.
- Provision of low income housing not sufficient justification for proposal.
- Proposal is over the top and cannot fit the neighborhood.
- Any redevelopment should have broad neighborhood support.
- Not best place for increased density.
- Wrong project at wrong place.

- Lack of property maintenance has caused crime, squalor, anti-social behavior, safety and health problems.
- Magnitude of project is unprecedented.
- Maximum height should be 4-6 stories.
- Proposed open space is inadequate.
- Reserve block in front of RHS between 65th and 66th as a park.
- Shocking that City would consider a 160-foot building.
- Should not build anything taller than RHS on site.
- Follow example of Northgate's Thornton Creek project.
- City should reject proposal.
- Locate taller buildings in existing commercial core.
- The schedule for light rail station may slip.
- Why isn't DPD using a uniform planning process for all station areas?
- Why did Roosevelt Plan amendment take so long to get to Council?
- When does vesting occur?
- Explain the MUP review process.
- Per City's SEPA rules, the proposal is not definite enough to conduct environmental review.
- Request EIS consultant's statement of qualifications/resume and copy of agreement required by Director's Rule 41-96.
- Will cause excessive traffic.
- Shadowing would be excessive.
- Buildings would loom over street.
- Oppose Alternatives 4 and 5.
- Buildings should not exceed 65 feet
- Tear down Sisley's buildings and make a park.
- High density rental units may attract university students rather than families and will result in more crime.
- Proposal is spot zoning.
- Density will exceed carrying capacity of roads.
- Intensive commercial development next to residential will have profound financial and community impact.
- Jamming too many people in one place in short period of time.
- Lack of parking for light rail.
- Alternatives 3, 4, 5 and 6 are obscene.
- Support Alternative 1.
- Support Alternative 2.
- The proposal would destroy the neighborhood.
- The feeling of neighborhood will be displaced.
- Consider developing townhouses.
- Would like information about relationship between developer and property owner.
- Alternatives are straw men, negotiating ploys.
- DCOU [sic] is providing erroneous advice to people about the process.
- Slumlordism should not be rewarded