

Comments on the Shoreline Project at 470 Bradley Blvd. in Richland Washington as proposed by Cedar and Sage Apartments1, LLC.

To: Mike Stevens, the City of Richland Planning Manager

From: Dwight Gottschalk, 460 Bradley Blvd, Richland, WA

After reading the environmental checklist and related file information online, I have numerous concerns about the review and approval of the above project. I will address these concerns on this letter as a condo owner of the property at 460 Bradley Blvd. which is part of the River Walk Village HOA and is adjoining 470 Bradley Blvd on the South side.

I have lived at my current location since the condos were built. We moved in on July 13, 2005. The current HOA is comprised of 9 units from 440 to 468 Bradley Blvd. all of which are located South of the proposed building site. All units are high-quality, privately-owned condos that are two level, and all are greater than 3000 square feet plus a two-car garage. We have spent a lot of time, effort, and expense to keep our units, the associated grounds and the surrounding areas maintained and to provide a positive image to the many tourist and local people that frequent the Riverfront Trail.

My concerns, after reviewing the proposal, consists of 8 major items.

1. Are the legal aspects of the environmental requirements (SEPA) being met? Those need to be fully reviewed, and it does not appear that this requirement has been met.
2. The proposed height, 55 feet, does not meet the criteria to be changed from the standard of 35 feet. There is not any additional green space to allow that determination. The additional elevation encroaches on the privacy of the adjoining properties as well as blocking river views from numerous nearby locations.
3. The setback proposed also conflicts with the view of the river from the patios, balconies, and front rooms of numerous units in the HOA. From the drawings, the edge of the building is 10 feet from the South property line and online with the middle of our lawn on the river side. That is a major issue. It seems that the location is only to meet the required 10-foot distance from the property lines with no consideration that the building will be blocking the view of the adjoining residences.
4. The 470 Bradley Blvd. location has always been proposed as being for small retail or restaurants on the lower level with premium condos above. This project, as originally publicized and supported by the developer, was for Premium Quality Condos. Upon getting the approval package, the plan has changed. It is now 32 apartments. The size being as small as 525 square feet to a maximum of 1262. The average is below 1000 square feet if you remove common hallways, etc. the balconies are small and almost unusable, and they also impose on neighbor's privacy.
5. The asphalt parking area and semi underground parking is not adequate for the 32 apartments without considering any visitors or additional vehicles. During current peak times, there are vehicles

overflowing into the 270 Bradley Blvd. area from the businesses located along Bradley Blvd. That conflict will be worse due to the lack of parking locations at the proposed apartments.

6. The drawings show one garbage receptacle for the entire location. That is really an issue for 32 apartments. Any additional or a larger container would impact the limited number of parking spaces available.

7. There will be significant impact from additional vehicle and foot traffic. As the traffic increases, so does the congestion problems and the additional demand on parking locations. Safety concerns and potential injury and conflicts will be an issue. The impact will exacerbate the current problems at Comstock and Bradley Blvd. intersections on GWW as well as at access points to Bradley Blvd.

8. The drawings of the proposed building do not show any continuity with the surrounding buildings. My thoughts are that the building looks like a minimal cost structure and would not be a visual asset to the riverfront.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns.

Dwight Gottschalk, 460 Bradley Blvd, Richland, WA 99352

My name is Michael Walker and I reside at 464 Bradley Blvd. and represent both myself and the homeowners for the Riverwalk Village Association.

As presented in our response letters to Mr. Stevens, we oppose this applicant's development plans as presented. The proposed development is inconsistent with Richland's Shoreline Master Program-Substantial Development objectives and policies as well as Waterfront Zoning requirements.

In short, this project fails to follow the intent and policies of the Shoreline Master Plan which clearly states that multifamily development is not a priority use and to consider such, a significant public benefit must be provided by means of ecological restoration and enhanced public access, neither of which were provided for in the application.

Of significant concerns are the following issues:

Height Variance: These applicants request for a height variance to 55 ft is not consistent with the Code requirements for such a variance. As calculations were not provided, it is unclear what percentage of additional open space in excess of 15% is provided for to earn “bonus floor area”. The existing pedestrian pathway easement must not be considered in this open space calculation as it is already there and by no means additional. The open space provided is not accessible to the public as it indicates ornamental vegetation adjacent to the pathway, which is not allowed. Finally, no additional amenities are provided as the benches are already in place by the City of Richland Parks & Recreation.

Additional Code provisions required for additional height are also not met:

- Increased height will obstruct views of adjacent residences: Riverwalk Village Condos and Apartments will both have significant views compromised as the result of increased height;

- There is no “overriding consideration of the public interest” to be served by providing additional height, nor would additional height enhance public enjoyment of the shoreline;
- Finally the code states that the building must be aesthetically pleasing in relation to buildings and other features in the vicinity; the design presented in the application shows a nondescript structure with very limited fenestration detail. No building materials are identified and no renderings were provided to show this structure in relationship to those around it. The excessive height is completely out of character and a glaring departure from the existing shoreline development in this area. This building is better suited for urban core development and does not meet the desired design intent for shoreline development
- To be clear, the proposed parking is not underground, but rather on the ground floor of the proposed building. This presents a very stark and unattractive ~10 wall along the river trail for nearly 112 ft.
- The proposed decks on each level breach basic privacy consideration of the private patios of the adjacent condos and

all the north facing windows of the northern most condo would now look on to a very stark wall and the apartment windows of this development.

Setbacks: As presented, the design does not adhere to the required side yard setbacks for a structure in excess on 30 ft. The Code clearly indicates that setbacks must be 1 ft for every 3 ft of height. In this case the required setback for both the north and south sides must be about 18-19 feet. The southeast corner of this structure is 10-15 feet proud of the northeast corner of the condos and significantly impacts river views from several condos.

Finally, the Code calls for a 15 ft public access easement unless “undue hardship” would result. The applicant has only provided for an 8 ft easement and the only hardship would be the reduction of their excessive unit count of the proposed development.

Parking: No consideration for public parking is considered for access to the Shoreline. Parking would undoubtedly impact the

parking capacity at both the Hampton In and the Riverwalk Village development.

Fire Department Access: As stated in 4/27 response email from FM Ken Buechler the access to this site from Bradley Blvd is not adequate for fire apparatus required for a 55 ft structure. Furthermore, I question the staging and hammerhead design (turnaround) in the parking lot of the proposed site should an incident occur.

Together, myself and the Riverwalk Village Association agree and support the decision of Mr. Stevens and the planning staff that this application should be denied as presented as it fails to meet the provisions of Richlands Shoreline Master Program and/or the applicable Waterfront Zoning requirements. There is absolutely no public benefits associated with the applicants request for additional height variance, except to the bottom line of this project. Nobody supports this project except for the developer who interest is clearly economic with disregard to public use and enjoyment of our wonderful shoreline.

Thank You