APL20130006

Thomas R. Waggener
65 Pine Street -- Unit 103
Edmonds, WA 98020
425-582-0410
tom.waggener@comcast.net

RECEIVED
AUG 20 2013
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
COUNTER

August 20, 2013

Kernen Lien, Senior planner
City of Edmonds
Development Services Department –Planning Division
121 5th Avenue North
Edmonds, WA 98020

RE: Appeal of Type III B Decision of the Architectural Design Board Regarding PLN20130022 -- Point Edwards Building 10 located at 50 Pine Street

Dear Mr. Lien:

This letter and the accompanying documents constitute a timely appeal to the Notice of Final Decision regarding PLN20130022 issued on August 7, 2013 by the Architectural Design Board. Included with this correspondence and incorporated by reference herein are the following documents:

1. Summary of Appeal;

2. Content of Appeal -- including appellant names, statement on standing to appeal, identification of the application which is the subject of the appeal, statement of grounds for appeal with facts upon which the appeal is based (with references to facts in the record), the specific relief sought, and a statement that appellants have read the appeal and believe its content to be true. (Attachment 1--Factual Bases for Appeal of ABD Approval of PLN 20130022);

4. The Documents identified in Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 above, are hereby substituted for copies of the documents submitted with the Appellant's prior appeal. These documents have been updated to reflect modifications to the originals on file with City.

5. In addition to the terms and conditions of the appeal documents described above, the Appellant identifies the following findings and conclusions stated in the Findings, Conclusions and Decision of the ADB, dated August 7, 2013 as clearly erroneous

a. Findings 13, 20 and 22;

b. Conclusions 2 and 3;

c. Conclusion 4(a) generally and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, more specifically, C.2.a, C.6.b, C.7.a, C.8.a, C.8.b, C.8.c, C.8.d, C.13.a, C.13.d, C.14.c, D.1.b, D.2.a, D.2.b, D.2.c, D.3.a, D.3.b, D.4.b, D.4.c, D.4.e, E.1.b, E.1.c, E.1.e; and

d. Conclusions 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 12.

Pursuant to Council Action on July 2, 2013, Appellant Waggener is exempt from filing an appeal fee for this appeal.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Waggener

Thomas R. Waggener

Summary: Appeal of ADB Approval of PLN 20130022	
Appellant(s) and Standing	**Thomas R. Waggener,** individually and on behalf of the additional parties listed in Attachment 2 pursuant to ECDC 20.07.003, has standing to appeal since every individual has submitted written comments to the Planning Division ("Division") and/or provided testimony at the Architectural Design Board ("ADB") meeting held on May 15 2013. I, Thomas R. Waggener, submitted a written letter to the ADB and also presented verbal comments at the May 15, 2013 public hearing before the ADB. The standing of the other appellants is found on Attachment 2.
Subject	ADB Approval on May 15, 2013 of PLN 20130022 "Building 10" located at 50 Pine Street in the Point Edwards development in Edmonds, Washington.
Summary of Grounds for Appeal	*The factual basis for each of these grounds is provided in Attachment 1* 1. The ADB failed to issue accurate and credible findings based on the recommendations and conditions set forth in the Staff Report date May 9, 2013 with respect to: 1.1 Design requirements for human scale and consistency with surrounding environment, 1.2 Modulated roof exemption, and 1.3 Parking. 2. The ADB failed to consider the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan. 3. The ADB and the Division failed to correct technical errors in the applicant's methodology for measuring Building 10's height and the adequacy of its 35-foot exemption request. 4. The Proposal failed to address adequately the specifics of the ADB's December 19, 2012 design recommendations for PLN 20120040 (the previous proposal for Building 10, withdrawn and resubmitted as PLN 20130022)
Specific Relief Sought	1. Set aside the ADB Approval of Proposal PLN20130022 issued on May 15, 2013 and remand for redesign and resubmission as an independent new proposal without reference to prior findings and previous design determinations. 2. In the alternative, follow all five of the Planning Division's written recommendations as set forth in its Staff Report dated May 9, 2013.
Statement and signature	I, Thomas R. Waggener, state that I have read the contents of this appeal and believe them to be true. The additional individuals listed in Attachment 2 have affixed their signatures also certifying they have read the appeal and believe the contents to be true. SIGNED Thomas R Waggener

Attachment 1: Factual Bases for Appeal of ADB Approval of PLN 20130022

1.	**The ADB failed to issue accurate and credible findings based on the recommendations and conditions set forth in the Staff Report date May 9, 2013 with respect to design requirements for human scale and consistency with surrounding environment, applicant's request for modulated roof exemption, and parking.**
Facts	*Implications of approved PLN 20130022*
The ADB failed to issue accurate and credible findings of fact and conclusions of law based on the recommendations and conditions set forth in the Staff Report dated May 9, 2013.	• *The approval of PLN 20130022 is invalid because the written findings and conclusions issued by the ADB on August 7, 2013 are not consistent with staff recommendations, and are not supported by the official transcript of the May 15, 2013 ADB meeting.*
1.1. Human Scale and Consistency with Surrounding Environment	
ECDC Title 10 establishes the Architectural Design Board; the powers and duties to review and study land use within the city of Edmonds from a design standpoint are found in ECDC 10.05.040B ECDC Title 20.10 establishes criteria for Design Review in addition to the general purposes of the comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance. The purpose for including design review in the community development code is set forth at ECDC 20.10.100 which lists the following factors to be considered: • Encourage aesthetic environments in Edmonds; • Promote development which features amenities and excellence in the form of variations of siting, types of structures and adaptation to and conservation of topography and other natural features; and • Encourage creative approaches to the use of land and related physical developments. Except for certain exemptions not relevant to this discussion, design review pursuant to ECDC 20.10.020 includes, but is not limited to, buildings, parking lots, and lighting.	• *The ABD directives issued in December 2012 clearly relate to design and place the issue of the size and mass of Building 10 squarely and properly before the ADB for its full consideration.* • *The conclusion of the ADB to prohibit further discussion in May related to items it specifically requested in December is not in keeping with its prescribed duties.*

ECDC 20.11.030A specifically states that: *"The building shall be designed to...avoid conflict with the existing and planned character of the nearby area. All elements of building design shall form an integrated development, harmonious in scale, line and mass....Long, massive unbroken or monotonous buildings shall be avoided in order to comply with the purposes of this chapter and with the design objectives of the comprehensive plan."* ECDC 20.11.030B states that: *"The existing character of the site and the nearby area should be the starting point for the design of the building and all site treatment."*	• *There is no evidence, as cited below, that the ADB considered the extent to which the Proposal meets these explicit requirements of ECDC 20.11.030A and B.*
Following the hearing held on December 19, 2012, the ADB made several recommendations including: • Directing the applicant to make the design of Building 10 more consistent with other development approved and constructed at Point Edwards and with the Point Edwards Master Plan. • Directing the applicant to "take into consideration the following design elements present in the existing Point Edwards Buildings…more human scale…" ADB Verbatim Transcript May 15, 2013 Public Hearing ("Transcript") pages 2-3. The Staff Report of May 9, 2013 regarding PLN 20130022 cites the lack of Building 10's overall design conformance with the Master Plan. • Section VI.3.C, p. 8: *...the scale of Building 10 is out of character with the rest of the Point Edwards development and the overall topography of the site.* • Section VI.L.4, p. 10: *...the scale and form of the building is out of character with other buildings in the Point Edwards development. Stepping the eastern portion of the building down would still result in one of the tallest buildings in the Point Edwards development, but would be closer in scale with the rest of the Point Edwards development, providing a more human scale....*	• *Despite Staff Report citations of design inadequacy, at its May 15, 2013 meeting, the ADB ignored the Planning Division's recommendations without explanation; no alternatives were explored or discussed.* • *The construction of Building 10, as currently envisioned, does not comply with ECDC 16.75, the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan, or design codes found in ECDC Title 20.* • *Now envisioned by the applicant as a "stand-alone" building, it will be far more massive and much taller than any other Master Plan building.* • *Its proposed length (measuring in excess of 375 feet from East to West) is almost twice the length of the longest existing Point Edwards buildings.* • *It includes above-ground parking for 77 vehicles and provides 24-hour lighting.* • *The nine existing buildings at Point Edwards (constructed from 2005 to 2011) all fit into a common set of Master Plan design elements and assumptions of unity and harmony with the site including:* o *Height (three residential stories)*

• VI.L.6, p 11: *The five stories of the eastern portion of the proposed Building 10 do not maintain the smaller scale that is historically found in Edmonds.* • Section VI.L.8, p11: *As proposed, Building 10 would not reinforce the existing building patterns found in Point Edwards.*	○ *Scale (21-34 units per building—one building has 41 units)* ○ *Building design and materials,* ○ *Landscaping* ○ *Underground residential parking spaces (only transient parking is accommodated with above ground parking.)* • *Building 10 fails to conform to the Master Plan or to meet the design standards contained in the City's Comprehensive Plan, which the ADB is required to review and consider under ECDC 20.11.020 and 20.11.030.*
At the May 15, 2013 hearing several ADB members made the following comments to indicate there was no jurisdiction to consider the bulk, mass, and height of the Proposal including the following excerpts (found at Transcript pages 27-28): • "The design meets the code;" • "To comment on height when it's meeting code is going beyond our responsibility;" • "We are going beyond what we requested in April (sic);" • "I don't think we have the opportunity now to change the parameters for them (applicant);" and • "Changing building size wasn't mentioned." One member stated: "The building is *approaching* being consistent with the rest of the site as far as materials." (emphasis added).	• *Without explanation the ADB selectively chose which conditions to enforce from its own December 19, 2012 hearing, and which conditions to ignore.* • *Both the applicant and the Division explicitly acknowledged at the May 15, 2013 hearing that the withdrawal/resubmission by the applicant rested on a SEPA consideration and that the December 19, 2012 conditions remained relevant to a review of the Proposal. The comment by one member that the proposal is "approaching consistency" implies the proposal is not yet fully compliant and more information is needed.* • *Failure to consider all relevant design issues based on an (erroneous) conclusion that once a project 'meets code' nothing further need be considered essentially eliminates the necessity for any review by a design board.*

1.2. Modulated Roof Exemption	
ECDC 16.75.020 outlines site development standards and at footnote 4 specifically states as follows: *"Roof may extend up to five feet above the state height limit if designed as part of an approved modulated design in accordance with Chapter 20.10 ECDC."* Section VII, p.14 of the Staff Report discusses "Building Height:" *"The ADB will have to determine if the roof design is modulated enough to warrant the additional five feet allowed by the zoning code. If the additional five feet is granted, the building as proposed appears to comply with the maximum allowable height for the MP1 zone. While the building may comply with the maximum height allowed by the zone, the proposal must also meet site design standards."* *"As discussed in detail above....staff is recommending the eastern portion of Building 10 be stepped down to better conform with the site's topography and be more consistent with the rest of the Point Edwards development."*	• *The ADB and the Division failed to properly to consider the adequacy of the applicant's Roof Modulation 35- foot height exemption request.*
1.3. Parking	
The nine existing buildings completed from 2005 to 2011 all fit into a common set of Master Plan design elements and assumptions of unity and harmony with the site including: building design and materials, landscaping, and underground spaces (only Transient parking is accommodated for above-ground parking.) • There were approximately 25 on-street parking spaces initially associated with Building 10. Approved PLN20130022 includes an above- ground parking lot with 74 stalls and 24-hour lighting. • Mr. Lien acknowledges this was a significant change over the earlier 2006 design when he states, "…(i)t was a large increase in the surface parking area." Transcript, page 3. • No applicable regulations exist for underground parking. There are no codes related to underground parking, so the Division used general City parking standards to conclude above-ground parking was permissible. Transcript, page 4.	• *The ADB failed to apply appropriate review standards to the issue of on street parking.* • *The ADB did not explain its rationale for relying on ordinary City parking standards rather than examining the increased parking numbers in accordance with the Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan. A more proper analysis would have been to compare the proposed increase with the surrounding development which features 100% underground garage parking for residents in existing buildings.* • *By failing to address how above-ground parking deviates from underground parking in all other existing buildings, the ADB has failed to perform its design review function.*

2. The ADB failed to consider the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan	
Facts	*Implications of approved PLN 20130022*
Section C of the Comprehensive Plan states the following with respect to site design: • *Do not use repetitive monotonous building forms and massing in multi-family or commercial projects* (C.8.a.) • *Retain connection with the scale and character of the City of Edmonds through the use of similar materials, proportions, forms, masses or building elements.* (C.8.c.) Section D of the Comprehensive Plan states the following with respect to design objectives for building forms: *Building height and modulation guidelines are essential to create diversity in building forms, minimize shadows cast by taller buildings upon the pedestrian areas and to ensure compliance with policies in the city's Comprehensive Plan.* • D.2. Design Objectives for Massing. *D.2.a. Encourage human scale elements in building design.* *D.2.b. Reduce bulk and mass of buildings.* *D.2.d. Explore flexible site calculations to eliminate building masses that have one story on one elevation and four or greater stories on another.* • D.3. Design Objectives for Roof Modulation. *D.3.a. To break up the overall massing of the roof.* *D.3.b. Create human scale in the building.* • D.4. Design Objectives for Wall Modulation. *D.4.b. Break up large building mass and scale of a facade.* *D.4.c. To avoid stark and imposing building facades.* *D.4.d. To create a pedestrian scale appropriate to Edmonds.* *D.4.e. To become compatible with the surrounding built environment.* The Master Plan states at page 14: *"In the Upper Yard (governed in the proposed MP-1 Zone regulations), the residential buildings 'will be designed to fit into the terraced hilltop and hillside."*	• *While building materials and some horizontal applications were added by the applicant, the issue of mass and scale were not substantively addressed. See Staff Report XII. Summary.* • *Staff Report section I, line 2 states "the overall scale of the building is out of character with the Pt. Edwards development and is not harmonious with the site's topography."* • *Further, the Master Plan clearly links the "Building Dimensions and Relationships" to the Design guidelines.*

3.	**Both the ADB and the Division failed to correct technical errors in the applicant's methodology for measuring the height of Building 10 and the adequacy of the applicant's 35-foot exemption request.**
Facts	*Implications of approved PLN 20130022*
• ECDC Title 16.75 was created by Ordinance 3402 and was passed on July 2, 2002, as part of the contract rezone agreement incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 1995. • The upper portion of the zone, including the site of Building 10, was designated as MP1. It was recognized that the topography of the site presented unique issues addressed in ECDC 16.75.020 B. • Not yet having a Master Plan, but needing to control building height on the steep slopes (35 feet), the City included three specific illustrations (Figures A, B, and C of 16.75.020) to insure clarity regarding the measurement of the allowed height of 35 feet. • There is a consistency in the wording and diagrams of all three examples: The 'rectangle' used to determine the mean altitude from which measurement is calculated is around the walls of the visible portions of the building. It is clear from the drawings, and the words of this section, that it is the visible portion of the structure that is to be enveloped by the rectangle for measurement, a method unique to the MP zones due to the topography of the site. • The City was aware of the site issues at the time of adoption in 2002 because the Ordinance specifically provides in ECDC 16.75.005 F the following statement: *"The height limit and calculation procedures established for the MP1 and MP2 zones have been adopted after full consideration of the topographical constraints of sites within the zones. Variances are not available under current City code provisions in order to make more profitable use of a property. In adopting these provisions, the City Council has specifically provided for, and made allowances for the site constraints and topographical features inherent in development of the designated MP1 and MP2 sites. Therefore, no other height variance would typically be available absent a special showing of constraints unanticipated at the date of adoption of this ordinance."* (emphasis added).	• *The Division's, and by extension the ADB's, error lies in failing to require the applicant to demonstrate that its use of the height measurement methodology stated in ECDC 21.40.030A will result in the same number of allowed stories and the same overall height at the Building 10 site as would the use of ECDC 16.75.020.* • *If the Division's stated goal is trying to achieve "consistency in application of the development code" this should have been required.* • *The applicant obviously could not have met this test, however, because application of ECDC 21.40.030.A at the Building 10 site results in measuring building height from a baseline almost 18 feet above the 1st level grade, a result which would have been impossible to achieve at a lesser-sloped site like that occupied by the Gregory Building.* • *At five stories tall as currently envisioned, Building 10 could not be built elsewhere in the Edmonds bowl.*

• Despite citing the necessity for Building 10 to conform to the provisions of ECDC Title 16.75, the May 9, 2013 Staff Report instead used ECDC 21.40.030.A to justify the five-story proposed height for a portion of the building based on comparison with another property -- The Gregory Building stating at page 5: *The height rectangle used to calculate the average grade for determining the maximum allowed height encompasses the underground parking structure. This is consistent with how height calculations were performed on the Gregory Building located at 505 Fifth Avenue South under ADB-2003-44.* • The Master Plan states at page 14: *"To encourage the appearance of smaller building masses – building heights will be calculated separately for each clearly separated portion of a building."* This is further emphasized in ECDC 16.75.020B. Footnote 5.	• *This is a different measurement methodology than that found in ECDC 16.75.020 and is not appropriate here; the topography of the Gregory Building was virtually flat and highly dissimilar to the hilly sloping site at Building 10. Thus, the comparison is flawed and not justified.* • *As noted above, the Division justifies ignoring ECDC Title 16.75 by citing the City's need for "consistency in application of the development code," thus potentially enabling the arbitrary use of any Edmonds building–rather than the MPI code–as the measurement standard.* • *The "rectangle" applied is an irregular, non-square configuration inconsistent with the Master Plan directive.*

4.	**The Proposal fails to adequately address the specific areas of concern noted by the ADB at the December 19, 2012 for PLN 20120040 (the previous proposal for Building 10 subsequently withdrawn and resubmitted as PLN 20130022)**
Facts	*Implications of approved PLN 20130022*
The Staff Report of May 9, 2013 regarding PLN 20130022 cites the lack of Building 10's overall design conformance with the Master Plan. • **Section VI.3.C, p. 8**: *...the scale of Building 10 is out of character with the rest of the Point Edwards development and the overall topography of the site.* • **Section VI.L.4, p. 10**: *...the scale and form of the building is out of character with other buildings in the Point Edwards development. Stepping the eastern portion of the building down would still result in one of the tallest buildings in the Point Edwards development, but would be closer in scale with the rest of the Point Edwards development, providing a more human scale....* • **VI.L.6, p 11:** *The five stories of the eastern portion of the proposed Building 10 do not maintain the smaller scale that is historically found in Edmonds.* • **Section VI.L.8, p11:** *As proposed, Building 10 would not reinforce the existing building patterns found in Point Edwards...*	• *Despite Staff Report citations of design inadequacy, the ADB ignored the Planning Division's recommendations without explanation; no alternatives were explored or discussed.* • *Building 10 still fails to conform to the Master Plan or to meet the design standards contained in the City's Comprehensive Plan, which the ADB is required to review and consider under ECDC 20.11.020 and 20.11.030.* • *The ADB selectively chose which conditions to enforce from its own December 19, 2012 hearing, and which conditions to ignore.* • *Both the applicant and the Division explicitly acknowledged at the May 15, 2013 hearing that the withdrawal and resubmission of the application by the applicant rested on a SEPA consideration and the December 19, 2012 conditions remained relevant to a review of the new Proposal. However, addressing those conditions neither constitutes -- nor substitutes for -- a thorough review of the new Proposal PLN20130022.*

Attachment 2: Additional Parties of Record With Standing To Join Appeal

We, the undersigned, having provided written and/oral comments regarding PLN 20130022 on or before May 15, 2013, affirm that we have read the contents of this appeal, believe it to be true, and hereby join in this appeal.

JANET E. DAWSON	Janet E Dawson
45 PINE ST #302	425 361-7493
Keith Dawson	
45 Pine St #302	425-361-7493
Thomas E Murphy	Thomas E Murphy
55- Pine Street # 304	425-967-3505
Mary Gail Murphy	Gail Murphy
55 Pine St # 304	425 967 3505
ANDREA BONNICKSEN	Andrea Bonnicksen
75 Pine Street # 204	425-678-0506
Shirley Jozkewicz	Shirley Jozkewicz
41 Pine St. #208	425-582-2267
Terri A. Golner	Terri A. Golner
45 Pine St #206	425-678-8961
Jan Barrett	Jan Barrett
45 Pine St #310	425-678-8339
Stephen Reitman	Stephen Reitman
45 Pine St #308	425 967-5390
Maureen Rivelle	Maureen Rivelle
51 Pine St #207	425-308-2252

Attachment 2: Additional Parties of Record With Standing To Join Appeal

We, the undersigned, having provided written and/oral comments regarding PLN 20130022 on or before May 15, 2013, affirm that we have read the contents of this appeal, believe it to be true, and hereby join in this appeal.

MARY D. PINTLER	Mary D. Pintler
65 pine St #305 Edmonds WA 98020	425-967-3357
JAMES Pellegrino	James B Pellegrino
45 PINE ST #202 Edmonds WA	425-776-6845
Earl & Susan Larson	Susan Larson Earl Larson
41 Pine St #107 Edmonds	425-999-6099
Ruth "JR" Thompson	J. Thompson
65 Pine St. #210 Edmonds 98020	425-493-4055
URSULA JOHNSON 51 P	Ursula Johnson
51 PINE ST. #311, Edmonds 98020	425-360-9915
May Louise Knapp	May Louise Knapp
61 Pine ST. #108 Edmonds	425-774-4544
Catherine L. Yocom	Catherine L Yocom
45 Pine St. #108 Edmonds WA 98020	425 771 8305
MARY MONTGOMERY	Mary M. Montgomery
65 PINE St #304 EDMONDS 98020	425 775 5337
31 Pine St #305, Edmonds WA 98020	Zoe Gurevich
ZOE GUREVICH	425 582 7712
Marjorie Swenson	Marjorie Swenson
45 Pine Street #205	(425) 744-0929

Attachment 2: Additional Parties of Record With Standing To Join Appeal

We, the undersigned, having provided written and/oral comments regarding PLN 20130022 on or before May 15, 2013, affirm that we have read the contents of this appeal, believe it to be true, and hereby join in this appeal.

RALPH SWENSON	Ralph Swenson
45 Pine St. #205, Edmonds	425-744-0929
James Peters	James Peters
45 Pine St #207	425-412-3531
Thomas J. Barrett	Thomas J. Barrett
45 Pine St. #310 Edmonds 98020	425-678-8539
ZE A. SHOBE	Zea Shobe
31 PINE ST #208 EDMONDS, WA 98020	425-582-0485
Edward Morris	Edward Morris
61 Pine #204 Edmonds WA 98020	760-902-1887
Nancy Bittner	Nancy Bittner
31 Pine St. #214 Edmonds WA 98020	425-640-6699
Margaret Mesaros	Margaret Mesaros
51 Pine St #211 Edmonds WA 98020	206/948-9516
DENISE REIBMAN	Denise Reibman
45 PINE ST #308	425-967 5390
LOIS RATHVON	Lois Rathvon
71 PINE ST # 302	425-744 2721
THOMAS R WAGGENER	Thomas R Waggener
65 PINE ST, #103	425-582-0410

3/16

Attachment 2: Additional Parties of Record With Standing To Join Appeal

We, the undersigned, having provided written and/oral comments regarding PLN 20130022 on or before May 15, 2013, affirm that we have read the contents of this appeal, believe it to be true, and hereby join in this appeal.

Sally E. Shobe	Sally E. Shobe
31 Pine St. #208	425-582-0485
FRANIA DEAN	[illegible]
45 PINE ST #209	425 743-9696
David Golner	[illegible]
45 Pine St #206	425-678-8961
Douglas K. Julien	[illegible]
65 Pine St #201	425-260-0249
Janis I. Smith	Janis I. Smith
45 Pine St. #204	425-771-2176
FLOYD E. SMITH	[illegible]
45 Pine ST #204	425 771-2176
Sharon L. Ruff	Sharon L. Ruff
55 Pine St. #212	425-776-6778
DANA DAVIES	Dana Davies
45 PINE ST #105	425-582-0354

Attachment 2: Additional Parties of Record With Standing To Join Appeal

We, the undersigned, having provided written and/oral comments regarding PLN 20130022 on or before May 15, 2013, affirm that we have read the contents of this appeal, believe it to be true, and hereby join in this appeal.

Karen WOLKOFSKY	Karenwolkofsky
71 Pine St. apt. 206.	425. 361. 2708
LEWIS WOLKOFSKY	
71 PINE ST. APT. 206	425-361-2708
Christy G. Cufley	Christy G. Cufley
51 Pine Street #309	425- 967-3666

5/6

PARTY OF RECORD

URSULA JOHNSON
51 PINE STREET, #311
EDMONDS, WA 98020
Phone: 425-967-3463

I SENT A LETTER TO MR. K. LIEN, SR. PLANNER CITY OF EDMONDS, ON APRIL 4, 2013, STATING OUR CONCERN THE PROPOSED RENTAL COMPLEX WOULD HAVE ON OUR COMMUNITY.

I HAVE READ THE CONTENTS OF THE APPEAL AND BELIEVE THEM TO BE TRUE.

I UNDERSTAND THAT CHRISTY CUFFLY IS ACTING SOLELY IN AN INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY AS A CITIZEN OF EDMONDS AND IS NOT THE LEGAL COUNSEL FOR ME, PERSONALLY, OR FOR THE GROUP IN GENERAL.

Ursula Johnson