From: STEPHEN ROBERTS
To: PRC
Subject: Proposed 5th and Virginia Project 3019699
Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 1:30:29 PM

CAUTION: External Email

I submit these comments in response to the EIS Addendum to the proposed 5th and Virginia development.

The EIS addendum is troubling because it minimizes the legitimate concerns over the health effects caused by substantially reduced natural light to residents of east facing condos in the Escala, a 31 story building which would be dwarfed and left in shadow by a proposed 48 story project less than 20 feet away.

Scientific articles are legion as to the adverse health effects, including depression, lethargy, and increased risk of cancer, caused by significant deprivation of natural light.

The EIS Addendum does not refute these adverse health effects, but merely cites the Brainard Study's finding that it is uncertain as to the relative impact of daylight versus electric light on human health.

The EIS Addendum confirms that the proposed project would result in the 300 lux threshold not being met for a majority (56%) of the regularly occupied homes on the east side of Escala, and therefore did not achieve the threshold to earn a WELL point.

Symantec Consulting notes a marked reduction in daylight to east facing Escala units if the project were to be approved.

The EIS Addendum does not even mention, much less address, the undisputed findings of expert Joel Loveland presented at the appeal hearing that if the project as proposed were built, some east facing units would receive adequate daylight conditions for only 12% of daytime hours, and that in winter months there would be less.

The EIS Addendum seeks to minimize these findings in two ways.

First it theorizes that residents in these darkened Escala units will have access to natural light because it claims that the average Seattleite spends two-thirds of daylight hours outside their home. This ignores the reality that a not insubstantial number of Escala residents are elderly, disabled, or home bound and are unable to spend two thirds of their time outside their homes.

Second, while conceding that reduction in daylight to residents of Escala will occur under the project as proposed, and is likely to be perceived as significant by residents of east facing Escala units, it is in the opinion of the authors of the EIS Addendum that it would cause a less than moderate impact to the downtown urban environment as a whole.

Many downtown residents who live far from the shadow of the proposed 48 story behemoth known as the Douglaston Tower would not be affected. But to the east facing Escala unit residents, the effect on their quality of life and potential adverse health effects will be deleterious and constant.

To the authors of the EIS Addendum, I ask would you find it acceptable for you and your loved ones to have adequate daylight conditions for only 12% of daytime hours, with even less than 12% in the winter? Would it not be cold comfort to you that downtown residents several blocks away would be unaffected when you and your family were suffering the adverse health effects and reduced quality of life caused by a 48 story building, 17 stories higher than yours, and less than 20 feet from your living room that consigned you and your family to a life lived in constant shadow?

The Downtown EIS Addendum notes that buildings that are taller and narrower with spacing between structures may (more correctly, certainly) cause fewer shadow impacts.

The obvious question thus is why even consider approval of a proposed project that would adversely affect the quality of life and the health of Escala residents living in a constant shadow, when an alternate design that is taller and narrower with a greater setback to provide adequate spacing between structures would ease these significant problems.

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Stephen Roberts, 1920 4th Ave. #2905, Seattle, WA 98101. (206) 899-6688.

Sent from my iPhone