



City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

Department of Planning & Development

D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3004704
Applicant Name: Bradley Khouri for Graham Black
Address of Proposal: 1911 East Madison Street

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to establish use for future construction of two, three-story townhouse structures, containing three-units each, and a one unit ground-related residential structure, for a total of seven residential units. The project includes providing seven accessory parking stalls within carport-like structure. Demolition of existing structure will be removed under separate permit.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review - Section 23.41, Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) with Development Standard Departure:

- 1) To allow increase in the amount of *Lot Coverage* (SMC 23.45.010.A)
- 2) To allow increase in *Structure Depth* quantity (SMC 23.45.011.A)

SEPA - Threshold Determination - (Chapter 25.05 SMC).

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS EIS

DNS with conditions

DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition or involving another agency with jurisdiction.

**Early Notice DNS published October 19, 2006.

BACKGROUND DATA

Site Description:

The subject site occupies a total land area of approximately 14,601 square feet, in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. The site is a corner lot with street frontages on two rights-of-ways; East Pine Street to the north, and 19th Avenue to the west in a Multifamily Lowrise Duplex/Triplex zone (LTD), with a minimum lot area requirement of one unit per 2,000 square feet.

The development site will combine three separate parcels of land into one site. Two of the three parcels are currently development with single family residential uses, with one containing a multifamily duplex use. The existing structures are older buildings, ranging in height between one and two-stories. The development site is modestly landscaped with vegetation that includes trees, shrubs, and grass.



The site slopes modestly downward from west to east, approximately 10 feet over a distance of 120 feet with a level area near the west half of the site. The abutting streets are fully developed rights-of-way with asphalt roadway; curbs, sidewalks and gutters. 19th Avenue is collector arterial roadway abutting the subject site to the west, along the north/south axis. The site is one block south from East Madison Street. East Madison Street connects the surrounding residential neighborhoods from Lake Washington to Downtown.

The site is not located in any identified or designated Environmentally Critical Area (ECA), or any other land use overlays.

Area Development:

The site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of East Pine Street and 19th Avenue. The site sits near the east crest of Capitol Hill, with views of the Cascades towards the east. The neighborhood features a mix of older single family and multi-story residential structures, and a mix of institutional and commercial uses to the north along the East Madison corridor. The older housing stock is dominated by a mix of one and two-story structures built as early as 1904. To the west across 19th Avenue, residential structures sit approximately 10 feet above sidewalk grade owing to existing topographic conditions. Across East Pine Street to the north the housing stock are modestly sized. The surrounding streets are spacious with wide roadways and planting strips. Zoning at the site and along a narrow strip extending south of the center line of East Pine Street is Multifamily Lowrise Duplex Triplex (LDT) with a density requirement of one unit per 2,000 square feet. This narrow LDT zoning band reaches a half block from the centerline of 19th Avenue. Abutting the subject site to the east is a less intensive Single Family 5,000 zone (SF 5000). North of the centerline of East Pine Street zoning intensifies to Multifamily Lowrise Three (L3), with a density requirement of one unit per 800 square feet. To the northwest, across the intersection, the zone changes to Neighborhood Commercial Two, with a 40 foot height limit (NC2-40). This area of Capitol Hill is undergoing a transformation as numerous development projects are changing the streetscape as they develop to the height limits of the underlying zones.

Proposal:

The applicant proposes to combine three parcels of land to construct three townhouse structures containing a total of seven units (two structures will house three units and the third structure will contain one unit). The site layout is proposed to be more organic in design to open up a central common area, "Pedestrian Canyon," to encourage social interactions, building a sense of community within the development site. The buildings will establish a strong street presence scaled to neighboring properties, using modulation and spatial separation to visually enliven the block. The programmed mix of unit sizes and layout is anticipated to provide a range of diversity both economically and socially, reflective of the neighborhood. The stated goal is to construct a thoughtful development which will share a pedestrian canyon that physically, emotionally, and architecturally strengthens links to all homes, and is intended to provide a dramatic addition to the Capitol Hill neighborhood.

Accessory parking will be accessed off both street frontages; an existing driveway will be reused to accommodate one parking stall off 19th Avenue. The remaining stalls will be accessed off Pine Street. All surface parking stalls will be covered to enhance the development site and reduce visual impacts upon adjacent properties. Special emphases will be directed towards providing an attractive and inviting pedestrian experience within the pedestrian canyon viewed from the right-of-way.

The applicant requested two departures from the Land Use Code development standards: lot coverage allowance per SMC 23.45.010.A; and Structure Depth quantity per SMC 23.45.011.A.

Public Comments:

Date of Notice of Application:	October 19, 2006
Date End of Comment Period:	November 1, 2006
# Letters	6
Issues:	

The SEPA comment period for this proposal ended on November 1, 2006. The Department received no comment letters during the public comment period. Five letters were received after the comment period ended, which were taken in account during the SEPA analysis phase. Four letters were in support of the proposed design, one voiced concern with spillover noise from parking areas onto adjacent properties, façade materials, among others comments was noted by the assigned planner. One letter was received during the Early Design Guidance (EDG) phase that voiced concern surrounding potential impacts regarding design compatibility with the existing neighborhood; specifically building location and bulk impacts on adjacent properties. During the time of the Design Review phase (EDG and Recommendation meetings) community members voiced their desire for maintaining and strengthening their neighborhood's vibrancy by commenting on aspects of the applicant's proposal. A number of their concerns were aired during the design review phase; including modifying the proposed structures massing and façade detailing.

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

Early Design Guidance

An Early Design Guidance Public Meeting was held by the At-Large Design Review Board on June 14, 2006. Seventeen (17) members of the public attended the June 14th meeting. Public comments included concerns related to following issues:

- The siting of the parking and driveway will be located next to a bedroom window, adjacent to the south property line.
- Liked preferred option (#3), especially the pedestrian canyon.
- What houses were acquired for this development - our neighborhood is rapidly changing with the removal of single family homes for townhouse and apartment construction.
- It is important that the replaced housing fits into our neighborhood character?
- What is the reasoning behind providing the common area at the site; it just seems too different from other projects in the area?
- What is the projected market price for each unit, will it be affordable to the existing population or just another project that forces Black people to move out of the community?
- Did the design team build the recently completed project on 19th Avenue?

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in the City of Seattle's "*Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings*" of highest priority to this project:

A. *Site Planning*

A-3 *Entrances Visible from the Street:* *Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.*

The Board stated that the residential entrances should be readily identifiable and should be emphasized, with sensitivity to adjacent street level uses. The entrance should have a distinctive and attractive presence that readily opens up to the surrounding neighborhood.

A-4 *Human Activity:* *New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.*

Entries are encouraged to open up to the street to invite informal social interactions. The establishment of pedestrian activity areas on 19th Avenue and East Pine Street is encouraged at street levels to create greater opportunities for pedestrian interaction and residential uses, and should be incorporated in the design. The Board also encouraged establishing street level structured entrances to be more interesting and inviting.

A-6 Transition between Residence and Street: For residential projects, the space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors.

The Board emphasized the location and quality of residential open space should be considered as a high value element that serves the needs of its residential inhabitants. Residential open spaces adjacent to the right-of-way should be framed in a fashion that does not create a hard surface that disconnects residential uses from activities adjacent to the development site.

A-10 Corner Lots: Buildings on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.

The Board felt that the buildings arrayed on the site were well sited that created a scale that was in keeping with the surrounding structures. The proposal should pay attention addressing vehicle access and parking impacts upon adjacent properties. The design should optimize natural light into the proposed interior court and should provide quality elements to encourage use.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 Height, Bulk and Scale: Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less-intensive zones.

The Board encouraged the applicant to take into account structures and uses in the adjacent Single family zone to the east and Lowrise zone to the south, to inform a design that reflects greater sensitivity to the existing scale on this block fronts.

D. Pedestrian Environment

D-2 Blank Walls: Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable, they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.

The Board recommended that the facades within the pedestrian canyon should be well defined with detailing to help create a lively, pedestrian experience through and around the common areas. Additionally, facades facing the street should be similarly designed. Weather protection devices employed over pedestrian entry thresholds should be animated.

D-4 Design of Parking Lots near Sidewalks: Parking lots near sidewalks should provide adequate security and lighting, avoid encroachment of vehicles onto the sidewalk, and minimize the visual clutter of parking lot signs and equipment.

Where parking is visible to the street, screening devices should be employed to minimize potential adverse impacts. Landscaped trellises, arbors should be incorporated into covered surface stalls.

D-7 Personal Safety and Security: Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.

The Board recommended serious consideration should be directed to installing well designed lighting elements in the pedestrian canyon to insure a sense of security during the evening hours. Additionally, lighting should be incorporated into the facades to illuminate pedestrian areas but which does not spillover onto the street or impact the residential tenants above. Spill lighting onto adjacent properties should be eliminated to the furthest extent possible.

Summary

The priority guidelines and guidance from the Board reflect their concern as to how the proposed project would better integrate into the existing and developing neighborhood.

Design Review Board Recommendations

On September 18, 2006, the applicant submitted the full Master Use Permit application, and on December 6, 2006, the Capitol Hill/First Hill Design Review Board (Area 7) convened for the recommendation meeting. The applicant presented elevation renderings, site plans that responded to design guidelines set forth by the Board during the previous meetings. The applicant requested two departures from the City's Land Use Code.

Developer's Presentation:

Bradley Khouri, architect, and Graham Black, developer, both co-owners of Urbansight, shared presentation responsibilities. They opened with their presentation with Urbansight's design principals: Building communities through design, by creating spaces for social interactions is a central theme in each project Urbansight embarks on. Using sustainable principals and materials to minimize adverse environmental impacts is an additional goal that will be employed at the development site. An overview of the project's history proceeded the site's context analysis and response to EDG guidelines. A number of changes have been made in response to comments from the Board and public, including scaling the massing down and reconfiguring parking access and location. During this phase, where possible, emphasis was placed on increasing opportunities to provide outdoor spaces for social interaction and allowing natural light into each unit. The design team used a scaled model, slides, presentation boards, and 11 x 17 colored packets to describe the design response.

Specific responses to Board Guidance:

1. Readable residential entry: The residential entries will be distinguishable by a facade composition and use of modulation treatments. The use of color, materials, and lighting will add to readability of each unit and help accent differentiation and scale of the development. Secondary entries have been added to emphasize street presence and create opportunities from the street perspective to encourage activity adjacent to the right-of-way.
2. Design should optimize natural light into pedestrian canyon and provide quality elements to encourage use: The updated design proposes to increase separation between structures at the west spur to allow additional afternoon sunlight to penetrate into the pedestrian canyon. During the summer months, owing in part to reflective façade materials the

canyon will maximize natural light into the open space areas. A common mailbox station, outdoor furniture, surface materials, and landscaping are among a number of elements designed to make this area an attractive and inviting outdoor room. The third floor of the residential structure will step back an additional 5 feet along the west spur to create a sense of openness. A common P-patch garden and tool/bicycle shed will have direct access to the canyon. Principal entrances to each unit will be access off the pedestrian canyon.

3. Design should be sensitive to adjacent zones: As viewed from both street fronts, which includes a less dense SF 5000 zone to the east, and the LDT zone to the south, the proposal seeks a scale the development in keeping with the rhythm of the existing residential character. Structure heights at the development site are varied invoking the eclectic housing pattern in the vicinity. The proposed minimum 10 foot separation between each building is reflective of setback pattern between adjacent properties. The roof systems will also be as varied as the existing eclectic pattern along the streetscape.
4. Install well designed lighting elements to insure a sense of security in the pedestrian canyon: Three different kinds of outdoor lighting are proposed; a front door light adjacent to the canyon, discreet light fixtures at the secondary entrances adjacent to the ROW, and strategically placed lights throughout the canyon is programmed to optimize a sense of security through out the development. Light in the canyon will feature sensors detecting natural ambient light and will increase intensity when individuals are in the canyon with motion sensors. The Lighting system will be design to reduce spillover onto adjacent properties.
5. Optimize protecting the pedestrian experience within the right-of-way: As noted, above the neighborhood character is eclectic and the design has added some modern flourishes to establish a visually engaging street presence compatible to surrounding structures. Façade modulations, fenestration, doors, low fences, and landscaping all combine to embrace activity within the right-of-way. The individual homes (townhouse units) are composed of a series of three-dimensional interlocking shapes clad in stained cedar and colored cement fiber boards. Vehicle access driveways will be readable from the right-of-way. Carport trellis and landscaping will be employed to indicate driveways as well to warn pedestrians of potential hazards.
6. Detailed colored landscape plan: Provided.

Public Comments

During the December 6, 2006, Final Recommendation meeting no members from the public commented on the proposal.

Board Recommendations

The Board thanked the applicant for their professionalism and unique design concept. They noted at the outset that the Board members felt that the overall presentation and design of the proposal had successfully achieved a high level of integration of modernized urban form into the existing neighborhood fabric.

The Board noted several areas that stood out that needed additional attention. One Board member inquired about the design and layout of the parallel parking stalls adjacent to the east property line. The layout appeared cumbersome, requiring additional maneuvering to negotiate in and out of stalls. The applicant assured the Board that the parking layout and design meet code development standards. A follow-up question related to permeability of the parking surface was raised. The applicant verified that the surface would be permeable but had not yet settled on the type of surface materials to be installed at the time of the meeting. The Board would leave it up to the applicant and land use planner to find the best solution to work through the surface materials in the parking and drive aisle areas. The Board was encouraged by the design team's emphasis on quality design to make the proposal more distinguishable and interesting.

(Guidelines A-3, A-10, D-4, D-7)

The Board wanted to know what type of materials was programmed for the carport trellis. Wood (Douglas fir) treated with a clear coat finish was identified as one material that was under consideration by the architect. A question arose as to the long-term durability of the wood material. The Board would like to see careful attention directed towards creating a more durable carport with equal time devoted to designing the structures with attractive flourishes. If feasible, concrete post should be employed for the carports to decrease potential damage due in part to motorists maneuvering in and out of stalls. **The Board felt their suggested design improvements did not warrant another meeting, but instead the assigned planner would be entrusted to finalize design details prior to issuing a MUP permit. *(Guidelines A-3, A-10, D-4, D-7)***

Discussion ensued among the Board, including the proposed "modernist" styled building which appears to successfully integrate itself into a neighborhood which features a wide array of architectural styles. The project is well designed and conceived with minor lapses in attention to the pedestrian experience along 19th and East Pine. The Board members were impressed with the objective of the owner and shared their appreciation for taking steps to build a sense of community through design, both within the site and with external connections to the neighborhood. Varying the building's mass on all street frontages to establish a more significant presence that plays on the eclectic urban form in the immediate area has been obtained.

The Board would like to see careful attention directed towards creating a more prominent residential entry with equal time devoted to opening up the façade with attractive flourishes. It was apparent to several Board members that the challenges of affixing hardi-panel siding to the frame and maintaining a high level of quality were of significant concern. The design team informed the Board that panels would be clear coated and nailed; asserting their previous success on other projects using this method. The Board was particularly interested in surface materials in the pedestrian canyon. A reexamination of the facade materials and how they are proposed to be attached is in order. **The Board recommended that the applicant refine the façades facing**

the streets and pedestrian canyon; explore long term durability of cedar siding, consideration of stainless steel screws attached to hardi-panels will need further development which the design team is instructed to resolve with the assigned planner. (Guidelines A-4, D-2, D-7)

Creating accessible and readable entries along the street level façade along 19th is a priority item.

The orientation and design of the secondary entrances visible from the street did not encourage use, the Board remarked. Brighter lighting and covered entrances may encourage pedestrian use. The design team responded by re-emphasizing the function and role of the canyon is to encourage opportunities for informal social interactions, and thus programmed the primary entrances off the pedestrian canyon. The design team agreed to explore lighting options over the secondary entrances. Creating readable and usable entries on street facing façades to encourage greater interaction with pedestrians along 19th has not been achieved and is a priority item. This area should be more welcoming owing in part to the residential zone that the development site is located. **Therefore, the Board recommended an attractive facade system be employed along the 19th Avenue frontage that actuates design. The Board encouraged the design team to consider adding overhead weather protection and exploring different lighting options to make the residential entries facing the street more distinctive. (Guidelines A-3, A-6, A-10, D-7)**

Overall, the Board acknowledged its pleasure with the design. In particular the modernist building represented an invigorated addition to the neighborhood that would only benefit from its organic composition. The pedestrian canyon and landscaping presentation was well done and achieved a sophisticated integration of urban form and social interaction. The architect was instructed to work out the details with the planner following the Recommendation meeting to address areas of concern identified above. **The four Board members present recommended that the design should be approved with the refinements noted to be worked out with DPD. In particular, the residential experience from the right-of-way and carport area needs further development.**

Departure Analysis

1. To allow increase in the amount of *Lot Coverage (SMC 23.45.010.A)*

Development's that contain a mix of townhouse and other residential structures on the same site; lot coverage is calculated using a formula expressing a ratio reflecting unit types. The maximum lot coverage in a Lowrise Duplex/Triplex zone is forty-five (45) percent for townhouses, and thirty-five (35) percent for other structures. When both types of development occur at the same site a formula is used. The requirement for the proposal is 43.4%. The applicant proposes a lot coverage in the amount of 46.6% (6,811/14,601 SF = or .466).

The proposal features surface parking stalls to maximize habitable living space within each unit. Parking has been arrayed around the perimeter to allow for an integrated common open space to dominate the proposal and encourage informal social interactions – to build a sense of community on site. As viewed from the street and adjacent properties, the parking areas would have an adverse impact and detract from a sophisticated and well designed proposal. To create a more attractive and inviting space and provide opportunities to green up the site, carports with trellis systems to soften surface parking pads have been introduced. This addition will cause the

lot coverage to exceed the maximum threshold. **The four Board members were in support of this addition at the time of the EDG meeting. The carport structures have evolved since the EDG meeting but further refinement is needed. The Board directed the design team to work with the DPD planner to create finer detailing elements to establish well portioned and durable structures that will be an asset to the proposal and neighborhood. (A-6, A-10, B-1)**

2. To allow reduction in *Structure Depth* quantity (*SMC 23.45.011.A*)

Maximum building depth for structures is sixty (60) percent of the lot depth, but not to exceed sixty-five (65) feet in the Lowrise Duplex/Triplex zone. The development site combines three parcels of land which has resulted in a development site larger than what is typically found in the zoned area. The site’s front and rear orientation is along the north/south axis, resulting in a lot depth of 118.59 linear feet. The applicant is proposing to construct two adjacent buildings encompassing 76.8 linear feet of street frontage, resulting in a lot depth of 65%. The applicant presented a street massing study During the Early Design Guidance (EDG) to illustrate the existing streetscape pattern. Along the 19th Avenue street frontage, the mass of the proposed buildings will be in keeping with the existing pattern. The corner structure will contain three units, with the second structure supporting one residential use. The size of each unit will be comparable in size and mass with existing structures.

The Board was supportive of the concept at the EDG meeting to fit within the rhythm along the 19th and encouraged the applicant to open up structures towards the street. **During the Recommendation meeting the Board expressed support, but felt additional attention needed to be directed towards making the entrances more significant. The applicant was instructed to work with the planner to address this minor lapse in the facade design. (A-3, A-4, A-6)**

Summary of Board’s Recommendation

<i>Development Standard</i>	<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Applicant rationale</i>	<i>Recommendation by Board</i>
<i>1. Lot coverage 23.45.010.A</i>	<i>Maximum lot coverage for townhouses is 45%, for other structures 35%; when both types of development occur at the same site a formula is used. The requirement for the proposal is 43.4%</i>	<i>6,811/14,601 SF = 46.6% or .466</i>	<i>To accommodate a carports or trellis system to soften surface parking pads upon adjacent properties. To create a more attractive and inviting space and provide opportunities to green up the site.</i>	<i>▪ Board Approved (Design Guidelines: A-4, A-6, B-1, & D-7)</i>

<p><i>2. Structure depth quantity.</i> <i>23.45.011.A</i></p>	<p><i>Maximum building depth is 60% of the lot depth, but not to exceed 65 feet</i></p>	<p><i>76.8 feet of 65% of lot depth</i></p>	<p><i>The depth of the lot is larger than most found within the zone, due in part to combining three separate parcels of land. The structures employ modulation and separation techniques to minimize visual presence along the north/south axis.</i></p>	<p>▪ <i>Board Approved</i> (Design Guidelines: A-10, B-1, & D-2)</p>
---	---	---	---	--

The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the December 6, 2006 meeting. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plans and other drawings submitted for review on June 28, 2006. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the four Design Review Board members who were present recommended approval of the subject design with conditions. Two departures were requested and recommended for approval. The four Board members unanimously made the following recommendations. (Authority referred to in letter and numbers are in parenthesis):

1. Design and install surface treatments using quality materials to green up and soften the parking pads and aisles with permeable materials to be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner. *A-10, D-4, & D-7*
2. Careful attention shall be directed towards creating a more durable carport with equal time devoted to designing the structures with attractive flourishes. If feasible, concrete post should be employed for the carports to decrease potential damage due in part to motorists maneuvering in and out of stalls to be approval by DPD planner. *A-10, D-4, & D-7*
3. Design an attractive facade system to be employed along the streets and pedestrian canyon; explore long term durability of cedar siding, consideration of stainless steel screws attached to hardi-panels will need further development which the design team is instructed to resolve with the assigned planner. *A-3, A-4, A-10, B-1, & D-2*
4. Design and use more detailing (texturing, etc.) along the street façade along 19th Avenue to make the façade more readable. Install overhead weather protection and explore different lighting options to make the residential entries facing the street more distinctive. *A-3, A-6, A-10, D-7*

Director’s Analysis and Decision: Design Review

The Design Review Board recommended that the assigned planner should work with the applicant to resolve several Board recommendations prior to DPD approval. DPD is equally pleased with the overall building design but as was noted in the recommendation meeting by the

Board, the street level pedestrian experience needs additional design development along 19th Avenue. Further, the Director is authorized to provide additional analysis and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F). The Design Review Board identified elements of the Design Guidelines (above) which are critical to the project's overall success with concurrence of the Director.

The new development site presents a unique design opportunity given its corner lot location with two street frontages that each has a distinct pedestrian activity demand that requires individual attention. The buildings fronting East Pine Street are well articulated to match the more residential feel along this less active right-of-way. What has been called into question is the readability and connection to the street experience along 19th Avenue. The architect has responded to the comments and concerns of both the public and the Design Review Board and has established a more distinct residential character along 19th Avenue which is well thought out and executed with minor lapses. To strengthen the streetscape experience DPD concurs with the Board that the proposed overhead weather protection and entry lighting along 19th Avenue is less than ideal. However, the 19th Avenue facing facades must be understated to encourage use of the internal pedestrian canyon and common areas. It may be a matter of installing visual cues at the pedestrian canyon to announce front entrance presence. During the course of conversations during the recommendation meeting the applicant proposed to change the overhead weather protection and lighting at the residential entries with accent materials and electric lighting to animate the facade. DPD is in the process of finalizing design details of the revised facade to punctuate the residential entries. The building facades have been broken down into elements which break up the bulk of the building, creating a distinctive residential presence.

The design of the three proposed three (3)-story buildings (with a total of seven residential units, six townhouse and one unit uses) has similar good overall scale and proportion of residential structures in the residential area. The design has incorporated influences of the surrounding vernacular within a bold modern context to provide visual interest that creates a sense of individuality. As viewed from the 19th Avenue street frontage, the proposed structures will feature a unique design with vibrant texture and materials. The roof systems for each structure are as varied as roofs found in the immediate area; that is both well scaled to the streetscape and has achieved a high composition level that truly is innovative for townhouse developments.

On February 7, 2007, Brad Khouri met with DPD to finalize design responses to the recommendation meeting. Among other items discussed;

- Street level experience along 19th Avenue. Changes to façade included detail of individual canopies (extending 18 inches from façade) at entry doors from 19th Avenue and East Pine Street. The design includes two pairs of cedar (1 x 6's) that will be ripped at an angle to taper to a thinner profile away from the building. They will be tied with cables back up to the building wall above and support a piece of translucent Plexiglas. Above the canopy a light will shine on the entry canopy and diffuse the light at the door. The façade siding will be similar to an Urbansight project at 1411 East Fir Street, with exposed stainless steel fasteners screwed through painted hardi panel. During the discussion an agreement was reached to install a common address sign in the canyon spaces directly visible from the street, which will draw visitors into the heart of the proposal.

- Changes to the parking areas and aisle surfaces included installing concrete post supporting a wood lateral trellis. The proposal will provide concrete columns at the corners of the two parallel parking spaces and details showing the connections to recycled beams supporting the carport. As discussed with planner, the carport will be entirely covered with a translucent lexan material to allow light to penetrate below the carport and completely shelter the automobile and owner. The lexan will be sloped to drain towards the driveway. In addition, car-stops will be included at the ends of the spaces to protect the cedar fences that screen the parking. At the time of the meeting design details of the parking surface had not been finalized. As agreed, a condition will be added to the decision that will require final determination of the type of pervious concrete or concrete grasscrete in the driveway and parking areas by the land use planner during construction, prior to our final inspection.
- Lastly, to properly frame the development site, proposed fencing will modulate in height; for unit number four a gate in to the private open space from E Pine Street will be introduced provide needed privacy and security since the glass door facing the street enters into a bedroom at the first floor.

The pedestrian canyon and integrated common open space areas are high value elements that have been designed to encourage social interactions including shared use of a common p-patch garden, to orientation of the internal primary access doors. The structures at development site have been designed and located to allow natural light to penetrate and brighten up this inner outdoor open space area.

- Benches, tables, shared mailbox, and a common shed will be provided to activate this area. The design features elements to build a sense of community that is intended to translate beyond the property boundary lines. With focus directed towards opening up internal communication, the perimeter may have been underdeveloped, if not for the applicants holistic design approach. DPD was pleased to learn that the design team took the extraordinary steps to address concerns from abutting property owners to minimize visual and noise impacts upon adjacent properties. DPD concurs with the Board in regards to ensuring durable materials are used for the carport and trellis structures. Based on the material board and color palette, DPD feels that the design team will deliver a quality product. Overall, the development will be a positive addition the City of Seattle.

The applicant requested departures from development standards related to lot coverage and structure depth requirements and the Board recommended approval. After evaluating the DR Board recommendations and meeting with the design team to resolve all outstanding design concerns, the Director has no objections and concurs with the Boards decisions. The assigned planner was given authorization to approve additional departures if any where uncovered during the final zoning review phase. The Director has no further conditions to add. The previously stated Board conditions will be made a part of DPD approval.

The Director of DPD has reviewed the recommendations and conditions of the four Design Review Board members. The Director finds that the proposal is consistent with the “*City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings.*” The Director **APPROVES** the subject design consistent with the Board’s recommendations above. This

decision is based on the Design Review Board's final recommendations and on the plans submitted at the public meeting on December 6, 2006. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in this decision are expected to remain substantially as presented in the plans resubmitted to DPD on September 18, 2006 and last revised on February 7, 2007.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist prepared by the Graham Black (dated September 18, 2006) and annotated by the Land Use Planner. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information submitted by the applicant and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, certain neighborhood plans, and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority.

The Overview Policy states, in part, "Where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" subject to some limitations. Under such limitations/circumstances (SMC 25.05.665) mitigation can be considered.

Short-term Impacts

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction workers' vehicles. Existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project such as: The Noise Ordinance, the Stormwater Grading and Drainage Control Code, the Street Use Ordinance, and the Building Code, would mitigate several construction-related impacts. Following is an analysis of the air, water quality, streets, parking, and construction-related noise impacts as well as mitigation.

Historic and Cultural Preservation - Construction of the proposed townhouse structures and single family structure will necessitate the demolition of three existing residential structures that were constructed during the early 1900's. In accordance with the *Department of Planning and Development – Department of Neighborhoods Interdepartmental Agreement on Review of Historic Building during SEPA Review*; the planner referred potential landmark eligibility approval to the Historic Preservation Officer. The Historic Preservation Officer evaluates criteria for designation of historic landmark structures (in response to the SEPA Historic Preservation Policy (SMC 25.05.675.H.2.d). The review of the information associated with the status of the existing structures (addressed 1911 East Pine Street, 1530 19th Avenue, and 1526 19th Avenue) did not warrant landmark status, as determined by the Landmarks Preservation Board, (LPB 54/07) in a letter dated February 14, 2007.

Parking and Traffic - Construction of the project is proposed to last for several months. Parking utilization along streets in the vicinity is moderate and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction is not anticipated to reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity. Parking demand for construction personal can be accommodated at the development site and any spillover can be managed within the right-of-way within the vicinity. Therefore, no further mitigation will be required.

The Street Use Ordinance includes regulations that mitigate dust, mud, and circulation. Temporary closure of sidewalks and/or traffic lane(s) would be adequately controlled with a street use permit through the Transportation Department, and no further SEPA conditioning would be needed

Noise - The development site is located adjacent to a residential area where construction of this scale would impact the noise levels. The SEPA Noise Policy (Section 25.05.675B SMC) lists mitigation measures for construction noise impacts. It is the department's conclusion that limiting hours of construction beyond the requirements of the Noise Ordinance is necessary to mitigate impacts that would result from the proposal on surrounding properties, due to the density of residential units in the area and the proximity of these structures to the subject site. All construction activities are subject to the limitations of the Noise Ordinance. Construction activities (including but not limited to demolition, grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays from 7am to 6pm. Interior work that involves mechanical equipment, including compressors and generators, may be allowed on Saturdays between 9am and 6pm once the shell of the structure is completely enclosed, provided windows and doors remain closed. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.

Construction activities outside the above-stated restrictions may be authorized by the Land Use Planner when necessitated by unforeseen construction, safety, or street-use related situations. Requests for extended construction hours or weekend days must be submitted to the Land Use Planner at least three (3) days in advance of the requested dates in order to allow DPD to evaluate the request.

Air and Environmental Health - Given the age of the existing structure on the site, it may contain asbestos, which could be released into the air during demolition. The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA), the Washington Department of Labor and Industry, and EPA regulations provide for the safe removal and disposal of asbestos. In addition, federal law requires the filing of a demolition permit with PSCAA prior to demolition. Pursuant to SMC Sections 25.05.675 A and F, to mitigate potential adverse air quality and environmental health impacts, project approval will be conditioned upon submission of a copy of the PSCAA permit prior to issuance of a demolition permit, if necessary. So conditioned, the project's anticipated adverse air and environmental health impacts will be adequately mitigated.

Construction is expected to temporarily add particulates to the air and will result in a slight increase in auto-generated air contaminants from construction worker vehicles; however, this increase is not anticipated to be significant. Federal auto emission controls are the primary means of mitigating air quality impacts from motor vehicles as stated in the Air Quality Policy (Section 25.05.675 SMC). No unusual circumstances exist, which warrant additional mitigation, per the SEPA Overview Policy.

There are no short term impacts identified with the creation of (unit lot) full subdivisions. Short term impacts are associated with the construction of the structures and have been analyzed and discussed with no further conditioning is warranted.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated from the proposal: increased surface water runoff from greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased demand on public services and utilities; increased light and glare; loss of vegetation; and increased energy consumption. These long-term impacts are not considered significant because the impacts are minor in scope.

The long-term impacts are typical of multifamily structures and will in part be mitigated by the City's adopted codes and/or ordinances. Specifically these are: Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code (stormwater runoff from additional site coverage by impervious surface); Land Use Code (height; setbacks; parking); and the Seattle Energy Code (long-term energy consumption). Additional land use impacts which may result in the long-term are discussed below.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The SEPA Height, Bulk and Scale Policy (Sec. 25.05.675.G, SMC) states that *"the height, bulk and scale of development projects should be reasonably compatible with the general character of development anticipated by the adopted Land Use Policies...for the area in which they are located, and to provide for a reasonable transition between areas of less intensive zoning and more intensive zoning."*

In addition, the SEPA Height, Bulk and Scale Policy states that *"(a) project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review Process shall be presumed to comply with these Height, Bulk and Scale policies. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that height, bulk and scale impacts documented through environmental review have not been adequately mitigated."* Since the discussion in the previous Design Review Section of this report indicates that there are no significant height, bulk and scale impacts as contemplated within this SEPA policy, and since the Design Review Board approved this project with conditions, no mitigation of height, bulk and scale impacts is warranted pursuant to this SEPA policy.

Traffic and Transportation

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (7th Edition) estimates that townhouse units generate approximately 5.86 vehicle trips per day in suburban communities. Within the City, vehicle trips are substantially lower due in part to the location of employment work centers, availability and proximity of public transit to downtown and other employment centers will make it likely that there will be fewer vehicle trips than from developments in outlying areas on which the ITE generation equation is based. The site has ready access to the East Madison, 23rd Avenue, and East Union Street to name a few arterials supporting public transit within walking distance. The amount of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed project is within the capacity of the streets in the immediate area, so no SEPA mitigation of traffic impacts is warranted.

Parking

The parking policy in Section 25.05.675M of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance states that parking impact mitigation may be required only where on-street parking is at capacity as defined by the Seattle Transportation Department or where the development itself would cause on-street parking to reach capacity. Parking utilization in the vicinity appears to be under capacity. Parking can be found during the daytime or evening hours. Seven (7) off-street parking spaces will be provided within the units for a parking ratio of 1 space per each townhouse which meets code requirements and is expected to accommodate parking demand generated by the 7 new residential units most of the day. On-street parking capacity in the surrounding area is sufficient to meet any additional spill-over parking, if any actually occurs. Therefore, no mitigation of parking impacts is necessary pursuant to SEPA.

There have been no long term impacts identified with the possible creation of a unit lot full subdivision. Long term impacts have been analyzed and discussed above with no further conditioning warranted.

CONCLUSION - SEPA

In conclusion, several adverse effects on the environment are anticipated resulting from the proposal, which are non-significant. The conditions imposed below are intended to mitigate specific impacts identified in the foregoing analysis, or to control impacts not regulated by codes or ordinances, per adopted City policies.

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of DPD as the lead agency of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- [X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).

- [] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment with respect to transportation, circulation, and parking. An EIS limited in scope to this specific area of the environment was therefore required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

Non-Appealable Conditions

1. Embed all conditions of approval into the cover sheet on the updated MUP plan set and all subsequent building permit drawings.
2. Embed colored elevation and landscape drawings into the MUP and building permit drawings.
3. Any proposed changes to the external design of the building, landscaping or improvements in the public right-of-way must first be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner prior to construction.

Appealable Conditions Prior to Issuance of MUP Permit

The owner/applicant shall update plans to show:

4. Update plan to reflect outcomes from the meeting with the assigned planner on February 7, 2007 with illustration and text. Specifically, include bulleted items updates within plan set.
5. Design and install surface treatments using quality materials to green up and soften the parking pads and aisles with permeable materials to be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner.
6. The applicant shall work with DPD to design and install a more durable carport with equal time devoted to designing the structures with attractive flourishes. If feasible, concrete post shall be employed for the carports to decrease potential damage due in part to motorists maneuvering in and out of stalls to be approval by DPD planner.
7. Design an attractive facade system to be employed along the streets and pedestrian canyon; explore long term durability of cedar siding, consideration of stainless steel screws attached to hardi-panels will need further development which the design team is instructed to resolve with the assigned planner.
8. Design and use more detailing to create more texturing, etc., along the street façade along 19th Avenue to make the façade more readable. Install overhead weather protection and explore different lighting options to make the residential entries facing the street more distinctive.

Prior to Groundbreaking & During Construction

9. Arrange a pre-construction meeting with the building contractor, building inspector, and land use planner to discuss expectations and details of the Design Review component of the project.

During Construction & Prior to Finalization

10. The applicant should work with the DPD land use planner to review and approve the type of pervious concrete or concrete grasscrete in the driveway and parking.

SEPA CONDITIONS

Prior to issuance of Demolition or Construction Permits

11. The owner(s) and/or responsible party (ies) shall submit a copy of the PSCAA permit prior to issuance of a demolition permit, if a PSCAA permit is required.

During Construction

The following condition(s) to be enforced during construction shall be posted at the site in a location on the property line that is visible and accessible to the public and to construction personnel from the street right-of-way. If more than one street abuts the site, conditions shall be posted at each street. The conditions will be affixed to placards prepared by DPD. The placards will be issued along with the building permit set of plans. The placards shall be laminated with clear plastic or other weatherproofing material and shall remain in place for the duration of construction.

12. Construction activities (including but not limited to demolition, grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays from 7am to 6pm. Interior work that involves mechanical equipment, including compressors and generators, may be allowed on Saturdays between 9am and 6pm once the shell of the structure is completely enclosed, provided windows and doors remain closed. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.

Construction activities outside the above-stated restrictions may be authorized by the Land Use Planner when necessitated by unforeseen construction, safety, or street-use related situations. Requests for extended construction hours or weekend days must be submitted to the Land Use Planner at least three (3) days in advance of the requested dates in order to allow DPD to evaluate the request.

Signature: _____ (signature on file)
Bradley Wilburn, Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development
Land Use Services

Date: February 19, 2007