



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:** 3005493  
**Applicant Name:** Peter Greaves, Project Manager,  
Weber + Thompson PLLC  
Pine + Belmont LLC, Property Owner  
**Address of Proposal:** 514 East Pine Street

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION**

Land Use Application to allow a six-story building, containing 12,602 square feet of ground floor retail, with 108 residential units. Parking for 108 vehicles will be provided in below grade garage. Review includes demolition of existing structures (demolition to occur under separate permit). Project includes 17,784 cubic yards of grades.<sup>1</sup>

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

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

- 1) To allow modifications to *Structure Depth (SMC 23.45.052.B.2.d)*
- 2) To allow modifications to *Site Triangle (SMC 23.54.030.G)*

**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 March 29, 2007.

**BACKGROUND DATA**

Site Description

<sup>1</sup> The project was originally noticed as follows: 'Land use application to allow a six-story, 106 unit apartment building with 12,602 sq. ft. of ground floor retail. Parking for 150 vehicles will be located in below grade garage. Review includes demolition of existing structures. Project includes 17,784 cu. yds. of grading.' During review phase the project was changed.

The development site will combine three parcels, totaling approximately 23,350 square feet of land area, in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. The site is an irregular shaped lot with street frontages on three rights-of-ways; Belmont Avenue to the east, East Pine Street to the south, and Summit Avenue to the west. The development site is classified as a split zoned lot with the majority of the land area located in a Neighborhood Commercial Three zone, with a height limit of 65 feet (NC3-65). The northeast portion of the site occupying an area of approximately 5,000 square feet (100' X 50') is sited in the Multifamily Midrise (MR) zone. The site is also located within the Pike/Pine Urban Center Village, and the Capitol Hill Station District Overlay (light rail).



Two of the three parcels of land, comprising the development site, are currently developed with residential and commercial uses, with retail and restaurant use at ground level. The third parcel contains a residential (apartment) use in the MR zone, and fronts along Belmont Avenue. The existing structures are older nondescript buildings, ranging in height between one and three-stories. The development site is modestly landscaped with vegetation concentrated along Summit Avenue.

The site slopes moderately downward from east to west, approximately 14 feet over a distance of 200 feet with slight bowl-like depressions within the site. The development site anchors the south third of a block that fronts upon East Olive to the north, East Pine Street, Summit Avenue, and Belmont Avenue. Except for the south 100 feet, the remaining part of the block is located in the MR zone and is developed with denser residential uses in multifamily structures; the Parc on Summit is a large condo development that abuts the site to the northwest, occupying the west half of the block. All street rights-of-way abutting the subject site are fully developed with asphalt roadways; curbs, sidewalks and gutters. East Pine Street and is a primary arterial street abutting the subject site to the south. The site is served by Metro bus routes 14 and 49. East Pine Street connects surrounding residential neighborhoods from Lake Washington to Downtown.

**The site is not located in any identified or designated Environmentally Critical Area (ECA), but is located in the Pike/Pine Neighborhood Design Review Guidelines area.**

### Area Development

The site sits along the west slope of Capitol Hill, with territorial views of downtown towards the west, and north. The neighborhood features a mix of older multi-story residential and commercial structures, and new mixed-use developments extending up to the zoned height limits. Along this stretch of East Pine, the commercial businesses offer a variety of shopping, entertainment, and restaurant uses which activates the street day and night. The smaller scaled storefronts create a density that is typical of older well entrenched neighborhood commercial zones throughout the city. To the east approximately three blocks away is Seattle Central

Community College's main campus. Zoning along the southern portion of the site and along this strip of East Pine Street is Neighborhood Commercial Three zone, with a sixty-five (65) foot height limit (NC3-65) within an Urban Village Commercial Zone Overlay. The Multifamily MR zone within the development site extends further northward. A mixed of old and new multi-family developments of various sizes are prevalent in this area.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant proposes to combine three parcels of land to construct a six-story mixed use building containing ground floor retail use and a total of 108 residential units. The portion of the building sited in the MR zone will contain six levels of residential use. Access to 108 parking stalls will be taken off Summit Avenue to two a level of underground parking garage. The proposed building will command a strong presence along East Pine due in part to the structure occupying the entire block frontage. One of the stated goals is to construct a thoughtful development that will to provide a dramatic addition to the Capitol Hill neighborhood while being sensitive to neighboring properties. Special emphases will be directed towards providing an attractive and inviting pedestrian oriented experience near the right-of-way.

Design objectives include strengthening the corner with distinctive features and/or uses to make a bold statement primarily along the Summit Avenue and East Pine Street frontage. The project will enhance the robust pedestrian activity along all street frontages; East Pine Street, Belmont and Summit Avenue. Exterior façade materials along the street frontage will include brick, metal and cement panel siding, and glazing, with cast in place concrete at the structure's base. The storefront window will be arrayed along East Pine and wrap around both side streets. Overhead weather protection will be prominently featured along the commercial frontages. Commercial entries will be taken off East Pine with residential use accessed off Belmont and Summit Avenue.

The following Design Review departures were identified during the recommendation meeting from the Land Use development standards: structure depth requirements per SMC 23.45.052.B.2.d and sight triangle standards SMC 23.54.030.G.

**Public Comments:**

Date of Notice of EDG Application:	October 19, 2006
Date of EDG Meeting:	November 1, 2006
Date of Notice of MUP Application :	March 29, 2007
Date End of Comment Period:	April 25, 2007 <sup>2</sup>
# Letters	11

**Issues:**

The extended MUP comment period for this proposal ended on April 25, 2007. The Department received nine (9) comment letters during the public comment period. Two letters were received at the time of public notification of the Early Design Guidance (EDG) meeting. During the time of the Design Review phase (EDG and Recommendation meetings) community members

---

<sup>2</sup> Public comment period was extended an additional two weeks at the request from a member of the public, from the initial closing date of 4/11/07 to 4/25/07.

expressed disappointment with the large scaled addition to the neighborhood. Among the comments voiced during the meetings was a need to break down the floor area of commercial storefront uses along East Pine, modulation and articulation of facades, and displacement of their smaller commercial uses and rental property.

One of the two comments received during Early Design Guidance (EDG) phase addressed potential traffic impacts on surrounding streets and intersections. The other comment requested to be kept updated on the proposal. Of the number of comments received after public notice of Master Use Permit (MUP) application, a number of common themes emerged including; achieving compatibility with adopted Neighborhood Design Guidelines, overall scale of building, displacement and impact on nightlife activity, design aesthetic, sustainable design elements, quantity of open space, and affordable housing. Several letters commented on the applicant's response to Design Review Boards guidance from the EDG meeting. One letter specifically addressed adequacy the of SEPA checklist. Another was concerned with the impact on the infrastructure to support a project of this scale. Other concerns included street pedestrian experience, and impacts related to height, bulk, and scale. The structure went through several design iterations to address many of the concerns raised by the public.

## **ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW**

### **Early Design Guidance**

An Early Design Guidance Public Meeting was held by the At-Large Design Review Board on November 1, 2006. Seventeen (17) members of the public fill out the sign in sheet at the November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. Public comments included concerns related to impacts of the frontage along Pine Street should be broken down to create smaller storefronts which are more in keeping with the character of the vicinity. It's important that East Pine maintain its uniqueness and not lose it sense of place and scale, a preference for a design alternative that decreased the proposal's upper level mass; and noise associated with. A number expressed disappointment in the large scaled addition to the neighborhood.

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*" and "*Pike/Pine Urban Center Village Design Guidelines*" of highest priority to this project:

- A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics***
- A-2 Streetscape Compatibility***
- A-6 Transition between Residence and Street***
- A-7 Residential Open Space***
- A-9 Location of Parking on Commercial Street Fronts***
- A-10 Corner Lots***
- B-1 Height, Bulk and Scale***
- C-1 Architectural Context***

**C-3 Human Scale**

**C-4 Exterior Finish Materials**

**D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structure**

**D-7 Personal Safety and Security**

**E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or site**

Specific Board Guidance:

Summary

Overall, the Board was split on the preferred design alternative scheme, whether to allow the building at street level to be pulled back at the corner of Summit and East Pine to create a “piazza” allowing outdoor seating area. Ensuring a well proportioned scaled building at the development site is a critical factor to successfully integrate the project into the existing neighborhood fabric. The design team should incorporate as many design elements as necessary to create quality infill development; utilizing building materials and modulation sensitive to the zoned area. The Board felt that there should be more attention directed towards the commercial experience at street level. The design team should incorporate as many design elements as necessary to recreate the feel of the existing smaller storefronts. Focused design attention to creating quality open space is a high value item, as well as, utilizing measures to be sympathetic to adjacent uses. *Pike/Pine Neighborhood Design Guidelines* should be followed to activate the streetscapes. The Board felt that there should be a greater number of retail or restaurant presence along Pine Street than is currently proposed. Several “hot bottom” items were identified by the Board for the applicant to address as they finalize their design:

- The building loses an opportunity to establish and hold the corner with the placement of a plaza area at the southwest corner - seems problematic. At the same time the plaza is a welcome element to allow opportunities for the neighbors to interact in an open café environment.
- The proposed upper level mass of scheme #1 is somewhat clunky. Additional upper setbacks may resolve this concern.
- As designed, the proposed three large storefronts do not fit into the existing vernacular of smaller scaled storefronts, which would be more in keeping and may provide affordability for the types of smaller businesses found in the area.
- Replicate the existing street level façade. The proposal needs to be broken up into smaller segments along East Pine at street level.
- Floor plan system should be designed to be more flexible, should delineate diversity of internal spaces.
- Press Building represents a strong presence along Belmont Avenue, and as such, the proposal should establish a strong design connection; In particular, the residential entry needs a grand outdoor plaza.
- The garage entry needs more focused attention; the conceptual design raises concerns related to the quality of the pedestrian experience along Summit.

The design guidelines above were all chosen by the Board to be high priority. The Board wants the developer to engage the streetscape wherever possible and scale the design to integrate itself into area at a site with three street frontages; Summit Avenue and East Pine, and Belmont Avenue.

Refer to the MUP file or Design Review website ([www.seattle.gov/designreview](http://www.seattle.gov/designreview)) for complete copies of the EDG document.

### **Design Review Board Recommendations**

On February 14, 2007, the applicant submitted the full Master Use Permit application, and on September 5, 2007, the Capitol Hill/First Hill Design Review Board (Area 7) convened for the official 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 three departures from the City's Land Use Code. All Five Board Members were present.

### **Applicant's Design:**

Peter Greaves, architect, opened with an overview of the project's history and then preceded to the site context analysis, and response to Board guidelines. An emphasis was placed on increasing opportunities to provide outdoor spaces for social interaction and allowing natural light into the "piazza." The development site's southwest corner provided the greatest opportunities to engage the public through design to activate the streetscape with social interaction. The building has been sculpted to reduce its scale along all facades through terracing, setbacks, materials, and color deployment. A number of changes have been made in response to comments from the Board and public, including scaling the massing down and reconfiguring commercial space, access and location. The design team used 3-D modeling, slides, presentation boards, and 11 x 17 colored packets to describe the design response. Two development departures were asked for during the presentation: structure depth and site triangle.

Specific responses to Board Guidance:

1. The design should also explore design options to establish readable residential entry points that are distinctive, attractive, and more compatible with the Crest Building across Belmont Avenue: To better scale the design along the more residentially oriented Belmont Avenue, a garden pathway leads to a two story glass walled lobby to the main residential entry. A gatehouse feature will mark the entry. The portion of the building in the MR zone has three units that will have access to a small path with a landscaped area set behind a metal fence with gate leading directly out to the sidewalk. The use of color, materials, and glazing will add to readability of this residential oriented street.
2. The location and quality of the residential open space should be considered a high value element and should serve the needs of its residential inhabitants. Residential open spaces should be functional and directly connected to residential uses: The updated design proposes to increase the volume of plantings at ground level. Five units will have direct access to ground level open space in the MR zone which will have ample landscaping

between the structure and property line. The landscaped area will be placed in an area surrounded by adjacent buildings. Roof decks are not being proposed to accommodate open space. Within the NC portion of the building a residential amenity area has been provided on a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor 1,737 square foot terrace deck. Plants will be placed in planting boxes to green up the space.

3. The design should take into consideration zone transition from NC to MR to the north: As viewed from the east and west elevations, the building steps down and provides setbacks to demark a transition area. Additionally, exterior wall materials including brick, masonry, and wood, textured or patterned concrete, have been arranged to take full advantage of identifying this portion of the building as residential. The height limit of the MR zone is 60 feet which is five feet below the NC portion of the site. The look and feel of the building has taken cues from neighboring properties to better integrate the design into the residential fabric. Existing and proposed trees and landscaping will scale the development in keeping with a pedestrian oriented residential character.
4. Establish pedestrian activity areas at street level along East Pine Street: The project establishes at up to seven possible storefronts along the entire length of East Pine with large expanses of glazing nearly extending the entire height of the commercial level. The building will step back from the property line in two segments to create opportunities for tenants to use this additional space to place furniture and racks outdoors. A planter wall and vertical planting features will serve to soften portions of the building with visual interest. The most important design element along East Pine is the proposed “piazza” where the design envisions a social gathering/meeting space to anchor the building to the neighborhood.
5. The Board was split on the proposed setback at the corner of Summit and Pine. The proposal should pay attention to the corner by strengthening the building’s edge to activate commercial uses in this area: The double height retail space with strong vertical and horizontal lines adjacent to the “piazza” solidly anchors the building to the ground as it steps away from the property lines. Overhead weather protection will extend over a portion of this area to announce a commercial presence (and provide needed protection against the weather). Planter boxes will frame this area to help define the space.

### Public Comments

Generally speaking, public members felt that the design was out of scale for the neighborhood but was resigned that development would occur. The building does not appear to be consistent with Pike/Pine Design Guidelines, and did not reflect neighborhood context. A number of suggestions were shared to help scale the building down to create a better fit in the neighborhood.

The Pine Street frontage wants to read as two distinct buildings but still appears to read as one, with a lot of busy architectural design elements that overwhelms the streetscape. One member thanked the applicants for involving community groups in the design phases of the project. The building’s southeast corner appears to be more successfully designed than the southwest corner – it may be a matter of composition of fenestration on the upper level. The building appears to be

too long between the anchoring corners along Pine. Corrugated metal exterior finishes does not seem to work in Pike/Pine neighborhood. Belmont Avenue frontage also appears successfully designed; except for the white vinyl windows. The proposed white vinyl windows are a problem throughout the building's exterior, a different color and material should be considered. The design for wrapping balconies around Summit is ill conceived and should be removed.

### Board Recommendation

Board members were concerned with the scale of the proposed building within the neighborhood context. The Board acknowledged that breaking down a building's scale and mass through manipulation of architectural detailing is challenging. The design team has done an admirable job thus far in their response to our guidelines but additional steps need to be taken. The Board noted two significant areas that stood out that needed focused attention:

- The street façades at the corner of East Pine and Belmont were not fully realized affecting a number of guidelines. (*A-1, A-2, A-4, A-8, A-10, B-1, C-1, C-3, C-4, D-1*) The design features an upper level lantern component (with volume of glazing) to punctuate the corner from the east and south perspectives. Abutting this corner element to the west along East Pine is a white metal clad cantilevered projection above the street-level. The design intent was to break down the building's mass along East Pine. This projection serves to diminish a distinctive corner element that should be celebratory. The corner should be distinctive, readable, creating a sense openness and engagement for pedestrians.
- The (white) portion of the building projecting along Pine appears incongruous in light of the neighborhood design guidelines. It also appears to be in conflict with the design's Belmont corner tower element.

**The Board recommends that the applicant should explore alternatives to create a stronger presence along East Pine, including removing the white projection and carrying the brick upwards from the retail level. The brick should wrap boldly around Pine to Belmont to the residential entry. 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-1, A-2, A-4, A-8, A-10, B-1, C-1, C-3, C-4, D-1*)**

The Board was encouraged by the design team's proposed street level "piazza" at the southwest corner along Pine to make the proposal more distinguishable and interesting. The "piazza" works to create opportunities for invigorating the pedestrian experience along East Pine. **The Board encouraged the design team to provide amenities in the right-of-way including bike racks, seating areas, overhead weather protection. The architect should work with DPD on the details for improvements to the proposal as identified above. (*Guidelines A-2, A-4, A-5, A-10, C-3, D-7, E-2*)**

Though the Board was concerned with the design and layout of all street façades; the Board was encouraged by the steps taken by the design team to break down the building's mass through use of modulation, color and fenestration. The Board acknowledged that the applicant has created dynamic and lively facade surfaces – a little too lively on some exterior walls. The facades

appear too busy with the amount of modulations, colors, materials, types of balconies, bay features, etc. **The architect should simplify the building's façades to achieve a more coherent architectural expression is needed. The Board agreed that the proposed materials including brick, concrete, metal siding, fiber concrete lap panel, and wood trim reflected materials found within the immediate area and suited the development site. (Guidelines C-2 & C-4). With the exception of white vinyl window frames, window size in the MR zone, and contrasting orientation of metal siding, the proposed structure could achieve greater design coherence. The design should vary the building's mass with more simplicity on all street frontages to establish a significant presence that plays on Pike/Pine's eclectic urban form if designed mindfully.**

The proposed contrast of lighter colored window frames is a jarring distraction that is easily resolved. The Board is in support of reducing the amount of vinyl windows on the upper levels and running storefront windows (ideally metal framed) to the base along East Pine. **The Board recommends that the applicant explore alternatives colors for the window frames to soften the contrast upon the exterior walls and increase the amount of aluminum. The architect should work with DPD on the details for improvements to the proposal as identified above. (Guidelines, A-6, C-1, C-3, C-4)**

Within the MR zone, the front façade did not evoke a strong enough residential presence. The Board determined that window size, color, and frame material should be reexamined to enhance the external façade along Belmont. **The Board requested the applicant and land use planner to continue to work to find the best solution to work through the façade design details along Belmont Avenue. (Guidelines, C-1, C-3, C-4)**

The contrasting orientation (horizontal and vertical) of the corrugated metal panel siding is further evidence of design elements that create additional complexity without achieving the desired goal of reducing the building's scale. The design team should simplify the facades which feature this array. **The Board recommends the design team work with the land planner to finalize design details prior to issuing a MUP permit. (Guidelines B-1, C-1, C-3, C-4)**

The Board would like to see careful attention directed towards minimizing visual impacts of a garage entry, with equal time devoted to opening up the façade with attractive flourishes. If feasible, sidewalk textured surfacing should be employed on either side of the driveway to decrease potential conflicts with motorists. The architect is encouraged to work with DPD and SDOT, on the details for improvements in the Summit Avenue ROW. **(Guidelines A-2, C-1, D-5, D-7). Therefore, the Board recommended an attractive facade system (including gate) be employed along the Summit Avenue frontage that activates the design form at the parking entry. The applicant is instructed to work with SDOT and DPD to introduce paving changes through color and texture at the vehicle access points along East Pine Street. (Guidelines A-2, C-1, D-5, D-7)**

### Departure Analysis

1. To allow modifications to *Structure Depth (SMC 23.45.052.B.2.d)*

Maximum structure depth in Multifamily Midrise zone is 65% of the lot depth. As previously stated, the development site is classified as a split zoned lot; with a 5,000 square foot area located in the MR zone. The development site’s front setbacks have been identified along Summit and Belmont Avenues, which establishes structure depth orientation in the MR zone. The proposal is required to meet development standards found within each zone. Lot depth of the MR portion is approximately 100 feet which allows a maximum of 65 feet for structure. The applicant is proposing a structure depth of 76 feet 7 ¾ inches, which represents an increase to 76.45%. Under certain circumstances exceptions are allowed to increase structure depth, but in no case shall structure depth exceed 150 feet. In order to achieve the desired scale in relationship to the subject lot the applicant is seeking to construct a structure (in the MR zone) with a depth of 76 feet 7 ¾ inches without providing a modulated feature; 8 foot (depth) by 10 foot 9 (width) feature along the north facade. The applicant proposes to increase the amount of glazing along the north façade to achieve a level of transparency to mitigate the presence of a solid wall. The applicant has chosen to animate the façade with each unit featuring operable windows opening up to the outside. At ground level the setback area will be richly landscape to soften the building’s edge. **The Board agreed that the split zone provided unique design challenges. When the design is taken as a whole design composition, the request warrants granting the departure request. However, further refinement will be needed, and instructed the design team to work with DPD to develop a palette of quality materials to green up and soften the edges along north property line and street level façade along Belmont. (A-1, A-7, B-1, C-4, E)**

2. To allow modifications to *Site Triangle (SMC 23.54.030.G)*

The area between 32 inches and 82 inches is required to be kept clear of visual obstruction on the side of the driveway used as an exit shall be provided, ten (10) feet from the intersection of driveway with the sidewalk. The applicant proposes to locate the driveway adjacent to the north property line, where the neighboring property has a retaining wall to accesses the ground floor level, which is approximately 10 feet above sidewalk grade. The Summit Avenue frontage has a more residential feel along the streetscape with the number of residential uses and moderate vehicle traffic in comparison to East Pine Street. Vehicle and pedestrian traffic moves through this block front which would allow partial obstruction of the view area for exiting vehicles. Due to the location of the curb cut serving the proposal, and the Summit Avenue and East Pine Street intersection, tenant vehicles are not anticipated to create safety conflicts. However, the concern lies from the north to minimize the potential pedestrian vehicle conflicts. **The Board approves removing the site triangle so long as the applicant provides other means to secure exiting visibility and/or warning systems to minimize the potential pedestrian vehicle conflicts. The architect will provide alternative means to warning pedestrians and vehicles, such as mirrors, warning lights and or buzzers. (A-2, A-9, D-5, D-7)**

Summary of Board’s Recommendation

<i>Development Standard</i>	<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Applicant rationale</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
-----------------------------	--------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

<p><i>1. Structure depth 23.45.052.B.2.d</i></p>	<p><i>Maximum structure depth shall be limited to 65% of lot depth. Lot depth 100 feet, equal 65 feet. Exception is allowed when depth is in excess of 65% when structure is modulated along side façade.</i></p>	<p><i>76.45% (76.65 feet) with no modulation.</i></p>	<p><i>Split zone lot creates design composition challenges. The exterior n wall along the north façade will be animated to soften façade along with quality landscaping at grade</i></p>	<p>▪ <b>Approved</b></p>
<p><i>2. Site triangle 23.54.030.G</i></p>	<p><i>The area between 32 inches and 82 inches shall be kept clear of visual obstruction 10 feet from the intersection of driveway with the sidewalk on both sides of the driveway.</i></p>	<p><i>No on the exit side triangle.</i></p>	<p><i>To create a greater street presence by locating the proposed driveway away from the central “piazza” at the corner of Summit and Pine. Warning devices will be employed to safeguard the pedestrian environment.</i></p>	<p>▪ <b>Approved</b></p>

The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the September 5, 2007 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 October 23, 2007. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the five Design Review Board members who were present recommended approval of the subject design with conditions. Two departures were requested. The five Board members unanimously made the following recommendations. (Authority referred to in letter and numbers are in parenthesis):

1. Design and appoint a well defined the garage entry that will visual enhance the pedestrian experience along the Summit Avenue, subject to the approval by the DPD. *A-2, C-1, D-5, D-7*
2. The applicant was instructed to work with SDOT and DPD to update the MUP plans to provide to amenities in the right-of-way including bike racks, seating/resting areas, and overhead weather protection. The architect is encouraged to work with DPD and SDOT on the details for right-of-way improvements, details to be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner. *A-8, D-1 & D-7*
3. Along Summit Avenue, the applicant is instructed to work with SDOT and DPD to update the MUP plans to provide to introduce paving changes through color and texture at the vehicle access point to the parking garage subject to approval by DPD planner. *A-2, C-1, D-5, D-7*
4. The architect is encouraged to simplify the design of the building’s façade to establish stronger design coherence: Eliminate stark color contrast between windows and surface materials (white vinyl windows are discouraged, especially in the MR zoned area); reduce the amount vinyl windows; storefront windows should be metal framed and extend full length of commercial level; corrugated metal siding should seek greater uniformity in orientation to reduce business. *A-6, C-1, C-3, C-4*
5. Explore alternatives to create a stronger presence along East Pine. The white portion of the exterior wall projecting along East Pine appears incongruous in light of the neighborhood guidelines and should be removed. Increase the volume of brick material

along the East Pine frontage vertically from street level and horizontally. *A-1, A-2, A-4, A-8, A-10, B-1, C-1, C-3, C-4, D-1*

6. At the East Pine and Belmont corner design and install a more celebratory facade that enhances the pedestrian experience with well defined detailing, with canopies and other amenities, details to be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner. *A-1, A-2, A-4, A-8, A-10, B-1, C-1, C-3, C-4, D-1*

### **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 satisfied with the overall building design, but as was noted in the recommendation meeting by the Board, the southeast corner element, street side facades, and street level pedestrian experience needs additional design development. Further, the Director is authorized to provide additional analysis and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F) to advance the proposal forward. 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 location of the development site presents a unique design opportunity given its three street frontages that each have distinct pedestrian activity demands that requires individual attention. The architect has responded to the comments and concerns of both the public and the Design Review Board and has established a more distinct commercial character along East Pine Street that is not fully realized. To strengthen the proposed building's architectural connection to the vernacular of Pike/Pine, the white clad portion of the structure stepping approximately three feet closer to Pine Street property line serves no other discernable design purpose, than to increase building floor area. This portion of the facade juts out with no defining characteristic; it's not well suited in an area that features strong boned buildings, in a more traditional warehouse/industrial mode.

Along East Pine there is no design context for a pop-out feature as proposed at the recommendation meeting. This portion of the facade has since been redesigned after a series of meeting with DPD. The projection has been eliminated and is now clad in brick to establish a stronger presence that is more in keeping with the heavy-boned style found throughout Pike/Pine. Brick extends four-stories above sidewalk grade and wraps around onto Belmont. A green wall cable system will allow vegetation to grow up along the vertical columns, combining with aluminum storefront windows and doors, and overhead weather protection will open up and animate the pedestrian experience. The building has been designed to integrate into the existing collection of buildings in the area and better responds to its location. The building facade has been broken down into elements which break up the appearance of bulk with less "busyness," creating a distinctive residential and commercial presence with good solar exposure and views on the upper level.

The design of the proposed mixed-use building (with 108 residential units above 12,602 square feet of ground level retail) has similar good overall scale and proportion of mixed use structures in the zone - proportionally sized. The design has incorporated influences of the surrounding vernacular within a modern context to provide visual interest that creates a sense of individuality. As viewed from the west along East Pine Street frontage, the proposed structure will feature a strong glazed commercial base with a plaza area to encourage social interactions. The plaza or "piazza" serves two functions; opens the commercial use to spill out into the public

domain and provides a rest bit to allow a protected social meeting place. Above the commercial level, the building's character becomes more distinctly residential with its interplay of metal siding, fiber cement panel and fenestration. With territorial views to the west, shared residential open space on the upper level, the west end units will enjoy spectacular views of Downtown and the Olympics. All units in the proposed structure will have views out onto the city.

On October 11, 2007, the design team met with DPD to finalize street level changes to enhance the pedestrian experience along Summit Avenue, East Pine and Belmont Avenue. At the previous meetings held on September 20, 2007, the design team presented a packet that included responses to the Board's major concerns; redesign of the upper level façade along East Pine, and fenestration upon all facades. Though the assigned planner was encouraged with the design team's specific responses to the Board's recommendations, DPD felt that additional design effort were still needed. The pedestrian experience along Summit, with a 22 foot wide driveway leading to underground parking could create a void that needs to be filled with design elements to enliven the streetscape. Attention was directed to the proposed gate and ground surface texture. Several designs concepts were explored. In the end the design team and DPD choose a design that connects and honors the past with a gate design that is visually engaging. Additionally, the design pattern was carried forward to the Belmont and Pine corner, creating a signature element.

Common open space in the MR zone was placed in an area that few units had access. In essence, ground level open space for the proposed residential use in the MR zone provided access to only three units. Due to the number of proposed units, quality open space is essential for passive recreation for all. In response, the design is providing quality common areas with landscaping features. The front entry can be considered as an outdoor room with scored paving, lush landscaping, and benches. Additionally, residential units will have direct access to a rooftop common area with views to the west. When taken together, DPD is satisfied with residents ability find a good area for passive recreation in the MR zone.

The applicant requested departures from development standards related to structure depth in Multifamily MR zone and site triangle requirements, that the Board recommended approval. After evaluating the Design Review 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 Director has no further conditions to add. The previously stated Board conditions will be made a part of conditions of decision approval summarized at end of decision.

The Director of DPD has reviewed the recommendations and conditions of the Design Review Board. The Director finds that the proposal is consistent with the "*City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings and Pike/Pine Urban Center Village Design Guidelines.*" 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 September 5, 2007 and updated MUP plans dated October 23, 2007. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in this decision are expected to remain substantially as presented in the plans submitted to DPD on October 23, 2007 in response to the outcome of the September 20, 2007 & October 11, 2007 meetings.

## ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist prepared by the David Newcomb (dated February 14, 2007) 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 six-story residential and commercial building will necessitate the demolition of the four existing structures (common known addresses: 1611 Belmont Avenue, 500 East Pine Street, 506 -508 East Pine Street, and 1606 Summit) all of which are subject determination of their historic status. 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 at the development site (addressed 514 East Pine Street) did not warrant landmark status, as determined by the Historic Preservation Officer, (LPB 403/07) in a letter dated November 5, 2007.

### Traffic

Construction of the project is proposed to last for several months. 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.

To prepare the site for development will entail demolition of existing structure and grading. The hauling of excavated material that will require approximately 1,136 truck loads, and the importing of rock products requiring 9 truck trips, for an approximate total of 1,145 truck trips. The site abuts to East Pine Street, a principal arterial, which provides access to Interstate Five (5). As documented the proposed truck haul routes are consistent with the existing City code provision (SMC 11.62) which requires truck activities to use arterial streets to every extent possible. Traffic impacts resulting from the truck traffic associated with the hauling of debris will be of short duration and mitigated by enforcement of SMC 11.62.

For the removal and disposal of the spoil materials, the Code (SMC 11.74) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that a minimum of one foot of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container) be provided in loaded uncovered trucks, which minimizes the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed enroute to or from a site.

### Noise

The development site is located adjacent to a residential area where construction of this scale would impact noise levels in the immediate area. 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, because existing City ordinances do not adequately mitigate such impacts. This is due to the density of residential units in the area and the proximity of these structures to the subject site. The proposal is, therefore, conditioned to limit construction activity to non-holiday weekday hours between 7:30 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. and Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. After the structure is enclosed, interior construction may be done in compliance with the noise ordinance. The department may modify this condition to allow work of an emergency nature or which cannot otherwise be accomplished during these hours by prior written approval of the Land Use Planner.

### Air and Environmental Health

Given the age of the existing structures 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.

### 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 mixed use structures (containing residential and commercial uses), 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 area of development is located along the west slope on Capitol Hill over looking Downtown and the Olympics to the west. The proposal will occupy the south portion of a block that is bounded by Summit, East Pine Street, and Belmont Avenue. Across each right-of way measuring at least 60 feet in width is structures of varying heights. The proposed six-story project will rise to approximately 65 feet to the top of the flat roof from the lowest elevation grade along the East Pine Street frontage, with the stair and elevator penthouse extending an additional 9 feet. The development site is located on a split zoned lot within a Neighborhood Commercial Three zone with a height limit of 65 feet (NC3-65) and Multifamily Midrise with a height limit of 60 feet (MR). Abutting the development site to the north, the height limit is 60 feet within a MR zone. Currently a multifamily use (The Parc on Summit condominium) occupies the remaining west half of the block to the north. The Parc development site feature two five-story buildings elevated approximately 10 feet above street grade on a 24,881 square foot lot. The residential use to the north will not experience the full weight of the proposed structure; nearly forty percent of 100 foot wide north façade will be glazed. The east half of block contain three separate development sites that are fully developed with residential uses of varying heights extending up to 60 feet. Abutting the subject lot on the east half of the block is a three-story residential building. With a few exceptions the remaining area surrounding the development site are occupied by a mix of new and old structures with significant presence. A number of existing buildings in the immediate area have a visual presence that will be unaffected by the addition this proposal. Topography and site location have helped to scale the building within the neighboring bulk context, while taking

advantage of its unique end block location. The proposed structure is terraced from west to east in keeping with the site's topography, which serves to scale the building down as viewed from the north, south, and west. After project completion several existing structures further east along Pine will still maintain a presence in the immediate area. The proposed project is being developed to NC3-65 and MR standards, as allowed by the Land Use Code, and is thereby in keeping with the scale of the potential of the zone as well as that of several existing structures in the vicinity.

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 goals and policies set forth in Section C of the land use element of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan 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 paragraph indicates that there are no significant negative 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

The applicant submitted a Traffic Analysis, prepared by TraffEx that addressed on-site parking demand and mode of travel. The report contrasted existing and proposed uses at the development site with impacts associated with personal trip generation. Trip generation for the proposal was determined by employing figures derived from Trip Generation (*Institute of Transportation Engineers' [ITE], Trip Generation Manual, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2003*). Quantitative values found within the reference document reflect nationwide studies in suburban communities that are not necessarily representative of urban trends. It has been DPD's experience that vehicle trip generation figure's based on the aforementioned manual have been found to be less in urban areas, with proximity to employment centers that have ready access to mass transit and other alternative modes of travel, i.e., choosing to walk or bike. In the traffic impact analysis, credit was given for the existing retail and residential uses at the development site. Net changes in trips generated by the proposed development are estimated to be 30 trips during the AM peak hour and 43 trips during the PM peak hour. During the peak PM hour 24 (56%) net new trips will be entering and 19 (44%) net new trips will be exiting the development site.

The proposed project is anticipated to generate an average of 1,284 vehicle trips per day; currently an estimated 546 trips are generated at the development site. The net increase in total daily vehicle trips at the combined development site is 738. The residential use accounts for approximately 57% (726) of the daily vehicle trips. With an increase of approximately 30 trips during the AM peak hour and 43 trips during the PM peak hours anticipated from the existing uses, this increase is not expected to have a substantial impact on the surrounding roadways.  
[insert intersection analysis]

Circulation within the area includes bus routes providing access to downtown and other employment destinations. There are also many dining, shopping, educational, medical, and entertainment options within walking/bicycling distance and along the public transit routes. The proposed commercial uses at the development site are expected to draw clientele from the surrounding neighborhood. It is anticipated that East Pine Street, a primary arterial, will handle the increase demand falling within its capacity. Secondary local streets which can be used to access the site will experience slight increased volumes.

### Parking

The project proposes a total of 108 parking stalls for the entire development site. The Land Use Code sets minimum parking requirements for residential and commercial uses within Capitol Hill Urban Center Village, among other Centers, which eliminated required parking for all use in commercial zones. Additionally, no parking is required for uses in the Station Area Overlay District; the proposed development is not required to provide parking as it is located within the Capitol Hill Station Overlay District. This regulation is a manifestation of policy changes the City is implementing to encourage alternative modes of travel (i.e., public transit, bicycle) for urban city dwellers. The applicant has proposed to exceed the Code requirement to accommodate a total of 108 residential parking spaces at the development site for 108 residential units. Additionally, Ordinance (121792) modified SEPA Parking Policy (Sec. 25.05.675M, SMC) removing SEPA authority to mitigate residential parking impacts within the Pike/Pine Urban Center Village.

Peak parking demand for the proposed commercial (retail) use (we have assumed apparel store to capture the entire development site) was based on empirical studies from the *ITE Trip Parking Generation Report, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*, with peak demand for the apparel store occurring on Saturdays between 2:00 – 3:00 PM. Based on the mode-share survey results within the Capitol Hill neighborhood, approximately 35% of the local residents will choose alternative modes of travel for commercial uses, which is assumed, will reduce on-site parking demand. In general, the peak parking demand should be accommodated off-site. The applicant is not proposing any commercial parking stalls which is allowed by Code for retail uses. Any anticipated spill-over can be accommodated on-street or in nearby lots. It is assumed approximately seven parking spaces are available within the Summit Avenue right-of-way abutting the site of the new development. On balance, the adverse parking impacts of the project are likely to be infrequent and transitory.

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 near capacity. Parking can be found during the daytime with limited availability during evening hours. One hundred and eight (108) vehicle off-street parking spaces will be provided on-site for the new development. Residential parking will be at a ratio of one (1) space per each unit which exceeds code requirements and is expected to accommodate parking demand most of the day. In the Pike/Pine Urban Center Village, no SEPA authority is provided for the decision maker to require more parking than the minimum required by the Land Use Code which is equivalent 1 space for each dwelling unit; per Section 25.05.675M(2bii).

On-street parking capacity in the surrounding area is sufficient to meet any additional spill-over parking that might be generated from the proposed commercial uses, if any actually occurs. Therefore, no mitigation of parking impacts is necessary pursuant to SEPA.

### **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.
4. Revise landscape plan identifying correct scale. The landscape plan must clearly identify the planting areas (the existing planting area designation key map is unreadable and will not be able to be microfilmed), the associated quantities of planting area and

numbers of plantings that directly corresponds with the numbers on the Green Factor Scoring Sheet. The current Green Factor Scoring Sheet needs to be updated to match the current Planting Area Designation Spreadsheet. Planting Area G (visible from public right of way or public open spaces) must also be clearly identified on the landscape plan. The planting areas must be fully dimensioned to be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner prior to MUP issuance.

Appealable Conditions Prior to Issuance of MUP Permit

The owner/applicant shall update plans to show:

5. Design and appoint a well defined the garage entry that will visually enhance the pedestrian's experience along the Summit Avenue, subject to the approval by the DPD.
6. Work with SDOT and DPD to provide amenities in the right-of-way including bike racks, seating/resting areas, and overhead weather protection. The architect shall work with DPD and SDOT on the details for right-of-way improvements, details to be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner.
7. Along Summit Avenue, the applicant shall work with SDOT and DPD to develop a plan for paving changes through color and texture at the vehicle access point to the parking garage subject to approval by DPD planner.
8. The architect shall simplify the building's façades to establish stronger design coherence: Eliminate stark color contrast between windows and surface materials (white vinyl windows are discouraged, especially in the MR zoned area); reduce the amount vinyl windows; storefront windows shall be metal framed and extend full length of commercial level; corrugated metal siding should seek greater uniformity in orientation to reduce business, subject to approval of DPD.
9. Explore alternatives to create a stronger presence along East Pine. The white portion of the exterior wall projecting along East Pine appears incongruous in light of the neighborhood guidelines and should be removed. Increase the volume of brick material along the East Pine frontage vertically from street level and horizontally, details to be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner.
10. At the East Pine and Belmont corner, the applicant shall design and install a more celebratory facade that enhances the pedestrian experience with well defined detailing, with canopies and other amenities with, details to be reviewed and approved by the DPD planner.

Prior to Groundbreaking and Prior to Sheathing the Exterior of the Structure (During Construction)

12. 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.

**SEPA CONDITIONS**

Prior to issuance of Demolition or Construction Permits

13. 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.

14. In order to further mitigate the noise impacts during construction, the owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall limit the hours of construction to non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM and Saturdays between 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM. This condition may be modified by the Department to permit work of an emergency nature to allow low noise exterior work (e.g., installation of landscaping) or to allow work which cannot otherwise be accomplished during the above hours upon submittal of a noise mitigation plan and after approval from the Land Use Planner. After the structures are enclosed, interior work may proceed at any time in compliance with the Noise Ordinance.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ (signature on file) Date: November 8, 2007  
Bradley Wilburn, Land Use Planner  
Department of Planning and Development  
Land Use Services

BW:lc

I:\WILBURB\Design Review\3005493\3005493Dec.doc