



City of Seattle

Department of Planning and Development
D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3012431
Applicant Name: Jeff Williams, Johnson Braund Inc. Architects
Address of Proposal: 416 John Street

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow an 8-story structure containing 56 residential units above a 116 room hotel (approximately 78,505 sq. ft.). Parking for 62 vehicles and 22 bicycle stalls will be provided in a two level below grade garage. Project includes 37,770 cubic yards of grading.

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

Design Review – Seattle Municipal Code Section 23.41 with Development Standard Departures:

1. Blank Façade Limits (SMC 23.48.018.B.3)
2. Loading Berth Requirement and Space Quantity (SMC 23.54.035.C.2)
3. Parking Space Standards (SMC 54.030.B.2.c)

SEPA Environmental Review - Seattle Municipal Code Section 25.05

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

DNS with conditions

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

SITE AND VICINITY

The site is currently occupied by a principal use surface parking lot with a perimeter fence and gate to secure vehicles parked on the lot. The asphalt surface parking lot features a modest eight (8) foot downward slope, from the southwest corner to the northeast corner, dropping eight feet over a distance of 230 feet. Parking is accessed off John Street. There are no other distinguishable characteristics associated with the development site.



The site is zoned Seattle Mix with a height limit of 85 feet (SM-85), and is located within the Uptown Urban Center District. Zoning in the immediate vicinity is currently Neighborhood Commercial Three with a height limit of 85 (NC3-85) to the east and north, SM-85 to the east, and several Downtown zoned lands ranging in height from 65 feet 400 feet. The general area is located at the south edge of the Uptown Urban Character Area district and is home to a number of iconic structures including the Seattle Space Needle, Experience Music Project, and the Pacific Science Center, all on the campus of Seattle Center. One block south of the subject site, is the six-story Fischer Plaza complex that visually dominates the 5th Avenue streetscape south of Broad Street. Across 5th Avenue to the east the buildings are smaller in scale with large pockets of surface parking lots. The monorail train runs within the 5th Avenue right-of-way adjacent to the development site's street frontage. The monorail's Y-shaped columns supporting pairs of concrete beams, which span the length of the development site. The typical concrete beams are approximately 70ft in length and are supported by columns approximately 30 feet above street grade.

The area is made up of a variety of uses surrounding the south edge of Seattle Center made accessible by connections to major roadway corridors. Seattle Center hosts year round attractions and events attracting hundreds of thousands of people annually. Board Street and 5th Avenue generates heavy traffic as people access the Seattle Center Campus. Except for the Fischer Plaza complex, development along 5th Avenue, within a two block radius, is varied with surface parking lots and undersized buildings. The area offers high levels of pedestrian and vehicular traffic with excellent access to transit and amenities

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicants propose an eight-story building with 56 residential apartment units and 116 hotel rooms distributed through floors 2-8, with lobby and restaurant use on the ground floor. Parking for 62 vehicles and 22 bicycles is to be provided underground.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING:

Approximately six members of the public attended the Early Design Guidance meeting held on October 05, 2011. The following comments were offered:

- A representative of Fischer Communications inquired about the potential height of the roof and equipment/stair penthouses in order to be assured they would not interfere with the operation of the helipad atop the Fischer Building.
- Inquired if there would be meeting rooms in the hotel and was informed that this had not been determined yet.
- Inquired as to the amount of grading which would be necessary and was informed it would be two levels deep and match the 16,000 sq. ft. building floor plate.

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING:

Approximately one member of the public attended the 2nd Early Design Guidance meeting held on June 20, 2012. The following comment was offered:

- A representative of Fischer Communications preferred that the location of the parking entry avoid the entries to Fischer Plaza.

MASTER USE PERMIT:

Date of Notice of Application:	August 16, 2012
Date End of Comment Period:	September 26, 2012
# Letters	1

The SEPA comment period for this proposal ended on September 26, 2012. The Department received one comment letter during the public comment period.

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING:

Approximately three members of the public attended the Initial Recommendation meeting held on December 19, 2012. The following comments were offered:

- Liked evening lighting scheme as depicted in the oral presentation and recommendation packet.
- In favor of the treatment and arrangement of material reveals on exterior facades.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING:

Approximately one member of the public attended the Final Recommendation meeting held on April 10, 2013. Prior to the meeting, two comment letters were received and shared during the public comment phase. The following comments were offered:

- A representative of Fischer Communications inquired about the potential height of the roof and equipment/stair penthouses in order to be assured they would not interfere with the operation of the helipad atop the Fischer Building.
- An individual inquired if there would be meeting rooms in the hotel and was informed that this had not been determined yet.

- Another individual inquired as to the amount of grading which would be necessary and was informed it would be two levels deep and match the 16,000 sq. ft. building floor plate.

DESIGN REVIEW

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: November 21, 2012 DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

Three alternative design schemes were presented.

Three massing options were presented which varied the location and size of cut out used to provide light and air to internal facing residential units. One option had an entirely interior light well with building mass around it in a “doughnut” shape. The other two options utilized “C” shaped building structures above the podium base story, having a larger area of open space on the lid than the other. The applicants also showed three options for configuration of vehicular access, drop off space and loading docks. Two of the access plans utilized vehicle access points from both 5th Avenue and John Street and the third took access only from John Street but required an internal “hammerhead” turning space to allow vehicles to turn around to leave after dropping off at the lobby or using the ADA space.

PRIORITIES & BOARD GUIDANCE

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. The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines & Neighborhood specific guidelines (Pike/Pine Urban Center Village) of highest priority for this project.

At the 1st EDG meeting, the Board provided the following guidance:

1. Facade:
 - a. The Board encouraged the applicants to be bold in their overall design. A transportation influenced theme, relating to the Monorail, would be appropriate. A floating mass over a light base was suggested. The Board called for futuristic looking elements. (A-1, C-1, C-2, C-4).
2. Street-level Facade:
 - a. The Board observed that the courtyard location could have many forms. It should respond to site conditions, namely buildings on two sides and an “amazing open space” at Seattle Center on another. The Board requested that courtyard configuration and orientation be explored. (A-2, A-4, C-1, C-3, and E-2)
 - b. The Board observed that the proposal site is in a highly pedestrian area which is expected to get even more heavily pedestrian in the future. Denny Way is likely to

become more highly pedestrian and Fifth Avenue along past the site is a fairly significant bike route.

The Board asked for some response to the new, wide sidewalk, green landscaped Broad Street planned for the post viaduct era. There could be a softening with landscape or street furniture. Opportunity for building modulation is very limited. A workable approach might be in the façade / right of way seam where landscaping could be incorporated and a building entry expressed. (A-3, A-4, D-1, E-1 and E-2)

- c. The Board observed that when looking at the site from a broad, external perspective it is most observable from Seattle Center. From Fifth Avenue it is hidden by the Monorail. From the south the site is hidden by the Fischer Building. From the north the site narrows to a point. The Board indicated they were interested in the building's response to Broad Street. They called for an expression looking back at Seattle Center; possibly over the entry. (A-3, A-4, C-1)

3. Location of Parking:

- a. When considering the best place for vehicle entry, the Board encouraged the applicants to consider the alley. If an internal auto court with street access is to be created the Board indicated the street to use for access would be John Street with one possible configuration having an entry from John Street and an existing alley. (A-2, A-8, A-9, C-3, D-1).
- b. The Board indicated if a curb side drop off area is to be incorporated, Broad Street should be considered as a strong candidate because Fifth Avenue is complicated by the presence of the overhead Monorail with support pillars in the right of way along the proposal site. John Street could be considered as another possibility for curb side drop off if designed with respect to adjacent structures. The Board asked that this issue be studied and a resolution shown at the next Design Review meeting. (A-2, A-8, A-9, C-3, D-1).

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: June 20, 2012

The Board expressed their collective opinion that the design team responded well to their comments from previous EDG meeting, however several issues remain unresolved:

1. Facade

- a. Along the east façade the building should acknowledge and respond to the monorail on the upper level. At grade pedestrian entries should be located in such a way as not to be obscured by the monorails support columns (A-3, C-4, D-1, & D-12).
- b. Explore surrounding spatial characteristics along Broad Street and provide options to soften the exterior wall as it relates to Seattle Center and Fischer Plaza (A-1, A-2, C-1 & C-2).
- c. The Board indicated a desire to reinforce design elements in a stronger manner with the incorporation of curtain walls and bold fins on the corner of Broad Street and Fifth Avenue (A-10, C-3, and C-4).

- d. Develop a well conceived south façade that acknowledges its street frontage. John Street is not a back door and should not be treated as such when considering application of façade materials and fenestration pattern on its exterior wall (A-3, C-1, & C-4).

2. Street Level Façade

- a. The Board indicated the pedestrian realm at the corner of Broad Street & Fifth Avenue needed a high level of transparency to visually engage the pedestrian at a prominent intersection. Take the opportunity to locate active uses behind the windows to put eyes on the street in this corner location (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-1, C-4, & D-11).
- b. The Board asked that the venting system be relocated away from the prominent corner in an effort to establish a more desirable experience at the pedestrian level in the right-of-way (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-1, C-4, & D-11).
- c. Celebrate pedestrian entries to all points of access; they should be readable from the rights-of-way (A-3).

3. Parking and Access

- a. The Board supported the direction to provide vehicle access from John Street to open up Fifth Avenue to uninterrupted pedestrian activity. The Board reached this conclusion after the design team explained that if they used the alley they would be chasing grade and lose valuable commercial floor area. The Board acknowledged the difficulty of establishing underground parking at the development site. The loading dock will be accessed off the alley to minimize associated visual, noise and odor impacts. Hotel guest vehicle pick up and drop off location along Fifth Avenue still needs further refinements set between the monorail support columns. The Board asked that this issue be studied and a resolution shown at the next Design Review meeting (A-8, A-9).

4. Massing

- a. The proposed building modulates both vertically and horizontally to reduce the appearance of bulk as viewed from Broad Street and Fifth Avenue. Having the vertical break in the building's mass along the north façade is well executed and promotes visual connections to Seattle Center. The Board indicated attention should be directed to address the visual impact of the Broad Street and Fifth Ave corner. The corner should be bold yet sympathetic in design to its unique location at a busy intersection at the southeast corner of the Uptown Urban Center (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-1 & C-2).

5. Materials

- a. Select quality materials that are complementary at the development site. The Board observed the monorail datum line should be incorporated along the east façade. Consideration should be made to provide architectural nuances to establish a sense of presence in an area dominated by iconic structures (A-2, A-10, C-1, C-2, & C-4).

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION DESIGN GUIDANCE: December 19, 2013

The Board expressed their collective opinion that the design team responded well to their comments from the previous meeting. A vast improvement at the corner of Broad Street and Fifth Avenue was noted. One major obstacle preventing a full evaluation of the proposal's addition to the neighborhood was the noticeable lack of design improvements

1. Façade: The Board appreciated the design development of the “north” building better than the “south” building. But refinements are still needed:
 - a. Remove reference in this building's façade treatment to the “south” building's Mondrian-esque multicolor panel scheme. It's not necessary as a device to “tie in” the two building masses (other elements do that and the reference should be slight anyway), and it appears messy. This also applies to the base (“jumping kickplates”), at the “faux window” storefront areas and in the eroded corner treatment (A-1, C-2, C-4, & D-11).
 - b. In general, where possible, the entire façade should be simplified (C-1, C-2, & C-4).
 - c. In addition to removing the multicolor panels from the eroded corner element, the introduction of a more playful color or different material might pull off or finesse this element even more was suggested, especially given the applicant's intention of illuminating this feature at night (A-10, C-1, C-2, & C-4).
2. Street Level Façade: The Board indicated the pedestrian realm along John Street needed a stronger “base” element. This can be accomplished by:
 - a. Expressing a stronger “cap” to the ground floor through materials, colors, and use of overhead weather protection/canopies (A-1, A-2, C-1, C-2, C-4, D-1 & D-12).
 - b. The resulting ground-floor base should be “calmer” and simpler in its design. The multicolor metal panel treatment should be left for the body of the building mass, but not reintroduced into the base element. For example, the “jumping kickplates” below the storefront system should be eliminated, in favor of a more standard, even, calmer treatment (C-1, C-2, C-3, D-1 & E-1).
 - c. One suggestion was to set back the ground-floor a foot or two to enhance the sense of base (A-1, A-2, C-1, & D-1).
 - d. Similarly to “c” another recommendation was to extend the entry “wedge” sequence from the corner of 5th and John to the entryway, creating a graduated entry setback along 5th Ave (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-10, C-4, D-1).
 - e. The John Street elevation should reconsider faux windows where no view of internal activity is possible or feasible. Either rediscover opportunities for actual views into the building at those locations or design creative, artistic or otherwise pedestrian-friendly treatments in those locations to provide the façade interest (even if that requires a minor design departure, which the Board would support) (A-1, A-2, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, & D-1).
3. Parking and Access.
 - a. The Board supported the direction to provide vehicle access from the alley to open up uninterrupted pedestrian activity along the site's street frontages: John Street, Fifth Avenue, and Broad Street (A-8, A-9).

4. Massing: The entries on both Fifth and Broad are good, but could be further enhanced as follows:
 - a. The design featured two building forms with a “gasket” separating the north segment from the south. Additional refinement in materials, colors, etc. is needed to strengthen the building’s form and design composition in its relationship to adjacent structures at the southeast corner of the Uptown Urban Center. The Board is in favor of the design direction (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-1 & C-2).
 - b. Use of more human-scaled façade materials. There was concern that continued use of the large metal panels at the entry sequence was not appropriate. Metal could still be used, if desired, but perhaps in smaller units. Or other, smaller-unit, human-scaled materials could be employed to enhance the entry experience (A-3, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-1 & D-12).
 - c. Potentially the light-colored “gasket” tower that joins the two building masses could potentially be continued aesthetically (either via use of the same materials, colors, etc.) into the entry sequence area in both locations (C-2, C-3, C-4, D-1 & D-10).
 - d. Develop and detail streetscape elements experienced by pedestrians demonstrating desirable spatial characteristics in the right-of-way (A-2, D-1, E-1 & E-2).

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: April 10, 2013

The packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3012431) at this website:

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp

or contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Address: Public Resource Center
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98124

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board discussed responses to the EDG meeting and recommended conditions to meet the applicable Design Review Guidelines listed at EDG:

The Board expressed their collective opinion that the design team responded well to their comments from the Initial Recommendation meeting including simplification of base, execution of canopies, and street-level landscaping especially at the corner of Broad Street and Fifth Avenue. The Board noted the new exterior wall colors may be too intense with the introduction of darker hues in reds and grays. On the upper level at the corner of Broad Street and Fifth Avenue the eroded corner element creates a dynamic presence with its lighter color and illuminated channel lights in the evening hours. This beacon-like feature establishes its sense of place, energizing an intersection without detracting from surrounding iconic structures.

1. Façade:
 - a. The simplified application of materials and building form relates well to its surrounding architectural context. (A-1, A-10, C-1, C-2, C-4, and D-11)
 - b. The change in the color of the metal panels and patterning is different from what was previously presented and seems confused on a couple of facades. Explore opportunities to lighten up exterior colors and eliminate the number of the materials. The bold exterior colors seem out of context with the surrounding buildings; lighter shades should be considered to lessen the color contrast. (A-1, C-1, C-2, and C-4)
 - c. The recessed beacon feature at the corner of Broad and Fifth Avenue should be painted a lighter color to provide greater visual vibrancy during the daytime hours. (A-1, A-10, C-2, and C-4)
 - d. The upper level accent color panels on the alley frontage and a portion of the Broad Street façade loses its sense of vertical proportionality by grouping the panels into horizontal clusters. The accent color panels should adhere to the vertical formula found on the 5th Avenue façade. (C-1, C-2, and C-4)

2. Street Level Façade:
 - a. The seating and landscaping is a positive component of the building's program at the corner of Broad and Fifth Avenue. (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-10, D-1, E-1, and E-2)
 - b. The recessed street-level street facing façade along 5th Avenue, north of John Street to the entry is a gracious relief at the base, creating visual interest to enhance the street level experience. (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-10, C-3, C-4, D-1, D-12, and E-1)
 - c. The slightly recessed iridescent tiled art wall along John Street will need artificial lighting to wash the wall in light. The design should include an exterior lighting plan that includes lighting the art wall. (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-10, D-12, and E-1)
 - d. A curb bulb is proposed at the corner of John Street and Fifth Avenue, with its proximity to the support column for the Monorail. The Board unanimously opposed a potential risk to pedestrian safety. The Board directed the planner to make sure the curb bulb is removed from future plans. (A-2, A-4, A-10, D-1, D-12, and E-1)

3. Massing:
 - a. The Board noted that the massing is an appropriate response to EDG and the Initial Recommendation guidance. (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-1, and C-2)
 - b. Secondary scale characteristics such as the inset tile, window proportions, and datum lines reflect a thoughtful response to nearby scale and adjacent the Monorail. (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-1, C-2)

The Neighborhood specific guidelines are summarized below. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

A. Site Planning

A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Solar Orientation
 - B. Stormwater Management
- A-2 **Streetscape Compatibility.** The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Architectural Diversity
 - B. Older and Historic Buildings
 - C. Wider Sidewalks
 - D. Ground Level Residential
 - E. Streetscape Improvement
- A-3 **Entrances Visible from the Street.** Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.
- A-4 **Human Activity.** New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Outdoor Dining
 - B. Individualized Storefronts
- 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.

Uptown-specific supplemental guidance:

- A. Celebratory Entries
 - B. Defensible space
- A-8 **Parking and Vehicle Access.** Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Parking on Queen Anne Avenue
 - B. Access to Parking
 - C. Preserving Existing Sidewalk Areas
 - D. Widening Narrow Alleys
- A-9 **Location of Parking on Commercial Street Fronts.** Parking on a commercial street front should be minimized and where possible should be located behind a building.
- A-10 **Corner Lots.** Building on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.

Uptown-specific supplemental guidance:

- A. Visual Openness Encouraged at Street Level**
- B. Synergetic Connection to Surrounding Iconic Structures**

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

- C-1 Architectural Context. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.**

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- C. Features Especially Encouraged**
- D. Small Local Businesses**

- C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.**

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Individualized Storefronts**
- B. Highlighting Distinctive Features**
- C. Screening Rooftop Systems**
- D. Sustainable Building Features**

- C-3 Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.**

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Pedestrian Orientation**

- C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.**

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Building for the Long Term**
- B. Cladding Materials**
- C. Ground-floor Façade Materials**
- D. Colors**
- E. Renewable Materials**

D. Pedestrian Environment

D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Building Setbacks for Wider Sidewalks**
- B. Creating Pedestrian Open Space**
- C. Recessed Retail Entry Areas**
- D. Avoiding Dark, Unusable Spaces**
- E. Pedestrian Weather Protection**
- F. Operable Storefront Windows**
- G. Retail Use and Open Space at Sidewalk Level**
- H. Pedestrian Amenities and Street Furniture**
- I. Bus Waiting Facilities in Buildings**
- J. Residential Entries**

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

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Avoid Recesses that are not Defensible**
- B. Enhance and Protect Alley**

D-10 Commercial Lighting. Appropriate levels of lighting should be provided in order to promote visual interest and a sense of security for people in commercial districts during evening hours. Lighting may be provided by incorporation into the building façade, the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and/or on signage.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- C. Preferred Pedestrian Lighting**
- D. Pedestrian lighting considerations**

D-11 Commercial Transparency. Commercial storefronts should be transparent, allowing for a direct visual connection between pedestrians on the sidewalk and the activities occurring on the interior of a building. Blank walls should be avoided.

D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions. For residential projects in commercial zones, the space between the residential entry and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.

E. Landscaping

- E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites.** Where possible, and where there is not another overriding concern, landscaping should reinforce the character of neighboring properties and abutting streetscape.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Uniform Street Tree Plantings**
- B. Landscape Maintenance and Irrigation**
- C. Street-level Landscaping**
- D. Visible Landscaping**
- E. Art in the Pedestrian Environment**

- E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site.** Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Green Factor Focus on Ground-level Plantings**
- B. Recommended Landscape Enhancements**
- C. Evergreen Plantings**
- D. Quality Landscaping Materials**
- E. Recommended Plants**
- F. Planted Containers**

- E-3 Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions.** The landscape design should take advantage of special on-site conditions such as high-bank front yards, steep slopes, view corridors, or existing significant trees and off-site conditions such as greenbelts, ravines, natural areas, and boulevards.

Queen Anne Supplemental Guidance:

- A. Creative Usable Spaces**

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departures is based upon the departures' potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departures.

- 1. (Blank Façade Limits (23.48.018.B.3)):** The Code requires blank facades shall be limited to segments of 30 feet in width. The proposed blank wall segment will be less than 60 feet along the John Street frontage. The applicant proposes to install an art wall incorporating a design concept from a nearby art installation. The intermitted vertical pieces will provide an enhanced street level visual experience adjacent to John Street to enliven the street-level street-facing facade.

At the Recommendation meeting, the revised design with iridescent vertical tiles arrayed on the street-level street-facing facade creates visual interest adjacent to the pedestrian realm. This tile design provides an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines. The Board unanimously recommended approval with one conditions: In order to maximize the public benefit of the art wall, exterior lighting will be required to illuminate the piece on overcast days and during evening hours.

(A-2, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, and D-1)

2. **(Loading Berth requirements and Space Quantity (23.54.035.C.2)):** The Code requires each loading for low- and medium uses, shall be a minimum of 35 feet in length, except as provided in subsection 23.54.035.C.2.c. The proposal would be required to provide two loading berths at 35 feet in length. The proposed design provides two loading berths at 25 feet in length.

At the Recommendation meeting, the Board unanimously approved this departure that provides an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines, by orientating loading activity to minimally impact the surrounding street level pedestrian realm, and by providing additional street level floor area in active use. (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-8, and D-1)

3. **(Parking Space Standards (23.54.030.B.2.c)):** The Code requires when 20 or more parking spaces are provided, a minimum of 35% of the parking spaces shall be striped for small vehicles. The minimum required size for small vehicles shall also be the maximum size. A maximum of 65% of the parking spaces may be striped for small vehicles. A minimum of 35% of the spaces shall be striped for large vehicles. The proposed design will have 13 parking stalls (20%) for large vehicles.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of the proposed departure as the design better meets the intent of Design Review Guidelines by allowing vehicles to take access through a widened alley, and by providing opportunities to lesson on-street parking demands by shifting parking within the development site which would otherwise not be required. (A-1, A-8, and A-9)

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated April 10, 2013, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the April 10, 2013 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comments, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures with the following conditions.

1. Façade:

- a. The design should lighten exterior colors and reduce the number of the materials. (A-1, C-1, C-2, C-4)
- b. The recessed beacon feature should be painted a lighter color up to give the building more visual vibrancy during the daytime hours. (A-1, A-10, C-1, C-2, and C-4)

- c. The accent color panels should adhere to the vertical formula found on the Fifth Avenue. (A-1, A-10, C-1, C-2, and C-4)

2. Street Level Façade:

- a. The art wall should be lit. (A-1, A-4, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, and E-1)
- b. The curb bulb should be removed from future plans. (A-2, A-4, A-10, D-1, D-12, and E-1)

Subsequent to the April 10, 2013 meeting, the applicant worked with DPD staff to respond to the Design Review Board Recommended Conditions as follows:

1. The applicant has modified the dark pre-weathered metal panel to a light grey, in response to recommended condition #1.a. This recommended design review condition has been satisfied.
2. The applicant has lightened the color of the recessed beacon to provide greater contrast applying a light grey as opposed to a dark pre-weathered metal color, in response to recommended condition #1.b. This recommended design review condition has been satisfied.
3. The applicant established a stronger datum line with the monorail tracks and made consistent the vertical orientation of the accent panels, in response to recommended conditions #1.c. These recommended design review conditions have been satisfied.
4. The applicant has design an under canopy lighting system to provide illumination to the art wall below, in response to recommended condition #2.a. This recommended design review condition has been satisfied
5. The applicant has removed the curb bulb resulting in a more safe and secured pedestrian environment, in response to recommended condition #2.b. This recommended design review condition has been satisfied

The plans on file reflect the updated design and are included in the issued MUP plan set.

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.014.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the DPD Director’s decision reads in part as follows:

The Director’s decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board, provided that, if four (4) members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to the Director, the Director shall issue a decision which incorporates the full substance of the recommendation of the Design Review Board, unless the Director concludes the Design Review Board:

- a. *Reflects inconsistent application of the design review guidelines; or*
- b. *Exceeds the authority of the Design Review Board; or*

- c. *Conflicts with SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the site; or*
- d. *Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.*

Director's Analysis:

Four members of the Queen Anne/Magnolia Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project's overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board's recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3). The Director agrees with and accepts the conditions recommended by the Board that further augment the selected Guidelines.

Following the Recommendation meeting, DPD staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board. The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Uptown Urban Center. The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board. The Director is satisfied that all of the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

Director's Decision:

The design review process is prescribed in Section 23.41.014 of the Seattle Municipal Code. Subject to the above-proposed conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines. The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting, provided additional review and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Uptown Urban Center. The Design Review Board agreed that the proposed design, along with the conditions listed, meets each of the Design Guideline Priorities as previously identified. Therefore, the Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design and the requested departure with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the Seattle State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), WAC 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05) because the proposed project is located in a Neighborhood Commercial zone and an urban center and exceeds the 12,000 square foot threshold.

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated August 14, 2012 and annotated by the Land Use Planner. The information in the checklist, pertinent public comment, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed the environmental checklist and submitted by the project applicant and reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file. As indicated in this analysis, this action will result in adverse impacts to the environment. However, due to their temporary nature and limited effects, the impacts are not expected to be significant.

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, and 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 and environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation*” subject to some limitations. Short-term adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposal. No adverse long-term impacts on the environmentally critical area are anticipated.

Short Term Impacts

Air

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with development come from multiple sources; the extraction, processing, transportation, construction and disposal of materials and landscape disturbance (Embodied Emissions); energy demands created by the development after it is completed (Energy Emissions); and transportation demands created by the development after it is completed (Transportation Emissions). Short term impacts generated from the embodied emissions results in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases thereby impacting air quality and contributing to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse they are not expected to be significant. The other types of emissions are considered under the use-related impacts discussed later in this document. SEPA conditioning is not necessary to mitigate air quality impacts pursuant to SEPA policy SMC 25.05.675.A.

Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. These impacts would be especially adverse in the early morning, in the evening, and on weekends. The Seattle Noise Ordinance permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends.

The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance are not sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore, pursuant to SEPA authority, the applicant shall be required to limit periods of construction activities (including but not limited to grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) to non-holiday weekdays from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM, unless modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, to be determined by DPD prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit, whichever is issued first.

Historic Preservation

The site is adjacent to a Landmark Structure, the elevated track structure of the Seattle Monorail Line, along Fifth Avenue. The Department of Neighborhoods (DON) is responsible for managing landmark structures within Seattle. The operating authority for the monorail is Seattle Center Monorail. To protect and safeguard the Monorail System a set of guidelines have been established to maximize the safety of employees, patrons, and the general public; to prevent action that would compromise or jeopardize the status of the landmark structure. The applicant received a copy of the guidelines and has interacted with Seattle Center Monorail to assure the design from construction to the life of the structure will adhere to the guidelines contained with the memo from Seattle Center Monorail entitled: Memo for the Monorail Proximity Guidelines (dated February 8, 2013). Any future exterior maintenance or improvements to the building's exterior will require contacting the monorail authority to determine current mitigation measures to ensure compatibility or reduce the impacts to the Monorail System. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for historic preservation.

Construction Parking and Traffic

Construction activities are expected to affect the surrounding area. Impacts to traffic and roads are expected from truck trips during excavation and construction activities. The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675B) allows the reviewing agency to mitigate impacts associated with transportation during construction. The construction activities will require the removal of material from site and can be expected to generate truck trips to and from the site. In addition, delivery of concrete and other materials to the site will generate truck trips. As a result of these truck trips, an adverse impact to existing traffic will be introduced to the surrounding street system, which is unmitigated by existing codes and regulations.

During construction, existing City code (SMC 11.62) requires truck activities to use arterial streets to the greatest extent possible. This immediate area is subject to traffic congestion during the PM peak hour, and large construction trucks would further exacerbate the flow of traffic. Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675(B) (Construction Impacts Policy) and SMC 25.05.675(R) (Traffic and Transportation), additional mitigation is warranted.

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 minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed en route to or from a site.

To mitigate construction parking impacts and other haul truck trip impacts, the applicant shall submit a Construction Haul Route for approval by Seattle Department of Transportation and Construction Parking Plan for approval by DPD. These plans may include a restriction in the hours of truck trips to mitigate traffic impacts on nearby arterials and intersections. Evidence of these approved plans shall be provided to DPD prior to the issuance of demolition, grading, and building permits.

On-street parking in the neighborhood is limited, and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction could increase demand for on-street parking but is anticipated not to result in an adverse impact on surrounding properties.

The Street Use Ordinance requires sweeping or watering streets to suppress dust, on-site washing of truck tires, removal of debris, and regulates obstruction of the pedestrian right-of-way. This ordinance provides adequate mitigation for these construction transportation impacts; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Long Term Impacts

Historic Preservation

The site is adjacent to a Landmark Structure, the elevated track structure of the Seattle Monorail, along Fifth Avenue. Pursuit to SMC 25.05.675.H.2.d, the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) did a adjacency analysis incorporating DPD project information and a memo from Seattle Center Monorail entitled; Memo for the Monorail Proximity Guidelines and requirements for Development Adjacent to City of Seattle Monorail Line (dated February 8, 2013), determined DON would not require additional mitigation to ensure compatibility or reduce the impacts of the proposed project (Landmarks Preservation Board letter, reference number LPB 129/13). Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for historic preservation.

The applicant worked with Seattle Center Monorail to assure the design from construction to the life of the structure will adhere to the guidelines contained with the memo from Seattle Center Monorail entitled; Memo for the Monorail Proximity Guidelines (dated February 8, 2013). Any future exterior maintenance or improvements to the building's exterior will require contacting the monorail authority to determined current mitigation measures to ensure compatibility or reduce the impacts to the Monorail System. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for historic preservation.

Parking and Traffic

As part of the environmental checklist, the project submitted a transportation analysis (Transportation Impact Analysis by Heffron Transportation, Inc., dated March 12, 2013). An addendum addressing trip generation estimates and commercial parking demand was prepared on August 1, 2013 and submitted the DPD for review on August 1, 2013

Three major right-of-way improvements are currently under construction; Mercer Corridor Project, Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project (Bored Tunnel and North Surface Street), and Denny Way Active Traffic Management Project. These projects are expected to be completed within the next three years. The transportation analysis took the future impact of these three projects into consideration in determining traffic impacts of the proposal in the neighborhood. The project is expected to generate a net total of 430 daily vehicle trips; with 35 net new AM Peak Hour trips and 37 net new PM Peak Hour trips. Level of service analysis was performed for nearby intersections. That analysis showed that the project is expected to add a small amount of delay at each of the study intersections, but is not expected to significantly affect their overall operation.

DPD's Transportation Planner has reviewed the Traffic and Parking Analysis and determined that the additional peak hour trips do not contribute significant adverse impacts requiring mitigation. Accordingly, no mitigation of impacts disclosed in this section is required. The Transportation Impact Analysis noted that the residential peak parking demand for this development is 36 vehicles during the weekday and 31 during the weekend. Peak commercial parking demand is 52 vehicles during the weekday (this peak demand would occur in the morning around 8:00 AM.), and 73 during the weekend. The proposed number of parking spaces (62) is expected to have a small amount of parking spillover. If overflow occurs, there are a number of parking facilities in the vicinity of the site that can accommodate peak demand; therefore no additional mitigation is required.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that there is no SEPA authority provided for mitigation of residential parking impacts in the Uptown Urban Center. This site is located in that Urban Center, and the project is mostly residential with some commercial. Regardless of the parking demand impacts, no SEPA authority is provided to mitigate impacts of parking demand from the residential components of this project, even if impacts were identified.

Greenhouse Gas

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the projects' energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

DECISION – STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), 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).

CONDITIONS – SEPA

Prior to Issuance of any Construction, Shoring or Grading Permits

1. The applicant shall provide a copy of a Construction Haul Route, approved by Seattle Department of Transportation, and a Construction Parking Plan approved by DPD.
2. If the applicant intends to work outside of the limits of the hours of construction described in condition #3, a Construction Noise Management Plan shall be required, subject to review and approval by DPD, and prior to a demolition, grading, or building permit, whichever is issued first. The Plan shall include proposed management of

construction related noise, efforts to mitigate noise impacts, and community outreach efforts to allow people within the immediate area of the project to have opportunities to contact the site to express concern about noise. Elements of noise mitigation may be incorporated into any Construction Management Plans required to mitigate any short-term transportation impacts that result from the project.

During Construction

3. 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. This condition may be modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, required prior to issuance of a building permit as noted in condition #2.
4. To protect and safeguard the Monorail System the applicant shall work with Seattle Center Monorail to adhere to the set of guidelines to maximize the safety of employees, patrons, and the general public; to prevent action that would compromise or jeopardize the status of the landmark structure.

For the Life of the Project

5. Any future exterior maintenance or improvements to the building's exterior will require contacting the monorail authority to determined current mitigation measures to ensure compatibility or reduce the impacts to the Monorail System.

CONDITIONS-DESIGN REVIEW

During Construction

6. Any changes to the design, building exterior or landscape plan shall be submitted to DPD for review and approval.

Prior to Issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy

7. The applicants shall arrange for an inspection with the Land Use Planner to verify that the construction of the buildings with siting, materials, and architectural details is substantially the same as those documented in the approved plans dated July 24, 2013 and updated by the graphic presentation to the Design Review Board on July 31, 2013.

For the Life of the Project

8. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Bradley Wilburn (206) 615-0508 or Bradley.wilburn@seattle.gov).

Signature: _____ (signature on file) Date: August 5, 2013
Bradley Wilburn, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

BMW:drm

H:\DOC\Design Review\3012431 (416 John Street)\3012431 Dec