



City of Seattle

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

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

Project Number: 3012878
Applicant Name: Brian Runberg of Runberg Architects for SRM Development
Address of Proposal: 315 1st Avenue North

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a six-story structure containing 212 residential units and 12,018 sq. ft. of retail space. Parking for 238 vehicles to be provided below grade. Project also includes 25,000 cubic yards of grading.

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

Design Review Departures (SMC Chapter 23.41)

Development Standard Departure to allow larger structural building overhangs
(23.53.035)

Development Standard Departure to allow less than the required floor to floor
height (23.47A.008.B.3.b)

SEPA-Environmental Determination (Chapter 25.05 SMC)

DPD SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-significance

- No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.
- Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.06.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

Current Development:

A one-story, commercial structure built in 1970 occupies the site. Surface parking lots surround this structure and occupy most of the site.

Access:

Existing curb cuts and alley access.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The site is located in the Uptown Urban Center. This neighborhood includes multifamily housing, community services, restaurants, entertainment and shopping. Directly adjacent to the east side of the site is Key Arena and Seattle Center. East of the site on 1st Avenue North there are residential and retail buildings. Within walking distance from the site there are banks, grocery stores, schools, medical offices, book stores, movie theaters, restaurants, and the Seattle Center. Natural amenities in the area include Lake Union, the park like grounds of the Seattle Center, Kinnear Park, Myrtle Edwards Park and the Olympic Sculpture garden.



Metro bus routes provide service with stops close to the site providing links to the central downtown core and other areas. 1st Ave N and Queen Anne Ave N are planned for Rapid Ride lines starting in Fall 2012. First Avenue North is designated as a principal arterial and a major transit street. Harrison Street and Thomas Street have no special classifications.

Harrison Street is more residential in character, with older brick multi-family buildings and mature street trees. Thomas Street has more surface parking lots, few street trees, views to Elliott Bay to the west, and the pedestrian bridge across Elliott Ave. 1st Ave character is dominated by Key Arena, monumental scale, and large plazas. The overall area is characterized by strong street walls and some surface parking lots. Ground floor uses in the area are both residential and commercial. Newer mixed use buildings in the area are six to seven stories tall.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: March 21, 2012

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3012878) at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The EDG packet is also available to view in the 3012878 EDG file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Mailing Public Resource Center
Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

The applicant noted the intent to do a modern building with Google expression, playing on the Century 21 plan and architectural styles of the mid-century modern designs at Seattle Center and nearby. The concepts of a “folding plane” and a “tectonic expression” were presented, with the elements expressing form and movement in north-south directions. The ‘sliding element’ between the east and west forms would be very transparent, in order to strengthen the design concept.

The applicant noted that the developer hopes to obtain the SE corner lot. If they succeed, any of the options shown could be easily adapted to occupy the entire ½ block.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately 12 members of the public affixed their names to the Early Design Review meeting sign-in sheet. Those who spoke raised the following issues:

- Concern with sufficient alley circulation, especially at the north garage entry that will be used for event parking.
- More commercial space is needed in the proposed development, in order to create a lively street experience at night.
- The mature street trees at this site should be retained.
- The modern expression is exciting and interesting – the applicant should really play up the forms, angles, curves, and colors.
- Question about the level of affordability of units – the applicant responded they will be market rate rentals
- Support for option A or B because of the open space at the alley, across from the residential buildings.
- Support for option C if it were possible to place plaza space at grade to respond to the Key Arena plaza and high pedestrian traffic.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: February 27, 2013

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The meeting packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3012878) at this website:

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

The meeting packet is also available to view in the 3012878 EDG file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Mailing Public Resource Center
Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

The site and proposed development size has been expanded since EDG, to include all the parcels on the east half of this block. At the EDG meeting, the proposal didn't include the southeast parcel of this block, but the Board gave guidance in anticipation of the possible addition of this parcel.

The applicant noted that the proposal retains all the existing street trees and adds 5 street trees. The applicant presented a materials and colors board and explained that the cementitious panels will be Swiss Pearl, Natura, or similar high quality.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments and questions were raised at the Recommendation meeting:

- Supportive of the proposed Googie design.
- The retail spaces should include deeper overhead weather protection than shown at the Recommendation meeting, especially on 1st Ave N.
- The second phase of the Lake to Bay trail will include wayfinding kiosks, and there may be a good opportunity for a kiosk at this site. The location of the Lake to Bay trail will temporarily run along the north side of this site. The permanent trail location will likely be along the south side of this site.
- The south façade is the most valuable retail exposure due to natural light; the design of the retail use at this façade should be optimized for indoor/outdoor use.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE (MARCH 21, 2012):

1. **Street Level:** (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-2, D-1)
 - a. 1st Ave W and W. Harrison Street need wide sidewalks and open space, due to very high levels of pedestrian activity at this intersection and location across the street from Key Arena and Seattle Center events.
 - b. Continue developing the intent of wider sidewalks at all street frontages.

2. **Massing Options:** (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-2, D-1)
 - a. A combination of Option A and B may be the best massing option in response to adjacent residents across the alley, and the need for pedestrian open space at the northeast corner. The location of open space should provide light and air for adjacent residents across the alley, as well as relief for pedestrians at the northeast corner.
3. **Architectural Concept:** (A-1, A-2, A-10, C-2, D-11)
 - a. The Board strongly supported the modern “Googie” architectural concepts, and the idea of a mass floating above a transparent base.
 - The Board directed the applicant to play up the design concept to the maximum amount possible.
 - Strongly express the building forms, include a two-story transparent base expression, include interesting colors, and the south end of the building should appear to ‘fly’ in response to the grade drop at that end of the site (cantilever where possible to express this concept). The Board noted that the construction type (wood over concrete) may make some of the cantilever concepts more difficult to achieve.
 - The Board suggested that the “folding plane” concept may work better with the construction type, but there was support for either concept.
 - The Board suggested a design response to nearby existing datum lines, but noted that very strong expression of the modern design concept is more important than referencing datum lines.
 - b. The glassy transparent base should include operable garage door storefronts or other operable systems.
 - c. Design the retail/restaurant spaces to create opportunities for interacting with the sidewalk activity, with porosity such as operable storefronts.
4. **Alley facade:** (A-1, C-2, D-8)
 - a. Residential units across the alley have their primary windows on the alley façade. Therefore, the alley should be designed to provide human scale, and light and air.
 - b. Erode the building and providing additional alley circulation area near the north end of the site, in response to the proposed event parking entry as well as the existing buildings across the alley with residents that have their primary windows facing the alley.
 - c. Continue the façade treatment into the alley, preferably past the garage entries. Fenestration or green screens may be appropriate treatment at the alley façade in these areas.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS (FEBRUARY 27, 2013):

1. **Street Level:**
 - a. As the Lake to Bay trail plan develops (signage, kiosks, etc.), the applicant should closely coordinate with SDOT to integrate these amenities at this site. (A-1, A-2)
 - b. The southeast corner retail is well-sited in response to the southern exposure and provides sufficient overhead weather protection. (A-1, A-2, A-10, D-1)
 - c. The 1st Ave N. façade includes an area near the southeast corner where the building overhang serves as overhead weather protection but is only 4.5’ deep and

located 20' above the sidewalk area. The height and depth of this area will not provide adequate overhead weather protection, human scale, or serve to identify the retail entries.

- i. The Board recommended a condition to provide canopies along the southern portion of the east façade. At a minimum, canopies should be provided at the retail entries. The canopies should be designed to provide functional weather protection and entry identification. The canopies should be consistent with the overall building design (i.e. transparent glass as opposed to c-channel that visually interrupts the transparent base). (A-1, C-2, D-1)
- d. The Board noted that the pedestrian spaces at the corners are sufficiently sized and well-designed, in response to EDG. (A-1, A-2, D-1)

2. **Architectural Concept:**

- a. The Board noted that if SDOT doesn't approve or requires a term permits for the structural building overhangs (the angled fins), then the proposed design could be modified and remain within the scope of the approved design. Modifications necessary to respond to SDOT requirements can remain within the scope of the approved design, as long as the modifications are consistent with the following:
 - i. Maintain the appearance of the edge of the fin and parapet in the shape and proportion shown at the Recommendation. For example, revisions should not include a stepped parapet or significant reduction in the angle of the fins. (A-10, C-2)
 - ii. The building signage could be hung from the angled fin, rather than mounted on the fin. (C-2)
- b. The Board discussed the exhaust vents between windows and determined that these are well integrated into the overall design. (C-2)
- c. The Board noted the following aspects of the design concept are a critical part of the design concept and recommended approval. A change to these items may trigger additional Recommendation meetings: (C-2)
 - i. The rooftop mechanical equipment is cleanly grouped and screened. The rooftop forms are interesting and complement the overall design.
 - ii. The landscape plan is well designed and the patterned use of seasonal color enhances the overall design.
 - iii. The pattern of mullions on the storefront windows and different pattern of mullions at the entries is critical to the design concept.
 - iv. The 6" plane change between materials ("exaggerated rain screen") is an important aspect of the design concept.

3. **Alley facade:** (A-1, C-2, D-8)

- a. The Board appreciated the design of the alley façade, the additional setbacks for adequate circulation and planting, and the green screen.

The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines & Neighborhood specific guidelines (as applicable) of highest priority for this project.

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

- 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.

Uptown-specific supplemental guidance:

Throughout Uptown new developments should, to the extent possible, be sited to further contribute to the neighborhood's pedestrian character.

Uptown Urban and Heart of Uptown character areas encourage outdoor dining areas utilizing sidewalks and areas adjacent to sidewalks. Outdoor dining is especially encouraged for sites on block faces with southern exposure.

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

Uptown-specific supplemental guidance:

Throughout Uptown, developments that respond outward to the public realm are preferred.

- Site outdoor spaces in accordance with the location and scale of adjacent streets, buildings, and uses. For example, an on-site plaza should not unduly interrupt the retail continuity of a street.
- Locate plazas intended for public use at or near grade to promote both a physical and visual connection to the street. Special paving materials, landscaping, and other elements can be used to provide a clear definition between the public and private realms.
- Define outdoor spaces through a combination of building and landscaping, and discourage oversized spaces that lack containment.

- 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:

Corner Lots in Uptown

Generally, buildings within Uptown should meet the corner and not be set back. Building designs and treatments as well as any open space areas should address the corner and promote activity. Corner entrances are strongly encouraged, where feasible.

- 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.

Uptown-specific supplemental guidance:

Throughout Uptown buildings and landscaping should strive to create projects with an overall neat and cohesive appearance.

- 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.

Uptown-specific supplemental guidance:

Throughout Uptown entries should be designed to be pedestrian friendly (via position, scale, architectural detailing, and materials) and should be clearly discernible to the pedestrian.

Throughout Uptown special attention to the pedestrian experience and street right-of-way should be given along pedestrian corridors as identified on the map (pg. VI).

Throughout Uptown the use of a pedestrian-scaled streetlamp within all character areas is encouraged. In addition, streetscape features such as street clocks and benches are encouraged in Heart of Uptown and Uptown Urban character areas.

In the Uptown Urban and Heart of Uptown character areas, encourage Seattle Center campus redevelopment along its boundaries to either open vistas from Uptown into Seattle Center or to provide activation for the street.

Including amenities for transit riders in a building's design rather than the traditional use of curbside bus shelters generates a safer and more active street. In the Uptown Urban and Heart of Uptown character areas the elimination of curbside bus shelters is encouraged in retail areas as appropriate.

- D-8 Treatment of Alleys.** The design of alley entrances should enhance the pedestrian street front.

Uptown-specific supplemental guidance:

Throughout Uptown ensure alleys are designed to be clean, maintained spaces. Recessed areas for recyclables and disposables should be provided.

In Heart of Uptown and Uptown Urban character areas encourage alleys to be activated with subordinate retail spaces at the mouth of the alley. Encourage retail to "turn the corner" at alley entrances.

- 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.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

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

- 1. Structural Building Overhangs (SMC 23.53.035):** The Code allows a maximum 3'0" horizontal projection and 2'6" vertical projection at the roof for architectural features such as cornices, eaves, sills, and belt courses. The applicant proposes horizontal projections up to

7'0" beyond the property line, and vertical projections up to 3'6" to provide angled projections on the north, south, and west facades.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines A-1, A-2, A-10, and C-2 by enhancing the architectural "Googie" concept through the use of angled projections from the building.

The Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the departure, subject to the condition listed at the end of this report.

- 2. Nonresidential Floor to Floor Height (SMC 23.47A.008.B.3.b):** The Code requires a minimum floor to floor height of 13'. The applicant proposes a floor to floor height of 12'2" at the north facade.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines A-1, A-2, A-10, and C-2 by expressing the architectural "Googie" concept through the use of a consistent horizontal street level to enhance the appearance of a floating upper mass.

The Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the departure, subject to the condition listed at the end of this report.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated February 27, 2013, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the February 27, 2013 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the three Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures, with the following condition:

1. The proposed design shall be modified to provide canopies along the southern portion of the east façade. At a minimum, canopies should be provided at the retail entries. The canopies should be designed to provide functional weather protection and entry identification. The canopies should be consistent with the overall building design (i.e. transparent glass as opposed to c-channel that visually interrupts the transparent base). (A-1, C-2, D-1)

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Conditions:

1. The applicant has added glass canopies above the retail entries, as shown in the MUP plan sets. The proposal satisfies condition #1.

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED** subject to the conditions listed below.

SEPA ANALYSIS

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)

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated June 19, 2012. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed and annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant, reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file, and pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered.

As indicated in the checklist, this action may result in adverse impacts to the environment. However, due to their temporary nature or 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 an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation”* subject to some limitations.

Codes and development regulations applicable to this proposed project will provide sufficient mitigation for many short and/or long term impacts. Applicable codes may include the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. Additional discussion of short and long term impacts is found below.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on September 12, 2012. Comments were received and are available for viewing in the DPD file.

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. Some of the surrounding properties are developed with housing and will be impacted by construction noise.

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.

Long Term Impacts

Traffic and Parking

As part of the environmental checklist, the project submitted information about estimated vehicle trips and parking impacts ("Traffic Impact Analysis for 315 1st Ave N" prepared by William Popp Associates, dated March 27, 2013 and follow up memo dated December 14, 2012).

The project is expected to generate a net total of 891 daily vehicle trips, with 31 net new AM Peak Hour trips and 71 net new PM Peak Hour trips. This volume of traffic is not expected to significantly affect the overall operation of level of service for nearby intersections. The traffic impact analysis recommended mitigation to provide clear lines of sight at the alley intersection with the sidewalk. The proposed design includes setbacks and landscaping adjacent to the building near the alley. The DPD Transportation Planner determined the proposed design will provide sufficient lines of sight between pedestrians and vehicles at the alley intersections.

The proposed development includes 239 parking spaces, with 38 stalls for the proposed commercial use and 201 stalls for 212 apartments. The estimated peak parking demand is 21 stalls for the commercial use and 174 stalls for the residential use. The proposed parking exceeds anticipated parking demand.

DPD's Transportation Planner has reviewed the traffic and parking information, and determined that the additional peak hour trips do not contribute significant adverse impacts requiring mitigation, and the parking supply exceeds the peak demand. Accordingly, no mitigation of impacts disclosed in this section is required.

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

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 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.

- 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 43.21.030(2) (c).

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW [43.21C.030](#) (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC [197-11-355](#) and early review DNS process in SMC 25.05.355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

SEPA - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to Issuance of a Demolition, Grading, or Building Permit

1. If the applicant intends to work outside of the limits of the hours of construction described in condition #2, 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

2. 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.

DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

3. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Shelley Bolser 206-733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov).
4. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 10-2011, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Shelley Bolser (206) 733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

5. 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 (Shelley Bolser 206-733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov).

Signature: (signature on file) Date: May 23, 2013
Shelley Bolser, AICP, LEED AP
Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

SB:rgc