



**City of Seattle**

---

**Department of Planning and Development**

Diane M. Sugimura, Director

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

**Application Numbers:** 3012892  
**Applicant Name:** Chaohua Chang  
**Address of Proposal:** 4055 8th Avenue Northeast

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS**

Land Use Application to allow a four story, building with 60 residential units and parking for 10 vehicles located below grade. Review includes demolition of two residential structures.

The following approvals are required:

**Design Review - Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Section 23.41**

**SEPA - Environmental Determination** pursuant to SMC 25.05

**SEPA DETERMINATION:**  Exempt  DNS  MDNS  EIS  
 DNS with conditions\*  
 DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition or  
involving another agency with jurisdiction

\* Notice of the Early Determination of Non-significance was published on June 7, 2012.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant proposes to construct a four-story structure with 60 residential units on Eighth Avenue Northeast between NE 40<sup>th</sup> St to the south and NE 42<sup>nd</sup> St. to the north. Ten parking spaces would be provided below grade. The proposal would require demolition of a single family structure and a duplex.

The applicant's three options form variants on traditional courtyard schemes. The first option illustrates a central courtyard wrapped on three sides by an enclosed corridor with units facing outward to the property lines and five levels of units on the west facing the courtyard. These units have a corridor between them and the noise generated by I-5 to the west. An entry lobby on axis connects Eighth Avenue with the central courtyard. Facing Eighth Ave., the east elevation rises five floors and its mass pushes forward to the east property line. The ends of the volume recede at the corners.

The second option forms a progression of open spaces beginning from the east with a covered entry court enclosed on three sides, continuing to a large lobby, and terminating at a sizeable rectangular shaped courtyard open to the west. The western open space extends to the height of the proposed structure. Units to the south of the courtyard face outward away from the open space. Units to the north look into the court capturing southern and western light. The building's mass approaches the Eighth Ave. property line without any significant modulation. Option #3 varies the previous scheme's "C" shaped design with a roughly "H" shaped configuration. A capacious entry courtyard open to the sky is flanked by five levels of residential units. A lobby similar in size to the courtyard permits the possibility of interaction between the court and the lobby/amenity area. Two corridors, flanking the lobby and two units behind it, extend to a small rear deck also open to the sky and facing west. This scheme has greater modulation on all elevations with the exception of the north.

Access to the ten or so parking spaces beneath the structure is the same for each option. The curb cut occurs on the south end of the parcel's Eighth Ave frontage, descends along the south property line and curves into the partially enclosed space. The applicant seeks to inhabit the roof by installing a roof deck, a small garden for the tenant's use and a green roof.

By the Initial Recommendation meeting, the applicant had refined the design in particular the sequence of outdoor and indoor common areas.

The architect's presentation at the Final Recommendation meeting illustrated his response to each of the earlier requests for modification to the architectural and landscape designs. The modifications also included changes to the color scheme and to the program.

## **SITE & VICINITY**

The 10,000 sq. ft. site lies within a Multifamily Lowrise Three (LR 3) zone within the University District Northwest Urban Center Village. A duplex and a single family structure occupy the two parcels comprising the development site. The site's declension totals approximately 18 feet from the northeast to the southwest corner. The site does not have a mapped environmentally critical area.

The University District is a diverse neighborhood with a plethora of building types and land uses. The immediate vicinity of the proposal includes single family houses, townhouses and mid-size residential buildings. On the same block to the south lie a rooming house (built in 2009), duplexes and a triplex, University P-patch and a King County Metro facility. An apartment building occupies the lot to the north. The western edge of the University of Washington sits two blocks to the east. Major arterials include NE 45th St. to the north, I-5 a block to the west, and NE 40th to the south. To the south at 4039 8th Ave NE another multifamily project (3013403) is under review by DPD. 8th Ave. NE is a collector street.

## ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

### Public Comments

Five members of the public affixed their names to the EDG sign-in sheet. Those who spoke raised the following issues:

- The proposal has too few parking spaces for the amount of units.
- If no parking is provided, students won't bring their cars.
- Townhouses were an inappropriate use for the neighborhood. Apartments and the density achieved by them are better.
- Don't look backward for design precedence.
- An entry courtyard brings noise and security issues. People will congregate in the courtyards facing the streets. Transients also populate the courtyards if there is no security.
- Private courtyards are okay but make them safe.
- Option B is preferred.
- The University District is difficult to keep secure.
- Useful roof decks are an alternative.
- The L3 zone is difficult to build in and make money. There is more benefit building in an NC zone.

## GUIDELINES

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponent, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the siting and design guidance described below and identified highest priority by letter and number from the guidelines found in the City of Seattle's "Design Review: Guidelines for Multi-family and Commercial Buildings". 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.**

#### **University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context: The pedestrian-oriented street streetscape is perhaps the most important characteristic to be emphasized in the neighborhood. The University Community identified certain streets as "Mixed Use Corridors". These are streets where commercial and residential uses and activities interface and create a lively, attractive, and safe pedestrian environment. The Mixed Use Corridors are shown in Map 1. Another important site feature in the University Community is the presence of the Burke Gilman Trail. The primary goal is to minimize impacts to views, sunlight and mixed uses while increasing safety and access along the trail.**

The relationship of the proposed structure to the neighbors as rendered in Options B and C seems adequate to the Board. The architect should be sensitive to the privacy of the tenants and the neighbors by ensuring that windows are not aligned.

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

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context:** Another way to emphasize human activity and pedestrian orientation, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors, is to provide clearly identifiable storefront entries. In residential projects, walkways and entries promote visual access and security.

**Guidelines:**

- 1. On Mixed Use Corridors, primary business and residential entrances should be oriented to the commercial street.**
- 2. In residential projects, except townhouses, it is generally preferable to have one walkway from the street that can serve several building entrances.**
- 3. When a courtyard is proposed for a residential project, the courtyard should have at least one entry from the street.**
- 4. In residential projects, front yard fences over four (4) feet in height that reduce visual access and security should be avoided.**

The visibility of the entrance from the street is an important consideration. Although the entry court will need to be secure, the court should still exude an openness and direct or clear access from the right of way.

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

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context:** Pedestrian orientation and activity should be emphasized in the University Community, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors. While most streets feature narrow sidewalks relative to the volume of pedestrian traffic, wider sidewalks and more small open spaces for sitting, street musicians, bus waiting, and other activities would benefit these areas. Pedestrian-oriented open spaces, such as wider sidewalks and plazas, are encouraged as long as the setback does not detract from the “street wall.”

**Guidelines:** On Mixed Use Corridors, where narrow sidewalks exist (less than 15’ wide), consider recessing entries to provide small open spaces for sitting, street musicians, bus waiting, or other pedestrian activities. Recessed entries should promote pedestrian movement and avoid blind corners.

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

The design of the entry court should provide a strong transition between residence and street by forming an outdoor room. The Board reacted favorably to the small east facing court, its transition to the lobby and its connection to the west courtyard.

**A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.**

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context:** There is a severe lack of both public and private open space in the community. Small open spaces—such as gardens, courtyards, or plazas—that are visible or accessible to the public are an important part of the neighborhood’s vision. Therefore, providing ground-level open space is an important public objective and will improve the quality of the residential environment.

**Guidelines:**

- 1. The ground-level open space should be designed as a plaza, courtyard, play area, mini-park, pedestrian open space, garden or similar occupiable site feature. The quantity of open space is less important than the provision of functional and visual ground-level open space.**
- 2. A central courtyard in cottage or townhouse developments may provide better open space than space for each unit. In these cases, yard setbacks may be reduced if a sensitive transition to neighbors is maintained.**

Considerable deliberation occurred on the configuration of the two courtyards. The architect should develop a hybrid of schemes B and C. The Board finds the circulation and relationship of the courtyards to the lobby in scheme B appealing. The rear (west) courtyard should be the major open space linked by the lobby to the minor open space of the entry court. Both should have amenities for the tenants (seating, garden etc.) as they will be used in different manners depending up on the time of the day and seasons. Option C had qualities that the Board also liked. The entry court, which would be ideally smaller than this option, should be open to the sky, similar to Option C, rather than partially enclosed as in Option B. The plan configuration of Option C might work if one of the units between the lobby and the rear deck were shifted allowing direct circulation from entry court to lobby to rear court.

Ground level units facing the west courtyard should have a defined area separate from the courtyard which is for their private use.

## **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.**

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context:** Buildings in the University Community feature a broad range of building types with an equally broad range of architectural character. Because of the area’s variety, no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction

for new construction. As an example, the University of Washington campus sets a general direction in architectural style and preference for masonry and cast stone materials, however, new buildings on and off campus incorporate the general massing and materials of this character, rather than replicating it.

**Guidelines:**

1. Although no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction in the University Community, project applicants should show how the proposed design incorporates elements of the local architectural character especially when there are buildings of local historical significance or landmark status in the vicinity.
2. For areas within Ravenna Urban Village, particularly along 25th Avenue NE, the style of architecture is not as important so long as it emphasizes pedestrian orientation and avoids large-scale, standardized and auto-oriented characteristics.
3. On Mixed Use Corridors, consider breaking up the façade into modules of not more than 50 feet (measured horizontally parallel to the street) on University Way and 100 feet on other corridors, corresponding to traditional platting and building construction.
4. When the defined character of a block, including adjacent or facing blocks, is comprised of historic buildings, or groups of buildings of local historic importance and character, as well as street trees or other significant vegetation (as identified in the 1975 Inventory and subsequent updating), the architectural treatment of new development should respond to this local historical character.
5. Buildings in Lowrise zones should provide a “fine-grained” architectural character.

The Board observed that the local context did not lend a strong argument for creating a contextual building. The members of the Board urged the architect to design a “forward looking” structure that did not rely on stylistic precedent from neighboring structures. The City’s recent revisions to the Lowrise Code and the availability of new building materials create an opportunity for something new.

- 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.**

The architect’s ability to achieve a strong and consistent concept will be among the Board’s significant considerations when it reviews the project at the Recommendation meeting.

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

The Board requires detailed drawings of the elevations showing how the large mass has sufficient detail to relate to human scale.

- 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.**

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Guidelines:**

1. New buildings should emphasize durable, attractive, and well-detailed finish materials, including: Brick; Concrete; Cast stone, natural stone, tile; Stucco and stucco-like panels; Art tile; Wood.
2. Sculptural cast stone and decorative tile are particularly appropriate because they relate to campus architecture and Art Deco buildings. Wood and cast stone are appropriate for moldings and trim.
3. The materials listed below are discouraged and should only be used if they complement the building's architectural character and are architecturally treated for a specific reason that supports the building and streetscape character: Masonry units; Metal siding; Wood siding and shingles; Vinyl siding; Sprayed-on finish; Mirrored glass.
4. Where anodized metal is used for window and door trim, then care should be given to the proportion and breakup of glazing to reinforce the building concept and proportions.
5. Fencing adjacent to the sidewalk should be sited and designed in an attractive and pedestrian oriented manner.
6. Awnings made of translucent material may be backlit, but should not overpower neighboring light schemes. Lights, which direct light downward, mounted from the awning frame are acceptable. Lights that shine from the exterior down on the awning are acceptable.
7. Light standards should be compatible with other site design and building elements.

**Signs**

**Context:** The Citywide Design Guidelines do not provide guidance for new signs. New guidelines encourage signs that reinforce the character of the building and the neighborhood.

**Guidelines:**

1. The following sign types are encouraged, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors – Pedestrian oriented shingle or blade signs extending from the building front just above pedestrians; Marquee signs and signs on pedestrian canopies; Neon signs; Carefully executed window signs; such as etched glass or hand painted signs; Small signs on awnings or canopies.
2. Post mounted signs are discouraged.
3. The location and installation of signage should be integrated with the building's architecture.
4. Monument signs should be integrated into the development, such as on a screen wall.

**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.**

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context:** The University Community would like to encourage, especially on Mixed Use Corridors, the provision of usable, small open spaces, such as gardens, courtyards, or plazas that are visible and/or accessible to the public. Therefore, providing ground-level open space is an important public objective and will improve the quality of both the pedestrian and residential environment.

**Guidelines:**

1. **On Mixed Use Corridors, consider setting back a portion of the building to provide small pedestrian open spaces with seating amenities. The building façades along the open space must still be pedestrian-oriented.**
2. **On Mixed Use Corridors, entries to upper floor residential uses should be accessed from, but not dominate, the street frontage. On corner locations, the main residential entry should be on the side street with a small courtyard that provides a transition between the entry and the street.**

See guidance for A-7.

- D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.**

The solid waste storage area should not front onto Eighth Ave. as shown in Options A and C. The Board prefers a dwelling unit in this location.

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

Re-emphasizing public comments, the Board requests that the entry courtyard be secure. The court should be visible from the street but remain safe.

A lighting plan should be submitted at the time of the MUP and presented at the Recommendation meeting.

**E. Landscaping**

- 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.**

The two courtyards should be well landscaped and accommodate a variety of tenant uses. The entry court ought to be gracious and welcoming with seating and a strong visible connection to the street.

## **MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION**

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a design review component on May 17, 2012.

## **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

The Design Review Board conducted Initial and Final Recommendation meetings on September 10, 2012 and November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2012 respectively to review the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to the previously identified priorities. At the public meetings, site plans, elevations, floor plans, landscaping plans, and computer renderings of the proposed exterior materials were presented for the Board members' consideration.

### **Public Comments**

One member of the public affixed his or her name to the Recommendation sign-in sheet. No one spoke during the public comment period.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, no one signed-in. No one spoke during the public comment period.

DPD received one comment letter in which the writer disapproved of the paucity of parking provided by the proposal.

### **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.**

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context: The pedestrian-oriented street streetscape is perhaps the most important characteristic to be emphasized in the neighborhood. The University Community identified certain streets as "Mixed Use Corridors". These are streets where commercial and residential uses and activities interface and create a lively, attractive, and safe pedestrian environment. The Mixed Use Corridors are shown in Map 1. Another important site feature in the University Community is the presence of the Burke Gilman Trail. The primary goal is to minimize impacts to views, sunlight and mixed uses while increasing safety and access along the trail.**

See Board's C-1 guidance below for the south facing windows. (September 10, 2012)

See Board response for C-1 guidance. (November 5, 2012)

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

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context:** Another way to emphasize human activity and pedestrian orientation, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors, is to provide clearly identifiable storefront entries. In residential projects, walkways and entries promote visual access and security.

**Guidelines:**

1. **On Mixed Use Corridors, primary business and residential entrances should be oriented to the commercial street.**
2. **In residential projects, except townhouses, it is generally preferable to have one walkway from the street that can serve several building entrances.**
3. **When a courtyard is proposed for a residential project, the courtyard should have at least one entry from the street.**
4. **In residential projects, front yard fences over four (4) feet in height that reduce visual access and security should be avoided.**

See the discussion of the copper canopy under guidance C-2. (September 10, 2012)

The alignment of the front entry sidewalk with the two-story wing wall troubled the Board, which recommended that the sidewalk align on axis with the front doors of the lobby. This will strengthen the understated entrance. (November 5, 2012)

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

The Board praised the revisions to the open spaces and their flow or sequence from one to another.

The architect and landscape architect ought to contact SDOT to decide whether the planter boxes in the right of way (adjacent to the sidewalk) will be allowed. (September 10, 2012)

The landscape architect removed the planter boxes from the right of way. Due to the recommended condition to align the sidewalk with the front doors, the Board acknowledged that the design of the entry plaza may change somewhat to emphasize the passage from street or sidewalk to lobby entrance. (November 5, 2012)

**A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.**

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context:** There is a severe lack of both public and private open space in the community. Small open spaces—such as gardens, courtyards, or plazas—that are visible or accessible to the public are an important part of the neighborhood’s vision. Therefore, providing ground-level open space is an important public objective and will improve the quality of the residential environment.

**Guidelines:**

1. **The ground-level open space should be designed as a plaza, courtyard, play area, mini-park, pedestrian open space, garden or similar occupiable site feature. The**

- quantity of open space is less important than the provision of functional and visual ground-level open space.
2. A central courtyard in cottage or townhouse developments may provide better open space than space for each unit. In these cases, yard setbacks may be reduced if a sensitive transition to neighbors is maintained.

The Board expressed its appreciation of how well the architect responded to its earlier suggestions regarding the indoor and outdoor common areas. (September 10, 2012)

## 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.

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Context:** Buildings in the University Community feature a broad range of building types with an equally broad range of architectural character. Because of the area's variety, no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction. As an example, the University of Washington campus sets a general direction in architectural style and preference for masonry and cast stone materials, however, new buildings on and off campus incorporate the general massing and materials of this character, rather than replicating it.

**Guidelines:**

1. Although no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction in the University Community, project applicants should show how the proposed design incorporates elements of the local architectural character especially when there are buildings of local historical significance or landmark status in the vicinity.
2. When the defined character of a block, including adjacent or facing blocks, is comprised of historic buildings, or groups of buildings of local historic importance and character, as well as street trees or other significant vegetation (as identified in the 1975 Inventory and subsequent updating), the architectural treatment of new development should respond to this local historical character.
3. Buildings in Lowrise zones should provide a "fine-grained" architectural character.

The spacing of the south and north facing windows conveyed the architect's sensitivity to the neighbors' privacy. The Board, noting the substantial distance between the proposed south façade and the adjacent structure, urged the addition of windows for two of the corner units. (September 10, 2012)

The Board praised the inclusion of horizontal windows on the south façade and raised the possibility that the same type of window could be added to the north elevation. (November 5, 2012)

**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.**

The Board questions the consistency of several elements of the design. The curve of the canopy appears unrelated to any other design element of the design. Should the architect desire to keep the canopy shape, he should relate it to another element of the overall design. The Board wants to see a detail of how rain is captured by the canopy (i.e. a gutter) so that it does not pour on people entering and exiting the building. Copper weathers and changes color. Show the canopy's appearance once it ages.

The diagonal struts on the balconies lack consistency with the other architectural elements and appears dated. The Board asks the architect to reconsider the design.

The sunscreens act as both a functional element and as an aesthetic device emphasizing the building's horizontality. The Board urges the architect to limit the application of the metal sunscreens to the areas above the windows.

The Board also questions the logic of the vertical fin on the east elevation but had not specifically request a change. (September 10, 2012)

After reviewing the architect's response to all of the modification requests, the Board praised the deftness in which both the architect and landscape architect improved the design.

The architect changed the sculpturally curved copper canopy to a modest open grid resembling the upper level sunshades. Discussion focused on whether the revised canopy made the entrance more visible from the street. Satisfied with the new canopy, the Board emphasized the importance of shifting the entry sidewalk to align with the front door. (November 5, 2012)

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

Noting its discomfort with the detailing or relationship of materials with one another, the Board requests explicit drawings on how these materials join with one another. The schematic nature of the elevations did not provide enough information on how the materials relate. (September 10, 2012)

Although the architect did not present detail drawings as requested, the Board noted that some of the uncommon material choices and their joinery would be an unusual construction system for carpenters. The decorative panels complementing the rich brown and white color scheme produce a finer grain and scale to the project. (November 5, 2012)

**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.**

**University-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Guidelines:**

- 1. New buildings should emphasize durable, attractive, and well-detailed finish materials, including: Brick; Concrete; Cast stone, natural stone, tile; Stucco and stucco-like panels; Art tile; Wood.**
- 2. Sculptural cast stone and decorative tile are particularly appropriate because they relate to campus architecture and Art Deco buildings. Wood and cast stone are appropriate for moldings and trim.**
- 3. The materials listed below are discouraged and should only be used if they complement the building's architectural character and are architecturally treated for a specific reason that supports the building and streetscape character: Masonry units; Metal siding; Wood siding and shingles; Vinyl siding; Sprayed-on finish; Mirrored glass.**
- 4. Where anodized metal is used for window and door trim, then care should be given to the proportion and breakup of glazing to reinforce the building concept and proportions.**
- 5. Fencing adjacent to the sidewalk should be sited and designed in an attractive and pedestrian oriented manner.**
- 6. Awnings made of translucent material may be backlit, but should not overpower neighboring light schemes. Lights, which direct light downward, mounted from the awning frame are acceptable. Lights that shine from the exterior down on the awning are acceptable.**
- 7. Light standards should be compatible with other site design and building elements.**

**Signs**

**Context:** The Citywide Design Guidelines do not provide guidance for new signs.

**New guidelines encourage signs that reinforce the character of the building and the neighborhood.**

**Guidelines:**

- 1. The location and installation of signage should be integrated with the building's architecture.**
- 2. Monument signs should be integrated into the development, such as on a screen wall.**

The Board notes the lack of a color and materials board. Provide a materials board at the next meeting. The Board also observes that without better detailing the limestone base could look pasted on rather than an integral part of the elevations. (September 10, 2012)

The change in color and the addition of decorative highlights near windows and on blank walls, complementing the brown and white tones, received considerable praise. (November 5, 2012)

## **D. Pedestrian Environment**

- D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.**

The change in location of the solid waste storage area from fronting onto 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NE to behind one of the units met with the Board's approval.

The Board noted the harshness of the laundry room due to its size, lack of windows, and location within the garage. The architect ought to consider integrating the laundry room for this 60 unit apartment into the life of the building. (September 10, 2012)

The revision for the Final Recommendation meeting removed the laundry facility in the garage and added separate facilities on each floor. (November 5, 2012)

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

In order to ensure building security, the Board suggests 1) installing fencing along the lower portion of the driveway to prevent people wandering into the rear open space and 2) placing a gate between the north property line and the northeastern most unit.

The Board did not think it necessary to provide security fencing around the entry patio. (September 10, 2012)

The applicant revised the placement of the fencing to respond to each of the Board's earlier recommendations. (November 5, 2012)

## **E. Landscaping**

- 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.**

The proposed landscaping design received praise. However, the Board requested that the fencing along the perimeter of the site be changed from a cyclone or chain link to one possessing better quality and nicer design. Other types of fencing will accommodate vines.

The size of the roof deck appears larger than the occupancy that one stair access will allow. The architect should consult the building code. Building code experts are also available to review this design at DPD's public resource center. Instead of using fencing as means to achieve the department's green factor requirement, portions of the roof (i.e. green roof) may be used to meet this zoning regulation.

The Board notes the placement of a tree in a landscaping drawing in front of the wing wall. (September 10, 2012)

The architect and landscape architect revised the drawings to respond to the guidance from the previous meeting by offering a type of fencing that visually resembles wrought

iron but also has a wire grid between posts to accommodate the growth of climbing jasmine and clematis Montana. The reduction of the roof deck's size and the removal of the tree from the center of the entry plaza also met the earlier guidance. (November 5, 2012)

**Board Recommendations:** The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the November 5th, 2012 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 available at the November 5<sup>th</sup> public meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the four Design Review Board members present unanimously recommended approval of the subject design.

The Board recommended the following **CONDITIONS** for the project. (Authority referenced in the letter and number in parenthesis):

- 1) Align the entry sidewalk with the front doors of the lobby in order to strengthen the visual connection to the street. (A-3)

### **DIRECTOR'S ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW**

The Director finds no conflicts with SEPA requirements or state or federal laws, and has reviewed the City-wide Design Guidelines and finds that the Board neither exceeded its authority nor applied the guidelines inconsistently in the approval of this design. The Director agrees with the conditions recommended by the four Board members and the recommendation to approve the design, as stated above.

### **DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW**

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

### **ANALYSIS - SEPA**

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated May 17, 2012. The information in the checklist, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision. The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) 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 certain limitations and/or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

### 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, a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Several construction-related impacts are mitigated by 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. The following analyzes construction-related noise, air quality, earth, grading, construction impacts, traffic and parking impacts as well as its mitigation.

### Noise

Noise associated with construction of the mixed use building and future phases could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area, which include residential and commercial uses. Surrounding uses are likely to be adversely impacted by noise throughout the duration of construction activities. Due to the proximity of the project site to residential uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675 B), mitigation is warranted.

Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the applicant will submit a construction noise mitigation plan. This plan will include steps 1) to limit noise decibel levels and duration and 2) procedures for advanced notice to surrounding properties. The plan will be subject to review and approval by DPD. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:

- 1) Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
- 2) Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
- 3) Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
- 4) Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.

### Air Quality

Construction for this project is expected to add temporarily particulates to the air that will result in a slight increase in auto-generated air contaminants from construction activities, equipment and 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). To mitigate impacts of exhaust fumes on the directly adjacent residential uses, trucks hauling materials to and from the project site will not be allowed to queue on streets under windows of the nearby residential buildings.

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. In order to ensure that PSCAA will be notified of the proposed demolition, a condition will be included pursuant to SEPA authority under SMC 25.05.675A which requires that a copy of the PSCAA permit be attached to the demolition permit, prior to issuance. This will assure proper handling and disposal of asbestos.

#### Earth

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code (SGDCC) requires preparation of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction on sites where grading will involve cuts or fills of greater than three feet in height or grading greater than 100 cubic yards of material.

The soils report, construction plans, and shoring of excavations as needed, will be reviewed by the DPD Geo-technical Engineer and Building Plans Examiner who will require any additional soils-related information, recommendations, declarations, covenants and bonds as necessary to assure safe grading and excavation. This project constitutes a "large project" under the terms of the SGDCC (SMC 22.802.015 D). As such, there are many additional requirements for erosion control including a provision for implementation of best management practices and a requirement for incorporation of an engineered erosion control plan which will be reviewed jointly by the DPD building plans examiner and geo-technical engineer prior to issuance of the permit. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code provides extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

#### Grading

Excavation to construct the mixed use structure will be necessary. The maximum depth of the excavation is approximately 10 feet and will consist of an estimated 1,200 cubic yards of material. The soil removed will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site by trucks. City 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 enroute to or from a site. Future phases of construction will be subject to the same regulations. No further conditioning of the grading/excavation element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

#### Construction Impacts

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves 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.

### Traffic and Parking

Duration of construction of the apartment building may last approximately 16 months. During construction, parking demand will increase due to additional demand created by construction personnel and equipment. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities and parking (SMC 25.05.675 B and M). Parking utilization along streets in the vicinity is near capacity and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction would likely reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity. Due to the large scale of the project, this temporary demand on the on-street parking in the vicinity due to construction workers' vehicles may be adverse. Upon completion of the parking garage, construction workers shall park in the garage. In order to minimize adverse impacts, the applicant will need to provide a construction worker parking plan to reduce on-street parking until the new garage is completed and safe to use. The authority to impose this condition is found in Section 25.05.675B2g of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance.

The construction of the project also will have adverse impacts on both vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the project site. During construction a temporary increase in traffic volumes to the site will occur, due to travel to the site by construction workers and the transport of construction materials. Approximately 1,200 cubic yards of soil are expected to be excavated from the project site. The soil removed for the garage structure will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site. Excavation and fill activity will require approximately 120 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 60 round trips with 20-yard hauling trucks. Considering the large volumes of truck trips anticipated during construction, it is reasonable that truck traffic avoid the afternoon peak hours. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.

Truck access to and from the site shall be documented in a construction traffic management plan, to be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the beginning of construction. This plan also shall indicate how pedestrian connections around the site will be maintained during the construction period, with particular consideration given to maintaining pedestrian access along Broadway. Compliance with Seattle's Street Use Ordinance is expected to mitigate any additional adverse impacts to traffic which would be generated during construction of this proposal.

### Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area; increased demand for parking; and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires on site collection of stormwater with provisions for controlled tightline release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, due to the size and location of this proposal, green house gas emissions, historic preservation, traffic, and parking impacts.

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the project's 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.

### Historic Preservation

A review by the Department of Neighborhoods determined that the existing structures, built in 1916 and 1920, and determined that it is unlikely, due in part to a loss of integrity, that it would meet the standards for designation as an individual landmark.

### Transportation

According to the transportation consultant, Perteet, the 60 dwelling unit apartment building would likely generate 465 average daily vehicle trips (accounting for the loss of trips generated by the duplex and single family house) with 16 trips occurring in the PM peak hour. DPD staff believes, based on experience with similar projects in the project vicinity, that the ADT will be significantly smaller than estimated by the consultant due to propinquity of transit, the likelihood that a substantial number of residences will be students enrolled at the nearby University of Washington and the presence of a robust commercial district. DPD does not anticipate that the impacts to level of service on nearby streets would be significant. No SEPA mitigation of traffic impacts to the nearby intersections is warranted.

### Parking

The development site lies within the University District Northwest Urban Center which, based on the Land Use Code section 23.54.015, does not require residential off-street parking. The applicant intends to supply 10 on-site parking spaces resulting in a potential unmet parking demand of 50 stalls although a more likely demand based on less conservative ratios (using a range of .77 and .83 multiplier) would be closer to 38 to 41 parking spillover demand. The neighborhood has a variety of on-street parking and off-street pay parking lots available to capture some of the demand.

## **DECISION - 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 and form. 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 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 2C.

[ ] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.

## **CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW**

### *Prior to MUP Issuance*

- 1) Revise plan sets to align the entry sidewalk with the front doors of the lobby in order to strengthen the visual connection to the street.

### *Prior to Commencement of Construction*

- 2) 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.

### *Prior to Issuance of all Construction Permits*

- 3) Embed the MUP conditions in the cover sheet for all subsequent permits including updated building permit drawings.

### *Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy*

- 4) Compliance with all images and text on the MUP drawings, design review meeting guidelines and approved design features and elements (including exterior materials, landscaping and ROW improvements) shall be verified by the DPD planner assigned to this project (Bruce P. Rips, 206.615-1392). An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at least five working days in advance of field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether submission of revised plans is required to ensure that compliance has been achieved.

### *For the Life of the Project*

- 5) Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building or the site or must be submitted to DPD for review and approval by the Land Use Planner (Bruce Rips, 206.615-1392). Any proposed changes to the improvements in the public right-of-way must be submitted to DPD and SDOT for review and for final approval by SDOT.

## **CONDITIONS – SEPA**

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

- 6) Attach a copy of the PSCAA demolition permit to the building permit set of plans.
- 7) A construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the issuance of the permit. This plan will identify off-street construction worker parking, construction materials staging area; truck access routes to and from the site for excavation and construction phases; and sidewalk and street closures with neighborhood notice and posting procedures. The intent of the construction worker parking plan is to reduce on-street parking until the new garage is constructed and safe to use.

During Construction

- 8) Grading, delivery and pouring of concrete and similar noisy activities will be prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, only the low noise impact work such as that listed below, will be permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.:
  - A. Surveying and layout.
  - B. Testing and tensioning P. T. (post tensioned) cables, requiring only hydraulic equipment (no cable cutting allowed).
  - C. Other ancillary tasks to construction activities will include site security, surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance of weather protecting, water dams and heating equipment.
  
- 9) In addition to the Noise Ordinance, requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:
  - A. Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
  - B. Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
  - C. Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
  - D. Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
  
- 10) Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.
  
- 11) Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, and weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.

For the Life of the Project

- 12) Compliance with all applicable conditions must be verified and approved by the Land Use Planner, Bruce Rips, (206-615-1392) at the specified development stage, as required by the Director's decision. The Land Use Planner shall determine whether the condition requires submission of additional documentation or field verification to assure that compliance has been achieved.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ (signature on file) Date: November 19, 2012  
Bruce P. Rips, AAIA, AICP  
Department of Planning and Development