



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: 3013040
Applicant Name: Mack Selberg, Ankrom Moisan Architects for Alliance
Address of Proposal: 1414 10th Avenue

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a seven-story residential building with 249 units above 14,000 sq. ft. of retail. Parking for 124 vehicles to be provided below grade. Review includes partial demolition of existing structures (53,200 sq. ft.). Building façades at 1406 10th Ave., 1401 and 1405 11th Avenue to remain.

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

Design Review – Seattle Municipal Code Section 23.41 with Development Standard Departures (see pages 13-16 of this report)

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 rectangular 44,029 sq. ft. site along East Union Street occupies runs between 10th Ave and 11th Ave. There is no alley located on or adjacent to the site.

The site is zoned NC3P-65' (Neighborhood Commercial 3 with a Pedestrian designation). The adjacent zoning in all directions is also NC3P-65'.

The low point along the property line is 297.57' at the SW corner. The high point is at the NE corner, at 303.19'. The site dips to 287' near the center of the site in a parking lot.

There are four buildings currently located on the site, as well as surface parking.

- #1 – 1406 10th Ave: Two story office and event space.
- #2 – Union Garage: One-story automotive repair use.
- #3 – Madison Park Group (I): One-story commercial use.
- #4 – Madison Park Group (II): One-story commercial use



Across the street to the west, a new development is under construction. Across the street to the east is the Union Co-op Arts Building. Across Union Street to the south are a one story commercial use and two, two-story commercial and residential mixed use building. Abutting the site to the north is a three story commercial, retail and residential mixed use building and surface parking lots.

Walking, bicycling, and taking the bus are all excellent alternatives to driving in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. The site is surrounded by bus routes providing direct access to and from Madrona, Madison Valley, Downtown, North Capitol Hill, and the University District. Bicycle lanes have been placed on the major North-South arterial, 12th, and the major East-West arterial, Pine. Just north of Cal Anderson Park, a light rail station is under construction, which connects riders as far south as the Seatac airport, and in the future as far north as Northgate.

A mixture of historic brick apartment buildings, industrial “auto row” style buildings, and contemporary mixed-use developments are commonly found in the immediate context. The applicant provided some examples of nearby context in the EDG packet.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to allow a seven-story residential building with 249 units above 14,000 sq ft. of retail. Parking for 124 vehicles to be provided below grade. Review includes partial demolition of existing structures (53,200 sq. ft.). Building façades at 1406 10th Ave., 1401 and 1405 11th Avenue to remain as character structures under the Pike Pine Conservation Overlay.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Approximately 35 members of the public attended the Early Design Guidance meeting held on March 21, 2012. The following comments were offered:

- Appreciated the outreach by the applicants. Would like to see treatment of the blank wall condition of the north elevation, which is highly visible. Suggested seeking easements with the abutting property owner to allow openings in the north elevation. Advocated for the preservation of the Pravda Building (1406 10th Ave) to be adaptively re-used as part of the proposed development.
- Nearby music venue across 10th Avenue to the west is concerned that the noise generated by this existing use does not become a nuisance to future residential tenants. Suggested high quality, solid buildings materials with acoustical buffering and noise dampening in mind.
- Noted that potential development abutting the site to the north may be far in the future and the blank wall should be enhanced and treated. Suggested modulation, openings or other design interventions to treat an otherwise blank wall and provide more visual interest.
- Supported preservation and adaptive re-use of the Pravda Building and showed examples of similar building entrance conditions in the neighborhood.
- Applauded efforts to reduce massing. Reiterated support for the preserving the Pravda Building and avoiding creation of a blank wall condition along the north side of the property.
- Suggested that the 40 foot separation between the two proposed masses be reduced and create three buildings rather than two.
- Concerned that the site challenges are being treated as stumbling blocks rather than seeking solutions.
- Concerned that the conservation goals of the neighborhood are not being met with the proposed development. Adaptive re-use and retaining a collection of buildings was strongly encouraged.
- Felt the proposed design concept was too contemporary and not in keeping with the historic auto-row character of the neighborhood. Also concerned about simply preserving a façade and not a more substantial amount of the building.
- Suggested a pedestrian pathway through the site along the north edge that would allow the north façade to be activated.
- Noted that efforts to clean up 11th Avenue and encourage businesses had occurred and is concerned with a proposed vehicular access/loading and service area off of that street. 11th Avenue should not be treated as the backside of the development. The 11th Avenue massing appeared too solid and should be broken up into more distinct masses.
- Advocated for the full 15-foot setback to be maintained. Opposed the added height created by the elevator penthouse and mechanical screening. Did not want decks to be included along the 11th Avenue elevation to protect the privacy of Union Arts Co-op.
- Reiterated that the proposed development should be knit into the community rather than dominate the surrounding context.
- Suggested that development incorporate creative culture.
- Encouraged a more terraced shape to the building form. Suggested use of insulated building materials for noise dampening.

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised Early Design Guidance meeting held on June 6, 2012:

- Should show three full alternatives. The north façade should include greater transparency. The justification for the departures is lacking. Retail entries should be recessed similar to those found in the neighborhood.
- The conservation overlay is intended to preserve the texture of the neighborhood. Disagree with the application of the height incentive across the site. Three of the structures should be preserved. The proposed project is an important precedent. Smaller and flexible retail spaces are desired. Suggested east-west alley way along the north side of the site to allow loading to occur away from the streets. Preferred concrete instead of metal on the north façade and would like to see more transparency on that blank wall. Supportive of the proposed shifts in planes and materials.
- Encouraged street art mural on this wall. The proposed access on 11th Ave appears too wide.
- Would like to see Pravda retained. Existing storefront should be preserved. Encouraged working with abutting property owner to the north to allow great openings along the north façade. Supportive of brick.
- Supportive of preservation of the Madison Park II building. Objects to the bonus height application.
- Should explore designing a corridor along north façade to create a neighborhood connection and increase pedestrian access around and through the site.
- Agreed with preservation of the Madison Park II building as more desirable and interesting than the Pravda. Supportive of expanding the windows to the ground. Suggested use of acoustical windows for sound insulation.
- Best replacement of the Pravda is with a brick building.
 - Explanation of the exoskeleton impacts is not clear; however the Pravda building is not remarkable. The design of the corner building is overly historicist.
- Buildings should be brick (not stucco) and meet the corners. Supportive of the different components of the building proposed.
- Disagrees with the height bonus application. A solar study showing impacts to the Union Arts Coop should be completed and inform the design. Noted the traffic volumes along 11th.
- Would like to see more glass along the north façade. Supportive of the third Pravda preservation scheme.
- Supportive of project and the departures.

The applicant applied for a Master Use Permit on July 13, 2012. Notice of Application was published on July 26, 2012 and a 14-day comment period ended on August 11, 2012. Two comments were received.

- Request to be a party of record.
- Concerned regarding Yesler Terrace.

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised and three letters were received at the Initial Recommendation meeting held on August 1, 2012:

- Expressed a preference for not setting back the top level and encouraged a mural treatment of the blank wall portion of the north façade.
- Supportive of project and departures.
- Excited for the proposed development.
- Encouraged preservation of the Pravda Building (Davis Hoffman Building).

- Liked glass entry building and design of the north façade. Would like David Hoffman Building to be retained as part of collection of auto row structures in the neighborhood.
- Described how rehabilitation can be profitable and asserted that no compelling argument has been presented regarding the lack of preservation.
- Noted that adaptive re-use not as expensive as has been represented.
- Commend development of the design since the last meeting, but concerned with the development assumptions.
- Asserted that the Board needs to discuss design guidelines more explicitly.
- Encouraged further alternatives that respond to the intent of the overlay.
- Stated that commercial depth departure should align with viable commercial spaces in the neighborhood.

The following comments were offered at the Final Recommendation meeting on January 23, 2013:

- PPUNC submitted a letter in support of the proposed development and departures. The preservation of the Davis Hoffman Building as well as the two Madison Park buildings is commendable. Concern remains regarding the materials and detailing, specifically with regard to the quality and durability of the siding and the quality of the balconies.
- Support for the project and the north façade design.
- Like the proposed color schemes, but not pleased with the design of the “sidecar” buildings. Would like to see smaller retail bays to encourage smaller local business to occupy the spaces.
- Concerned with the glass balconies and would prefer railings. Feels the material is too bland.
- Support project design as coherent and responsive to community and Board guidance. Pleased with north façade design.
- Efforts to implement the green street concept along 11th Avenue are appreciated.
- Would like to see material with integral color used instead of *hardi* panel.
- Concerned that neighborhood noise will be considered a nuisance to the new residential tenants.
- Discouraged access by tenants to the rooftop areas as private patios. Pleased with the reduction in mass and treatment of 11th Ave more as a street than an alley.
- Feels *hardi* panel is a material that will not compete with the character structures and can be appropriate if applied well.

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

For all of the meetings, the design packet presented is available online by entering the project number at this website:

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp or by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: March 21, 2012

- 1. Massing & Architecture.** The Board agreed that the perceived massing should be further broken down. (B-1)
 - a. The proposed L-shaped building creates a relentless, massive interior view and should be broken into modules consistent with the surrounding urban form shown in the context analysis. Design the large building with large scalar moves to reduce the appearance of building mass, at both the east edge and the facades facing the interior courtyard. (B-1, C-1)
 - b. The Board suggested exploration of a scheme with three building masses and a reduced separation between the buildings via a departure request. (B-1)
 - c. The Board agreed that the proposed corner building at 11th Avenue and Union (above the proposed Madison Park Group Building) express a more successful scale and design concept. (C-1)
 - d. Bigger moves to break down the 11th Avenue elevation are needed beyond the narrow vertical notch shown in the preferred scheme. (B-1, C-1)
 - e. High quality, durable and permanent materials consistent with the character structures and neighborhood should be considered. (C-4)

- 2. Blank Wall Treatment.** The Board agreed that the blank north wall elevation should be designed to create visual interest. (D-2)
 - a. The north wall is highly visible due to the lack of development on the surface parking lot to the north and appears much more expansive due to the topographic depression. (D-2)
 - b. Treatment of this elevation should include physical articulation of the wall, breaking it into more than one mass, use of color, texture, materials, art, etc. (D-2)

- 3. Context.** The Board encouraged maximizing the preservation of the character structures.
 - a. Additional analysis of how the project supports the intent of the Pike Pine Conservation Overlay and discussion of character structures should be explored and presented at the next meeting. (C-1)
 - b. Further exploration of the adaptive re-use of the “Pravda Building” (1406 10th Avenue) should occur as part of the site redevelopment. (C-1)

- 4. Pedestrian Streetscape.** All three streets are crucial pedestrian streets and connectors in this neighborhood and should be designed to enhance the pedestrian experience and streetscape. (D-1)
 - a. The site is an important link between Seattle University and Cal Anderson in terms of pedestrian circulation. (A-1, D-1)
 - b. The presence of driveways and service areas should be minimized to the greatest extent possible. (A-8,D-1)
 - c. Driveways and service areas should be consolidated to the greatest extent possible. (A-8, D-1)
 - d. The potential for public or semi-public ground level open space should be considered. (E-2)

The Board also encouraged further dialogue with various neighborhood groups.

SECOND DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: June 6, 2012

1. Façade Articulation:

- a. The Board was very concerned with the proposed departure from the setback above the character structure. The Board noted, however, that if the corner design is highly transparent and glassy, then such a departure may be more positively considered. See departure discussion. (A-10, C-4)
- b. The Board strongly emphasized the importance of achieving granularity and scale in the proposed design that was intended by the overlay concept. (C-1)
- c. The Board was supportive of the design of the new building above the character structure which appears to float on top of the older edifice. (C-1, C-2)
- d. The Board warned that the corner building appears too large and connected to the other masses along 11th Avenue. Instead, this corner building and overall faced should endeavor to reinforce the granularity of the historic development pattern. (A-10)
- e. The Board encouraged the use of varied cornice lines on the different building masses to retain the finer scale, range of buildings and character of the neighborhood. (C-1, C-2, C-4)

2. North Façade:

- a. The Board was pleased with the direction of the design of the north elevation, including the step back at the top and the inclusion of windows. The vertical and horizontal window slots should be authentic (actual windows) and use restraint in their composition along this wall. (D-2)
- b. Materials changes along this wall should occur with shifts in the planes. The Board discouraged the use of metal on this wall and noted that the materiality should be strong and highlight this elevation. (C-4, D-2)
- c. The Board suggested that the uses might express themselves differently in the wall design. (D-2)
- d. The Board would not be opposed to a green wall provided there are assurances that the selected vegetation would survive the north facing exposure. (D-2, E-2)

3. 10th and Union Corner/Character Structure:

- a. The Board noted that the building at the corner of 10th and Union should strive for the following qualities that create a sense of scale and familiarity in the neighborhood context:
 - i. At least a 20-foot ground floor height
 - ii. Larger glazing, openings and fenestration details, such as sills
 - iii. Proportion of glass to masonry
 - iv. Contrast from the abutting building to the east
 - v. Include multiple entrances
 - vi. Set back from the property line or from the 65-foot height to appear more consistent with the building heights in the area.
 - vii. The residential floors should include more generous heights. (C-1, C-2, C-4)

- b. The Board was supportive of use of brick for the corner and specified that the brick should be used authentically and fully wrap corners and not appear applied. (C-4)
- c. The Board would like to review alternative massing schemes for the 10th and Union corner building. (B-1, C-1)

4. 11th Avenue:

- a. The three different expressions of massing above the character structure should avoid reading as a single building. (C-1, C-2, C-4)
- b. The verticality of this elevation should be emphasized with modulation and proportions. (C-1, C-2, C-4)
- c. The center portion of this elevation is incongruous and should enjoy a larger setback and be less intrusive on the streetscape, while being more aligned with the Code standards or be very deliberate with the massing design. (C-1, C-2, C-4)
- d. The Board was generally satisfied with both corner expressions. (A-10)
- e. The Board expressed more interest in the quality of the street facing facades than the interior courtyard articulation. (A-4, A-10, D-1)

5. Site Planning Schemes:

- a. The Board would like to see a scheme that shows what departures would be required in order to save all three buildings and be feasible. This analysis should include what level of departures would be involved to make such an option feasible. The Board would be very interested in and supportive of departures that would preserve all three buildings.

6. Entry Sequence:

- a. The Board expressed interest in the courtyard expressing itself to the public entry off of 10th Avenue. (D-1, E-2)
- b. The Board encourages porosity and transparency between the sidewalk and the interior courtyard as described in the presentation, but not supported by the graphics presented. (A-4, D-1, E-2)
- c. If the public doesn't have access to the courtyard, then the Board advocated for visual access to the courtyard from the entry recess. (A-4, D-1, E-2)
- d. The Board was very enthusiastic about the retail use wrapping into the entry court space and encouraged further programming of this space to be active and engaging. (D-1, E-2)

7. Garage/Access:

- a. The Board noted that the garage and loading area shown off 11th Avenue needs to be further developed. (A-8)

8. Streetscape Context:

- a. The Board would like to see a perspective of the site and proposed development from Seattle University towards Cal Anderson Park, along 11th Avenue. (A-1, A-4, D-1)

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: August 21, 2012

1. **Departures:** The Board spent the bulk of the deliberation discussing the proposed departures. See departure discussion at conclusion of document.
2. **10th and Union Building:**
 - a. The Board was very distressed with the lack of preservation of the David Hoffman Building (Pravda Building). The Board reiterated that they would be inclined in favor of departures that would help retain this building, in addition to the two Madison Park buildings. (C-1, C-2)
 - b. The proposed design for the new building at this corner is evolving in response to the previous guidance by stepping back the top floor. (B-1)
 - c. The height of the commercial base should respond to the neighborhood typology of tall commercial spaces at ground level. The Board recommended a retail height of the 15 feet shown, plus the height of the transom windows. The Board did not support the inclusion of two floors in what appeared to be a singular commercial base. (C-1, C-2, C-4)
3. **Façade Articulation Along 11th Avenue:**
 - a. The Board agreed that the 11th Avenue façade should be broken into the three masses shown, in keeping with the historic platting and granularity and scale of the neighborhood context. The 11th Avenue elevation should read as three buildings, independent from each other. (B-1, C-1, C-2)
 - b. The Board agreed that the façade articulation should be achieved with a push and pull of the facades along 11th Avenue, however the corner building (Madison Park I) should be set back 15 feet and the façade above the middle section (Madison Park II) should be greater than 15 feet and seek to differentiate between the buildings. (B-1, C-1, C-2)
 - c. The Board noted that other treatment, such as material usage, might be used to emphasize the differentiation between the buildings. (C-4)
 - d. The Board reiterated that the corner character structure should appear as a free-standing building when viewed from different vantage points. (A-10)
 - e. The Board was pleased with the development of the garage entry design and look forward to further details at the next meeting. (A-8)
4. **North Façade:**
 - a. The Board was pleased with the development of the design of the north façade, specifically the inclusion of the recessed notch with windows facing north and providing relief to the expanse of the wall, providing activation and authenticity of the uses expressed on this façade. (D-2, C-4)
 - b. In addition, the Board liked the treatment of the wall, breaking it in half with a color and material change. (D-2)
 - c. Finally, the Board strongly supported wrapping the materials treatment around the corner to the 11th Avenue street frontage. (C-4)

5. Next Meeting:

- a. Provide typical floor plans.
- b. Provide all courtyard elevations.
- c. Provide more views of the northwest corner structure.
- d. Provide sections through the site.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: January 23, 2013

1. **Quality of Materials.** The Board was concerned with the appearance and durability of the proposed hardi-board siding material.
 - a) The Board recommended that the reglets be painted the same color as the hardi-board.
 - b) The Board recommended use of a concealed fastening system, but would support use of exposed fasteners if the head of fastener has a baked on finish color to match the hardi-board.
 - c) The Board recommended that the vents be integrated into the building design. (The Brix Building is an example of a design where this was done well).
2. **Garage/Loading Entrance.** The Board agreed that the portions of the building at the pedestrian level should receive the highest quality materials. The application of materials around the proposed development achieves this, with the exception of the garage entrance area.
 - a) The Board recommended that the hardi-board materials shown around the garage entrance at the northeast corner of the building (on 11th Avenue) be changed to *ceraclad*, concrete or other masonry material.
3. **Balcony Projections.** The Board was concerned that the balconies be well-detailed to provide visual interest and compatibility with the building architecture.
 - a) The Board recommended that the balcony glass should read as continuous glass that is uninterrupted by railings.
 - b) The Board recommended that the detailing of the railings should be finely crafted and custom made for the building.
 - c) The Board recommended that the flashing be well-detailed.
 - d) The Board recommended that the underside of the balconies read as a clean, solid rectilinear piece.
4. **Fenestration of Character Buildings.** The Board was concerned that the quality of the windows used in the character buildings appear as authentic divided light windows.
 - a) The Board recommended that the windows used in the character buildings appear as authentic divided light windows (even if a solid sheet of glass is used; mullions should be applied on both sides).

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Board identified the following Citywide and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project.

Site Planning

A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities.

Pike/Pine: Characteristics and opportunities to consider in Pike/Pine include both views and other neighborhood features including:

- *A change in street grid alignment causing unique, irregular-shaped lots, including Union and Madison and 10th and Broadway Court*
- *“Bow tie” intersections at 13th/14th between Pike/Pine/Madison*

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

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.

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

Pike/Pine: Buildings on corner lots should reinforce the street corner. To help celebrate the corner, pedestrian entrances and other design features that lend to Pike/Pine’s character may be incorporated. These features include architectural detailing, cornice work or frieze designs.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to nearby, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between the anticipated development potential on the adjacent zones.

Architectural Elements

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.

Pike/Pine: The Pike/Pine vernacular architecture is characterized by the historic auto-row and warehouse industrial features of high ground floor ceilings and display windows, detailed cornice and frieze work, and trim detailing. Architectural styles and materials that reflect the light-industrial history of the neighborhood are encouraged.

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.

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.

Pike/Pine: New developments should respond to the neighborhood's light-industrial vernacular through type and arrangement of exterior building materials. Preferred materials include: brick, masonry, textured or patterned concrete, true stucco (DryVit is discouraged) with wood and metal as secondary, or accent materials.

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.

D-2 Blank Walls. Buildings should avoid blank walls. Where unavoidable, walls should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.

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

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.

Pike/Pine: The creation of small gardens and art within the street right-of-way is encouraged to activate and enliven the public realm. Vertical landscaping, trellises or window boxes for plants is also desirable. Please see the Design Guidelines document for specific streets along which such treatment is emphasized.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

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

At the time of the Final Recommendation meeting, the following departures were requested:

#	LAND USE STANDARD	DEPARTURE	DESIGN RATIONALE	BOARD RECOMMENDATION
1	<p>23.47.A.005C2 RESIDENTIAL USE LIMITS</p> <p>Residential uses may not occupy more than 20% of a street-level street-facing façade on a principal pedestrian street.</p>	<p>10th Avenue has 39.4 % of street level in residential use.</p>	<p>The impacts of residential uses on 10th are offset by a public plaza, widened planting strip, which are amenities for the public and the retail spaces adjacent.</p> <p>The aggregate of the building street facades in residential use is 15.8%, less than the maximum.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, D-1, E-2)</p>
2	<p>SMC 23.47A.005D and SMC 23.47A.008C1 RESIDENTIAL USE LIMITS</p> <p>80% of the street level use to be occupied by specific commercial uses. In all neighborhood commercial and C1 zones, residential uses may occupy, in the aggregate, no more than 20% of the street-level street-facing facade</p>	<p>Residential use exceeds 20% on 10th Ave; therefore 80% of the street level cannot meet specific commercial uses.</p>	<p>The aggregate of the building street facades in residential use is 15.8%; therefore 84.2% of total façades across all three streets are devoted to the commercial uses. The inclusion of a public plaza at the residential entryway and enhanced landscaping surrounding the site will help activate the pedestrian streetscape.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, D-1, E-2)</p>
3	<p>SMC 23.73.010B2c(2) FLOOR AREA INCREASE</p> <p>A 25% increase in the floor size limit is permitted for projects that incorporate a character structure on the same lot, either as a whole structure or as a portion of a structure, provided that all portions of the new structure above the height of the street-facing facades of the character structure are set back a minimum of 15’ from all street property lines that abut the character structure.</p>	<p>Proposed setback along E Union St, above both the Davis Hoffmann and Madison Park 1 buildings (character structures) is 8’.</p>	<p>Setbacks provided on 10th and 11th Avenues on the new structures at street facing facades of character structures meet the setback requirement. Additionally, setbacks that are not required have also been provided on these streets to create public spaces and relieve the top floors of the building mass.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, B-1, D-1)</p>

4	<p>SMC 23.73.014B.2b SETBACK FOR CHARACTER STRUCTURES</p> <p>In zones with a 65' mapped height limit; the director may permit the height of a structure to exceed the height limit of the zone by 10', provided that all portions of the new structure above the height of the street-facing facades of the character structure are set back a minimum of 15' from all street property lines that abut the character structure.</p>	<p>Proposed setback along E Union St, above both the Davis Hoffmann and Madison Park 1 buildings (character structures) is reduced to 8'.</p>	<p>Setbacks provided on 10th and 11th Avenue at character structures meet setback requirement. Additionally, setbacks not required by Code have also been provided on these streets to create public spaces and relieve the top floors of the building mass.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, B-1, C-1, C-2, D-1)</p>
5	<p>SMC 23.73.010B2c(3) FLOOR AREA INCREASE</p> <p>A 25% increase in the floor size limit is permitted for projects that incorporate a character structure on the same lot, either as a whole structure or as a portion of a structure, provided that the original floor-to-ceiling height of the ground story shall be maintained.</p>	<p>Within the Madison Park building the ceiling has been raised approximately 5'.</p>	<p>Floor to ceiling height exceeds that of the original space, creating a higher volume in the commercial space that is more open to the street.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4,C-1, C-2, D-1)</p>
6	<p>A 25% increase in the floor size limit is permitted for projects that incorporate a character structure on the same lot, either as a whole structure or as a portion of a structure, provided that the original floor-to-ceiling height of the ground story shall be maintained.</p>	<p>Within the Madison Park 1 building, the floor has been lowered to the relative sidewalk level.</p>	<p>A variety of retail uses at street level is better achieved with a floor at street level, allowing ADA entrances and more flexible retail demising walls.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4,C-1, C-2, D-1)</p>
7	<p>A 25% increase in the floor size limit is permitted for projects that incorporate a character structure on the same lot, either as a whole structure or as a portion of a structure, provided that the original floor-to-ceiling height of the ground story shall be maintained.</p>	<p>Within a small portion of the Madison Park 1 building, there are two floors of units within the original floor-to-ceiling height on the courtyard (internal) side of the buildings.</p>	<p>Units have been created that face the residential courtyard, and are not seen from the street, nor do the units have any adjacency with retained facades. Ideal retail depth for the neighborhood has been provided. Allowing flexible use of this footprint area allows for more articulation at the street.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)</p>
8	<p>A 25% increase in the floor size limit is permitted for projects that incorporate a character structure on the same lot, either as a whole structure or as a portion of a structure, provided that the original floor-to-ceiling height of the ground story shall be maintained.</p>	<p>Within the Davis Hoffman building the ceiling has been lowered approximately 6".</p>	<p>Better suits the massing of the building above and allows the total height of the new structure to be three feet (3') less than the zoning maximum.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)</p>

9		Within the Davis Hoffman building, the floor has been lowered to the relative sidewalk level.	Transparency at street level with a variety of retail uses is better achieved with a floor at street level, allowing ADA entrances and more flexible retail demising walls.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)
10		Within a small portion of the Davis Hoffman building, there are two floors of units within the original floor-to-ceiling height on the courtyard (internal) side of the buildings.	Units have been created that face the residential courtyard, and are not seen from the street, nor do the units have any adjacency with retained facades. Ideal retail depth has been provided. Allowing flexible use of this footprint area allows for more articulation at the street.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)
11	<p>SMC 23.73.014B.2c</p> <p>HEIGHT EXCEPTION FOR CHARACTER STRUCTURE</p> <p>In zones with a 65-foot mapped height limit; the Director may permit the height of a structure to exceed the height limit of the zone by 10', provided the original floor-to-ceiling height of the ground story shall be maintained.</p>	Within the Madison Park 1 building, the ceiling has been raised approximately 5'.	Floor to ceiling height exceeds that of the original space, creating a higher volume in the commercial space that is more open to the street.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)
12		Within the Madison Park 1 building, the floor has been lowered to the relative sidewalk level.	A variety of retail uses at street level is better achieved with a floor at street level, allowing ADA entrances and more flexible retail demising walls.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)
13		Within a small portion of the Madison Park 1 building, there are two floors of units within the original floor-to-ceiling height on the courtyard (internal) side of the buildings.	Units have been created that face the residential courtyard, and are not seen from the street, nor do the units have any adjacency with retained facades. Ideal retail depth has been provided. Allowing flexible use of this footprint area allows for more articulation at the street.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)
14		Within the Davis Hoffman building the ceiling has been lowered approximately 6".	Better suits the massing of the building above and allows the total height of the new structure to be three feet (3') less than the zoning maximum.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)

15		Within the Davis Hoffman building, the floor has been lowered to the relative sidewalk level.	Transparency at street level with a variety of retail uses is better achieved with a floor at street level, allowing ADA entrances and more flexible retail demising walls.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)
16		Within a small portion of the Davis Hoffman building, there are two floors of units within the original floor-to-ceiling height on the courtyard (internal) side of the buildings.	Units have been created that face the residential courtyard, and are not seen from the street, nor do the units have any adjacency with retained facades. Ideal retail depth has been provided. Allowing flexible use of this footprint area allows for more articulation at the street.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, C-1, C-2, D-1)
17	<p>SMC 23.54.035.C1 LOADING BERTH</p> <p>Each loading berth shall be minimum 10' wide and provide minimum 14' vertical clearance.</p>	The proposed loading berth at the northeast corner of the building provides 11'-6" clearance.	An 11'-6" vertical clear loading berth is proposed. The size of retail tenants in this location are typically 3,500 SF or smaller and are not expected to utilize larger vehicles for loading and unloading. A smaller loading bay is more compatible with the scale of the streetscape.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, A-8, D-1)
18	<p>SMC 23.47A.008A2b BLANK FAÇADE</p> <p>Blank segments of the street-facing facade between 2' and 8' above the sidewalk may not exceed 20' in width.</p>	Along E Union St., the blank segment is 70' in length.	The intent of the overlay is to retain character structures with significant architectural features intact; in doing so our design does not meet the base zoning requirements. Although the Davis Hoffman façade and Madison Park façade have been modified to be more transparent,	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, D-1, D-2, D-11)
19	<p>SMC 23.47A.008.B2a TRANSPARENCY</p> <p>60% of the street-facing facade between 2' and 8' above the sidewalk shall be transparent.</p>	Along E Union St., the transparency is 56%.	The intent of the overlay is to retain character structures with significant architectural features intact; in doing so our design does not meet the base zoning requirements. Although the Davis Hoffman façade and Madison Park façade have been modified to be more transparent....	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, D-1, D-2, D-11)
20	<p>SMC 23.47A.032A.2b CURB CUT WIDTH</p> <p>Access is permitted from the principal pedestrian street, and limited to one two-way curb cut for a total of 25'.</p>	The proposed curb cut combines parking and loading access for a total curb cut width of 30'.	Combining loading and parking access in one location minimizes the impact to pedestrians for curb cuts on the project and is more suitable to the pedestrian uses by maximizing uninterrupted sidewalk.	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, A-8, D-1)

21	<p>SMC 23.54.035C.4a MANUEVERING SPACE FOR LOADING BERTH</p> <p>In addition to the length of the loading berth, additional maneuvering space may be required by the Director for uses with over 10,000 SF of gross floor area with loading berth access from a principal or minor arterial street.</p>	<p>No maneuvering space is proposed on-site.</p>	<p>A large on-site maneuvering zone would create a large blank wall and would not be consistent with the street level use design standards suggested by the code and the design guidelines. Parking and loading entrances have been set back from the street to enhance pedestrian and vehicle safety and meet all required site triangles.</p>	<p>The Board voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of recommending this departure. (A-4, A-8, D-1)</p>
----	---	--	---	---

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.*

Subject to the following conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines.

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting in January 23, 2013, the Board recommended approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The reglets should be painted the same color as the hardi-board.
2. The design should use a concealed fastening system; if exposed fasteners if the head of fastener has a baked on finish color to match the hardi-board.
3. The vents should be integrated into the building design. (The Brix Building is an example of a design where this was done well).
4. The hardi-board materials shown around the garage entrance at the northeast corner of the building (on 11th Avenue) should be changed to *ceraclad*, concrete or other masonry material.
5. The balcony glass should read as continuous glass that is uninterrupted by railings.
6. The detailing of the railings should be finely crafted and custom made for the building.
7. The flashing should be well-detailed.
8. The underside of the balconies should read as a clean, solid rectilinear piece.
9. The windows used in the character buildings should appear as authentic divided light windows (even if a solid sheet of glass is used; mullions should be applied on both sides).

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director’s Analysis

Four members of the East Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) 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 Multifamily and Commercial Buildings. 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 Multifamily and Commercial Buildings. 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 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 January 26, 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

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected; decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from demolition and building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources.

Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general. Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the City.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675B) allow the reviewing agency to mitigate impacts associated with construction activities. Most short-term impacts are expected to be minor. Compliance with the above applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment. However, impacts associated with air quality, noise, and construction traffic warrant further discussion.

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from construction activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased dust caused by drying mud tracked onto streets during construction activities; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction materials hauling, equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources. Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts:

- The applicant estimates approximately 29,360 cubic yards of excavation for construction. Excess material to be disposed of must be deposited in an approved site.
- The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction.

- The Street Use Ordinance requires watering streets to suppress dust, on-site washing of truck tires, removal of debris, and regulates obstruction of the pedestrian right-of-way.
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general.
- Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the city.

Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most short-term impacts to the environment. However, given the amount of building activity to be undertaken in association with the proposed project, additional analysis of drainage, grading, noise, greenhouse gases, and traffic impacts is warranted.

Drainage

Soil disturbing activities during site excavation for foundation purposes could result in erosion and transport of sediment. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code provides for extensive review and conditioning of the project prior to issuance of building permits. Therefore, no further conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Earth - Grading

The construction plans will be reviewed by DPD. Any additional information showing conformance with applicable ordinances and codes will be required prior to issuance of building permits. Applicable codes and ordinances provide extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code 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 current proposal involves excavation of approximately 29,360 cubic yards of material. 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.

Traffic, Circulation and Parking

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.

For the duration of the construction activity, the applicant/responsible party shall cause construction truck trips to cease during the hours between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays. This condition will assure that construction truck trips do not interfere with daily PM peak traffic in the vicinity. As conditioned, this impact is sufficiently mitigated in conjunction with enforcement of the provisions of existing City Code (SMC 11.62).

On-street parking in the neighborhood is limited, and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction could exacerbate the demand for on-street parking and result in an adverse impact on surrounding properties. The owner and/or responsible party shall assure that construction vehicles and equipment are parked on the subject site or on a dedicated site within 800 feet for the term of the construction whenever possible. To facilitate these efforts, a Construction Management Plan will be required as a condition of approval identifying construction worker parking and construction materials staging areas; 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 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.

Noise

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

Construction activities outside the above-stated restrictions may be authorized upon approval of a Construction Noise Management Plan to address mitigation of noise impacts resulting from all construction activities. The Plan shall include a discussion on 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.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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.

Long-Term Impacts

Traffic and Transportation

A Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed project was prepared by TSI and dated July 2012. The report was updated in October 2012. The report evaluates traffic volumes associated with the proposed construction of the new building. According to the traffic report, there are approximately 80 additional PM peak hour vehicle trips associated with the proposed development on the subject site. The trip assignment analysis concludes that the studied intersections would operate at the same Level of Service with the additional trips. Therefore, the project is not expected to adversely affect street capacity or intersection level of service and no mitigation is warranted.

Parking

The proposed development is located in the Capitol Hill Urban Center where parking is not required per SMC 23.54.015B2. However, the proposal includes 124 parking spaces to be provided below grade and accessed from a driveway via 11th Avenue.

In the Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed project prepared by TSI and dated July 2012 and updated in October 2012, parking generation rates from the Journey to Work census statistics on residential vehicle ownership in the vicinity of the site were used to estimate the project's parking demand.

The total peak parking demand is estimated to be 162 stalls and is expected to occur overnight. This would result in a spillover of 38 stalls. Several private parking lots in the vicinity offer capacity for this spillover parking. Therefore, the estimated parking demand may be adequately accommodated within the private off-site parking lots. Given high levels of on-street parking utilization, however, this spillover may make on-street parking more difficult in the vicinity of the project site, and also may serve as a disincentive for project residents to own cars. However, no code authority exists to condition the project to mitigate this impact, as the project is located in the Capitol Hill/First Hill Urban Center and under SMC 25.05.675M such conditioning is prohibited.

Historic and Cultural Preservation

The proposed action includes full demolition of the building at 1406 10th Ave and partial demolition of the other three buildings. An Appendix A survey was completed and submitted to the Department of Neighborhoods Landmarks Coordinator. After review by the Landmarks Preservation Board staff, a determination was made that the subject buildings were unlikely to meet the standards for designation as individual landmarks due in part to the loss of integrity (see letter dated November 20, 2013). Therefore, no mitigation related to the demolition activities is warranted or imposed.

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 to the DPD Land Use Planner for approval a Construction Management Plan which identifies construction worker parking and construction materials staging areas; truck access routes to and from the site for excavation and construction phases; and sidewalk and street closures with neighborhood notice and posting procedures.

During Construction

2. The hours of construction activity shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays (except that grading, delivery and pouring of cement and similar noisy activities shall be prohibited on Saturdays). This condition may be modified by DPD to allow work of an emergency nature. This condition may also be modified to permit low noise exterior work (e.g., installation of landscaping) after approval from DPD.
3. For the duration of the construction activity, the applicant/responsible party shall cause construction truck trips to cease during the hours between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays.

CONDITIONS-DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Building Permit Issuance

4. The reglets should be painted the same color as the hardi-board.

5. The design should use a concealed fastening system; if exposed fasteners if the head of fastener has a baked on finish color to match the hardi-board.
6. The vents should be integrated into the building design. (The Brix Building is an example of a design where this was done well).
7. The hardi-board materials shown around the garage entrance at the northeast corner of the building (on 11th Avenue) should be changed to *ceraclad*, concrete or other masonry material.
8. The balcony glass should read as continuous glass that is uninterrupted by railings.
9. The detailing of the railings should be finely crafted and custom made for the building.
10. The flashing should be well-detailed.
11. The underside of the balconies should read as a clean, solid rectilinear piece.
12. The windows used in the character buildings should appear as authentic divided light windows (even if a solid sheet of glass is used; mullions should be applied on both sides).

During Construction

13. 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

14. 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 January 16, 2013 and updated by the graphic presentation to the Design Review Board on January 23, 2013.

Signature: _____ (signature on file)
Lisa Rutzick, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

Date: March 14, 2013