City of Seattle

Department of Planning and Development
Diane M. Sugimura, Director

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

Application Number: 3013235

Applicant Name: Jodi Patterson-O'Hare/Permit Consultants Northwest

Address of Proposal: 4041 Roosevelt Way Northeast

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use Application to allow a seven-story, structure containing 214 residential units, 3,600 sq. ft. of commercial space and 150 parking stalls. Review includes 20,300 cu. yds. of grading.

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

[X] 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 August 16, 2012.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to design and construct a mixed-use building with 214 residential units and 3,600 square feet of commercial space with below grade parking garage containing 150 parking stalls. The proposed demolition would remove abutting single and two story structures.

The applicant presented three design scenarios at the early design guidance stage. Massing options A and C represent similar approaches to the site. Both options illustrate two parallel and linear rectangular volumes along the two north and south streets, Roosevelt Way NE and Ninth Ave NE, which form courtyards in the interstitial space between the two prominent masses. These linear bars contain double loaded corridors at the residential levels. Option A links these six to seven story volumes with hallways on each floor that divide the courtyard into separate realms. In Option C the upper floors of the Roosevelt spine inflect away from the street leaving a deck above grade and acknowledging the splitting of Eastlake into Roosevelt and 11th Ave NE.

Option B preserves the linear volume adjacent to Roosevelt and adds two perpendicular wings extending west from the spine. This solution forms an "F" shape plan with one courtyard between the two wings and a smaller second court between the stem of the spine and the western most portions of the neighboring Allegro Apartments.

The plinth common to each of these schemes contains similar configurations: shallow commercial use fronting onto Roosevelt Way NE (and a residential amenity area for Option C); a large, residential lobby facing NE 40th St.; two garage entries facing Ninth Ave NE and lofts or townhouse-like units also lining Ninth Ave. These uses enclose one level of garage parking. The second garage access leads to a ramp that connects to lower parking levels. The schemes vary the height of the massing at the Ninth Ave and NE 40th St corner and incorporate slightly different approaches to the design of an entry plaza between NE 40th and the lobby. In plan and diagrammatic massing, the scale of the proposed complex roughly approximates the size of the Allegro Apartments.

By the Initial Recommendation meeting, the applicant refined Option C. The plans illustrate a slight reorientation of the southwest volume and establishment of more generous upper level setbacks along Ninth Ave. NE. The applicant also eliminated one of the garage entrances.

The Board and community reviewed alterations of the design based on the earlier guidance at the Final Recommendation meeting. The changes introduced at the Final Recommendation meeting included a canopy above the Roosevelt Way residential entrance and a long, vertically oriented blade-sign closer to the corner of Roosevelt and NE 40th St. The architect also further defined the building corner by creating a vertical notch or recession in the façade next to the blade sign and projecting a portion of the south façade forward slightly.

SITE & VICINITY

Located in the University District just west of the University of Washington, the irregular shaped site has boundaries defined by Roosevelt Way NE on the east, Ninth Avenue NE on the west and NE 40th Street on the south. The "L" shaped Allegro Apartments to the north and west defines the northern boundary. Existing structures on the site include an unoccupied one story brick building fronting Roosevelt Way and a two story, wood office building behind the lower building. A surface parking lot lies between NE 40th St. and the office building.

Land uses in the neighborhood comprise institutional, multifamily and single family residential uses to the west. The University of Washington Medical Center is to the north and south and the U.W. campus to the east. Commercial, entertainment and medical facilities lie close by.

Recreational and scenic amenities, Lake Union and the Burke Gilman Trail, are within close proximity. Noted buildings in the vicinity include the elegant Japanese styled design University Friends Meeting (meeting house), the newly constructed Cedar Apartments, Hardwick and Sons hardware, the Watertown and the University Inn hotels.

One way street patterns surround the site. Roosevelt Way, a principal arterial, travels south bound, NE 40th St. is west bound and Ninth Ave moves traffic north bound. The east/west couplet NE Campus Parkway provides an axis from the campus and dives under Eastlake Ave E connecting to NE 40th St. to the west. Between the site's south property line and the Burke Gilman Trail / NE 40th St. lay rights of way lined with trees.

Roosevelt Way is the primary commercial corridor adjacent to the site. Roosevelt functions as a thoroughfare for vehicular traffic between the Eastlake neighborhood and University District. Roosevelt separates and creates a barrier for the east west pedestrian movement traveling from the University of Washington to the subject lot. Roosevelt Ave NE corner with NE 40th Street has been identified as a gateway by the University District Guidelines.

NE 40th Street is a one-way westbound section of street that serves as a connecter between the commercial and institutional districts on Roosevelt and the primarily residential neighborhood to the west.

9th Ave NE travels one-way northbound from the subject lot. The street, primarily residential in character, separates the subject lot, zoned C1-65, from the lower density zoning of LR3 across the street.

The site drops approximately ten feet from the north to south across the site. There are mature trees and landscaping to the south of NE 40th Street.

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

Public Comments

Approximately twelve members of the public attended this Early Design Review meeting. The public raised the following issues:

- Opposes the two vehicular entrances off 9th Avenue NE. One entrance is sufficient for access.
- Reduce the number of parking spaces.
- The proposed height and mass of structure facing 9th Avenue NE is too big.
- Create setbacks in the 9th Avenue NE façade to better match the size and residential character of other structures on the block.
- Reduce the building massing along 9th Avenue NE similar to massing Option B.
- Make sure that the building façade along 9th Avenue NE does not have a large quantity of blank walls similar to the UW Medical Center at Roosevelt.
- How viable is ground level retail along NE 40th Street given the lack of pedestrian circulation in area and steepness of grade change along street?
- The project will increase traffic along 9th Avenue NE.

DPD received two letters from two neighboring institutions. One letter endorsed the project while the other raised questions regarding the complex's impacts on the neighborhood.

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".

PRIORITIES

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.

Guideline: For properties facing the Burke Gilman Trail, new buildings should be located to minimize impacts to views of Mount Rainier, Cascade Mountains and Lake Washington, and allow for sunlight along the trail and increase safety and access for trail users.

The Board directed the applicant to demonstrate at the Recommendation Meeting how the location of proposed uses, entries, open spaces, building massing, and articulation reflect the three different adjacent street characters. The building should respond directly to the surrounding character of uses on each street frontage.

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Reinforcing the pedestrian streetscape and protecting public view corridors are particularly important site planning issues. Stepping back upper floors allows more sunlight to reach the street, minimizes impact to views, and

maintains the low- to mediumrise character of the streetscape. Roof decks providing open space for mixed-use development can be located facing the street so that upper stories are, in effect, set back.

Guideline - Solar Orientation: Minimizing shadow impacts is important in the University neighborhood. The design of a structure and its massing on the site can enhance solar exposure for the project and minimize shadow impacts onto adjacent public areas between March 21st and September 21st. This is especially important on blocks with narrow rights-of-way relative to other neighborhood streets, including University Way, south of NE 50th Street.

The 9th Avenue NE façade should respond to the adjacent residential uses. The Board liked the idea of the proposed ground related units along the 9th Avenue Street level frontage. These ground level residential uses should be clearly distinguishable from the massing on the upper levels. Use fine grain details to create a human scale façade. Architectural features ought to include a variable setback for the ground level units, incorporation of stoops, and upper level setback to accentuate the ground level plane.

A-3 **<u>Entrances Visible from the Street</u>. 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.

Position the commercial and residential entries to directly correlate with the pedestrian circulation to the site.

Show how the grade change along the NE 40th Street property separates or combines the residential function to the west with the commercial uses to the east.

The siting of the commercial spaces to achieve maximum visibility particularly concerned the Board. Consider shifting the primary commercial entry from the NE 40th Street façade to the corner of Roosevelt and NE 40th Street. This corner location would then be visible to the pedestrian traffic along Roosevelt and the pedestrian traffic moving

from the Urban Center to the west to the residential area to the east. The increased setback provided at this location should include the commercial outdoor courtyard. This location could be further maximized if the commercial space setback and 20' vertical clearance were incorporated into the corner gateway design.

The Board observed that the NE 41st Street corridor is the major corridor from the University of Washington campus to the site. The design of the building and pedestrian entries should use this visual corridor to attract more pedestrian traffic to the site.

The applicant must demonstrate that the entries are easily identifiable from the major pedestrian and vehicular corridors with the primary building entries acting as a natural terminus for the intended users.

A-4 **<u>Human Activity</u>. 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.

The Board endorsed the increased setbacks provided on each street frontage. The wider sidewalks will accommodate the pedestrian traffic. The Board specifically requested additional ground-level setback along Roosevelt Way NE to provide a more generous sidewalk. The Board noted that the setback is not required to be uniform, but could be varied, similar to the movement and weaving proposed for the upper stories. The additional street level setback could incorporate landscape nodes that create a more humane streetscape.

The Board strongly encouraged the increased setback along the Roosevelt Way NE and NE 40th Street corner. This setback with 20 feet vertical clearance provides greater visibility for vehicular traffic while separating the pedestrian walkway from vehicular traffic.

A-5 **<u>Respect for Adjacent Sites</u>. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: This Citywide Design Guideline is particularly important where a building's back side, service areas or parking lots could impact adjacent residential uses. Map 2 (page 8) shows potential impact areas—these are where Lowrise zones abut commercial zones.
Guideline: Special attention should be paid to projects in the zone edge areas as depicted in Map 2 to ensure impacts to Lowrise zones are minimized as described in A-5 of the Citywide Design Guidelines.

The Board supported the interior setback provided from the proposed building to the adjacent building to the north. The proposed setbacks range from 13 feet along the north facades and 16-20 feet along the shared property line between the east façade of the Allegro Apartment and the west façade of the proposed building. These generous setbacks should be maintained as the building massing evolves.

A-6 **<u>Transition Between Residence and Street</u>. 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 discussed increasing the setbacks along 9th Avenue NE at the ground level, as well as, providing sensitive landscaping at the ground plane between the ground related units and the street. Use of stoops, landscaping or other fine grain architectural features was encouraged.

A-7 **<u>Residential Open Space</u>. 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 appreciated the placement of the open space along the north south axis. This orientation incorporates the natural sunlight as a primary element in the open space design. Discussing the need to differentiate the private open space from the adjacent commercial courtyard, the Board recommended that the two spaces should read independent of one another. The private open space should be clearly identifiable by all users as residential in character and act as a terminus for residential pedestrian circulation.

A-8 **<u>Parking and Vehicle Access</u>. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: In Lowrise residential developments, single-lane driveways (approximately 12 feet in width) are preferred over wide or multiple driveways where feasible.

The Board agreed that 9th Avenue NE was the preferred right-of-way for vehicular entry and strongly endorsed one driveway location as being safer and more pedestrian friendly.

The applicant would need to provide convincing information justifying the site specific consideration to make two driveways necessary.

The design of the driveway entry should minimize visual impacts from the 9th Avenue street frontage.

A-9 **<u>Location of Parking on Commercial Street Fronts</u>. Parking on a commercial street front should be minimized and where possible should be located behind a building.**

The Board appreciated the residential and commercial street frontages with the parking located behind the street level use or under the structure.

A-10 **<u>Corner Lots</u>. Building on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The Citywide Design Guidelines encourage buildings on corner lots to orient to the corner and adjacent street fronts. Within the University Community there are several intersections that serve as "gateways" to the neighborhood.

Guideline: For new buildings located on a corner, including, but not limited to the corner locations identified in Map 3, consider providing special building elements distinguishable from the rest of the building such as a tower, corner articulation or bay windows. Consider a special site feature such as diagonal orientation and entry, a sculpture, a courtyard, or other device. Corner entries should be set back to allow pedestrian flow and good visibility at the intersection.

The Roosevelt Way NE and NE 40th Street corner has been identified in the University District Guidelines as a gateway corner requiring additional design development or elaboration.

The Roosevelt facade incorporates a sense of movement into the façade by the alternating setbacks of each floor level creating an overall organic weaving of the façade. The Board directed the applicant to use this idea on the corner to create the required gateway. The gateway does not need to be a large iconic corner element, but, according to the Board, it could be effectively communicated with subtle design cues using architectural elements that emphasize movement and transition.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 **<u>Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility</u>. 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 near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The residential areas are experiencing a change from houses to block-like apartments. Also, the proximity of lower intensive zones to higher intensive zones requires special attention to potential impacts of increased height, bulk and scale. These potential impact areas are shown in Map 4. The design and siting of buildings is critical to maintaining stability and Lowrise character.

Guideline: Special attention should be paid to projects in the following areas to minimize impacts of increased height, bulk and scale as stated in the Citywide Design Guideline.

The 9th Avenue NE façade did little to respond to the adjacent residential uses and the University Design Guidelines. The Board recommended decreasing the overall building mass along 9th Avenue NE by reducing the height, using modulation, and increasing setbacks. An upper level setback above the street level units would reduce overall bulk while responding to the lower density, ground level character of units across the street in the LR3 zone. The upper level setback is specifically called out as an example for mitigation along a zone edge in the University District Guidelines.

In addition to use of modulation, the design should possess a smaller or finer grain of scale along the residential street. Incorporating architectural and landscape elements such as green screens would help to reduce the bulk of the structure.

The Board referred to massing Option B as an example of a technique to reduce massing. Option C incorporates open space by using the north/south axis orientation to maximize sun exposure. However, if the same large open space could be oriented along the east west axis, it would provide the needed break in the massing along 9th Avenue NE.

In sum, the Board recommended a 9th Avenue N. façade reduced in scale and bulk by reorienting the open space, using more modulation, varying the setback distances and providing greater articulation of the landscape and the lower residential facade in order to better respond to the residential context of 9th Avenue NE and the adjacent lowrise structures.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

C-2 **<u>Architectural Concept and Consistency</u>. 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.**

Guidance reflects comments in response to A-1 and A-2.

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

Guidance reflects comments in response to A-2, A-4, A-6 and B-1.

C-4 **<u>Exterior Finish Materials</u>. 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.**

At the Recommendation meeting, a materials and color board is required.

C-5 **<u>Structured Parking Entrances</u>. The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.**

See A-8 guidance.

D. Pedestrian Environment

D-1 **<u>Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances</u>. 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.**

Guidance reflects comments in response to A-2, A-3 and B-1.

D-2 **<u>Blank Walls</u>. Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.**

Minimize blank walls on each façade by using glazing (or other means of achieving transparency) along the Roosevelt Way NE street front for both commercial storefronts and the residential amenity area. Roosevelt Way NE is intended as an active commercial corridor. The design of the storefronts should support an active streetscape.

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

All entrances should be designed to provide safe entry and passage by incorporating various Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) techniques which may include secure entries, lighting, landscaping to allow increased visibility and incorporating natural surveillance from building residents.

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

Guidance reflects comments in response to A-3 and D-2.

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

See A-2, A-3, A-6, A-7 and D-7 guidance.

E. Landscaping

E-2 **<u>Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site</u>. 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.**

Guidance reflects comments in response to A-6, A-7 and B-1.

MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a Design Review and SEPA components on July 26, 2012.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Design Review Board conducted a Final Recommendation Meeting on February 25, 2013 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

Six members of the public affixed their names to the Initial Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. The attendees who spoke liked the manner in which the proposal met the various street conditions. Speakers thought that the project would make a positive contribution to the neighborhood.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, three people signed-in. One person raised a question about whether the area designated as a sports court along Roosevelt Way could be converted to commercial use.

A Site Planning

A-1 **<u>Responding to Site Characteristics</u>. 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.

Guideline: For properties facing the Burke Gilman Trail, new buildings should be located to minimize impacts to views of Mount Rainier, Cascade Mountains and Lake Washington, and allow for sunlight along the trail and increase safety and access for trail users.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board provided extensive deliberation on whether the proposed structure responded to the varying street frontages. See guidance A-3, A-10 and C-2 for details.

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Reinforcing the pedestrian streetscape and protecting public view corridors are particularly important site planning issues. Stepping back upper floors allows more sunlight to reach the street, minimizes impact to views, and maintains the low- to medium-rise character of the streetscape. Roof decks providing open space for mixed-use development can be located facing the street so that upper stories are, in effect, set back.

Guideline - Solar Orientation: Minimizing shadow impacts is important in the University neighborhood. The design of a structure and its massing on the site can enhance solar exposure for the project and minimize shadow impacts onto adjacent public areas between March 21st and September 21st. This is especially important on blocks with narrow rights-of-way relative to other neighborhood streets, including University Way, south of NE 50th Street.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: With the exception of the residential entry on Roosevelt Way, no changes to the streetscape were recommended.

Final Recommendation Meeting: The applicant added a canopy to the Roosevelt Way residential entrance. The Board found the design acceptable.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The entry to the passageway on Roosevelt needs more "punch and character". The Board encouraged the addition of a canopy to enhance the building's presence along the streetscape. For the next Recommendation meeting, the applicant received direction to provide a revision to the entry notch or reveal that allows for as much transparency as possible and, at the same time, maintains the building's security.

Final Recommendation Meeting: See Board guidance for A-2.

A-4 **<u>Human Activity</u>. 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.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board did not recommend changes to the setbacks along the streets or at the corners.

A-5 **<u>Respect for Adjacent Sites</u>. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: This Citywide Design Guideline is particularly important where a building's back side, service areas or parking lots could impact adjacent residential uses. Map 2 (page 8) shows potential impact areas—these are where Lowrise zones abut commercial zones.

Guideline: Special attention should be paid to projects in the zone edge areas as depicted in Map 2 to ensure impacts to Lowrise zones are minimized as described in A-5 of the Citywide Design Guidelines.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The relationship of the proposal to the Allegro Apartments met the Board's expectations from the EDG.

A-6 **<u>Transition Between Residence and Street</u>. 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.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Ninth Ave. streetscape met with the Board's approval.

A-7 **<u>Residential Open Space</u>. 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:

3. **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.**
4. **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.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Board comments did not focus on this topic.

Final Recommendation Meeting: No discussion ensued at the meeting.

A-8 **<u>Parking and Vehicle Access</u>. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: In Lowrise residential developments, single-lane driveways (approximately 12 feet in width) are preferred over wide or multiple driveways where feasible.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The applicant reduced access to the garage from two to one garage openings meeting the Board's earlier guidance.

A-9 **<u>Location of Parking on Commercial Street Fronts</u>. Parking on a commercial street front should be minimized and where possible should be located behind a building.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: No follow-up discussion occurred during Board deliberation.

A-10 **<u>Corner Lots</u>. Building on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The Citywide Design Guidelines encourage buildings on corner lots to orient to the corner and adjacent street fronts. Within the University Community there are several intersections that serve as "gateways" to the neighborhood.

Guideline: For new buildings located on a corner, including, but not limited to the corner locations identified in Map 3, consider providing special building elements distinguishable from the rest of the building such as a tower, corner articulation or bay windows. Consider a special site feature such as diagonal orientation and entry, a sculpture, a courtyard, or other device. Corner entries should be set back to allow pedestrian flow and good visibility at the intersection.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Revising the southeast corner, particularly above the base, would both lend relief to the uniformity of the Roosevelt façade and respond to the community's desire for a gateway at the corner. As stated by the Board, the treatment at the corner should be "powerful and special".

Final Recommendation Meeting: Most of the Board's deliberation focused on the composition of the southeast corner. The architect should continue to explore refining "the cube" at the corner in order to enhance its definition. Although not recommending any specific conditions, the Board members expressed the desire for a stronger architectural statement at this corner. The land use planner will evaluate the architect's effort and work with the development team to determine the extent, if any, of revisions.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 **<u>Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility</u>. 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 near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The residential areas are experiencing a change from houses to block-like apartments. Also, the proximity of lower intensive zones to higher intensive zones requires special attention to potential impacts of increased height, bulk and scale. These potential impact areas are shown in Map 4. The design and siting of buildings is critical to maintaining stability and Lowrise character.

Guideline: Special attention should be paid to projects in the following areas to minimize impacts of increased height, bulk and scale as stated in the Citywide Design Guideline.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Although the bulk and height of the Roosevelt Way elevation appeared adequate, the monotonousness of the façade's length exacerbated the project's scale in relationship to the surrounding urban fabric. See guidance for A-10 and C-2.

Final Recommendation Meeting: The applicant responded to the earlier guidance by creating a six foot wide vertical recession above the commercial entrance on Roosevelt Way. This acts to establish a near cube-like corner. The introduction of a large blade-sign identifying the building near the recession and of a slightly projecting south façade at the corner helps to accentuate the idea of a gateway and reduce the monotony along the east façade's length. The Board welcomed these alterations but asked for more design exploration to enhance the corner element as an object related but distinct from the larger east and south elevations.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

C-2 **<u>Architectural Concept and Consistency</u>. 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.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board noted the monotony of the Roosevelt façade finding the southeast corner unresolved as a gateway and the entry passage to the open space lacking adequate presence. By the next Recommendation meeting, the applicant will need to revise the corner, which would include at least several bays on the Roosevelt and N. 40th St. elevations, and add a canopy at the passageway.

Final Recommendation Meeting: See Board guidance for A-2, A-10 and B-1.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: A canopy placed at the reveal and entry on Roosevelt Way will enhance the sense of human scale.

Final Recommendation Meeting: The Board accepted the canopy design at the Roosevelt residential passageway.

C-4 **<u>Exterior Finish Materials</u>. 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:

8. **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.**
9. **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.**
10. **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.**
11. **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.**
12. **Fencing adjacent to the sidewalk should be sited and designed in an attractive and pedestrian oriented manner.**
13. **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.**
14. **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:

5. **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.**
6. **Post mounted signs are discouraged.**
7. **The location and installation of signage should be integrated with the building's architecture.**
8. **Monument signs should be integrated into the development, such as on a screen wall.**

C-5 **<u>Structured Parking Entrances</u>. The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The applicant eliminated one of two proposed garage doors on Ninth Ave NE.

D. Pedestrian Environment

D-1 **<u>Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances</u>. 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:

3. **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.**
4. **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.**

D-2 **<u>Blank Walls</u>. Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The applicant's design reduced the presence of blank walls.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: No further discussion of this guideline ensued.

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

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

E. Landscaping

E-2 <u>Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site</u>. 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.

Board Recommendations: The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the February 25th, 2013 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 February 25th public meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the five Design Review Board members present unanimously recommended approval of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below).

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) are 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).

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION	RECOMMEND-ATION
1. Street Level uses. SMC 23.71.008D.1	Residential uses limited to 20% of the street level street-facing façade.	45% for residential uses at street level on Roosevelt Way NE	▪ Placement of a sports court for residential use 8' feet below grade would provide active uses.	Approved

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 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 July 26, 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 is an analysis of 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 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 93 feet and will consist of an estimated **20,300** 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 18 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 could 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. 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 constructed 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 20,300 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 2,030 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 1,015 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.

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; demolition of older structures, 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, traffic, parking impacts and public view protection warrant further analysis.

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

The two existing buildings on the subject site were reviewed by the Department of Neighborhoods and determined that it is unlikely, due in part to a loss of integrity, that the existing structures would meet the standards for designation as an individual landmark.

Traffic and Transportation

The proposed mixed-use development would produce approximately 1,400 new daily vehicular trips with 96 week day, PM peak hour trips or, roughly a 1,310 net increase from existing average daily vehicular trips and 84 PM peak hour trips respectively. The addition of the mixed-use building and the traffic generated by it would not cause the two signalized intersections and three un-signalized intersection analyzed to degrade to an unsatisfactory level of service (LOS). Traffic operations of the study-area intersections would be essentially unaffected by the proposed project. All movements at the intersections would operate at a LOS C or better.

No SEPA mitigation of traffic impacts to the nearby intersections is warranted.

Parking

The subject project lies within the University District Northwest Urban Center Village. Based on current City of Seattle code requirements for parking, the project has no minimum parking requirements. Further, Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) section 25.05.675M.2 states that "for residential uses location within the …University District Northwest Urban Center Village…no SEPA authority is provided for the decision maker to require more parking than the minimum required by the Land Use Code". Although parking is not required, the project proposes to include 150 on-site parking spaces. The building program is expected to generate a peak parking

demand of 158 vehicles overnight, which would be eight more autos than the proposed parking supply of 150 spaces. The developer proposes to include car-sharing vehicles within the building, which is likely to reduce the auto-ownership rate for residents as well as the overnight peak demand. Given the site's University District location, where on-street parking is regulated and highly utilized, no overflow parking is expected from the residential component of the project. Some parking demand generated by the commercial uses or by visitors to residents would likely occur at metered on-street spaces or in nearby pay lots

Summary

In conclusion, several adverse effects on the environment are anticipated resulting from the proposal, which are anticipated to be non-significant. The conditions imposed below are intended to mitigate construction impacts identified in the foregoing analysis, or to control impacts not regulated by codes or ordinances, per adopted City policies.

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of 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 Building Application

1. Include the departure matrix in the zoning summary section on all subsequent building permit plans. Add call-out notes on appropriate plan and elevation drawings in the updated MUP plans and on all subsequent building permit plans.

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 three (3) 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. Provide a construction worker parking plan with the intent to reduce on-street parking.

7. Submit a construction traffic management plan to be reviewed and approved by SDOT and DPD. The plan shall, at a minimum, identify truck access to and from the site, pedestrian accommodations, and sidewalk closures. Large trucks (greater than two-axle) shall be prohibited from entering or exiting the site between 3:30 P.M. to 7:00 P.M.

8. Provide a construction noise mitigation plan.

9. Attach a copy of the PSCAA demolition permit to the building permit set of plans.

During Construction

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.

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: April 11, 2013
Bruce P. Rips, AAIA, AICP
Department of Planning and Development

BPR:drm

H:\RIPS\DOC\DESIGN REVIEW\DEC 3013235 4041 Roosevelt Way NE.docx