



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

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

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

Application Number: 3015818
Applicant: Eric Blank, Runberg Architecture Group
Address of Proposals: 5019 Roosevelt Way NE

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 4-story structure containing 50 residential units above 6,927 sq. ft. of commercial space. Surface parking for 10 vehicles to be provided. Project also includes 3,850 cu. yds. of grading.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review (SMC 23.41)

- Development Standard Departure to allow less than the required driveway width (SMC 23.54.030 D2a)
- Development Standard Departure to allow less the minimum required large parking spaces (SMC 23.54.030 B2a)
- Development Standard Departure to allow parking along a street facing facade (SMC 23.47A.032 B1b)
- Development Standard Departure to allow the street level façade setback greater than 10 feet to the street lot line (SMC 23.47A.008 A3)
- Development Standard Departure to allow less than the required screening and landscaping (SMC 23.47A.016 B3m)
- Development Standard Departure to allow less than the required setback along a rear lot line abutting a residential zone (SMC 23.47A.014 B3)
- Development Standard Departure to allow less than the required amenity space area (SMC 23.47A.014 024 B2)

SEPA-Environmental Determination (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.

Site Description

The subject site is located midblock on the west side of Roosevelt Way NE between NE 50th Street and NE 53rd Street. Roosevelt Way NE serves as a one-way south-bound arterial along the north south axis traveling through the Roosevelt Neighborhood.

Along Roosevelt Way the zoning is Neighborhood Commercial with a 40 foot height limit. South of NE 45th Street, toward the UW campus, the zoning changes to allow a 65-85 foot height and the uses transition to newer multi story commercial and mixed use structures. North of NE 45th Street zoning allows a 40 foot height limit and uses are a mix of smaller one to four story commercial and residential buildings. To the east zoning changes to Lowrise Two multifamily. Existing buildings are primarily single family residences. Directly south of the subject lot is the University Library, a City of Seattle Landmark structure. To the north is an existing four story mixed use building. To the north of the mixed use building is the University Child Development School.



The subject lot contains substantial grade change from the low point on the street property line to the high point on the west property line, where an existing retaining wall is located along the shared property line. In total, the grade change is approximately 13 feet. The site is mostly rectangular with a small dog-leg in the southwest corner that projects into the Lowrise Two zone. The site is landlocked along three sides, pedestrian and vehicles access is available from the Roosevelt Way NE right-of-way.

ECAs:

Steep Slope Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) have been identified on site. An ECA exemption has been granted under the subject project number. DPD concluded that steep slope areas exist at the site and the project appears to qualify for the criteria established in the Critical Areas Regulations, SMC 25.09.180.B2c.

Access:

Vehicular access is available from Roosevelt Way NE.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

Roosevelt Way NE serves as a commercial corridor. Uses transition to multifamily and single family toward the west. The neighborhood consists of small commercial buildings, multistory mixed used buildings, apartment structures and single family homes.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: January 6, 2014.

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number(s) (3015818) at this website:

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

The EDG packet is also available to view in the 3015818 file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Mailing Public Resource Center

Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000

P.O. Box 34019

Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

The applicant presented three design alternatives. Each option includes a mixed-use structure containing 49 units, 6,225 square feet of commercial space, and approximately 10 parking stalls. Each design option locates the commercial space, intended to be a community food bank and restaurant space, in the southeast corner of the site along Roosevelt Way. The vehicle entry is positioned to the north of the commercial space with access from Roosevelt Way NE. Each massing option locates the building outside of the dog-leg in the Lowrise Two zone.

Massing Option A includes a residential lobby in the SE corner of the building along Roosevelt Way NE. To the north is the commercial space with a café. Vehicle access to ground level parking is located in the far NE corner. The upper level massing is rectangular and located adjacent to the street property line creating an upper level setback to the west, adjacent to the residential zone. Open space and roof decks are provided at level 2 and at the upper level roof deck adjacent to the east façade. The upper level setback ranges from 31-42 feet. Massing Option A is a code complying alternative.

Massing Option B includes a residential lobby in the NE corner of the building along Roosevelt Way NE. To the south is the vehicular access to ground level parking. The commercial space, with a café, is located in the SE corner of the site. The upper level massing is composed of two offset rectangles. The north rectangle is located along the street property line providing a 32 foot upper level setback to the west. The south rectangle is position more in the center of the site providing 26 foot upper level setback to the west and 17 feet to the east right-of-way property line. Open space is provided a roof decks on level 2 in the east and west setback, and at the upper level roof deck. Massing Option B is a code complying alternative.

Massing Option Three (Preferred Option) includes a residential lobby in the NE corner of the building along Roosevelt Way NE. To the south is the vehicular access to ground level parking. The commercial space, with a café, is located in the SE corner of the site. The upper level massing is a canted rectangle. The rectangle is located with the mass shifted to the east at the north of the site and to the west at the south portion of the site. The angled façade provides a 21 foot upper level setback in the NW corner of the site and a 13 foot setback to the west in the south portion. The upper level setback in the SE corner is 26 feet. Open space is provided on roof decks on level 2 in the east and west setback along the south half of the site and at the upper level roof deck. Massing Option C requires departures from parking location and size standards, parking screening and rear setback requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised during the public comment portion of the Early Design Guidance meeting:

- Expressed excitement about the prospect of a future partnership between the library and the Low Income Housing Institute. Felt collaborative work between the two organizations would help further the library's mission.
- Expressed concern that noise from outdoor café will impact library staff when windows are open during summer months.
- Expressed excitement about future café in this location.
- Noted the building integrates well with the adjacent library.
- Supportive of preferred design alternative which includes a canted building form with an upper level setback in the southeast corner adjacent to the library.
- Felt insufficient parking is provided.
- Felt a loading zone should be provided in front of the building for people pick-up and drop-offs.
- Felt solid waste and recycling should be incorporated into the building and not located along the street.
- Felt more information should be provided on how food deliveries will occur on site.
- Concerned insufficient space is provided to support box truck deliveries.
- Felt the garage entrance should be attractive.
- Would like to see a great mix of unit sizes which encourages diversity among the tenants.
- Encouraged applicant to present project to the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association.
- Supported urban agriculture proposed on the roof deck.
- Expressed concern about removal or pruning of the trees adjacent to the west property line.
- Expressed concerned about privacy impacts and windows facing the residential units to the west.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance. The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines & Neighborhood specific guidelines (as applicable) of highest priority for this project.

The Neighborhood specific guidelines are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website. The Uptown Neighborhood Design Guidelines identify the area where the subject site is located as an Uptown Urban Character Area.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE (JANUARY 6, 2014):

1. **Site Programming.** The Board felt additional analysis was necessary at the recommendation phase showing how the proposed uses would function on this tight infill site. The Board requested a visual analysis showing how pedestrian access, resident access, food bank queuing, parking and truck access, and the restaurant space would work in concert.
 - a) The Board requested visual explanation showing how loading/unloading, garbage movement to and from the site and, pedestrian movements will be accommodated throughout the day (A-3, A-4, A-8, D-6).

- b) Board noted there are multiple distinct user groups for the building: a) food bank patrons, b) restaurant patrons, c) residents, and d) staff. The Board felt that the applicant should observe other LIHI buildings to understand how people use the space day-to-day. The Board noted the long term success of the development requires the design be informed by the study of human behavior (A-4).
 - c) The Board requested the applicant demonstrate how users will approach the site and how the building will accommodate users upon arrival. The Board felt the building and site design should collect people and provide intuitive places for people to gather off of the Roosevelt right-of-way (A-4).
 - d) The Board requested incorporating a larger setback along Roosevelt to accommodate the large number of people queuing outside of the building (A-1, A-4).
 - e) The Board felt the café facing the park was a great addition to the project. The Board felt the applicant should demonstrate through design how the restaurant space relates to the food bank (A-1, A-4).
 - f) The Board felt specific focus should be given to building setbacks, architectural detailing, such as site wall and leaning rails, paving treatment, landscaping and signage to demarcate space for users (A-1, A-3, A-4, A-6, D-1).
2. **Residential Use.** The Board felt additional consideration should be given for the residential use within the building.
- a) The Board agreed the residential entry needed more prominence. The Board requested the applicant consider and demonstrate a gracious entry experience for the residents of the building (A-3).
 - b) The Board would like to see more information at the Recommendation meeting showing the design of the podium roof deck amenity space (A-7).
3. **Garage Entrance.** The Board felt the garage entrance was too prominent along the street façade. The driveway approach and structured parking entrance should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
- a) The Board noted the parking entrance currently reads as a public plaza. The Board suggested the applicant work with building form, a combination of hardscape and landscape features to minimize the driveway approach and designate the approach as a shared space for cars and pedestrians. The Board noted they would entertain future design departure to minimize the site of the curbcut (A-8, C-5, E-1).
4. **Privacy and West Property Line.** The Board noted the west and north façade treatment should consider and mitigate privacy impacts for the existing residential units to the north and west.
- a) The Board requested the applicant develop the architectural concept and façade fenestration so it is informed by the site's sensitive relationship to adjacent residential structures (A-5, C-2).
 - b) The Board requested the applicant provide a privacy study including the location of windows and outdoor space for adjacent residential structures across the west property line. The Board noted the apartment building to the north has minimal secondary windows facing the subject site. The applicant will need to demonstrate how the architectural concept, window glazing and deck location will address privacy concerns for adjacent residential structures (A-5 and C-2).
 - c) The Board requested a clear demonstration of how the building design will relate to the grade change on the west property line. The Board noted that the large retaining

wall depressions at the building wall and parking garage should be designed to mitigate visual impacts on adjacent residents and be designed so that they are not a collection area for weeds and trash (A-5, A-8).

5. **Material and Architectural Context.** The Board felt the architectural and material concept should be informed by existing building context and the intended use of the site.
 - a) Page 13 of the EDG Packet shows nearby architectural context photographs, including the adjacent landmark library. The Board noted the existing architectural context includes unique window groupings and detailing around the windows, entrances and roof. The Board did not feel that the development needed to duplicate the existing context, but felt the building should incorporate design cues from these buildings to reference the existing context (C-1, C-4).
 - b) The Board noted the application should include durable long lasting materials. The Board requested complete material demonstration at the recommendation meeting (C-4).
 - c) The Board felt the proposed canopy was a good addition to the project which should be maintained through design development (C-4).
 - d) The Board noted ground level materials must be durable to withstand the daily traffic supported at ground level (C-4).

6. **Trees and Landscaping.** The Board noted the trees located along the west property line had been reviewed during a site visit and the specimens did not warrant special site design or additional analysis.
 - a) The Board noted that the trees located along the west property line were generally in poor condition based on their health. The Board did not feel additional study of the trees was necessary (A-1).
 - b) The Board felt tree species and location in the right-of-way were important to the overall streetscape experience. The Board requested additional details on the right-of-way landscaping at the recommendation meeting (E-2).

RECOMMENDATION MEETING: SEPTEMBER 22, 2014

The packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3015818) at this website:

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised during the public comment portion of the Early Design Guidance meeting:

- Expressed concern about the daily operation of building and potential impacts to adjacent buildings and tenants but could also see the positive contribution to the neighborhood.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

At the Recommendation meeting, the Board discussed the response to EDG and offered the following recommendations for the proposal to meet the applicable Design Review Guidelines identified at the EDG meeting.

1. **Massing and Materials.** The Board agreed the massing and material treatment was responsive to EDG guidance.
 - a) The Board expressed support for the material composition including a dark grey metal frame with varied green and white alternating panels. The Board felt the color combination was tastefully composed (C-2, C-4).
 - b) The Board agreed the contrasting red color palette at the ground level successfully differentiates the upper level residential from the lower level non-residential uses (C-2, C-4).
 - c) The Board expressed concern about the durability of the cement panel materials and encouraged the applicant to incorporate metal panels where the budget may allow (C-4).
 - d) The Board felt the cement panel should be well detailed and requested the applicant investigate incorporating additional depth at the material change depth between metal panel and the cement panel or between the cement panel and windows (C-4).
2. **Ground Level Treatment.** The Board felt the overall ground level treatment was responsive to the Board's Early Design Guidance. The Board felt minor modifications would enhance the site design.
 - a) The Board discussed the merits of incorporating overhead weather protection at the café entrance on the south façade. Ultimately, the Board felt an architectural treatment was unnecessary and that seasonal weather protection could be provided by site specific outdoor furniture (C-3).
 - b) The Board agreed that the café space should be differentiated from the adjacent library driveway. The Board agreed the lighting fixtures would provide the necessary visual queue to users of the pace but felt at least one additional light, for a total of three should be used (A-1, A-4).
 - c) The Board recommended a condition to provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural (A-8).

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Board identified the following Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project. The specific guidelines are summarized below. The full text of the guidelines is available on the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development website.

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

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.

- 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 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 21 and September 21. This is especially important on blocks with narrow rights-of-way relative to other neighborhood streets, including University Way, south of NE 50th Street.

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

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

Guidelines:

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

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

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

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

- A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites.** 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.

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

- 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.

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.

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

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

Guidelines:

- 1.** Although no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction in the University Community, project applicants should show how the proposed design incorporates elements of the local architectural character especially when there are buildings of local historical significance or landmark status in the vicinity.
- 2.** For areas within Ravenna Urban Village, particularly along 25th Avenue NE, the style of architecture is not as important so long as it emphasizes pedestrian

orientation and avoids large-scale, standardized and auto-oriented characteristics.

3. On Mixed Use Corridors, consider breaking up the façade into modules of not more than 50 feet (measured horizontally parallel to the street) on University Way and 100 feet on other corridors, corresponding to traditional platting and building construction.
4. When the defined character of a block, including adjacent or facing blocks, is comprised of historic buildings, or groups of buildings of local historic importance and character, as well as street trees or other significant vegetation (as identified in the 1975 Inventory and subsequent updating), the architectural treatment of new development should respond to this local historical character.

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

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

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Guidelines:

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

Signs

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

Guidelines:

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

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

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

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

Guidelines:

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

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

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

- D-10 Commercial Lighting.** Appropriate levels of lighting should be provided in order to promote visual interest and a sense of security for people in commercial districts during evening hours. Lighting may be provided by incorporation into the building façade, the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and/or on signage.
- D-11 Commercial Transparency.** Commercial storefronts should be transparent, allowing for a direct visual connection between pedestrians on the sidewalk and the activities occurring on the interior of a building. Blank walls should be avoided.
- 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.
- E-3 Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions.** The landscape design should take advantage of special on-site conditions such as high-bank front yards, steep slopes, view corridors, or existing significant trees and off-site conditions such as greenbelts, ravines, natural areas, and boulevards.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The retention of existing, large trees is an important consideration in new construction, particularly on the wooded slopes in the Ravenna Urban Village. The 17th Avenue NE tree-lined boulevard is an important, visually pleasing streetscape.

Guidelines:

1. Retain existing large trees wherever possible. This is especially important on the wooded slopes in the Ravenna Urban Village.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departures 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 departures.

1. **Driveway Width (SMC 23.54.030 D2a):** The Code requires a 22 foot wide two way driveway for commercial uses. The applicant proposed a 12 foot driveway.

The Board unanimously approved the requested driveway width departure request. The Board agreed that minimizing the driveway width and associated curbcut would minimize parking garage impacts on the pedestrian environment consistent with Design Review Guideline A-8, Parking and Vehicle Access. The Board recommended a condition of approval to provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural to further minimize the parking and driveway impacts to the adjacent pedestrian space.

2. **Parking Space Distribution (SMC 23.54.030 B2a):** The Code a minimum of 75% of parking spaces provided to be striped for large vehicles when 10 or fewer parking spaces are provided. The applicant proposed less than the required large vehicle spaces.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from the parking space distribution requirements. The Board also noted that the tight site design requires creative space programing and the parking was designated for staff and not visitors to the site.

Reducing the size of the parking garage minimizes impacts on the pedestrian environment consistent with Design Review Guideline A-8, Parking and Vehicle Access. The Board recommended a condition of approval to provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural to further minimize the parking and driveway impacts to the adjacent pedestrian space.

- 3. Parking Location (SMC 23.47A.032 B1b):** The Code states street level parking shall be separated from the street-level, street facing facade by another permitted use. The applicant proposed two parking spaces that are not separated from the street by another use.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from parking location requirements. The Board felt the proposed ground level massing with two canted frames with a decorative metal gate spanning the space between provided the better massing and design solution for the overall building and site design. The Board felt by providing the decorative metal gate negative parking impacts to the pedestrian environmental would be minimized consistent with Design Review Guideline A-8, Parking and Vehicle Access.

- 4. Street Level Development Standards (SMC 23.47A.008 A3):** The Code requires street level street facing facades to be located within 10 feet of a street lot line. The applicant proposed the garage entrance be set back 13'-1" and 18'-10" from the street lot line.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from the street level setback. The Board noted that the garage entrance is flush with the building line from level two to the roof. The Board felt the flush facade provided a better architectural response than a projecting parking garage. The Board agreed that the garage and associated setback helped minimize the garage entrance rather than draw attention to it consistent with Design Review Guideline A-8, Parking and Vehicle Access. The Board recommended a condition of approval to provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural to further minimize the parking and driveway impacts to the adjacent pedestrian space.

- 5. Parking Screening and Landscaping (SMC 23.47A.016 B3m):** The Code requires an unenclosed parking garage on lots abutting a lot in a residential zone to provide 6 foot high screening and 5 feet deep landscape area. The applicant proposed to provide parking without the 1'-4" depth of landscape area.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from the parking screening requirements. The Board noted the parking was mostly below grade and the provided separation between the parking and the adjacent single family homes would minimize the impact of the parking on adjacent uses consistent with the intent of Design Review Guideline A-5, Respect for Adjacent Sites.

- 6. Setbacks (SMC 23.47A.014 B3):** The Code requires a 15 foot setback along any side or rear lot line that abuts a residential zone for portion of a structure above 13 feet in height. The applicant proposed a triangular encroachment in the setback area as demonstrated on Page 45 of the EDG packet.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from the setback requirement. The Board agreed that the building massing cant provided more than the required setback to the north adjacent to the single family residences. The Board felt the building massing met the intent of Design Review Guideline A-5, Respect for Adjacent Site and B-1, Height, Bulk and Scale.

- 7. Amenity Area (SMC 23.47A.024 B2):** The Code requires all amenity area to be located outside of the structure and not enclosed. The applicant proposed 44% of the required amenity area be located within the structure.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure to allow amenity area to be enclosed within the structure. The Board agreed the LIHI programming to create shared spaces within the building for community building for residents meets the intent of amenity space. The Board also noted locating the amenity space in exterior decks facing the street and within the building minimizes noise impacts to the single family homes along the west property line consistent with Design Guideline A-5, Respect for Adjacent Sites.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated September 22, 2014, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the September 22, 2014 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, three Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design. The Board recommends the following CONDITIONS (Authority referred in the letter and number in parenthesis):

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director's Analysis

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 held on September 22, 2014, the Board recommended approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. Add one additional light fixture (for a total of three) along the south property line to differentiate the café seating from the adjacent driveway (D-7).
2. Provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural (A-8).

Three members of the Northeast 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 three members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. 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.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Condition:

Condition:

1. Add one additional light fixture (for a total of three) along the south property line to differentiate the café seating from the adjacent driveway (D-7).

Master Use Permit sheet A1.0 has been updated to show three light bollards along the south property lien to differentiate the café seating area form the adjacent driveway.

2. Provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural (A-8).

DPD will require a condition to be satisfied prior to issuance of a building permit. Update the building permit plans to show the 32 foot wide decorate metal gate as one artistic piece so that when it is closed a cohesive mural is provided. The plans shall specify the artwork medium and form for the metal gate.

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 three members present at the decision meeting, provided additional review and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. 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.

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

SEPA ANALYSIS

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the Seattle State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), WAC 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated March 13, 2014. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed and annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant, reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file, and pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered.

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on April 16, 2014. Multiple comment letters were received.

Short Term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: temporary soil erosion; decreased air quality due to increased dust and other suspended air particulates during excavation, filling and transport of materials to and from the site; increased noise and vibration from construction operations and equipment; increased traffic and parking demand from construction personnel traveling to and from the work site; consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources; disruption of utilities serving the area; and conflict with normal pedestrian movement adjacent to the site. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment.

Noise – The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. These impacts would be especially adverse in the early morning, in the evening, and on weekends. The Seattle Noise Ordinance permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with construction and equipment. Properties located to the north and west of the site

include residential units and will be impacted by construction noise. The impacts including duration of construction noise in this area, and amount of noise-generating grading and construction activity warrant additional mitigation to reduce the impacts of construction noise on nearby residents.

To mitigate construction noise impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), the applicant submitted a Construction Management Plan with a noise mitigation element, which has been reviewed and approved by DPD. No further mitigation is warranted for construction noise impacts.

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 due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to specific environmental policies or the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665).

Long Term Impacts

Long term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result 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 and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; loss of plant and animal habitat; and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Drainage Code which requires on site detention of Stormwater with provisions for controlled tight line 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 and Design Review process 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, although some impacts warrant further discussion.

Greenhouse gas emissions - 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 due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to specific environmental policies or the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665).

Parking & Traffic - The project is expected to include 50 low-income housing units and the University District Food Bank. In addition to the residents, the residential portion of the project will have a resident manager who lives on the site and two to three other staff members who will provide supportive services to residents. Most residents of the site are not anticipated to own vehicles and instead would utilize bicycle and bus transportation. It is anticipated that staff will make fewer than 10 trips a day. University District Food Bank customers and volunteers largely travel to the food bank by walking, bicycling, or transit. Including customer and volunteer trips and van deliveries, it is expected that the Food Bank component of the project would generate roughly 60-80 daily trips. As these trips would be spread throughout the day, the transportation impacts of the facility at any one time would be small. No mitigation for project transportation impacts is warranted under SEPA.

The project is proposing to provide 10 on-site parking spaces. Data provided by the applicant indicate that parking demand generated by residential and food bank staff and delivery vans would fluctuate throughout the day, with the highest demand generally occurring between 9 AM and 5:30 PM. The peak estimated parking demand would be 9 vehicles, which could be accommodated by the proposed on-site parking stalls. No spillover parking is anticipated from staff and delivery vehicles associated with the project. As noted above, most residents of the low-income housing component of the project are not anticipated to own vehicles. Information from other LIHI projects that offer parking to residents indicates that well under half of residents in these projects use this parking. To the extent that a small number of residents would own vehicles, these vehicles would park on nearby streets, increasing on-street parking utilization. This increase in parking utilization is not expected to be significant. Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.M, there is no SEPA authority provided for mitigation of residential parking impacts in the University District Urban Center, within which this project is located.

Height, Bulk & Scale - The project went through a Design Review process which addressed the issue of Height, Bulk & Scale; see the above Design Review Analysis for details of the process and design changes.

Pursuant to SEPA Policy 25.05.675.G.2.c: Height, Bulk and Scale, “the Citywide Design Guidelines (and any Council-approved, neighborhood Design Guidelines) are intended to mitigate the same adverse height, bulk and scale impacts addressed in these policies. A project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review process is presumed to comply with the height, bulk and scale policies. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that height, bulk and scale impacts documented through environmental review have not been adequately mitigated. Any additional mitigation imposed by the decision maker pursuant to these height, bulk and scale policies that have undergone design review shall comply with the design guidelines applicable to the project.”

Additional SEPA Mitigation of height, bulk and scale is not warranted.

Historic Resources - The proposed development includes the demolition of an existing one story commercial building over 50 years old. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for potential impacts to historic resources, and indicated that the existing structures on site are unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (LPB 318/14).

The new proposed building is located adjacent to the University Library a City of Seattle landmark structure. In accordance with SMC 25.05.675 H2d Department of Neighborhoods has reviewed the proposed project to assess the impact of the project on the adjacent landmark. Based on the review of the Design Review Board Recommendation Meeting plan set, submitted

by Runberg Architecture Group, dated September 22, 2014, Department of Neighborhoods has determined no additional mitigation is necessary.

Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for historic preservation.

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 requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21.030(2) (c).

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

This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355 and Early review DNS process in SMC 25.05.355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

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

1. If the applicant intends to work outside of the limits of the hours of construction described in condition #2, a Construction Noise Management Plan shall be required, subject to review and approval by DPD, and prior to a demolition, grading, or building permit, whichever is issued first. The Plan shall include the specific mitigation, and may include additional proposed management of construction related noise, efforts to mitigate noise impacts, and community outreach efforts to allow people within the immediate area of the project to have opportunities to contact the site to express concern about noise. Elements of noise mitigation may be incorporated into any Construction Management Plans required to mitigate any short -term transportation impacts that result from the project.

During Construction

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

security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition. This condition may be modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, required prior to issuance of a building permit as noted in condition #1.

CONDITIONS - DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit

3. Update the building permit plans to show the 32 foot wide decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when it is closed a cohesive mural is provided. The plans shall specify the artwork medium and form for the metal gate.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

4. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).
5. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 10-2011, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

6. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

Signature: (signature on file) Date: December 29, 2014
Lindsay King, Senior Planner
Department of Planning and Development

LMK:rgc
K:\Decisions-Signed\3015818.docx

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

The appealable land use decision on your Master Use Permit (MUP) application has now been published. At the conclusion of the appeal period, your permit will be considered "approved for issuance". (If your decision is appealed, your permit will be considered "approved for issuance" on the fourth day following the City Hearing Examiner's decision.) Projects requiring a Council land use action shall be considered "approved for issuance" following the Council's decision.

The "approved for issuance" date marks the beginning of the **three year life** of the MUP approval, whether or not there are outstanding corrections to be made or pre-issuance conditions to be met. The permit must be issued by DPD within that three years or it will expire and be cancelled (SMC 23-76-028). (Projects with a shoreline component have a **two year life**. Additional information regarding the effective date of shoreline permits may be found at 23.60.074.)

All outstanding corrections must be made, any pre-issuance conditions met and all outstanding fees paid before the permit is issued. You will be notified when your permit has issued.

Questions regarding the issuance and expiration of your permit may be addressed to the Public Resource Center at prc@seattle.gov or to our message line at 206-684-8467.