



**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:** 3016093  
**Applicant Name:** Steve Bull, Workshop AD  
**Address of Proposal:** 7612 Aurora Avenue North

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS**

Land Use Application to allow a four-story, mixed-use building containing 34 residential units, 3,308 square feet of retail at ground level, 17 parking spaces in a below-grade garage and four at grade spaces. The existing building is to be demolished. Project also includes 2,300 cubic yards 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

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 July 3, 2014.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant proposes to design and construct a four-story, mixed use building with 34 residential units, 3,308 sq. ft. of retail space at ground level and 21 parking spaces consisting of 17 spaces located in a below-grade garage accessed from the alley and four enclosed spaces at-grade at the rear of the proposed building lining the alley.

The applicant presented three design options or alternatives at the Early Design Guidance meeting all of which represent variations on an internal courtyard scheme. Other commonalities of the three schemes include vehicular access from the alley, commercial uses fronting Aurora Ave., dwelling units on the upper three floors, and physical deference to the power lines at the corner of N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. and Aurora Ave. The building mass approaches the two streets and meets the north elevation of the St. Germain Foundation. The east façade sits slightly back from the alley. The three designs show a consistent approach to ensuring mostly glazed storefronts along the ground floor. In addition to a below grade garage, the three schemes provide at-grade parking off the alley.

Scheme A, “The Notch”, illustrates a subtraction from the upper corner building mass at the intersection of the two streets to ensure compliance with distance from the power lines. The design includes a primary residential entry on Aurora Ave., five foot projecting canopies above the commercial uses on Aurora, commercial uses extending along N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. and project balconies extending east toward the alley. The second scheme, “The Slice”, sets a portion of the north façade back from N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. and eliminates balconies from the east elevation. The upper building mass projects forward of the storefronts; the centrally located residential entry on Aurora provides a modest shelter for pedestrians. In this scheme the parking spaces directly facing the alley have doors to screen the vehicles.

In the “Inflected” scheme, Option C, the north wall cants away from the right of way at the Aurora and alley corners. The architect locates the primary residential entry at the mid-section of this façade opening to a grand staircase that eventually continues to the roof. The stairs lead to the courtyard that begins at the second floor. The inflection in the walls has several purposes: to accommodate the power line, to accentuate visually the corner at Aurora and to provide a larger pedestrian realm at the corner. The intention of the chamfer near the alley suggests deference to the larger setbacks in the single family neighborhood to the east. The scheme adds an at-grade live/work unit along N. 77<sup>th</sup> St closest to the alley. Canopies extend along both the west and north facades to cover a portion of the sidewalk. No balconies would overlook the east. A row of trees would modestly screen the open parking spaces adjacent to the alley. At this concept stage, the most unusual design characteristic is the chasm through the north elevation revealing a wide, even dramatic, staircase and courtyard visually open to the pedestrian.

By the Recommendation meeting, the architect had refined Scheme C with its inflected walls and raised, central courtyard.

## **SITE & VICINITY**

Located within the northwest portion of the Green Lake neighborhood, the 10,020 sq. ft. nearly square site fronting onto Aurora Avenue N. at the southeast corner of North 77<sup>th</sup> St. has a slight north to south declension of two to three feet. The property does not contain a mapped environmental critical area. The site houses a two-story wood framed commercial building constructed in 1925. Behind the structure, a small parking lot borders the alley.

The St. Germain Foundation, a religious organization, borders the subject site to the south. It possesses an ornate two-story entrance tower fronting Aurora and a larger horizontally oriented structure behind a parking lot. To the west across Aurora Ave lies a mix of single story commercial structures. On the northwest corner of Aurora and N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. is a single residential structure converted to a commercial use leading to the Greenwood/Phinney Ridge neighborhoods

beyond. Occupying the northwest corner across Aurora and N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. sits a motorcycle sales and service business. On the northeast corner of the intersection, a two-story structure houses a holistic center and Aikido operation. The building has commercial storefront windows and awnings along Aurora and a portion of N. 77<sup>th</sup>.

East of the alley, behind the subject property, a neighborhood of single family one and two story homes generally possess pitched roofs, raised front porches and generous front lawns. Two traffic calming bulbs extend into N. 77<sup>th</sup> St augmenting the amount of landscaping into the right of way. The side yard of one home borders the alley across from the subject site.

Aurora Ave N., SR 99, serves as a principal arterial connecting the west side of Seattle to the north and south beyond. The city has designated N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. as a local or non-arterial street. An adjacent alley and its T intersection lies to the east of the property.

The site possesses a zoning classification of Neighborhood Commercial Three with a 40 foot height limit (NC3 40). The NC3 40 zone flanks Aurora Ave N. from West Green Lake Dr. N. to N. 80<sup>th</sup>St, where it changes to a Commercial One zone with a 40 foot height limit (C1 4). In the immediate project vicinity, Single Family 5000 (SF 5000) embraces the Aurora corridor on the west and east.

## **ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW**

### **Public Comments**

Twenty-four members of the public affixed their names to the Early Design Review meeting sign-in sheet. Speakers raised the following issues:

#### Massing

- Terrace the rear of the structure away from the single family neighborhood.
- Four-story buildings will create a canyon on Aurora Ave.
- Avoid installing balconies on the east side. (mentioned by others)
- Set the structure further back from the alley.
- The building's shadow will shade the nearby single family homes. (mentioned by others)
- Residents of the building will be able to look down on the yards and houses of the neighbors. There won't be a sense of privacy.
- The images in the presentation booklet don't show the neighboring houses and the nearby one-story businesses. The one building shown is the St. Germain Foundation.
- Build a three-story rather than four-story structure.
- Reduce the massing to achieve a pleasing transition to the single family neighborhood.
- The building footprint is too large.
- Step back the building from the old Arabian Theater tower on the south side.
- Better integrate the stairs and elevators into the massing.
- Tier the building from both the east and west.

#### Aesthetics

- Don't make the building similar to the newer buildings in the Green Lake core which are unimaginative boxes.
- Tie the design elements to the scale and age of the neighborhood. Materials and other building elements should reflect the character of the neighborhood (mentioned by others).

- There is a need to improve Aurora. Place better materials on the front façade to attract a higher level of commercial tenants.
- The building is too monolithic looking.
- Add bays and other architectural elements to provide variety.
- Use the craftsman style detailing from the nearby homes as inspiration.
- The building should have a visual conversation with the nearby homes.

#### Programming

- Don't place the roof top open space amenity near the single family homes.
- Keep the commercial side of the building on Aurora. Don't place a commercial use on N. 77<sup>th</sup> St.
- The overhead canopies may attract undesirable behavior.
- Ensure the privacy of the neighbors by careful window placement.

#### Alley

- The project will double the number of people using the alley.
- Access to the garage is too close to the T intersection created by the two alleys and the nearby home.
- There is not enough information on how the solid waste is transferred. Do not allow garbage trucks to block the alley
- PCC trucks park in the alley.
- During construction do not allow trucks to park in the alley.
- There are concerns about bottlenecks occurring in the alley.
- The alley is used as a PCC driveway.
- People use the alley to turn around.
- Vehicles will cause damage to the building and the proposed trees on the alley.

#### Parking

- The building won't have adequate parking.
- Do not grant the departure from screening of the parking.
- Do not grant the departure to decrease the width of the parking stalls.
- The alley is not wide enough. The trees on the alley will be taken out by drivers and they won't survive.
- There are Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) concerns with the open parking facing the alley. It won't be safe.

#### Streets and Safety

- It is difficult to cross Winona Ave N.
- Children use N. 77<sup>th</sup> Ave to bike to Daniel Bagley Elementary and its school buses.
- N. 77<sup>th</sup> and Aurora is a challenging corner.
- N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. is a bike corridor.
- Traffic barriers on the streets exacerbate the line-up of vehicles.

#### Other

- The project will devalue the adjacent homes.
- Pay attention to the adjacent building during construction.
- Consider the impact of the project on the neighbors.
- Option C is preferred.

- Because of the bus lane on Aurora, the trees in the right of way will not likely survive.
- This proposal will change the feel of the community.

DPD received several letters and emails from neighbors concerned with the project. Some of the authors reiterated several issues outlined above this paragraph. Issues identified in the emails included noise impacts, parking spillover into the neighborhood, alley traffic, the size of the dwelling units, limits on commercial development, and building bulk. Other concerns are shadow impacts, privacy and the legitimacy of the departure requests.

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

##### **Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

**A continuous street wall is an important design consideration within Green Lake’s commercial and mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented areas.**

- **Aurora Avenue North: A continuous street wall is less of a consideration on Aurora Avenue N, where numerous parking lots punctuate the streetscape. In this area, a more pleasant and consistent streetscape can be achieved by reinforcing the rhythm of alternating buildings and well-landscaped vehicle access areas. Parking lots should be placed at the rear and to the sides of buildings, and the buildings should be located near the street. Parking lot landscaping and screening are particularly important in improving the appearance of the Aurora Avenue North corridor.**
- **Multifamily Residential Areas: Landscaping in the required front setbacks of new multifamily development is an important siting and design consideration to help reinforce desirable streetscape continuity.**

The Board indicates its satisfaction with the design direction in terms of streetscape compatibility. See guidance for A-4.

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

The location of the residential entrance on N. 77<sup>th</sup> St met with approval. The intriguing opening to the courtyard on the north elevation met with Board enthusiasm.

Meet security concerns by designing an attractive entry gate.

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Pedestrian activity is a high priority in the Green Lake business areas. It is recognized, however, that within commercial zones, the appropriateness of traditional storefronts may depend upon location, adjacent properties and the type of street on which the development fronts. In the case of a mixed-use building, for example, at the intersection of an arterial and a residential street, it might be more appropriate to place non-storefront commercial facades on the quieter residential street. In such cases, the following can contribute to a commercial facade that exhibits a character and presence that achieves a sensitive transition from commercial to residential uses:**

- **slightly less transparency than a standard storefront window;**
- **recessed entries;**
- **landscaping along the building base and entry; and**
- **minimized glare from exterior lighting.**

The transition between the Aurora commercial corridor and the quiet residential neighborhood requires landscaping sensitive to pedestrian movement and expressive of the greater changes along the N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. right of way. The type of use or program and its placement along the street ought to reinforce this transition. Detailing and materials along the ground floor should respond to the transition between zones.

- 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.**

The presence of the St. Germaine Foundation's ornate tower did not suggest to the Board the need for a setback or some architectural recognition of it.

Locate the roof top open space away from the building's east side to ensure reduced noise and privacy for the neighbors.

- 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.**

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Residential Buildings: Residences on the ground floor should be raised for residents' privacy, if allowed by site conditions. Well landscaped, shallow front yard setbacks are also typical and appropriate.**
- **Mixed-Use Buildings: For mixed-use buildings with residential units over commercial ground floor uses, consider locating the primary residential entry on the side street rather than in the main commercial area. This maintains a continuous commercial storefront while increasing privacy for the residential units.**

The Board expects the design of an attractive gate at the primary residential entrance on N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. The openness or transparency between the pedestrian realm and the courtyard/circulation system at the center of the building appealed to the Board.

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

**The Design Review Board may reduce the amount of open space required by the Land Use Code if the project substantially contributes to the objectives of the guideline by:**

- **Creating a substantial courtyard-style open space (see sketch below) that is visually accessible to the public and that extends to the public realm.**
- **Setting back development to improve a view corridor.**
- **Setting upper stories of buildings back to provide solar access and/or to reduce impacts on neighboring single-family residences.**
- **Providing open space within the streetscape or other public rights-of-way contiguous with the site. Such public spaces should be large enough to include streetscape amenities that encourage gathering. For example, a curb bulb with outdoor seating adjacent to active retail would be acceptable.**

The two significant residential open spaces, the courtyard and the roof top terrace, lacked concept landscape plans. In order to reduce noise and privacy impacts on the neighbors, locate the roof top open space away from the east side of the structure. Future drawings presented at the Recommendation meeting should show cross sections illustrating the relationship between the roof top open space and the single family neighbors.

Develop landscape plans for the courtyard and the roof top for the MUP application submittal.

**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.**

Given the neighbors' concern about the project's impacts upon the alley, the transportation impact analysis should study the choice of location along the alley for the garage entrance. Is the proposed access at the south end of the property near the T-intersection the safest location? By the Recommendation meeting the applicant ought to have a rationale for the most appropriate location.

The applicant will also need to show the mechanics of parking on the alley. Illustrating turning radii and how the alley is utilized by the neighbors and the proposal will be helpful in evaluating the departures.

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

The Green Lake neighborhood specific guidelines do not call out this corner at Aurora Ave and N. 77<sup>th</sup> St for special treatment. The inflection or chamfering of the north wall, in essence, acknowledges the corner in a subtle manner as well as accommodates the power lines.

## **B. Height, Bulk and Scale**

**B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility.** Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to 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.

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

Some properties adjacent to Green Lake's Neighborhood Commercial areas are zoned single-family, but have a small portion zoned Neighborhood Commercial. In general, these properties can only be developed with single-family houses. In such cases where a property with more-intensive zoning is adjacent to a property that contains such split zoning, the following design techniques are encouraged to improve the transition to the split-zoned lot:

- Building setbacks similar to those specified in the Land Use Code for zone edges where a proposed development project within a more intensive zone abuts a lower intensive zone.
- Techniques specified in the Citywide Design Guidelines A-5 and B-1.

Along a zone edge without an alley, consider additional methods that help reduce the potential 'looming' effect of a much larger structure in proximity to smaller, existing buildings.

- One possibility is allowing the proposed structure's ground floor to be built to the property line and significantly stepping back the upper levels from the adjacent building (see sketch below). The building wall at the property line should be designed in a manner sympathetic to the existing structure(s), particularly regarding privacy and aesthetic issues.

The four-story height of the proposal did not trouble the Board. However, the massing toward the alley needs to recognize the single family zone and the neighborhood. The Board purposefully did not indicate specific techniques to reduce the building bulk leaving the architect to find a suitable approach to the change in zones.

The lack of shadow studies became evident at the meeting. Studies should be provided at the Recommendation meeting.

## **C. Architectural Elements and Materials**

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Distinct Architectural Themes and Styles:** Aurora Avenue North Corridor - Recognize Aurora's 1920-1950 commercial character while making the area more friendly to the pedestrian.
- **Signage:** The design and placement of signs plays an important role in the visual character and identity of the community. While regulatory sign review is not in

**the purview of design review, integration with the overall architectural expression of a building and appropriate scale and orientation are important design considerations.**

**Franchises should not be given exceptions to these guidelines. Except within the Aurora Avenue North corridor, signage should be oriented to pedestrians.**

- **Facade Articulation: Multi-family residential structures - The façade articulation of new multifamily residential buildings (notably in Lowrise zones) should be compatible with the surrounding single-family architectural context. Neighborhood commercial structures - Modulation in the street-fronting façade of a mixed-use structure is less important when an appropriate level of details is present to break up the facade.**

This guidance provides a general direction to the applicant. The Board did not elaborate on specific techniques or styles for relating to both the Aurora corridor and the adjacent single family homes preferring to see more developed façades at the Recommendation meeting.

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

The overall concept or parti illustrated in Option C met with the Board's support. The enchanting spatial quality of the interior should inspire the street and alley facades.

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

Good material choices detailed well begin to provide the sense of human scale needed at the transition between the commercial qualities of Aurora Ave and the adjacent single family neighborhood.

- 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.**

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Special material requirements and recommendations**
  1. **Metal siding**
  2. **Masonry units**
  3. **Wood siding and shingles**
- **Discouraged Materials**
  1. **Mirrored glass**
  2. **Sprayed-on finish**

The architect must present a colors and materials board at the Recommendation meeting. Include a color photo of the board in the booklet. The Board did not discuss specific or desirable materials.

**D. Pedestrian Environment**

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Make Aurora More Pedestrian Friendly:** Although Aurora Avenue North is likely to retain its automobile-oriented character, new development should make the entire Aurora corridor more friendly to pedestrians by encouraging: Street-fronting entries, Pedestrian-oriented facades and spaces and overhead weather protection.
- **Streetscape amenities:** New developments are encouraged to work with the Design Review Board and interested citizens to provide features that enhance the public realm. The Board would be willing to consider a departure in open space requirements if the project proponent provides an acceptable plan from, but not limited to: curb bulbs adjacent to active retail spaces, pedestrian-oriented street lighting, and street furniture.

Explicitly addressing this guideline in the building design ought to produce a project sensitive to the transition between the neighborhood commercial zone and the single family neighborhood.

**D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures.** The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.

Responding to citizen concern, the Board noted the problematic nature of open parking spaces on the alley. The addition of trees along the alley may act as a transition in the larger sense between the building mass and the single family neighborhood; however, the large maw and security concerns warrant the need for an enclosure of the parking at the alley.

**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.

Given the narrowness of the alley, the Board inquired whether the applicant expected that garbage trucks would park in the alley on pick-up day. The traffic and parking study should investigate whether blocking traffic in the alley will create problems.

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

The presence of Aurora and the undesirable behaviors that occur on the strip warrant extra effort at ensuring the safety and security of the building residents/tenants and

customers as well as the neighbors. The Board recommended enclosing the at-grade parking.

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

The design of the building corner at the alley needs to preserve sight lines for safety and security as well as introduce the transition between commercial and residential zones. Discussion focused on the appropriateness of a live/work unit at this location.

**D-9 Commercial Signage. Signs should add interest to the street front environment and should be appropriate for the scale and character desired in the area.**

The applicant will need to provide a concept signage plan for the Recommendation meeting.

**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.**

Create a concept lighting plan for the exterior of the structure. Ensure shielded lighting in the alley.

**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.**

The concept drawings presented at the EDG convey the architect's desire for extensive glazing at the storefronts.

**D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions. 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.**

The primacy of the residential entry on N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. acknowledges the transition in zones and establishes the intriguing connection between the pedestrian at the sidewalk and the second floor open space (courtyard)/circulation system (grand steps) intrinsic to the building parti or organizing idea. The gate and the framing of the aperture into the structure must be aesthetically pleasing, functional and consistent with the building concept. This four-story opening, which connects interior and exterior, represents the structure's sine qua non as it supports the horizontal movement from commercial to residential zones and the vertical circulation up and through the building.

**E. Landscaping**

**E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.**

**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.**

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Celebrate the Olmsted heritage: Green Lake Park, Ravenna Boulevard and Lower Woodland Park are visible and accessible examples of the Olmsted brothers' design. New development should build on this character by employing informal groupings of large and small trees and shrubs. A mix of deciduous, evergreen, and ornamental plant materials is appropriate. Continuous rows of street trees contrasting with the informal, asymmetric landscaping of open spaces are also typical.**

The survival of proposed trees planted along the alley generated skepticism among the public and the Board. The board members, however, did not dismiss the idea. A recently constructed project at 19<sup>th</sup> and Mercer has a similar row of trees dividing the parking spaces at the alley.

Quality landscaping along Aurora and N. 77<sup>th</sup> St will greatly enhance the commercial corridor and produce a pleasant transition between Aurora and the neighborhood to the east.

## **MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION**

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with Design Review and SEPA components on June 4, 2014.

## **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

The Design Review Board conducted a Final Recommendation Meeting on November 17, 2014 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 Comment**

Three individuals affixed their names to the Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. Speakers raised the following issues:

- Adding garage access from the alley isn't safe. There is considerable pedestrian traffic, especially children walking to and from school. Move the access to Aurora Ave or further north on the alley. The proposed garage access nearly lines up with the east/west bound alley creating poor sight lines especially with the adjacent building.
- Drivers will use the alley for high speed access to the nearby streets.

- The project does not contain enough parking spaces to accommodate the number of tenants. Tenants and their guests will park on overly crowded streets. (Mentioned several times by others.)
- The multiple metal garage doors will make too much noise.
- The proposal diminishes or kills the unique character of Aurora Ave. This project will be harmful to the neighborhood.
- Ensure that the roof top amenity area is kept away from the alley and the neighbors.
- There are too many windows on the east elevation to ensure the privacy of the neighbors.
- N. 77<sup>th</sup> St is a preferred bike lane.
- Ensure a sufficient amount of bike parking.
- Neighbors were sent the wrong meeting notice.
- The building has nice attributes.
- The notion of community established by the courtyard is confusing.

DPD received numerous letters discussing most of the issues above including the location of the parking garage ramp, the insufficiency of parking spaces, the building bulk, and noise impacts.

#### **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](#).

#### **A Site Planning**

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

**A continuous street wall is an important design consideration within Green Lake's commercial and mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented areas.**

- **Aurora Avenue North: A continuous street wall is less of a consideration on Aurora Avenue N, where numerous parking lots punctuate the streetscape. In this area, a more pleasant and consistent streetscape can be achieved by reinforcing the rhythm of alternating buildings and well-landscaped vehicle access areas. Parking lots should be placed at the rear and to the sides of buildings, and the buildings should be located near the street. Parking lot landscaping and screening are particularly important in improving the appearance of the Aurora Avenue North corridor.**
- **Multifamily Residential Areas: Landscaping in the required front setbacks of new multifamily development is an important siting and design consideration to help reinforce desirable streetscape continuity.**

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

The picket fence type gate at the primary residential entry into the building appealed to the Board; however, rather than just a single door opening into the foyer, add double doors for the full breadth of the opening.

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Pedestrian activity is a high priority in the Green Lake business areas. It is recognized, however, that within commercial zones, the appropriateness of traditional storefronts may depend upon location, adjacent properties and the type of street on which the development fronts. In the case of a mixed-use building, for example, at the intersection of an arterial and a residential street, it might be more appropriate to place non-storefront commercial facades on the quieter residential street. In such cases, the following can contribute to a commercial facade that exhibits a character and presence that achieves a sensitive transition from commercial to residential uses:**

- slightly less transparency than a standard storefront window;
- recessed entries;
- landscaping along the building base and entry; and
- minimized glare from exterior lighting.

**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.**

Ensure that the location of the roof top amenity area remains in the same location as shown in the Recommendation booklet (p. 32). The habitable area of the deck should not advance or expand toward the eastern property line. This will help to reduce noise and privacy impacts upon the neighbors to the east.

**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.**

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Residential Buildings:** Residences on the ground floor should be raised for residents' privacy, if allowed by site conditions. Well landscaped, shallow front yard setbacks are also typical and appropriate.
- **Mixed-Use Buildings:** For mixed-use buildings with residential units over commercial ground floor uses, consider locating the primary residential entry on the side street rather than in the main commercial area. This maintains a continuous commercial storefront while increasing privacy for the residential units.

See guidance A-3.

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

The Design Review Board may reduce the amount of open space required by the Land Use Code if the project substantially contributes to the objectives of the guideline by:

- **Creating a substantial courtyard-style open space (see sketch below) that is visually accessible to the public and that extends to the public realm.**
- **Setting back development to improve a view corridor.**
- **Setting upper stories of buildings back to provide solar access and/or to reduce impacts on neighboring single-family residences.**
- **Providing open space within the streetscape or other public rights-of-way contiguous with the site. Such public spaces should be large enough to include streetscape amenities that encourage gathering. For example, a curb bulb with outdoor seating adjacent to active retail would be acceptable.**

At the EDG meeting, the Board asked the applicant to locate the roof top open space away from the east side of the structure in order to reduce noise and privacy impacts on the neighbors. The Board noted its satisfaction with the roof deck's location and sought to ensure that the applicant not move the deck closer to the roof's eastern edge. (See guidance A-5.)

**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.**

See Board guidance for D-8.

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

The architect reduces the visual impact of the northeast corner by wrapping a raised planter around the corner, setting the structure back from the alley property line and angling the wall of the street level corner unit. The extent of glazing helps visually to reduce the building bulk.

## **B. Height, Bulk and Scale**

**B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to 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.**

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

**Some properties adjacent to Green Lake's Neighborhood Commercial areas are zoned single-family, but have a small portion zoned Neighborhood Commercial. In general, these properties can only be developed with single-family houses. In such cases where a property with more-intensive zoning is adjacent to a property that contains such split zoning, the following design techniques are encouraged to improve the transition to the split-zoned lot:**

- **Building setbacks similar to those specified in the Land Use Code for zone edges where a proposed development project within a more intensive zone abuts a lower intensive zone.**

- **Techniques specified in the Citywide Design Guidelines A-5 and B-1.**  
Along a zone edge without an alley, consider additional methods that help reduce the potential ‘looming’ effect of a much larger structure in proximity to smaller, existing buildings.
- **One possibility is allowing the proposed structure’s ground floor to be built to the property line and significantly stepping back the upper levels from the adjacent building (see sketch below). The building wall at the property line should be designed in a manner sympathetic to the existing structure(s), particularly regarding privacy and aesthetic issues.**

The Board praised the overall design intent. The project exhibits a sensitivity toward the neighborhood to the east by setting back from the property line and by the use of landscape at the northeast corner to create a restrained yet potentially sophisticated façade.

## **C. Architectural Elements and Materials**

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Distinct Architectural Themes and Styles: Aurora Avenue North Corridor - Recognize Aurora’s 1920-1950 commercial character while making the area more friendly to the pedestrian.**
- **Signage: The design and placement of signs plays an important role in the visual character and identity of the community. While regulatory sign review is not in the purview of design review, integration with the overall architectural expression of a building and appropriate scale and orientation are important design considerations.**  
Franchises should not be given exceptions to these guidelines. Except within the Aurora Avenue North corridor, signage should be oriented to pedestrians.
- **Facade Articulation: Multi-family residential structures - The façade articulation of new multifamily residential buildings (notably in Lowrise zones) should be compatible with the surrounding single-family architectural context. Neighborhood commercial structures - Modulation in the street-fronting façade of a mixed-use structure is less important when an appropriate level of details is present to break up the facade.**

**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.**

Overall the Board appreciated the architect’s ability to realize the strong concept presented at the EDG meeting. The design exhibits both restraint and complexity, avoiding an overreliance on multiple colors and excessive shifts in the vertical planes.

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

The mix of wood and concrete finishes, the angled walls and the layering of materials produces a scale that relates to both the pedestrian and the vehicular oriented Aurora corridor at the same time.

**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.**

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Special material requirements and recommendations**
  1. **Metal siding**
  2. **Masonry units**
  3. **Wood siding and shingles**
- **Discouraged Materials**
  1. **Mirrored glass**
  2. **Sprayed-on finish**

**D. Pedestrian Environment**

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

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Make Aurora More Pedestrian Friendly:** Although Aurora Avenue North is likely to retain its automobile-oriented character, new development should make the entire Aurora corridor more friendly to pedestrians by encouraging: Street-fronting entries, Pedestrian-oriented facades and spaces and overhead weather protection.
- **Streetscape amenities:** New developments are encouraged to work with the Design Review Board and interested citizens to provide features that enhance the public realm. The Board would be willing to consider a departure in open space requirements if the project proponent provides an acceptable plan from, but not limited to: curb bulbs adjacent to active retail spaces, pedestrian-oriented street lighting, and street furniture.

**D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures. The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.**

Based on public comment during the EDG meeting, the applicant added roll-up doors in front of the alley parking spaces. The Board recommended installing sound dampening devices on the doors to reduce the noise impacts on the neighbors to the east.

- 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.**

See guidance for D-5.

The Board encouraged the expansion of bicycle storage for the project.

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

Dwelling units on the east side of the three upper floors have a small niche or exterior foyer between their doors and the walkways. The design poses potential security concerns. Redesign the residential entries in these locations to either widen the nooks in the courtyard or eliminate the solid wall enclosing the niche to provide improved visibility.

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

After listening to public comment, staff input and reviewing drawings of vehicle movement in the alley, the Board recommended adding a mirror at the garage entry to ensure greater safety in the alley.

- D-9 Commercial Signage. Signs should add interest to the street front environment and should be appropriate for the scale and character desired in the area.**

The applicant provided a concept signage plan at the Recommendation meeting. The Board did not comment on it.

- 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.**

The applicant submitted a concept lighting plan for the exterior of the structure that included lighting in the alley. The Board did not comment on the effort.

- 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.**

- D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions. 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.**

Deliberation focused on the merits of the residential unit and the raised planter fronting N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. The corner unit with its wrap around planter, angled walls and mix of concrete and wood exterior provides an appropriate transition to the single family

neighborhood to the east and endows the project with a charmingly idiosyncratic character.

**E. Landscaping**

**E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.**

**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.**

**Green Lake-specific supplemental guidance:**

- **Celebrate the Olmsted heritage: Green Lake Park, Ravenna Boulevard and Lower Woodland Park are visible and accessible examples of the Olmsted brothers’ design. New development should build on this character by employing informal groupings of large and small trees and shrubs. A mix of deciduous, evergreen, and ornamental plant materials is appropriate. Continuous rows of street trees contrasting with the informal, asymmetric landscaping of open spaces are also typical.**

Discussion focused on the viability of the plantings beneath the canopy at the northeast corner. Installing irrigation would be one of several techniques to ensure that the plants thrive.

**Board Recommendations:** The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the November 17th, 2014 meeting. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plans and other drawings available at the November 17th public meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the four Design Review Board members present unanimously recommended approval of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below).

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION	RECOMMEND-ATION
1. Residential Uses at Street Level SMC 23.47A.008D.2	Residential uses located along a street-level street facing façade shall have a prominent pedestrian entry and the floor of a dwelling unit located along the street level street facing façade shall be at least 4’ above or below sidewalk grade or set back at least 10’ from the sidewalk.	Allow the floor of a sidewalk level dwelling unit to be located at sidewalk grade and less than 10’ from the sidewalk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Design of the dwelling unit and the raised planter at the streetscape create an inviting corner transition to the residential neighborhood beyond the alley.</li> </ul>	Approved

2. Setback Requirements. SMC 23.47A.014B.3.b	For each portion of a structure above 40' in height, additional setback at the rate of 2' for every 10' of height.	Maintain 15' setback at portions of the structure above 40'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed design maintains the continuity of the east façade.</li> </ul>	Approved
3. Parapet Extension Above Height Limit SMC 23.47A.12C.7.f	Non-firewall parapets shall be located at least 10' from the north edge of the roof unless a shadow diagram is provided that demonstrates that locating a non-firewall parapet with 10 of the north edge of the roof would not shade property to the north on Jan. 21 <sup>st</sup> at noon more than would a structure build to the maximum permitted height and FAR	Allow a non-firewall parapet to extend 25.5 inches above the height limit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The parapet mitigates views from the roof top deck to the adjacent single family neighborhood.</li> <li>▪ Maintains a consistent building roof form on all facades.</li> </ul>	Approved
4. Screening Surface Parking Areas SMC 23.47A.016D.1.c.2	Surface parking abutting or across an alley from a lot in a residential zone must have 6' high screening along the abutting lot line and a 5' deep landscaped area inside the screening.	Allow parking spaces adjacent to the alley and within the proposed structure with each stall to have direct ingress/egress from the alley.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides convenient parking for commercial uses.</li> <li>▪ Three trees proposed near the alley between parking spaces will act as a screen for the larger building mass.</li> </ul>	Approved

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

- 1) Add double doors at the primary residential entry on N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. for the full breadth of the opening. (A-3)
- 2) Ensure that the location of the roof top amenity area remains the same distance from the east property line as shown in the Recommendation booklet (p. 32). (A-5, A-7)
- 3) Add sound dampening devices to the garage doors to reduce the noise impacts generated by the metal doors on the neighbors to the east. (D-5).
- 4) Redesign the residential entries on the east side units of the three upper floors either to widen the nooks in the courtyard or to eliminate the solid wall enclosing the niche. This should ensure improved visibility. (D-7)
- 5) Add a mirror at the garage entrance to ensure greater pedestrian and vehicular safety in the alley. (D-8)

**DIRECTOR’S ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW**

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

## **DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW**

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

## **ANALYSIS - SEPA**

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated June 2, 2014. 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 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. Although there is adjacency to residential uses, the Noise Ordinance is found to be adequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts.

### *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. Excavation will consist of an estimated 2,300 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 2,300 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 230 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 115 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 existing building on the subject site was 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 individual landmarks.

### Traffic and Transportation

The applicant submitted a traffic and parking study by Gibson Traffic Consultants, Inc documenting the likely transportation and parking impacts from the project. The project's 34 dwelling units and small retail space is forecast to generate approximately nearly 300 daily vehicle trips. However, with the demise of the existing retail building, the project's contribution would be a total of 10 daily vehicles beyond what the existing building does or could generate. At the PM peak hour, the proposal will generate a net total of approximately four new trips. Vehicle access for both the commercial and residential components of the project would occur directly from the alley, which will be widened by two feet. DPD does not anticipate that the impacts to level of service on nearby streets would be significant. No SEPA mitigation of traffic impacts to the nearby intersections is warranted.

### Parking

Based on the applicant's proposed 34 dwelling units, the estimated parking demand rate is 24 spaces. The proposed development would generate an estimated demand of 24 vehicles on a weekday. The proposed parking supply is 17 vehicles on the site for residents. As a result, parking spillover of seven vehicles onto neighborhood streets is anticipated. The neighborhood streets has the capacity in the evenings, when demand is highest, to accommodate the parking demand generated by the proposal.

The parking demand for the retail space (3,308 sq. ft.) is anticipated to be approximately six vehicles. The applicant would supply four spaces at-grade directly behind the building. During the day, the streets would be capable of accommodating the parking spillover of two vehicles.

No SEPA mitigation of parking impacts is warranted.

### 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 MUP Issuance*

#### Revise plan sets to show:

1. Add double doors at the primary residential entry on N. 77<sup>th</sup> St. for the full breadth of the opening.
2. Ensure that the location of the roof top amenity area remains the same distance from the east property line as shown in the Recommendation booklet (p. 32).
3. Redesign the residential entries on the east side units of the three upper floors either to widen the nooks in the courtyard or to eliminate the solid wall enclosing the niche. This should ensure improved visibility.

### *Prior to Commencement of Construction*

4. 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 a Certificate of Occupancy*

5. Add a mirror at the garage entrance to ensure greater pedestrian and vehicular safety in the alley.
6. Add sound dampening devices to the garage doors to reduce the noise impacts generated by the metal doors on the neighbors to the east.
7. 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

8. 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

9. Provide a construction worker parking plan to reduce on-street parking.

During Construction

10. 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: January 26, 2015  
Bruce P. Rips, AAIA, AICP  
Department of Planning and Development

BPR:rgc  
K:\Decisions-Signed\3016093.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](mailto:prc@seattle.gov) or to our message line at 206-684-8467.