



### **Current Development**

The subject site is located on the northwest corner of E Howell Street and 15th Avenue. The site consists of two lots, each containing a 4-plex multifamily structure. The site is mostly flat but is elevated from the E Howell Street sidewalk where an existing 2-6 foot rockery is located. Three very large, mature street trees are located within the E Howell Street planting strip. While street trees exist in each planting strip, SDOT has stated the 22” Douglas Fir, 20” Western Red Cedar and the 24” Austrian Pine must be maintained through future development. 15th Avenue is designated as a minor arterial street. The site is also located within the Capitol Hill Urban Center designation.

Vehicular and pedestrian access is available from E Howell Street and 15th Avenue.

### **Surrounding Development**

The neighborhood is characterized by small single family homes, low- and mid-rise apartment and condominium buildings, most of which date from the early to mid-twentieth century. Older buildings on 15th Avenue are typically 3-4 story brick structures, while later buildings tend to be wood frame or concrete structures, ranging from 3-4 stories. Recent developments are typically wood frame buildings, 3-4 stories in height. Most of these buildings occupy only one or two parcels, creating a fairly consistent scale of development throughout the neighborhood. Many of the existing buildings are set back from the street and from adjacent property lines, while others, particularly larger buildings, are built out to their property lines. Brick is the most common cladding material, particularly in older buildings, while later buildings are clad in a variety of materials including wood, brick and concrete masonry.

## **I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW**

### **EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: July 30, 2014**

The Early Design Guidance (EDG) Design Proposal booklet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number at this website:  
<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/upcomingreviews/>

The booklet is also available to view in the DPD 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](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Multiple members of the public attended this Early Design Review meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Expressed concerned about the potential noise impacts of the proposed rooftop deck.
- Felt design option A and B do not do enough to save the street trees on E Howell Street.

- Noted there is substantial separation between buildings on E Howell Street. Felt the proposed building should respect the existing spatial context.
- Felt option A provided the better response to the E Howell Street context.
- Felt the larger façade should be oriented towards 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Felt option A was preferable for a number of reasons including providing a courtyard, the ground level green space, and orienting the longer façade toward 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Expressed concern about a 40 foot tall façade facing the west. Noted the new façade will be substantially larger than the existing building.
- Noted option A could be modified to provide a larger setback to the north if necessary.
- Would like to see a smaller building that matches the height of the existing structures.
- Preferred a mix of housing unit sizes to encourage varied demographics.
- Would like to see an architectural design that fits within the neighborhood.
- Felt bicycle storage should be as friendly and usable as possible to make it encouraging for residents.
- Felt the material and color choices should be appropriate for the earthy, eclectic neighborhood.
- Would like to see basement units removed and parking provided.
- Expressed concern about construction impacts on adjacent neighbors and streets. Would like additional information submitted at MUP stage of review showing the truck travel routes.

## **FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: January 28, 2015**

### **DESIGN PROPOSAL**

The Recommendation #1 Design Proposal booklet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number at this website:

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design\\_Review\\_Program/Project\\_Reviews/Reports/default.asp](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp).

The booklet is also available to view in the DPD 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](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the design had evolved to include a symmetrical U-shaped building configuration with a central courtyard. The building footprint was shifted northward to avoid compromising the health of the mature street trees. The material palette included brick on three of the four exterior elevations and fiber cement panels in several tones on the north and interior facades, as well as the uppermost portion of all elevations. The large windows were black vinyl the metal accents (building numbers, Juliette railings, etc.) a black/dark charcoal color. The courtyard was elevated approximately four feet above sidewalk and all of the setback areas heavily planted to provide buffering in this semi public/private space.

## PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY

The following public comments were offered at the Recommendation meeting:

- Felt the building is too large with too many units for the neighborhood.
- Supported the proposed design and the set back from the sidewalk, as well as the location of the bike room.

## 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.

### EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE (July 30, 2014)

#### 1. Massing and Building Location

The Board felt Massing Option A provided the better design solution by locating a south facing courtyard space on E Howell Street. The Board felt option A should move forward to MUP submittal with the following guidance:

- a) The Board noted many benefits of Massing Option A which included:
  - i) A more sympathetic façade for the E Howell Street (CS-A2, CS-B3, DC2-A).
  - ii) A strong street wall on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave (CS2-A2,DC2-A).
  - iii) Inclusion of a south facing courtyard (CS-B2, PL1-A2, DC2-A, DC3-I-ii).
  - iv) Locating amenity space at ground level rather than a rooftop deck, lowering the overall height of the structure (PL1-A2, DC2-A).
- b) The Board was not concerned with the reduced north setback of Option A, noting the provided setback is consistent with the setback provided by the existing structure to the north (DC2-A).
- c) The Board did note that Massing Option A should include an appropriate corner treatment consistent with the existing context (CS2-C).
- d) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested window overlay diagrams for the building to the north and west. The Board noted the facades facing adjacent residential structures should be designed to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings (CS2-D5).
- e) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested site sections beyond the property line, to include the buildings next door to the north and west (CS2-D4 and D5).

**2. E Howell Street Right-of-Way Street Trees.** The Board noted the street trees on E Howell Street are exceptional specimens and great care should be taken with site and building design to maintain the street trees.

- a) The Board felt the final massing location and setbacks should be resolved to support the future long term survival of the street trees within the E Howell right-of-way. The Board did support slight changes to the massing to accomplish this goal (CS2-D, DC3-I-v).
- b) The Board expressed support for maintaining the existing smaller Hawthorne within the E Howell Street right-of-way, but recognizes SDOT will make the final decision (DC3-I-v).

**3. Courtyard.** The Board felt the south facing courtyard provides a great opportunity for public visual amenity. The Board also notes the courtyard is consistent with the Capitol Hill vernacular. The Board noted that Massing Option A was not the preferred option and that substantial work was necessary to further develop the site and building design.

- a) The Board felt the façade facing E Howell Street should be treated to encourage a friendly, neighborly street character (CS2-A1 and A2, CS2-I, CSA3-I-iv, DC2-A, C and D).
- b) The Board noted they were particularly interested in a successful transition from the sidewalk to the primary entry. At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board would like to see a study of the entry sequence for the pedestrians and bicycles entering the site. The Board noted this transition study should inform an appropriate location for the primary residential entry (CS2-B, CS2-II, PL2-I and II, DC2-D, DC3-A).
- c) The Board did not give specific guidance on the design for the front entry, but felt that a front porch gesture could further the neighborly character of the building and courtyard space (PL2).
- d) The Board expressed support for integrating bike parking entry and storage location into the overall flow of the building. The Board noted that locating bike parking near the front entry would help encourage use by residents (PL4-B).
- e) At the Recommendation Meeting the Board requested character sketches and detailed renderings of the courtyard space (DC3-B, DC3-I-i-vii).
- f) The Board felt the applicant should consider reducing exterior circulation walkways by locating doors for corner units to reclaim walkway as interior space (DC2-A).

#### **4. Materials**

- a) The Board encouraged use of durable, quality materials respectful of the existing materiality context of the established Capitol Hill neighborhood (CS3-A1 and A4, CS3-I-iv, DC4-II).
- b) The Board noted that this is not an appropriate location for bright color materials but is most appropriate for materials that express characteristics of the local neighborhood character (DC4-II).
- c) The Board requested the applicant demonstrate at the Recommendation meeting how the chosen materials will express connection and form in application (DC4-A).

#### **FINAL RECOMMENDATION (January 28, 2015)**

The Board was very pleased with the proposed design and its progression since the last meeting. The Board agreed that the design was attractive and contemporary, while including significant respect to the neighborhood character. The material palette featured a predominance of high quality brick and expansive glazing, along with significant ground level landscape vegetation. In addition to these features, the Board also agreed that the design provided a responsiveness to the context with the courtyard configuration and setbacks to preserve the Exceptional street trees and respect neighboring properties.

The Board offered further guidance on the following items:

##### **1. North Elevation.**

- a. The Board was pleased that the fenestration of the north elevation was configured to minimize direct lines of sight into the windows of the neighboring property.

- b. The Board was concerned that the design of the north façade was too flat and monotonous in color. (CS2-A-2, CD2-A-2)
      - i. The Board recommended that the light color shown as Heron Plume be replaced with the darker tone shown as Urban Bronze, already included along the top section of this elevation. See pages 23 and 24 in the presentation packet.
      - ii. The Board also noted that if the applicant decided to change the fiber-cement panel to brick along this elevation that would be considered a very satisfactory and welcome change.
2. **South Elevation.** The Board was very pleased with the courtyard configuration and materiality. However, they recommended that the light color, shown as Heron Plume, be adjusted to a warmer, more muted tone of grey to create less contrast from dark grey and brick tones, and distract emphasis away from the brick materiality. (DC4-I)
3. **Materials.** The Board discussed the two versions of brick color shown in the packet: a monochromatic burgundy color versus a variegated brick blend mix. While the renderings showed a variegated pattern, the material board included only the solid burgundy. The Board saw compelling arguments to each palette option and recommended the design team to explore both palettes with the Planner to avoid an institutional appearance, while recognizing the contemporary design within the more traditional neighborhood context. (CS3-A-1, CS3-A-4, CS3-I-iv)
4. **Architectural Details.** In order to provide a more to provide a more consistent palette of architectural details, the Board recommended the following.
  - a. The Board recommended that the exterior light fixtures be a dark bronze color, rather than the silver color (shown on page 28) to match the windows, bollards and other lighting fixtures. (PL2-III-I, DC4-II-i)
  - b. The Board recommended that the vents shown on all elevations be colored to match the building field color in which they are located. (DC4-II-i)
5. **Bike Storage.** The appearance and functionality of the bike storage room in such close proximity to the main residential entrance created a few contemplated by the Board. The Board is interested in promoting usability and security of this space and suggested providing direct access from the vestibule to the bike storage room, rather than from the entry lobby. (PL4-B-2)
6. **Landscape Design.** The Board was very pleased with several landscape design elements, shown on page 19, including:
  - a. The two seating benches shown in the courtyard;
  - b. The formality of the courtyard landscaping that harkens to a more traditional, formal, symmetrical design;
  - c. The preservation of the three large Exceptional street trees;
  - d. The increased dimensions of the front and side setback areas;
  - e. The generously planted landscape buffers provided on all sides of the site.

## DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

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](#).

## CONTEXT & SITE

**CS1 Natural Systems and Site Features: Use natural systems/features of the site and its surroundings as a starting point for project design.**

### **CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation**

**CS1-B-1. Sun and Wind:** Take advantage of solar exposure and natural ventilation. Use local wind patterns and solar gain to reduce the need for mechanical ventilation and heating where possible.

**CS1-B-2. Daylight and Shading:** Maximize daylight for interior and exterior spaces and minimize shading on adjacent sites through the placement and/or design of structures on site.

**CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.**

### **CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood**

**CS2-A-1. Sense of Place:** Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists, and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

**CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence:** Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

### **CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces**

**CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street:** Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm.

**CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space:** Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

### **CS2-C Relationship to the Block**

**CS2-C-1. Corner Sites:** Corner sites can serve as gateways or focal points; both require careful detailing at the first three floors due to their high visibility from two or more streets and long distances.

### **CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale**

**CS2-D-4. Massing Choices:** Strive for a successful transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone.

**CS2-D-5. Respect for Adjacent Sites:** Respect adjacent properties with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings.

### ***Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:***

#### **CS2-I Streetscape Compatibility**

**CS2-I-ii. Street Trees:** Provide street trees with tree grates or in planter strips

**CS2-I-iii. Entrances:** Vehicles entrances to buildings should not dominate the streetscape

**CS2-I-v. Multiple Frontages:** For buildings that span a block and “front” on two streets, each street frontage should receive individual and detailed site planning and architectural design treatments.

#### **CS2-II Corner Lots**

**CS2-II-i. Residential Entries:** Incorporate residential entries and special landscaping into corner lots by setting the structure back from the property lines.

### **CS2-III Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility**

**CS2-III-i. Building Mass:** Break up building mass by incorporating different façade treatments to give the impression of multiple, small-scale buildings, in keeping with the established development pattern.

**CS2-III-ii. Views:** Consider existing views to downtown Seattle, the Space Needle, Elliott Bay and the Olympic Mountains, and incorporate site and building design features that may help to preserve those views from public rights-of-way.

**CS2-III-iii. Sunlight:** Design new buildings to maximize the amount of sunshine on adjacent sidewalks throughout the year.

### **CS3 Architectural Context and Character: Contribute to the architectural character of the neighborhood.**

#### **CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes**

**CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together:** Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

**CS3-A-4. Evolving Neighborhoods:** In neighborhoods where architectural character is evolving or otherwise in transition, explore ways for new development to establish a positive and desirable context for others to build upon in the future.

#### *Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:*

#### **CS3-I Architectural Concept and Consistency**

**CS3-I-iv. Materials:** Use materials and design that are compatible with the structures in the vicinity if those represent the neighborhood character.

## **PUBLIC LIFE**

### **PL1 Connectivity: Complement and contribute to the network of open spaces around the site and the connections among them.**

#### **PL1-A Network of Open Spaces**

**PL1-A-1. Enhancing Open Space:** Design the building and open spaces to positively contribute to a broader network of open spaces throughout the neighborhood.

**PL1-A-2. Adding to Public Life:** Seek opportunities to foster human interaction through an increase in the size and quality of project-related open space available for public life.

### **PL2 Walkability: Create a safe and comfortable walking environment that is easy to navigate and well-connected to existing pedestrian walkways and features.**

#### **PL2-B Safety and Security**

**PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street:** Create a safe environment by providing lines of sight and encouraging natural surveillance.

**PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety:** Provide lighting at sufficient lumen intensities and scales, including pathway illumination, pedestrian and entry lighting, and/or security lights.

**PL2-B-3. Street-Level Transparency:** Ensure transparency of street-level uses (for uses such as nonresidential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

#### *Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:*

#### **PL2-I Human Scale**

**PL2-I-i. Building Entries:** Incorporate building entry treatments that are arched or framed in a manner that welcomes people and protects them from the elements and emphasizes the building's architecture.

**PL2-I-ii. Pedestrian Character:** Improve and support pedestrian-orientation by using components such as: non-reflective storefront windows and transoms; pedestrian-scaled awnings; architectural detailing on the first floor; and detailing at the roof line.

**PL2-II Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances**

**PL2-II-i. Entryways:** Provide entryways that link the building to the surrounding landscape.

**PL2-III Personal Safety and Security**

**PL2-III-i. Lighting/Windows:** Consider

- a. pedestrian-scale lighting, but prevent light spillover onto adjacent properties
- b. architectural lighting to complement the architecture of the structure
- c. transparent windows allowing views into and out of the structure—thus incorporating the “eyes on the street” design approach.

**PL4 Active Transportation: Incorporate design features that facilitate active forms of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and use of transit.**

**PL4-B Planning Ahead for Bicyclists**

**PL4-B-2. Bike Facilities:** Facilities such as bike racks and storage, bike share stations, shower facilities and lockers for bicyclists should be located to maximize convenience, security, and safety.

**PL4-B-3. Bike Connections:** Facilitate connections to bicycle trails and infrastructure around and beyond the project.

**DESIGN CONCEPT**

**DC2 Architectural Concept: Develop an architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings.**

**DC2-A Massing**

**DC2-A-1. Site Characteristics and Uses:** Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

**DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass:** Use secondary architectural elements to reduce the perceived mass of larger projects.

**DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features**

**DC2-C-3. Fit With Neighboring Buildings:** Use design elements to achieve a successful fit between a building and its neighbors.

**DC2-D Scale and Texture**

**DC2-D-1. Human Scale:** Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building facades, entries, retaining walls, courtyards, and exterior spaces in a manner that is consistent with the overall architectural concept

**DC2-D-2. Texture:** Design the character of the building, as expressed in the form, scale, and materials, to strive for a fine-grained scale, or “texture,” particularly at the street level and other areas where pedestrians predominate.

**DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the building design so that they complement each other.**

**DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship**

**DC3-A-1. Interior/Exterior Fit:** Develop an open space concept in conjunction with the architectural concept to ensure that interior and exterior spaces relate well to each other and support the functions of the development.

**DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities**

**DC3-B-4. Multifamily Open Space:** Design common and private open spaces in multifamily projects for use by all residents to encourage physical activity and social interaction.

**Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:**

**DC3-I Residential Open Space**

**DC3-I-i. Open Space:** Incorporate quasi-public open space with residential development, with special focus on corner landscape treatments and courtyard entries.

**DC3-I-ii. Courtyards:** Create substantial courtyard-style open space that is visually accessible to the public view.

**DC3-I-iii. View Corridors:** Set back development where appropriate to preserve view corridors.

**DC3-I-iv. Upper-floor Setbacks:** Set back upper floors to provide solar access to the sidewalk and/or neighboring properties.

**DC3-I-v. Street Trees:** Mature street trees have a high value to the neighborhood and departures from development standards that an arborist determines would impair the health of a mature tree are discouraged.

**DC3-I-vi. Landscape Materials:** Use landscape materials that are sustainable, requiring minimal irrigation or fertilizer.

**DC3-I-vii. Porous Paving:** Use porous paving materials to enhance design while also minimizing stormwater run-off.

**DC3-II Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions**

**DC3-II-ii. Mature Street Trees:** Supplement/complement existing mature street trees

**DC4 Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.**

**DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes**

**DC4-A-1. 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.

**DC4-A-2. Climate Appropriateness:** Select durable and attractive materials that will age well in Seattle's climate, taking special care to detail corners, edges, and transitions.

**DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials**

**DC4-D-4. Place Making:** Create a landscape design that helps define spaces with significant elements such as trees.

**Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:**

**DC4-I Height, Bulk, and Scale**

**DC4-I-i. Materials:** Masonry and terra cotta are preferred building materials, although other materials may be used in ways that are compatible with these more traditional materials. The Broadway Market is an example of a development that blends well with its surroundings and includes a mixture of materials, including masonry.

**DC4-II Exterior Finish Materials**

**DC4-II-i. 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.

1. Use wood shingles or board and batten siding on residential structures.
2. Avoid wood or metal siding materials on commercial structures.
3. Provide operable windows, especially on storefronts.
4. Use materials that are consistent with the existing or intended neighborhood character, including brick, cast stone, architectural stone, terracotta details, and concrete that incorporates texture and color.

5. Consider each building as a high-quality, long-term addition to the neighborhood; exterior design and materials should exhibit permanence and quality appropriate to the Capitol Hill neighborhood.
6. The use of applied foam ornamentation and EIFS (Exterior Insulation & Finish System) is discouraged, especially on ground level locations.

## **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

At the time of the Recommendation Meeting, one departure was requested.

1. **Building Width (SMC 23.45.527).** The Code requires a maximum combined length of facades within 15 feet of a lot line to not exceed 65% of the length of that lot line. The lot line is 122.49 feet long; 65% of this dimension is 79.6 feet.

The proposed design requested to increase the structure length to 90 feet, 7.5 inches (74%).

The Board recommended unanimously in favor of the departure request as the development of the design included a courtyard with comfortably proportioned dimensions, which was preferred by the Board at the EDG meeting. Furthermore, the building footprint was shifted to maintain distance from the existing Exceptional street trees on Howell Street for their protection (DC3-I-V) and provide wider setbacks from the neighbors to the north (CS2-D-5).

## **BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

At the conclusion of the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board recommended approval of the project with conditions.

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, January 28, 2015, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, January 28, 2015 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures with the following conditions:

1. On the north elevation, the light color shown as Heron Plume be replaced with the darker tone shown as Urban Bronze.
2. On the south elevation, the light color, shown as Heron Plume, be adjusted to a warmer, more muted tone of grey.
3. Explore with the Planner both brick palettes (monochromatic versus variegate) to avoid an institutional appearance, while recognizing the contemporary design within the more traditional neighborhood context.
4. The exterior light fixtures should be a dark bronze color, rather than the silver color (shown on page 28) to match the windows, bollards and other lighting fixtures.
5. The vents shown on all elevations should be colored to match the building field color in which they are located.

## 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 January 28, 2015, the Board recommended approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. On the north elevation, the light color shown as Heron Plume be replaced with the darker tone shown as Urban Bronze.
2. On the south elevation, the light color, shown as Heron Plume, be adjusted to a warmer, more muted tone of grey.
3. Explore with the Planner both brick palettes (monochromatic versus variegate) to avoid an institutional appearance, while recognizing the contemporary design within the more traditional neighborhood context.
4. The exterior light fixtures should be a dark bronze color, rather than the silver color (shown on page 28) to match the windows, bollards and other lighting fixtures.
5. The vents shown on all elevations should be colored to match the building field color in which they are located.

Four members of the East Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project's overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board's recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3). The Director agrees with and accepts the conditions recommended by the Board that further augment the selected Guidelines.

Following the Recommendation meeting, DPD staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board. The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. 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 Design Review Board Recommendation Conditions:**

1. The light color on the north elevation shown as Heron Plume has been modified to Urban Bronze.
2. The light color on the south elevation shown as Heron Plume has been modified to Mindful Grey, a warmer, more muted color.
3. The applicant proposed the use of a brick blend mix, Red Varitone, which was approved by the Land Use Planner.
4. The exterior light fixtures have been modified to the same dark bronze used for the windows and other lighting fixtures.
5. The vents has been modified on all facades to match the field color of the wall on which they are located.

The Director is satisfied that all of the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

**DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW**

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.

**II. ANALYSIS - SEPA**

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated 8/21/2014. The Department of Planning and Development (DPD) has annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the project file submitted by the applicant or it's agents; and any pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information, and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

City codes and/or ordinances apply to the proposal and will provide mitigation for short and or/long term impacts. Applicable codes may include the following: *Stormwater Code* (SMC 22.800-808); *Grading Code* (SMC 22.170), *Street Use Ordinance* (SMC Title 15), *Seattle Building Code*; *Regulations for Environmentally Critical Areas* (SMC 25.09); and *Noise Control Ordinance* (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. Washington State Department of Ecology regulations require mitigation of significant environmental contamination impacts, consistent with Model Toxics Control Act requirements. Under such limitations/circumstances, mitigation can be considered.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The SEPA public comment period ended September 21, 2014. In addition to the comments received through the Design Review process, numerous other comments were received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to parking, shadows, density, height, tree retention, and impacts to existing utilities and public services. Comments were also received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis per SMC 25.05.

A. 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. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinance will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment.

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.

Construction Parking and Traffic

The area includes limited and timed or metered on-street parking. Additional parking demand from construction vehicles would be expected to further exacerbate the supply of on-street parking. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities.

The site is located adjacent to a the 15<sup>th</sup> Ave arterial and near several other arterials and side streets that are often congested, especially at peak travel hours. Construction vehicles can further exacerbate existing traffic congestions, especially during peak travel hours.

To mitigate construction parking impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), a Construction Management Plan for parking and truck haul routes is required.

The Construction Management Parking portion of the plan shall demonstrate the location of the site, the peak number of construction workers on site during construction, the location of nearby parking lots that are identified for potential pay parking for construction workers, the number of stalls per parking lot identified, and a plan to reduce the number of construction workers driving to the site. This plan is subject to review and approval by the DPD Land Use Planner.

The Construction Haul Route portion of the plan shall identify haul routes and written approval of the haul routes from Seattle Department of Transportation.

Construction 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, east, and south of the site include residential units and will be impacted by construction noise.

The Pike Pine area of Capitol Hill is experiencing prolonged periods of construction noise from successive and numerous development activities in the immediate vicinity of the site. The combined impacts, 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.

The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance are therefore not sufficient to mitigate noise impacts at this particular site; therefore, pursuant to SEPA authority, the applicant shall be required to limit periods of construction activities (including but not limited to grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) to non-holiday weekdays from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM, unless modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, to be determined by DPD prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit, whichever is issued first.

**B. LONG –TERM IMPACTS**

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: greenhouse gas emissions; parking; potential blockage of designated sites from the Scenic Routes nearby; possible increased traffic in the area. Compliance with 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, greenhouse gas emissions; views from scenic routes; height, bulk and scale; traffic and transportation; and parking impacts warrant further analysis.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project construction 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, therefore, no further mitigation is warranted.

Parking and Traffic

The applicant submitted traffic and parking study information, including two reports (“1420 & 1426 E Howell St, Seattle WA, Multi-Family Residential Development” by William Pop Associates, December 2 2014; and “Parking Utilization Study Addendum for 1420 E Howell St”, by William Pop Associates, March 26, 2015). The reports indicates that the proposed development is expect to generate a net total of 103 daily vehicle trips, with 10 net new PM Peak Hour trips. The report indicated that these additional trips will not have significant impacts on the level of service at nearby intersections.

The traffic information has been reviewed by DPD and no significant adverse impacts have been identified. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

The reports also indicate that a peak parking demand of 20 parking stalls is expected. The study also notes that the project is in close proximity to existing bicycle and bus facilities, as well as the Capitol Hill Light Rail Station and street car lines currently under development.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that no SEPA authority is provided to mitigate parking impacts of development within the Capitol Hill Urban Center. The subject site is located within that Urban Center.

### 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 Preservation

The existing structure on site is more than 50 years old. Seattle Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the existing structure and determined that it is not likely to be eligible for historic landmark designation (Landmarks Preservation Board letter, reference number LPB 768/14). No further mitigation is warranted for historic preservation impacts to the existing structures on site.

## **DECISION - STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)**

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination 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.

### **SEPA - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

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

1. The applicant shall provide a copy of a Construction Haul Route, approved by Seattle Department of Transportation.
2. A Construction Parking Plan, approved by the Land Use Planner ([katy.haima@seattle.gov](mailto:katy.haima@seattle.gov)), shall be required.
3. If the applicant intends to work outside of the limits of the hours of construction described in condition #4, 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 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*

4. 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 #3.
5. The applicant or their contractor will ensure that open and safe pedestrian routes adjacent to the site are maintained in a manner approved by SDOT. A SDOT determination that this requirement is not feasible during a period or periods of construction will temporarily override this Condition.

### **DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

#### *Prior to Certificate of Occupancy*

6. 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 (Katy Haima, [katy.haima@seattle.gov](mailto:katy.haima@seattle.gov)).

7. 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 (Katy Haima, [katy.haima@seattle.gov](mailto:katy.haima@seattle.gov)).

*For the Life of the Project*

8. 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 (Katy Haima, [katy.haima@seattle.gov](mailto:katy.haima@seattle.gov)).

Signature: retagonzales-cunneutabby for \_\_\_\_\_ Date: July 20, 2015  
Katy Haima  
Land Use Planner  
Department of Planning and Development

KH:rgc  
K:\Decisions-Signed\3017142.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.