



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 & DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3017563
Applicant Name: Davis Sachs, Clark Design Group for Toulouse Children Partnership
Address of Proposal: 2134 Western Avenue

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow an 8-story structure containing 152 residential units above 5,934 sq. ft. of retail space. Parking for 153 vehicles to be provided below grade.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review pursuant to Chapter 23.41, Seattle Municipal Code, with Departures:

Development Standard Departure from residential setback requirements.
(SMC 23.49.166.A.1.)

Development Standard Departure from building length and width.
(SMC 23.49.164)

SEPA – Environmental Determination – Chapter 25.05, Seattle Municipal Code.

DPD SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-Significance

- No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.
- Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.06.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts.

Site Zone: Downtown Mixed Residential/Commercial 85-65 (DMR/C 85/65).

Nearby Zones: Across the alley to the 'east' is a DMR/R 85/65 zone. One block to the south is the PMM-85 zone of Pike Place Market. Further towards the waterfront the zone changes to DH2/85.

Lot Area: 21,600 square feet.

Environmentally Critical Areas: None.



Access: The site is bordered by Western Ave to the west, Blanchard St to the north and an improved alley to the east.

Current Development: The site is currently occupied by surface parking.

Surrounding Development: Across Blanchard Street from the site is the four-story brick clad, Union Stables building which has been designated as a Landmark was recently renovated into office and commercial space. Across the alley is a 33 story condo development with 124 units, built in 1981 and a single story retail structure built in 1926. Directly south of the site are two, two-story brick commercial buildings, the closest constructed in 1902 and the other constructed in 1923. At the corner of Western Ave and Lenora St. is an eight-story mixed use development with 43 residential units built in 2001. Across Western Ave is a triangular block configured due to the terminus intersection of Elliot Ave and Western Ave at Lenora St. The block is developed with a 1989 built, glass clad, seven-story mixed use building that house 9 residential and commercial condo units

Neighborhood Character: The Belltown site is located close to the southern boundary of Belltown and the northern edge of Pike Place Market. Approximately 200' to the southwest of the site is elevated state highway 99 which is scheduled to be relocated underground in the near future. Further southwest is the BN RR railroad tracks, a hotel, Alaskan Way and the Bell Harbor marina. From Western Ave to 1st Ave, Blanchard St. climbs about 34'. The elevation change separates busy 1st Ave from the less active section of Western Ave. The architectural character of the surrounding blocks includes many fine examples of early 19th century brick and masonry construction. Developments that occurred in the 1970's and 1980's are much larger and taller and of varying styles, than the older 1 to 4 story building and more recent development. Interspersed between the old and new building are a few surface parking lots.

Project Description: The proposed structure will have 7 stories of residential units over a ground level along Western Ave with 5,656 sq. ft. of retail space and the residential pedestrian lobby located at the corner of Western Ave and Blanchard St. Approx. 16,300 cubic yards of excavation is proposed.

Open space for the residents will be provided on a landscaped amenity terrace roof deck along the northern portion of the 7th floor. Seven units on the 3rd floor will access to a courtyard at the 'back' of the structure.

DESIGN REVIEW

INITIAL EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: July 29, 2014

The packet presented at the EDG meeting is available online by entering the project number (3017563) at this website:

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

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Stated they would prefer to see a curb cut from Blanchard St. instead of Western Ave.
- Encouraged more parking be provided.
- Concerned about the bulk of the proposed development.
- Did not support departures from required setbacks.
- Encouraged the Board to consider the impact of the proposed development on the outdoors amenity space of the existing development to the east.
- Encouraged the design team to take into consideration the location of the existing roof top features on the development to the west when locating roof top features on this project.
- Supported setbacks along the alley.
- Encouraged the design team to be sensitive to the existing outdoors amenity space on the development to the east.

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.

INITIAL EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE:

1. **Building Massing:** The Board noted that the three options presented were similar. The code compliant option has setbacks and reduced mass at the two upper stories above 65'. Both of the other options showed a similar massing with a unified floor plate size for all the residential levels. The Board directed the applicant to return for a second EDG meeting and provide two different code compliant options. (A1, B1, B2, B3, E1)
 - a. Consider notching the corners at the upper levels. (B2)
 - b. The Board advised shifting of the setbacks to be more sympathetic to the surrounding neighborhood. (A1.1)

- c. The Board noted they preferred the scale of the mixed use development at the corner of Lenora St. and Western Ave and advised the applicant to study its massing for cues on how to diminish the overall height, bulk and scale of this project. (B3.2, B3.1)
2. **Relationship to the Existing Development to the East:** The Board encouraged the applicant to consider the impact the proposed development will have on the outdoor amenity deck and alley functions of the existing development east of the alley. Study how the massing with the required setbacks and with the requested departures will impact the existing structure. (A1.I, B1.1, B1.I, C6.I, C6.III)
 - a. The Board advised shifting of the setbacks to be more sympathetic to the surrounding structures. (A1.1)
 - b. Attention needs to be given to the design and appearance of the upper stories along the alley. (C6.III)
 - c. Consider the location of nearby existing outdoors deck/roof amenity areas when located similar uses on the roof. (A1.I)
 - d. Study the relationship of the proposed garage entry in the alley to the existing entries of the development to the east. (C6.1)
3. **Streetscape and Uses:** The Board noted they would prefer to see all parking accessed off the alley even if it means a narrower depth of the live/work and retail spaces along Western Ave. They would like to see further study of how the corner location of the residential lobby would look and work, and debated if overhead weather protection should be provide along Blanchard St. The Board gave the following guidance on the landscaping, uses and design of the street-facing street level. (C1, D2.1, D3.II, E1)
 - a. Retail spaces and the area outside them should be designed so the use can spill out onto the sidewalk; avoid landscaping in this area. (C1.2)
 - b. Plan and design the live/work spaces with a retail character and to be easily adaptable to retail in the future. (C1)
 - c. Study how the corner will look with green street details such as a curb bulb and trees. (D3.1 & 2, D3.II)
 - d. Provide ‘compelling’ landscaping to replace the existing trees to be removed.
 - e. Provide trees on Blanchard St. (D2.1)
 - f. Bike parking needs to be considered. (C1)

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: October 14, 2014

The packet presented at the Initial Recommendation meeting is available online by entering the project number (3017563) at this website:

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

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Supported the preferred option.
- Supported the location of the upper massing of the proposal.
- Encouraged a lower penthouse on the roof.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After considering the context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following design guidance.

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE:

- 1. Massing and Concept:** The Board was supportive of the direction of the design but expressed concerns about the overall scale and mass of the building. They noted that the bays projecting from the Western Ave. façade increased the perception of building mass even with the massing reduction at the upper levels. The Board provided the following guidance. (A1.1, B1, B2.2, B3)
 - a. Separate the two upper levels from the lower massing with a subtle shifting, or use of materials to help mitigate the perceived height. (B2.2)
 - b. Carefully consider the treatment of the upper levels, consider a ‘brow’ at the top of the lower floors as a separating element. (B2.2;
 - c. Along Western Ave, decrease the height of the vertical bays to better relate to the existing massing along Western Avenue. (B1.I, B3.I)
 - d. Design the building to have a distinct base, middle and top. (B4.1, B4.2)
 - e. Study the language of punched opening and a consistent wrapping of nearby older buildings. (B3.I)
 - f. Maintain the 20’ upper level setback from the north lot line at Blanchard St. (A1.I)
 - g. Along Blanchard St. consider ‘punches’ in the bays or provide balconies instead. (B4.2)
- 2. Materials and Façade Detailing:** The Board did not support the use of brick or one consistent color for the elevations and expressed the building doesn’t need to be historic looking. The Board felt that materials should be used wisely and that a more limited color palette should be used discretely. (B1.III, B4.3)
 - a. Consider the use of metal as the only façade material above the base. (B4.3)
 - b. Use materials and colors to make the floor lines disappear. (B4.3)
 - c. Simplify the elevations; the materials should read more consistently to avoid a ‘plaid’ patterning. (B4.3)
 - d. Use the warmer and darker colors from the proposed color palette, as the warm and cooler colors as shown don’t work well together. (B4.3)
 - e. Consider guard rails on the upper balconies. (B4.3)
 - f. Provide form lines in the cast in place concrete podium wall along Blanchard St. Carry the concrete around the corner and hold the podium line. (C3.1)

- g. Provide details of the overhead canopy including materials, thickness and detailing. (C4.1)
 - h. Consider a solid material for the soffit along Western Ave. (C4.1)
 - i. The Board would be supportive of the use of fiber cement board in the courtyard off the alley, but only as an option for cost saving if needed. (B4.3)
3. **Street Level Design:** The Board directed the applicant to obtain the most current plans for the proposed Waterfront Master Plan and Rt. 99 tunnel realignment. Study the proposed configuration and landscaping design along Western Ave. and use the plan to inform the ground level design. The Board encouraged the widening off the sidewalk along Western Ave and advised the applicant to work with SDOT about possibilities to move the curb. (A1.2, D2.2, C1.1)
- a. Study the best way to activate the street and design a more meaningful outdoors space. (C1.1, C1.2)
 - b. Consider either larger, unsymmetrical, or no recesses along the Western Ave street level. (C1.1, C1.2, C1.3)
 - c. Consider operable windows or doors at grade to provide for outdoor seating along Western Ave. (C1.V, C1.2)
 - d. Design the placement of landscaping and pavers along Western to avoid a continuous strip. C1.III)
 - e. Provide details of the ground level metal screen along Blanchard St. (C3.1, D2.1)

RECOMMENDATION MEETING: April 21, 2015

The packet presented at the Final Recommendation meeting is available online by entering the project number (3017563) at this website:

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

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

- Supported the design as a beautiful building, but is concerned about the use of the alley. Would like a loading area provided in the project so trucks won't block alley.
- Supported the departures and design of the structure. Concerned about loading and unloading in the alley, wants a management plan for use of the alley.
- Supported the design review process as a nice building has been designed, however is concerned about traffic in the alley. Questioned how waste collection and pick-up will work.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After considering the context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following design guidance.

RECOMMENDATION GUIDANCE:

1. **Massing and Materials:** At the Second EDG, meeting the Board had expressed concerns about the overall scale and mass of the building and provided guidance (see above). At the Recommendation meeting the Board was not in agreement that the design had responded enough to the guidance given. They did note that removing the bay windows from the 7th story was a step in the right direction and acknowledged that locating the two upper stories along Western Ave was due to setting back at the northeast corner to respect the open space of Continental Place, east of the alley. After discussion, the Board gave further guidance to reduce the perception of mass and to treat the three sections of the facades, (lower two stories, the middle four stories with the bay windows and the two upper stories) differently. (A1.I, B1, B2.2, B4)
 - a. The contrast of the light colored bays to the darker background makes the bays pop-out. Use the same material color on the bays and the flat portion of the elevations. (B4.3)
 - b. Design a 'dark' middle section and a lighter upper section. Some texture or accent color is acceptable. (B4.3)
 - c. Wrap the darker middle section around to Blanchard St. (B4.3)
 - d. Provide subtle shifts of the same tone of color so any horizontal bands on the Blanchard St facade disappear. (B4.3)
 - e. The top section is visually busy, and should be simplified to make it quieter. (B4.3)
 - f. Simplify the elevations to create a more elegant effect. (B4.3)
2. **Street-Level:** The Board commented that the street front design along Western Ave has been articulated well and made the following recommendations: (B3.1, B4.3, C1.3)
 - a. Use fir or another cooler colored wood at the underside of the canopy. (B4.3, C1.3)
 - b. Remove the vertical screen near the residential entry on Western Ave and expose the concrete. (B4.3, C1.3)
 - c. Study the current lighting in the alley and provide lighting if needed. (D6.1)
3. **North Screen Wall:** The Board questioned why the glass of the lobby didn't extend further up Blanchard St. but did express that having residential decks above the screen wall on Blanchard St. would activate the street. The Board was concerned that people would climb the screen wall and dogs would use the low planter. (A1.III, C3.1, D2.1, D3.II, D6.1) The Board asked the applicant to consider the following:
 - a. Raise the planter or the use of tiered planters, designed to discourage use by dogs and sitting on. (C3.1, D2.1)
 - b. Do a careful study of the design on the planter and wall to ensure the vitality of the plantings and security for the residents. (C3.1, D6.1)
 - c. Consider adding lighting to make the landscaping and screen wall attractive without creating light pollution. (C3.1, D2.1)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Downtown and Belltown guidelines identified by the Board as Priority Guidelines are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

SITE PLANNING AND MASSING

A1 Respond to the Physical Environment: Develop an architectural concept and compose the building's massing in response to geographic conditions and patterns of urban form found nearby or beyond the immediate context of the building site.

A1.1. Response to Context: Each building site lies within a larger physical context having various and distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Develop an architectural concept and arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

- a. a change in street grid alignment that yields a site having nonstandard shape;
- b. a site having dramatic topography or contrasting edge conditions;
- c. patterns of urban form, such as nearby buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;
- d. access to direct sunlight—seasonally or at particular times of day;
- e. views from the site of noteworthy structures or natural features, (i.e.: the Space Needle, Smith Tower, port facilities, Puget Sound, Mount Rainier, the Olympic Mountains);
- f. views of the site from other parts of the city or region; and
- g. proximity to a regional transportation corridor (the monorail, light rail, freight rail, major arterial, state highway, ferry routes, bicycle trail, etc.).

A1.2. Response to Planning Efforts: Some areas downtown are transitional environments, where existing development patterns are likely to change. In these areas, respond to the urban form goals of current planning efforts, being cognizant that new development will establish the context to which future development will respond.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

A1.I. Views: Develop the architectural concept and arrange the building mass to enhance views. This includes views of the water and mountains, and noteworthy structures such as the Space Needle.

A1.II. Street Grid: The architecture and building mass should respond to sites having nonstandard shapes. There are several changes in the street grid alignment in Belltown, resulting in triangular sites and chamfered corners. Examples of this include: 1st, Western and Elliott between Battery and Lenora, and along Denny;

A1.III. Topography: The topography of the neighborhood lends to its unique character. Design buildings to take advantage of this condition as an opportunity, rather than a constraint. Along the streets, single entry, blank facades are discouraged. Consider providing multiple entries and windows at street level on sloping streets.

ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

B1 Respond to the neighborhood context: Develop an architectural concept and compose the major building elements to reinforce desirable urban features existing in the surrounding neighborhood.

B1.1. Adjacent Features and Networks: Each building site lies within an urban neighborhood context having distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

- a. a surrounding district of distinct and noteworthy character;
- b. an adjacent landmark or noteworthy building;
- c. a major public amenity or institution nearby;
- d. neighboring buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;
- e. elements of the pedestrian network nearby, (i.e.: green street, hillclimb, mid-block crossing, through-block passageway); and
- f. direct access to one or more components of the regional transportation system.

B1.2. Land Uses: Also, consider the design implications of the predominant land uses in the area surrounding the site.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

B1.I. Compatible Design: Establish a harmonious transition between newer and older buildings. Compatible design should respect the scale, massing and materials of adjacent buildings and landscape.

B1.II. Historic Style: Complement the architectural character of an adjacent historic building or area; however, imitation of historical styles is discouraged. References to period architecture should be interpreted in a contemporary manner.

B1.III. Visual Interest: Design visually attractive buildings that add richness and variety to Belltown, including creative contemporary architectural solutions.

B1.IV. Reinforce Neighborhood Qualities: Employ design strategies and incorporate architectural elements that reinforce Belltown's unique qualities. In particular, the neighborhood's best buildings tend to support an active street life.

B2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale: Compose the massing of the building to create a transition to the height, bulk, and scale of development in nearby less-intensive zones.

B2.1. Analyzing Height, Bulk, and Scale: Factors to consider in analyzing potential height, bulk, and scale impacts include:

- a. topographic relationships;
- b. distance from a less intensive zone edge;
- c. differences in development standards between abutting zones (allowable building height, width, lot coverage, etc.);
- d. effect of site size and shape;
- e. height, bulk, and scale relationships resulting from lot orientation (e.g., back lot line to back lot line vs back lot line to side lot line); and

- f. type and amount of separation between lots in the different zones (e.g. , separation by only a property line, by an alley or street, or by other physical features such as grade changes); g. street grid or platting orientations.

B2.2. Compatibility with Nearby Buildings: In some cases, careful siting and design treatment may be sufficient to achieve reasonable transition and mitigation of height, bulk, and scale impacts. Some techniques for achieving compatibility are as follows:

- h. use of architectural style, details (such as roof lines, beltcourses, cornices, or fenestration), color, or materials that derive from the less intensive zone.
- i. architectural massing of building components; and
- j. responding to topographic conditions in ways that minimize impacts on neighboring development, such as by stepping a project down the hillside.

B2.3. Reduction of Bulk: In some cases, reductions in the actual bulk and scale of the proposed structure may be necessary in order to mitigate adverse impacts and achieve an acceptable level of compatibility. Some techniques which can be used in these cases include:

- k. articulating the building's facades vertically or horizontally in intervals that reflect to existing structures or platting pattern;
- l. increasing building setbacks from the zone edge at ground level;
- m. reducing the bulk of the building's upper floors; and
- n. limiting the length of, or otherwise modifying, facades.

B3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area.: Consider the predominant attributes of the immediate neighborhood and reinforce desirable siting patterns, massing arrangements, and streetscape characteristics of nearby development.

B3.1. Building Orientation: In general, orient the building entries and open space toward street intersections and toward street fronts with the highest pedestrian activity. Locate parking and vehicle access away from entries, open space, and street intersections considerations.

B3.2. Features to Complement: Reinforce the desirable patterns of massing and facade composition found in the surrounding area. Pay particular attention to designated landmarks and other noteworthy buildings. Consider complementing the existing:

- a. massing and setbacks,
- b. scale and proportions,
- c. expressed structural bays and modulations,
- d. fenestration patterns and detailing,
- e. exterior finish materials and detailing,
- f. architectural styles, and
- g. roof forms.

B3.3. Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level: Consider setting the building back slightly to create space adjacent to the sidewalk conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, sitting, or dining. Reinforce the desirable streetscape elements found on adjacent blocks. Consider complementing existing:

- h. public art installations,
- i. street furniture and signage systems,
- j. lighting and landscaping, and
- k. overhead weather protection.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

B3.I. Respond to Nearby Design Features: The principal objective of this guideline is to promote scale and character compatibility through reinforcement of the desirable patterns of massing and facade composition found in the surrounding area. Pay particular attention to designated landmarks and other noteworthy buildings.

- a. Respond to the regulating lines and rhythms of adjacent buildings that also support a street-level environment; regulating lines and rhythms include vertical and horizontal patterns as expressed by cornice lines, belt lines, doors, windows, structural bays and modulation.
- b. Use regulating lines to promote contextual harmony, solidify the relationship between new and old buildings, and lead the eye down the street.
- c. Pay attention to excellent fenestration patterns and detailing in the vicinity. The use of recessed windows that create shadow lines, and suggest solidity, is encouraged.

B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building: Compose the massing and organize the interior and exterior spaces to create a well-proportioned building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept. Design the architectural elements and finish details to create a unified building, so that all components appear integral to the whole.

B4.1. Massing: When composing the massing, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- a. setbacks, projections, and open space;
- b. relative sizes and shapes of distinct building volumes; and
- c. roof heights and forms.

B4.2. Coherent Interior/Exterior Design: When organizing the interior and exterior spaces and developing the architectural elements, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- d. facade modulation and articulation;
- e. windows and fenestration patterns;
- f. corner features;
- g. streetscape and open space fixtures;
- h. building and garage entries; and
- i. building base and top.

B4.3. Architectural Details: When designing the architectural details, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- j. exterior finish materials;
- k. architectural lighting and signage;
- l. grilles, railings, and downspouts;
- m. window and entry trim and moldings;
- n. shadow patterns; and
- o. exterior lighting.

THE STREETScape

C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction: Spaces for street level uses should be designed to engage pedestrians with the activities occurring within them. Sidewalk-related spaces should appear safe, welcoming, and open to the general public.

C1.1. Street Level Uses: Provide spaces for street level uses that:

- a. reinforce existing retail concentrations;

- b. vary in size, width, and depth;
- c. enhance main pedestrian links between areas; and
- d. establish new pedestrian activity where appropriate to meet area objectives. Design for uses that are accessible to the general public, open during established shopping hours, generate walk-in pedestrian clientele, and contribute to a high level of pedestrian activity.

C1.2. Retail Orientation: Where appropriate, consider configuring retail space to attract tenants with products or services that will “spill-out” onto the sidewalk (up to six feet where sidewalk is sufficiently wide).

C1.3. Street-Level Articulation for Pedestrian Activity: Consider setting portions of the building back slightly to create spaces conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining. Further articulate the street level facade to provide an engaging pedestrian experience via:

- e. open facades (i.e., arcades and shop fronts);
- f. multiple building entries;
- g. windows that encourage pedestrians to look into the building interior;
- h. merchandising display windows;
- i. street front open space that features art work, street furniture, and landscaping;
- j. exterior finish materials having texture, pattern, lending themselves to high quality detailing.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

C1.I. Retail Concentration: Reinforce existing retail concentrations;

C1.II. Commercial Space Size: Vary in size, width, and depth of commercial spaces, accommodating for smaller businesses, where feasible;

C1.III. Desired Public Realm Elements: Incorporate the following elements in the adjacent public realm and in open spaces around the building:

- a. unique hardscape treatments
- b. pedestrian-scale sidewalk lighting
- c. accent paving (especially at corners, entries and passageways)
- d. creative landscape treatments (planting, planters, trellises, arbors)
- e. seating, gathering spaces
- f. water features, inclusion of art elements.

C1.IV. Building/Site Corners: Building corners are places of convergence. The following considerations help reinforce site and building corners:

- a. provide meaningful setbacks/open space, if feasible
- b. provide seating as gathering spaces
- c. incorporate street/pedestrian amenities in these spaces
- d. make these spaces safe (good visibility)
- e. iconic corner identifiers to create wayfinders that draw people to the site.

C1.V. Pedestrian Attraction: Design for uses that are accessible to the general public, open during established shopping hours, generate walk-in pedestrian clientele, and contribute to a high level of pedestrian activity. Where appropriate, consider configuring retail space to attract tenants with products or services that will “spill-out” onto the sidewalk (up to six feet where sidewalk is sufficiently wide).

C3 Provide Active — Not Blank — Facades: Buildings should not have large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.

C3.1. Desirable Facade Elements: Facades which for unavoidable programmatic reasons may have few entries or windows should receive special design treatment to increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest. Enliven these facades by providing:

- a. small retail spaces (as small as 50 square feet) for food bars, newsstands, and other specialized retail tenants;
- b. visibility into building interiors;
- c. limited lengths of blank walls;
- d. a landscaped or raised bed planted with vegetation that will grow up a vertical trellis or frame installed to obscure or screen the wall's blank surface;
- e. high quality public art in the form of a mosaic, mural, decorative masonry pattern, sculpture, relief, etc., installed over a substantial portion of the blank wall surface;
- f. small setbacks, indentations, or other architectural means of breaking up the wall surface;
- g. different textures, colors, or materials that break up the wall's surface.
- h. special lighting, a canopy, awning, horizontal trellis, or other pedestrian-oriented feature to reduce the expanse of the blank surface and add visual interest;
- i. seating ledges or perches (especially on sunny facades and near bus stops);
- j. merchandising display windows or regularly changing public information display cases.

C4 Reinforce Building Entries: To promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation, reinforce building entries.

C4.1. Entry Treatments: Reinforce the building's entry with one or more of the following architectural treatments:

- a. extra-height lobby space;
- b. distinctive doorways;
- c. decorative lighting;
- d. distinctive entry canopy;
- e. projected or recessed entry bay;
- f. building name and address integrated into the facade or sidewalk;
- g. artwork integrated into the facade or sidewalk;
- h. a change in paving material, texture, or color;
- i. distinctive landscaping, including plants, water features and seating
- j. ornamental glazing, railings, and balustrades.

C4.2. Residential Entries: To make a residential building more approachable and to create a sense of association among neighbors, entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street and easily accessible and inviting to pedestrians. The space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors. Provide convenient and attractive access to the building's entry. To ensure comfort and security, entry areas and adjacent open space should be sufficiently lighted and protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

C5 Encourage Overhead Weather Protection: Project applicants are encouraged to provide continuous, well-lit, overhead weather protection to improve pedestrian comfort and safety along major pedestrian routes.

C5.1. Overhead Weather Protection Design Elements: Overhead weather protection should be designed with consideration given to:

- a. the overall architectural concept of the building
- b. uses occurring within the building (such as entries and retail spaces) or in the adjacent streetscape environment (such as bus stops and intersections);
- c. minimizing gaps in coverage;
- d. a drainage strategy that keeps rain water off the street-level facade and sidewalk;
- e. continuity with weather protection provided on nearby buildings;
- f. relationship to architectural features and elements on adjacent development, especially if abutting a building of historic or noteworthy character;
- g. the scale of the space defined by the height and depth of the weather protection;
- h. use of translucent or transparent covering material to maintain a pleasant sidewalk environment with plenty of natural light; and
- i. when opaque material is used, the illumination of light-colored undersides to increase security after dark.

C6 Develop the Alley Façade: To increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest, develop portions of the alley facade in response to the unique conditions of the site or project.

C6.1. Alley Activation: Consider enlivening and enhancing the alley entrance by:

- a. extending retail space fenestration into the alley one bay;
- b. providing a niche for recycling and waste receptacles to be shared with nearby, older buildings lacking such facilities; and
- c. adding effective lighting to enhance visibility and safety.

C6.2. Alley Parking Access: Enhance the facades and surfaces in and adjacent to the alley to create parking access that is visible, safe, and welcoming for drivers and pedestrians. Consider

- d. locating the alley parking garage entry and/ or exit near the entrance to the alley;
- e. installing highly visible signage indicating parking rates and availability on the building facade adjacent to the alley; and
- f. chamfering the building corners to enhance pedestrian visibility and safety where alley is regularly used by vehicles accessing parking and loading.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

C6.I. Address Alley Functions:

- a. Services and utilities, while essential to urban development, should be screened or otherwise hidden from the view of the pedestrian.
- b. Exterior trash receptacles should be screened on three sides, with a gate on the fourth side that also screens the receptacles from view. Provide a niche to recess the receptacle.
- c. Screen loading docks and truck parking from public view using building massing, architectural elements and/or landscaping.
- d. Ensure that all utility equipment is located, sized, and designed to be as inconspicuous as possible. Consider ways to reduce the noise impacts of HVAC equipment on the alley environment.

C6.II. Pedestrian Environment:

- e. Pedestrian circulation is an integral part of the site layout. Where possible and feasible, provide elements, such as landscaping and special paving, that help define a pedestrian-friendly environment in the alley.

- f. Create a comfortably scaled and thoughtfully detailed urban environment in the alley through the use of well-designed architectural forms and details, particularly at street level.

C6.III. Architectural Concept:

- g. In designing a well-proportioned and unified building, the alley facade should not be ignored. An alley facade should be treated with form, scale and materials similar to rest of the building to create a coherent architectural concept

PUBLIC AMENITIES

D2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping: Enhance the building and site with generous landscaping— which includes special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, and site furniture, as well as living plant material.

D2.1. Landscape Enhancements: Landscape enhancement of the site may include some of the approaches or features listed below:

- a. emphasize entries with special planting in conjunction with decorative paving and/or lighting;
- b. include a special feature such as a courtyard, fountain, or pool;
- c. incorporate a planter guard or low planter wall as part of the architecture;
- d. distinctively landscape open areas created by building modulation;
- e. soften the building by screening blank walls, terracing retaining walls, etc.;
- f. increase privacy and security through screening and/or shading;
- g. provide a framework such as a trellis or arbor for plants to grow on;
- h. incorporate upper story planter boxes or roof planters;
- i. provide identity and reinforce a desired feeling of intimacy and quiet;
- j. provide brackets for hanging planters;
- k. consider how the space will be viewed from the upper floors of nearby buildings as well as from the sidewalk; and
- l. if on a designated Green Street, coordinate improvements with the local Green Street plan.

D2.2. Consider Nearby Landscaping: Reinforce the desirable pattern of landscaping found on adjacent block faces.

- m. plant street trees that match the existing planting pattern or species;
- n. use similar landscape materials; and
- o. extend a low wall, use paving similar to that found nearby, or employ similar stairway construction methods.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

D2.I. Belltown-Specific Landscape Character: Landscape enhancement of the site may include some of the approaches or features listed below, where appropriate:

- a. emphasize entries with special planting in conjunction with decorative paving and/or lighting;
- b. use landscaping to make plazas and courtyards comfortable for human activity and social interaction;
- c. distinctively landscape open areas created by building modulation, such as entry courtyards;
- d. provide year-round greenery — drought tolerant species are encouraged to promote water conservation and reduce maintenance concerns; and

- e. provide opportunities for installation of civic art in the landscape; designer/ artist collaborations are encouraged (e.g., Growing Vine Street).

D3 Provide Elements That Define the Place: Provide special elements on the facades, within public open spaces, or on the sidewalk to create a distinct, attractive, and memorable “sense of place” associated with the building.

D3.1. Public Space Features and Amenities: Incorporate one or more of the following an appropriate:

- a. public art;
- b. street furniture, such as seating, newspaper boxes, and information kiosks;
- c. distinctive landscaping, such as specimen trees and water features;
- d. retail kiosks;
- e. public restroom facilities with directional signs in a location easily accessible to all; and
- f. public seating areas in the form of ledges, broad stairs, planters and the like, especially near public open spaces, bus stops, vending areas, on sunny facades, and other places where people are likely to want to pause or wait.

D3.2. Intersection Focus: Enliven intersections by treating the corner of the building or sidewalk with public art and other elements that promote interaction (entry, tree, seating, etc.) and reinforce the distinctive character of the surrounding area.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

D3.I. Art and Heritage: Art and History are vital to reinforcing a sense of place. Consider incorporating the following into the siting and design:

- a. vestiges of Belltown Heritage, such as preserving existing stone sidewalks, curbs
- b. art that relates to the established or emerging theme of that area (e.g., Western, 1st, 2nd, 3rd Avenue street specific character.
- c. install plaques or other features on the building that pay tribute to Belltown history.

D3.II. Green Streets: Green Streets are street rights-of-way that are enhanced for pedestrian circulation and activity with a variety of pedestrian-oriented features, such as sidewalk widening, landscaping, artwork, and traffic calming. Interesting street level uses and pedestrian amenities enliven the Green Street and lend special identity to the surrounding area.

D3.IV. Street Edge/Furnishings: Concentrate pedestrian improvements at intersections with Green Streets (Bell, Blanchard, Vine, Cedar between 1st and Elliott, Clay, Eagle, and Bay Streets). Pedestrian crossings should be “exaggerated,” that is they should be marked and illuminated in a manner where they will be quickly and clearly seen by motorists.

D5 Provide Adequate Lighting: To promote a sense of security for people downtown during nighttime hours, provide appropriate levels of lighting on the building facade, on the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and on signage.

D5.1. Lighting Strategies: Consider employing one or more of the following lighting strategies as appropriate.

- a. Illuminate distinctive features of the building, including entries, signage, canopies, and areas of architectural detail and interest.

- b. Install lighting in display windows that spills onto and illuminates the sidewalk.
- c. Orient outside lighting to minimize glare within the public right-of-way.

D6 Design for Personal Safety & Security: Design the building and site to promote the feeling of personal safety and security in the immediate area.

D6.1. Safety in Design Features: To help promote safety for the residents, workers, shoppers, and visitors who enter the area:

- a. provide adequate lighting;
- b. retain clear lines of sight into and out of entries and open spaces;
- c. use semi-transparent security screening, rather than opaque walls, where appropriate;
- d. avoid blank and windowless walls that attract graffiti and that do not permit residents or workers to observe the street;
- e. use landscaping that maintains visibility, such as short shrubs and/or trees pruned so that all branches are above head height;
- f. use ornamental grille as fencing or over ground-floor windows in some locations;
- g. avoid architectural features that provide hiding places for criminal activity;
- h. design parking areas to allow natural surveillance by maintaining clear lines of sight for those who park there, for pedestrians passing by, and for occupants of nearby buildings;
- i. install clear directional signage;
- j. encourage “eyes on the street” through the placement of windows, balconies, and street-level uses; and
- k. ensure natural surveillance of children’s play areas.

VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING

E1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts: Minimize adverse impacts of curb cuts on the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

E1.1. Vehicle Access Considerations: Where street access is deemed appropriate, one or more of the following design approaches should be considered for the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

- a. minimize the number of curb cuts and locate them away from street intersections;
- b. minimize the width of the curb cut, driveway, and garage opening;
- c. provide specialty paving where the driveway crosses the sidewalk;
- d. share the driveway with an adjacent property owner;
- e. locate the driveway to be visually less dominant;
- f. enhance the garage opening with specialty lighting, artwork, or materials having distinctive texture, pattern, or color
- g. provide sufficient queuing space on site.

E1.2. Vehicle Access Location: Where possible, consider locating the driveway and garage entrance to take advantage of topography in a manner that does not reduce pedestrian safety nor place the pedestrian entrance in a subordinate role.

E2 Integrate Parking Facilities: Minimize the visual impact of parking by integrating parking facilities with surrounding development. Incorporate architectural treatments or suitable landscaping to provide for the safety and comfort of people using the facility as well as those walking by.

E2.1. Parking Structures: Minimize the visibility of at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the

rest of the building and streetscape. Where appropriate consider incorporating one or more of the following treatments:

- a. Incorporate pedestrian-oriented uses at street level to reduce the visual impact of parking structures. A depth of only 10 feet along the front of the building is sufficient to provide space for newsstands, ticket booths, flower shops, and other viable uses.
- b. Use the site topography to help reduce the visibility of the parking facility.
- c. Set the parking facility back from the sidewalk and install dense landscaping.
- d. Incorporate any of the blank wall treatments listed in Guideline C-3.
- e. Visually integrate the parking structure with building volumes above, below, and adjacent.
- f. Incorporate artwork into the facades.
- g. Provide a frieze, cornice, canopy, overhang, trellis or other device at the top of the parking level.
- h. Use a portion of the top of the parking level as an outdoor deck, patio, or garden with a rail, bench, or other guard device around the perimeter.

E2.2. Parking Structure Entrances: Design vehicular entries to parking structure so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building. Subordinate the garage entrance to the pedestrian entrance in terms of size, prominence on the street-scape, location, and design emphasis. Consider one or more of the following design strategies:

- i. Enhance the pedestrian entry to reduce the relative importance of the garage entry.
- j. Recess the garage entry portion of the facade or extend portions of the structure over the garage entry to help conceal it.
- k. Emphasize other facade elements to reduce the visual prominence of the garage entry.
- l. Use landscaping or artwork to soften the appearance of the garage entry from the street.
- m. Locate the garage entry where the topography of the site can help conceal it.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure was based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure. At the Recommendation Meeting two departures were requested:

At the time of the Recommendation Meeting the following two departures were requested:

1. **Downtown Mixed Residential Setback Requirements (SMC23.49.166.A.1):** The Code requires setbacks for portions of a structure above 65' in height from side lot lines that are not street lot lines if the frontage on the street is more than 120'. The development site requires a setback of 20', the applicant is proposing a 10' setback.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Guideline **B1.I. Compatible Design:** Establish a harmonious transition between newer and older buildings. Compatible design should respect the scale, massing and materials of adjacent buildings and landscape. The design is swapping two upper levels setback requirements and is providing an increased setback along Blanchard St. from the required 10' to 20'. This shifting will create a development that protects the open space of the existing development to the east. The Board voted, 4 for and 1 against, to recommend this departure.

2. **DMR Maximum Building Length and Width (SMC23.49.164.):** The Code requires a maximum width and depth for the portions of a structure above 65' in height and this portion of the structure shall be separated horizontally from any other portion of the structure on the lot above 65' by at least 20' at all points. The applicant is proposing a width of 150' along Western Ave for the two upper floors which are above 65' which is greater than the allowed 120'.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Guideline **B1.I. Compatible Design:** Establish a harmonious transition between newer and older buildings. Compatible design should respect the scale, massing and materials of adjacent buildings and landscape. The design is locating the allowable upper level square footage along Western Ave due to setting back at the northeast corner to respect the open space of the development east of the alley.

The Board voted, 4 for and 1 against, to recommend this departure.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated April 21, 2015, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the April 21, 2015 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, four of the five Design Review Board members recommended **APPROVAL** of the subject design and of departures with the following conditions:

1. Design a 'dark' middle section and a lighter upper section of the street facing facades.
2. Wrap the darker middle section around to the Blanchard St. facade.
3. Provide subtle shifts of the same tone of color so any horizontal bands on the Blanchard St. facade disappear.
4. The top facade section is visually busy, and should be simplified to make it quieter.
5. Remove the vertical screen near the residential entry on Western Ave. and expose the concrete wall.
6. Design the landscaped area below the vertical screen; consider either raising the planter or the use of tiered planters, that is designed to discourage use by dogs and sitting on by pedestrians.
7. Do a careful study of the design on the planter and wall to ensure the vitality of the plantings and security for the residents.

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

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.*

Director's Analysis

Five members of the Downtown 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.

As noted earlier 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. Four members of the downtown Board agreed to the recommendations.

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 five members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Conditions:

- 1. The applicant responded on the plans by using a darker metal panel at the middle section and a medium toned metal panel at the upper stories, therefore satisfying recommendation #1.*
- 2. The applicant responded on the plans by wrapping the darker metal panel on the middle section of the Western St facade around to Blanchard St, therefore satisfying recommendation #2.*
- 3. The applicant responded on the plans by simplifying the colors of the metal panels, therefore satisfying recommendation #3.*
- 4. The applicant responded on the plans by simplifying the colors of the metal panels, therefore satisfying recommendation #4.*
- 5. The applicant responded on the plans by removing the vertical screen near the residential entry, therefore satisfying recommendation #5.*
- 6. The applicant responded on the plans, showing a concrete planter curb with a tiered low metal screen, therefore satisfying recommendation #6.*
- 7. The applicant responded on the plans, showing a concrete planter curb with a tiered low metal screen, therefore satisfying recommendation #7.*

The Director is satisfied that conditions 1 through 7 of the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

Director's Decision

The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design and the requested departures with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision Board that further augment the selected Guidelines.

SEPA ANALYSIS

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the Seattle State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), WAC 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code (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 11/24/2014. 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 its 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.

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, and certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states in part: "*where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation*" subject to some limitations.

Under such limitations/circumstances, mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts in appropriate.

Public Comment:

The public comment period ended on December 31, 2014. In addition to the comment(s) received through the Design Review process, 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 access. Comments were also received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis per SMC 25.05.

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 Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency

regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The following analyzes construction-related noise, greenhouse gas, air quality, construction traffic and parking impacts, as well as mitigation.

Noise

This project falls within the Downtown Transition Area Hub as identified by SDOT.

Noise associated with construction of the building could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area, which include a large residential structure across the alley from the site. There will be excavation required to prepare the building site and foundation. The applicant has stated on the project cover sheet that approx. 13,600 cubic yards of soil will be removed from the site. Additionally, as development proceeds, noise associated with construction of the building could adversely affect the surrounding residential uses in the adjoining area.

The impacts of construction noise on nearby residential properties warrants additional mitigation. To mitigate construction noise impacts pursuant to SMC25.05.675.B the applicant shall submit a Construction Management Plan for approval by DPD.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

Construction Traffic

This project falls within the Downtown Transition Area Hub as identified by SDOT.

The nearby area has been experiencing numerous and successive construction projects. The combined impact and duration of this activity has an impact on nearby traffic and parking. Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, grading, and construction activity.

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, removal of up to 13,600 cubic yards of soil, grading, and construction activity, with haul routes restricted to nearby arterials. Large trucks turning onto arterial streets would be expected to exacerbate the flow of traffic. Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted.

To mitigate construction truck trip impacts, the applicant shall submit a Construction Haul Route for approval by Seattle Department of Transportation. This plan may include a restriction in the hours of truck trips to mitigate traffic impacts on nearby arterials and intersections. Evidence of the approved plan shall be provided to DPD prior to the issuance of demolition, grading, and building permits.

Long Term Impacts

Long term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of this proposal, including: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased

bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; loss of plant and animal habitat; and increased light and glare. 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; height, bulk and scale; historic preservation; 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.

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.

Traffic and Parking

The applicant submitted a Transportation Impact Analysis (Transportation Impact Analysis, by Transpogroup, dated December 2014). The numbers used by the consultant were 152 residential units, 6,000 sq. ft. of retail and 159 parking stalls, which is slightly different than the proposed 152 residential units, 5,656 sq. ft. of retail space and 153 parking stalls.

The study analyzed the proposed uses to determine the daily vehicle trip generation. The project is anticipated to generate 390 daily trips, with 35 PM peak hour trips.

The study determined that the site access to parking from the alley would operate at LOS B during the weekday peak PM hours with the additional traffic from the project. The project's traffic impact on the surrounding streets would meet the City's Transportation Concurrency requirements.

DPD's Transportation Planner has reviewed the Transportation Impact Analysis and determined additional SEPA mitigation is not necessary.

The project is providing 153 parking spaces for the 152 residential units and retail space. The Traffic Report noted that the parking demand for this development is anticipated to be 60 spaces.

DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

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. Approval of a construction management plan (CMP) by the Land Use Planner beth.hartwick@seattle.gov is required. In the CMP include hours of construction and any measures that will be taken to mitigate noise.
2. Provide a copy of a Construction Haul Route, approved by Seattle Department of Transportation to the Land Use Planner (beth.hartwick@seattle.gov).

DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

3. 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 (Beth Hartwick 206 684-0814 or beth.hartwick@seattle.gov).
4. 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 (Beth Hartwick 206 684-0814 or beth.hartwick@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

5. 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 (Beth Hartwick 206 684-0814 or beth.hartwick@seattle.gov) or a DPD assigned Land Use Planner.

Signature: Betty Galarosa for Date: August 13, 2015
Beth Hartwick, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

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

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

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

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