



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND INSPECTIONS**

Application Number: 3019360
Applicant Name: Brenda Barnes, Clark Design Group, PLLC
Address of Proposal: 1718 NW 56th St

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow a six-story structure containing 148 residential units above 16 live-work units and 1,898 sq. ft. of commercial space. Parking for 126 vehicles to be provided below grade. Existing structures to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review with Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)

SEPA - Environmental Determination (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)

SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-Significance

- No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.
- Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.05.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 3 with a 65' height limit (NC3-65)

Nearby Zones: (North) NC3-65
(South) Neighborhood Commercial 3 – 85' height limit (NC3-85)
(East) NC3-65
(West) NC3-65

Lot Area: 30,000 square feet (sq. ft.)

Current Development: The site consists of two parcels, each of which is occupied by commercial office buildings and surface parking. The site is located on the northwest corner of 17th Ave NW and NW 56th St and occupies approximately 300 ft. of frontage along NW 56th St and 100 ft. of frontage along 17th Ave NW.



Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character: The site is located within the Ballard Urban Center Village and is on the eastern edge of the Ballard Civic Core. The greater neighborhood context includes a mix of traditional, single family wood framed structures, mid-century low-rise commercial and office development, and contemporary mid-rise residential and mixed use development. The immediate context consists of multi-family and mixed-use structures with a number of projects in the near vicinity currently in development. South of the site across NW 56th St. the developer is proposing a seven story mixed use development with live/work units and retail at grade and 177 residential apartments on levels two through seven (MUP #3018670).

Access: Existing vehicle access to the site is from NW 56th St.

Environmentally Critical Areas: There are no mapped Environmentally Critical Areas on the site.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period began on November 16, 2015. In addition to the comments 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 concerns with new development and loss of existing building stock, concerns with increased density; loss of open space; desire for increased setbacks; access to light and air for existing development; desire for upper level setbacks to avoid a canyon effect; adequacy of noticing; construction related impacts and long term impacts exacerbated by concurrent construction and development in close proximity to the project; traffic and parking impacts; bulk and scale compatibility; bicycle and pedestrian safety and circulation during construction; housing affordability; additional sightlines to open space; desire for inclusion of design features to break up the length and scale; vehicle access away from the bicycle greenway; adequacy of transit to accommodate added growth; and desire to preserve existing bronze street name embedded in the sidewalk.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

The packets include materials presented at the EDG and Recommendation meetings, and are available online by entering the project number at the following website:

<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx>

The packets are also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at Seattle DCI:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE August 3, 2015

PUBLIC COMMENT

At the EDG meeting, several members of the public were present. Speakers provided comments and raised the following issues:

- Desired greenspace/landscape buffer along the western property line adjacent to the existing residential building and associated parking.
- Supported removal of existing curb cuts.
- Stated that waste pick-up in the area is very frequent and impacts should be minimized.
- Stated that three large scale development projects on this block face may be under construction simultaneously and expressed concern with the potential for cumulative construction impacts on the right-of-way, circulation, parking, and noise.
- Stated the live/work units should be ADA accessible from the street and interiors should be designed to comfortably accommodate ADA accessibility.
- Supported the ADA clearance and inclusion of ADA van stalls.
- Commented that 17th Ave NW is a well-used bicycle corridor and development should take into consideration the potential cycle track on 17th Ave NW in the future.
- Concerned that the proposal would be too similar to the building across the street (56th) and stated a preference for this proposal.
- Signage is important and should fit into the neighborhood context, should not be flashing.

RECOMMENDATION MEETING April 4, 2016

PUBLIC COMMENT

At the Recommendation meeting, several members of the public were present. Speakers provided the following comments:

- Concerned with the potential light pollution from signage; noted that the sign should be smaller scaled and signage lighting should be minimized.

- Questioned the timing of demolition and construction and expressed concern with the cumulative impacts from construction of this proposal and several concurrent projects also being developed.
- Appreciated the inclusion of greenspace and landscaping and noted that several large trees and other vegetation will be lost.
- Noted ground floor security in this area should be a concern and the project design should include security measures such as gates.

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 August 3, 2015

- 1. Massing & Height/Bulk/Scale:** At EDG, the Board supported the applicant's preferred option including the building siting and setbacks along both the north and south edges, the variety of apartment sizes, and the inclusion of underground parking. The Board expressed concern with the large scale and perceived mass of the proposal considering the 300 ft. length of frontage along NW 56th St. and expressed concern that it will read as one large building.
 - a. The Board directed the applicant to look at ways to further break down the scale and mass of the building through additional emphasis on the vertical articulations and exploration of larger volumes with smaller, deeper recesses to better integrate and emulate the smaller scale of established development in the area. **(DC2-A-2, DC2-C-1, CS2-C-3, CS2-D-1, & CS3-A-1)**
 - b. The applicant should incorporate finer grain, pedestrian scale details and materials to enhance the pedestrian experience and further break down the mass of the building. **(CS2-C-3, DC2-A-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-D-1, DC2-D-2)**
 - c. The Board expressed concern with the 300 ft. long parapet on both the north and south edges. For the next meeting, the applicant should incorporate ways to breakdown the scale and length of the north and south parapets. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-D-5)**
 - d. The eastern massing should respond to the transition from a higher zone to the south and lower zone to the north. **(CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3)**
 - e. The Board supported the further articulation and emphasis of the southeast corner. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1)**
- 2. Arrangement of Uses, Streetscape, & Landscaping:**
 - a. The Board directed the applicant to explore ways to enliven the southeast corner and make the ground floor, specifically along NW 56th St, more permeable. **(CS2-B-2, PL1-B-3)**
 - b. The Board generally supported the live/work units and setback located along the northern edge of the building but requested additional information on the concept for the units and walkway area. This area should be a well programmed space, designed to match the intended use and should include landscaping designed with the function in mind. The walkway should not be hardscape only.

- For the next meeting the applicant should provide additional information on the intended function and programming of this space, as well as details on the landscape/hardscape, safety elements, lighting, public/private accessibility and circulation. **(PL1-B-3, PL3-A-1, PL3-B-1&3, DC1-A-3, DC2-E-1, DC4-D)**
- c. The Board supported the live/work units located on NW 56th St. and the 9.5' setback as a transition between the public and private spaces. **(PL1-A-2, PL1-B-2, PL1-B-3, PL1-C-2, PL3-B-3)**
 - d. The Board identified this project as an opportunity to create a unified landscape along NW 56th Street and noted that it should set precedent for landscaping and pedestrian elements for the area. The streetscape design should tie back to the neighborhood and the NW 56th corridor west of the site and should look to the Greenfire Campus and Ballard Library as precedent landscaping to draw on. **(CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL1-A-2, PL1-B-2, DC4-D)**
 - e. The applicant should incorporate elements to enhance the permeability of the ground floor. **(DC1-A-all, PL3-C-1, PL3-C-2, PL3-C-3, PL3-B-3, CS2-B-2)**
 - f. For the next meeting, the applicant should provide window studies for the properties to the west and north of the proposal. **(CS2-D-5, PL3-B-1)**
 - g. For the next meeting, the applicant should provide visualizations of the NW 56th St streetscape (both a westward and eastward perspective). Visualizations should include both sides of the right-of-way including the proposed Valdok I development. **(CS2-A-1, DC3-C-1, DC4-D)**

3. Vehicular/Bicycle Access & Service Uses:

- a. The Board expressed general support for the parking location and supported the eroding at the southwest corner adjacent to the parking garage ramp. The Board directed the applicant to study ways to minimize impacts on the neighboring property along the western edge. **(DC1-B-1, PL3-B-1)**
- b. The applicant should study ways to minimize negative impacts from service uses on the right-of-way and provide additional information on how waste collection will function. **(DC1-B-1)**
- c. The applicant should locate the bicycle facilities to maximize safety and minimize potential conflict between vehicles and cyclists. **(PL4-B-2, DC1-B-1)**
- d. The building and streetscape should respond to and enhance the existing bicycle circulation and proposed greenway on 17th Ave NW.

4. Architectural Concept & Materials:

- a. The proposal should respond to proposed development (Valdok I) across the street, but should not be a "twin" or too similar. Architectural cues should be drawn on from Valdok I but cues from the larger neighborhood context and established neighborhood character should equally be drawn on to inform the design. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-B, CS2-C-3, DC2-B-1, CS3-A-1&2)**
- b. The development should include durable, high quality materials as were presented in the materials inspiration page in the EDG packet. The Board noted fiber cement panel should not be the primary cladding material and stated support for wood, metal, and architectural concrete. **(DC4-A-1, DC2-D-1, DC2-D-2)**

- c. Weather protection was identified as an important element should be integrated into **MEETING April 4, 2016**

1. Massing, Façade Composition, & Rear Live/Work Corridor (“Mews”): The Board discussed the massing at length and whether or not the building had been sufficiently broken up into distinct, separate volumes per the Board’s early design guidance. While one member of the Board noted that the proposal lacked needed scale hierarchy to break down the massing, the majority of the Board generally supported the proposed massing and composition. **(DC2-A-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-C-1)**

- a. The Board noted that the upper level recess at the NE corner was unsuccessful because it was not substantial enough or well-integrated enough to provide a meaningful design gesture and recommended a condition to modify the NE upper corner to better integrate into the eastern facade. This resolution should be tied to the entry into the Mews. Potential solutions are to omit the recess or carry it down to grade, peeling the entire massing back at the NE corner. **(DC2-A, DC2-B-1, CS2-D-1)**
- b. There was general support for the location of the co-work space adjacent to the mews entry. **(DC1-A, CS2-B-2, PL3-B-3, PL3-C)**
- c. The Board felt the entry to the mews was not substantial enough and recommended a condition to enhance the visual prominence and identity of this entry. The entry should be a strong cut in the massing and larger gesture to have more of an identifiable presence from the street.

As part of the condition, the co-work space should be integrated and more directly connected to the mews entry and identity. As proposed, the sunken co-work space was hidden and disconnected. Some possible solutions may include an external entry from 17th and/or more direct connection to the mews. In general, the co-work space should have a commercial/retail aesthetic to resemble a storefront.

Resolution of the upper levels should be incorporated into the design solution for the mews entry. **(DC1-A, DC2-E-1, CS2-B-2, PL3-A)**

- d. There was general support for the synthetic wood material proposed but the Board recommended that the fiber cement panel detailing be highly detailed to give a quality appearance. **(DC4-A-1, DC2-D)**
- e. The Board strongly recommended the parapets along the north be reduced and/or pulled back as much as possible. **(DC2-A-2)**

2. Signage & Security

- a. The Board acknowledged the public comments regarding signage and expressed similar concerns with the signage design. Specifically, the Board noted that the halo sign mounted on a glass railing would be problematic and the retail signage was too small and nondescript, lacking meaningful pedestrian engagement. There was support for alternatives, such as pulling up the metal volume in lieu of the glass railing at the upper SE corner.

The Board recommended a condition that the signage be modified to better integrate into the building design and lighting for signage should be subtle to minimize glare. **(DC4-B, CS2-D-5)**

- b. The Board acknowledged and agreed with the public comments regarding security as a concern, recommending a condition that the entry to the mews be well lit and highly transparent. Lighting at the entry should be enhanced to promote safety while still mindful of the neighboring properties. **(CS2-D-5, PL3-A-2, PL3-B-1)**
3. **NW 56th Street Frontage/Vehicle Access/Landscaping:** In general, there was support for the proposed landscape design along NW 56th St.
- a. The Board recommended a condition to modify the railings and landscaping along the live/work units at grade to create more of a buffer. The stoop railings should be more opaque with taller and/or wider landscaping, and in general the railing design could be more interesting. **(PL3-B-1, DC4-D, DC2-C-2)**
 - b. The Board agreed with the public concerns regarding the proposed one-lane driveway design because of the number of cars accessing the garage and noted that it would not be used that way. There was unanimous support for a two-lane driveway to the garage.

The Board noted that they thought this could be resolved without a departure but would support departure for an egress sight triangle if needed over a one lane driveway. **(DC1-B-1)**

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood 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](#).

CONTEXT & 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-C-3. Full Block Sites: Break up long facades of full-block buildings to avoid a monolithic presence. Provide detail and human scale at street-level, and include repeating elements to add variety and rhythm to the façade and overall building design.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning: Review the height, bulk, and scale of neighboring buildings as well as the scale of development anticipated by zoning for the area to determine an appropriate complement and/or transition.

CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions: For projects located at the edge of different zones, provide an appropriate transition or complement to the adjacent zone(s). Projects should create a step in perceived height, bulk and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zone and the proposed development.

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.

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-2. Contemporary Design: Explore how contemporary designs can contribute to the development of attractive new forms and architectural styles; as expressed through use of new materials or other means.

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-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.

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

PL1-B-2. Pedestrian Volumes: Provide ample space for pedestrian flow and circulation, particularly in areas where there is already heavy pedestrian traffic or where the project is expected to add or attract pedestrians to the area.

PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities: Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian oriented open spaces to enliven the area and attract interest and interaction with the site and building should be considered.

PL1-C Outdoor Uses and Activities

PL1-C-2. Informal Community Uses: In addition to places for walking and sitting, consider including space for informal community use such as performances, farmer's markets, kiosks and community bulletin boards, cafes, or street vending.

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

PL2-C Weather Protection

PL2-C-1. Locations and Coverage: Overhead weather protection is encouraged and should be located at or near uses that generate pedestrian activity such as entries, retail uses, and transit stops.

PL2-C-2. Design Integration: Integrate weather protection, gutters and downspouts into the design of the structure as a whole, and ensure that it also relates well to neighboring buildings in design, coverage, or other features.

PL2-C-3. People-Friendly Spaces: Create an artful and people-friendly space beneath building.

PL3 Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human interaction and activity at the street-level with clear connections to building entries and edges.

PL3-A Entries

PL3-A-1. Design Objectives: Design primary entries to be obvious, identifiable, and distinctive with clear lines of sight and lobbies visually connected to the street.

PL3-A-2. Common Entries: Multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors.

PL3-A-3. Individual Entries: Ground-related housing should be scaled and detailed appropriately to provide for a more intimate type of entry.

PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements: Design the entry as a collection of coordinated elements including the door(s), overhead features, ground surface, landscaping, lighting, and other features.

PL3-B Residential Edges

PL3-B-1. Security and Privacy: Provide security and privacy for residential buildings through the use of a buffer or semi-private space between the development and the street or neighboring buildings.

PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses: Maintain active and transparent facades in the design of live/work residences. Design the first floor so it can be adapted to other commercial use as needed in the future.

PL3-C Retail Edges

PL3-C-1. Porous Edge: Engage passersby with opportunities to interact visually with the building interior using glazing and transparency. Create multiple entries where possible and make a physical and visual connection between people on the sidewalk and retail activities in the building.

PL3-C-2. Visibility: Maximize visibility into the building interior and merchandise displays. Consider fully operational glazed wall-sized doors that can be completely opened to the street, increased height in lobbies, and/or special lighting for displays.

PL3-C-3. Ancillary Activities: Allow space for activities such as sidewalk vending, seating, and restaurant dining to occur. Consider setting structures back from the street or incorporating space in the project design into which retail uses can extend.

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-1. Early Planning: Consider existing and future bicycle traffic to and through the site early in the process so that access and connections are integrated into the project along with other modes of travel.

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.

DESIGN CONCEPT

DC1 Project Uses and Activities: Optimize the arrangement of uses and activities on site.

DC1-A Arrangement of Interior Uses

DC1-A-1. Visibility: Locate uses and services frequently used by the public in visible or prominent areas, such as at entries or along the street front.

DC1-A-2. Gathering Places: Maximize the use of any interior or exterior gathering spaces.

DC1-A-3. Flexibility: Build in flexibility so the building can adapt over time to evolving needs, such as the ability to change residential space to commercial space as needed.

DC1-A-4. Views and Connections: Locate interior uses and activities to take advantage of views and physical connections to exterior spaces and uses.

DC1-B Vehicular Access and Circulation

DC1-B-1. Access Location and Design: Choose locations for vehicular access, service uses, and delivery areas that minimize conflict between vehicles and non-motorists wherever possible. Emphasize use of the sidewalk for pedestrians, and create safe and attractive conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers.

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

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

DC2-B-1. Façade Composition: Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs—considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades are attractive and well-proportioned.

DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features

DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest: Add depth to facades where appropriate by incorporating balconies, canopies, awnings, decks, or other secondary elements into the façade design. Add detailing at the street level in order to create interest for the pedestrian and encourage active street life and window shopping (in retail areas).

DC2-C-2. Dual Purpose Elements: Consider architectural features that can be dual purpose—adding depth, texture, and scale as well as serving other project functions.

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.

DC2-E Form and Function

DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility: Strive for a balance between building use legibility and flexibility. Design buildings such that their primary functions and uses can be readily determined from the exterior, making the building easy to access and understand. At the same time, design flexibility into the building so that it may remain useful over time even as specific programmatic needs evolve.

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

DC3-C Design

DC3-C-1. Reinforce Existing Open Space: Where a strong open space concept exists in the neighborhood, reinforce existing character and patterns of street tree planting, buffers or treatment of topographic changes. Where no strong patterns exist, initiate a strong open space concept that other projects can build upon in the future.

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-B Signage

DC4-B-1. Scale and Character: Add interest to the streetscape with exterior signs and attachments that are appropriate in scale and character to the project and its environs.

DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

DC4-D-1. Choice of Plant Materials: Reinforce the overall architectural and open space design concepts through the selection of landscape materials.

DC4-D-2. Hardscape Materials: Use exterior courtyards, plazas, and other hard surfaced areas as an opportunity to add color, texture, and/or pattern and enliven public areas through the use of distinctive and durable paving materials. Use permeable materials wherever possible.

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

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board’s recommendation on the requested departure will be based on the departure’s potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departures.

At the Recommendation meeting the following departure was identified as a possible departure needed based on the applicant’s design:

1. **Sight Triangle (SMC 23.54.030.G.1):** For two way driveways less than 22 feet the Code requires a 10 foot sight triangle on both sides of the driveway be kept clear of any obstruction.

At the time of the Recommendation meeting, the applicant proposed a 20 foot wide driveway, striped as a 10 foot wide driveway with sight triangles proposed on-site.

The Board did not support the proposed design noting that it was impractical based on the number of vehicles anticipated to use the driveway and would likely be used as a two-way driveway. The Board noted, however, that a design solution with a two-way, code compliant driveway may be feasible but if it was not possible, the Board members would unanimously support a departure to omit the egress sight triangle to minimize the size and presence of the driveway on the right-of-way, consistent with Design Guideline DC1-B, Vehicular Access and Circulation. **(DC1-B-1)**

Staff Note: Based on the Board's previous comments related to minimizing the potential negative impacts from vehicle and service uses on the right-of-way and enhancing pedestrian and bicycle safety, safety features should be incorporated into the driveway design.

RECOMMENDATIONS

BOARD DIRECTION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Monday, April 04, 2016, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Monday, April 04, 2016 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, two of the three Design Review Board members present recommended APPROVAL of the subject design with the conditions outlined below. One of the Design Review Board members recommend the project return for additional guidance.

1. Modify the northeast upper corner massing to better integrate into the eastern façade as a whole and mews entry below. **(DC2-A, DC2-B-1, CS2-D-1)**
2. Enhance the visual prominence and identity of the mews entry by including a larger gesture, stronger cut in the massing, and better integration and connection to the co-work space. **(DC1-A, DC2-E-1, CS2-B-2, PL3-A)**
3. Lighting and high levels of transparency must be included at the entry to the mews with the intent of promoting pedestrian safety. Lighting at this location should be down lit and mindful of the neighboring properties. **(CS2-D-5, PL3-A-2, PL3-B-1)**
4. Modify signage to better integrate into the building design. Lighting for signage should be low intensity to minimize glare. **(DC4-B, CS2-D-5)**
5. The railings and landscaping along the live/work units at grade should be modified to create more of a buffer for the occupants. The railings should be more opaque with added visual interest and the adjacent landscaping should be taller and/or wider. **(PL3-B-1, DC4-D, DC2-C-2)**

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 Seattle DCI 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 recommended 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 April 4, 2016, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Three members of the Northwest 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 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.

Following the Recommendation meeting, Seattle DCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board.

The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents, details, and specifications are shown and constructed consistent with the approved MUP drawings.

The Director of Seattle DCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the three members present at the Recommendation meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director is satisfied that all 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 departure summarized at the end of this Decision.

II. ANALYSIS – SEPA

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the 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 10/28/2015. The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (Seattle DCI) 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 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 is appropriate.

Short Term Impacts

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Several construction-related impacts are mitigated by existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project such as: the 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 greenhouse gas, construction traffic and parking impacts, and environmental health, as well as mitigation.

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. Therefore, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

Construction Impacts - Parking and Traffic

During construction a temporary increase in traffic volumes to the site will occur, due to travel to the site by construction workers and the transport of construction materials. A net export of approximately 13,000 cubic yards of excavated soil is anticipated to be removed from the project site. Excavation and construction materials will require approximately 1,300 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 650 round trips with 20-yard hauling trucks. The area is subject to traffic congestion during peak travel times on nearby arterials and there are a number of projects currently under construction or planned for construction in the near future in the vicinity. Large trucks turning onto arterial streets would be expected to further exacerbate the flow of traffic.

The area includes limited 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.

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted and a Construction Management Plan is required, which will be reviewed by Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). The requirements for a Construction Management Plan include a Haul Route and a Construction Parking Plan. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>.

Environmental Health

The applicant did not identify any existing contamination on site however, based on the age of the structures asbestos and/or lead may be present onsite. If not properly handled, existing contamination could have an adverse impact on environmental health.

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. The City acknowledges PSCAA's jurisdiction and requirements for remediation will mitigate impacts associated with any contamination. No further mitigation under SEPA Policies 25.05.675.F is warranted for asbestos impacts.

Should lead be identified on the site, there is a potential for impacts to environmental health. Lead is a pollutant regulated by laws administered by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), including the [Toxic Substances Control Act \(TSCA\)](#), [Residential Lead-Based](#)

[Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992](#) (Title X), [Clean Air Act \(CAA\)](#), [Clean Water Act \(CWA\)](#), [Safe Drinking Water Act \(SDWA\)](#), [Resource Conservation and Recovery Act \(RCRA\)](#), and [Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act \(CERCLA\)](#) among others. The EPA further authorized the Washington State Department of Commerce to administer two regulatory programs in Washington State: the Renovation, Repair and Painting Program (RRP) and the Lead-Based Paint Activities Program (Abatement). These regulations protect the public from hazards of improperly conducted lead-based paint activities and renovations. No further mitigation under SEPA Policies 25.05.675.F is warranted for lead impacts.

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; and 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, height bulk and scale, parking, and traffic 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 pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The proposal has gone through the design review process described in SMC 23.41. Design review considers mitigation for height, bulk and scale through modulation, articulation, landscaping, and façade treatment.

Section 25.05.675.G.2.c of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance provides the following: "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 shall be presumed to comply with these 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 on projects that have undergone Design Review shall comply with design guidelines applicable to the project."

The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development and relationship to nearby context have been addressed during the Design Review process for any new project proposed on the site. Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to height bulk and scale are presumed to be sufficient, and additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.G.

Parking

The proposed development includes 148 residential units and 16 live-work units with 126 residential only off-street vehicular parking spaces. The traffic and parking analysis (Transpogroup, Transportation Impact Analysis, May 2016) indicates a peak residential parking demand for approximately 146 vehicles from the proposed development. Peak residential demand typically occurs overnight.

The retail use is anticipated to have a peak parking demand of 20 vehicles. Retail customers and residential guests would not be able to park on-site and instead would utilize off-street parking lots.

The traffic and parking analysis noted that the existing on-street parking utilization rate is approximately 100% within 800' of the site. The proposed 126 parking off-street spaces in the development would not accommodate the peak residential demand of 146 parking spaces and peak retail demand of 20 parking spaces, resulting in a spillover demand for 40 off-site parking spaces (on-street and off-street parking lots) to accommodate the demand. The proposal therefore would have a potential additional impact to on-street parking utilization, resulting in an on-street utilization that is at capacity or approximately 100% utilized.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that there is no SEPA authority provided for mitigation of residential parking impacts in Urban Villages within 1,320 feet of frequent Transit service. This site is located in the Ballard Hub Urban Village and is within 1,320 feet of frequent transit service. Regardless of the residential parking demand impacts, no SEPA authority is provided to mitigate residential impacts of parking demand from this proposal.

Transportation

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Transpogroup, Transportation Impact Analysis, May 2016) indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 670 daily vehicle trips, with 32 net new AM Peak Hour trips and 53 PM Peak hour trips.

The additional trips would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections and on the overall transportation system. Concurrency analysis was conducted for nearby identified areas. That analysis showed that the project is expected to be well within the adopted standards for the identified areas. The Seattle DCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that while these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant; therefore, no further mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.R.

DECISION – SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

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

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

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

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

1. Safety features such as a mirror or early-warning alarm system must be installed at the driveway access point to minimize potential vehicle and pedestrian and bicycle conflicts and enhance safety.

For the Life of the Project

2. 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.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

Prior to Issuance of Demolition, Excavation/Shoring, or Construction Permit

3. Provide a Construction Management Plan that has been approved by SDOT. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>.

BreAnne McConkie, Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: September 12, 2016

BM:drm

K\Decisions-Signed\3019360.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 Seattle DCI 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.