



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: 3020158
Applicant Name: Jodi Patterson O'Hare; Runberg Architecture
Address of Proposal: 123 Broadway

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow a 7-story, 195 unit apartment building which includes one live-work unit and 2,403 sq. ft. of retail at ground level. Parking for 121 vehicles will be located within the structure. Existing buildings to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review with Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)*

* *Departures are listed near the end of the Design Review Analysis in this document*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS PLANNED ACTION ORDINANCE

A Determination of Significance (DS) for redevelopment of Yesler Terrace was made in 2010, and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was conducted in 2010-2012. The Yesler Terrace Final EIS was issued in April 2012.

A Planned Action Ordinance was adopted by Seattle City Council, which defines the environmental impacts and required mitigation for redevelopment of Yesler Terrace as identified through the Yesler Terrace EIS (City of Seattle Ordinance 123962).

Pursuant to the authority for Type I decisions listed in SMC 23.76.006.B, Seattle DCI has determined that the proposal is consistent with the scope of the PAO and compliant with the mitigation described in the PAO.

BACKGROUND


Two proposed development sites, the “West Site” at 123 Broadway (3020158) and the “East Site” at 120 Broadway (3020159) proceeded through the design review Early Design Guidance Process together. Since the Early Design Guidance meeting, the applicant focused on the “West Site” at 123 Broadway (3020158). The West Site is progressing through review under a separate process, and will be analyzed separately.

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Zone: Master Planned
Community Yesler Terrace
(MPC-YT)

Nearby Zones: North: Midrise Multi-
family Residential (MR)
South: MPC-YT
West: MPC-YT
East: MPC-YT

Site Size: 44,879 sf



PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on July 22, 2015. 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 waste loading, traffic and density. Comments were also received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis per SMC 25.05.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

CURRENT AND SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT; NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The site is currently vacant, and was previously developed with early to mid-20th century low-rise affordable housing apartment buildings. The buildings were setback from the street and are separated by fenced yards and public walkways. The site included an early 20th century three-story multi-family building and several two-story buildings constructed in the 1940’s, with fenced yards and pedestrian walkways through the site and several mature trees on site.

Surrounding development consists primarily of early and mid-20th century apartment buildings, with some sites in the process of demolition and one site under construction. The historic landmark Yesler Terrace Steam Plant is located immediately west of the west development site. The structure has recently been converted to include community rooms and Seattle Housing Authority services. The Yesler Terrace Community Center is located across the street to the south, with a large park in the process of development to the southwest. A seven story multi-family building is under construction to the west of the west site. A Pedestrian Pathway is under construction next to this development, and will be adjacent to the site.

In 2013 the City Council adopted a rezone of the Yesler Terrace neighborhood, including Design Review Guidelines. A series of approved street vacations will result in realignment of the public rights of way and parks/open spaces within the Yesler Terrace neighborhood. A pocket park has been identified for the northern portion of the block to the east, and will be reviewed under separate permit and approval through Seattle Department of Transportation and City Council.

The Yesler Terrace community was developed following World War II in response to a need for housing in the Seattle area. A community center is located across Yesler Way from this site, and was constructed in 2005, replacing the original facility. A future park is planned adjacent to the west side of the community center.

The Yesler Terrace area is surrounded by First Hill hospitals to the north, I-5 and downtown to the west, the Central District to the east, and the International District to the south. The area is close to several mass transportation routes, including the Streetcar, several bus routes, and the Light Rail stations in downtown and the International District. A bridge connects Yesler Way from the site to downtown.

The Yesler Terrace neighborhood is steeply sloped at the west and south edges. The specific development sites are slightly sloped from east down to west, and moderately sloped from north down to south.

Access:

There is no existing vehicular access to the site. Parking is predominantly on-street. Pedestrian paths are located throughout both sites.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE May 13, 2015

As noted above, the Early Design Guidance meeting addressed both the subject site (“West Site”) and the block to the east.

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3020158) at this website: <http://www.seattle.gov/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx>

The packet is 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

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The applicant noted that the two proposed development sites are proceeding through the design review process together, but the sites will be developed at different times. The project goals were described as creating a healthy community including food gardens, moderate daily activity, strong social connections, and LEED for healthy buildings.

The applicant noted that the Yesler Terrace master plan was arranged around a series of open spaces and a green street loop. This site is located adjacent to the green street loop and a pocket park. The proposed development includes reconfiguration of the pocket park, which will be reviewed by Design Commission, SDOT, and City Council. The applicant noted that the pocket park design and configuration was presented to Design Commission recently and received support to move forward with the design.

The applicant's intent is to visually connect the proposed development and residential courtyard with the green street loop and pocket park. The Pedestrian Pathway adjacent to the west was described as another focus of the design, completing a strong connection to areas north and south. The west site proposed development includes completion of the north half of the path for this block. The applicant noted that the Pedestrian Pathway would likely include art, cultural references to the history and communities in the area, and connections to the Epstein Opportunity Center (in the historic Steam Plant building). The south half of the path for this block will be completed by the development under construction to the west (820 Yesler Way).

The applicant described improvements of the green street loop, including stormwater treatment, room for people to gather, and physical activity amenities. The Broadway corridor was also shown with similar stormwater amenities, outdoor terraces, bike amenities, and a series of steps and ramps to respond to the grade changes.

Street level residential units were proposed, with varied responses to each frontage condition. The north edge of the east site included a curb bulb at Fir and Broadway to the north and a cycle track.

Described as the community hub, the applicant emphasized design consideration for the intersection of Broadway and Yesler Way. Retail was focused on Yesler Way, consistent with the Yesler Terrace requirements and Yesler Terrace Design Guidelines. The applicant noted that the retail spaces might include restaurant at the west site due to the large adjacent plaza and natural light, as well as proximity to the park to the south. The proposal included live-work spaces, which would be designed to be as flexible as possible to allow for true retail in the future.

Residential entries were shown at the northeast corner of the west site and the northwest corner of the east site, with a relationship across Broadway. The west site also included entries to the Pedestrian Pathway, including a set of stairs connecting the courtyard to the Pedestrian Pathway. Bike entries were shown at various frontages.

As part of the strategy for creating strong social connections, active areas such as lobbies and amenity rooms were shown adjacent to the proposed plazas. The applicant described the intent to create 'irresistible stair' designs in each building, to connect the activity spaces at the roof, the courtyards, and other active uses at grade.

The west site preferred option showed large areas of modulation on the west façade, to break down the massing adjacent to the Pedestrian Pathway and the Opportunity Center.

The options for the east site included another option, beyond those shown in the original EDG packet. The additional massing option located the courtyard facing the proposed linear pocket park at the north edge of the site. This massing located the courtyard opposite the preferred massing, with the courtyard facing south. The applicant explained that the preferred massing creates a separation between the pocket park and courtyard, which allows the pocket park to clearly be identified as public open space. The additional massing showing the courtyard adjacent to the pocket park could create uncertainty about whether the pocket park was public or private open space.

The preferred massing for the east site included ground level setbacks at the northwest corner for visibility to the park and a courtyard to create deep modulation at the upper levels adjacent to Yesler Way.

The massing forms were intended to emphasize the power and character of Broadway/Yesler intersection. The proposed design concept was described as a series of bars, related to the history of timber and urban form of Yesler Terrace. The plinth was a response to the slope, with bar forms at the upper building, and articulation to create additional forms. The massing was oriented to maximize light and air, and create social activity areas for residents. The applicant explained that additional modulation, articulation, and material detail would be provided as the design develops. The forms of the two buildings related to each other, but the materials would be used to create a ‘cousin’ relationship rather than a ‘sibling’ relationship, to avoid a campus appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments were offered at the EDG meeting:

- Appreciated the linear pocket park design on the north site, which preserves natural light to nearby properties;
- Interested in knowing more about the proposed changes to the Fir Street right of way;
- The proposed west building should be designed to respond to the 820 Yesler building, currently under construction. The two buildings should include shared usable activated open space and encourage community interaction;
- The meeting location should be easily accessible to Yesler Terrace or Yesler Terrace transit routes in the future;
- The ground level open spaces should be designed to be open and accessible as well as provide security for the residents of the proposed buildings;
- Appreciated the design of the open spaces and Pedestrian Pathway.
- The intersection of Broadway and Yesler is the hub of the community (including the Community Center, the streetcar stop, the Park, and the only retail in Yesler Terrace), and should be designed to accommodate the large amount of future foot traffic that will likely be there in the future;
- The pocket park on the east block should be designed for security;
- The parking access at 10th Ave might create additional traffic from E. Fir St. The east site should be designed to accommodate the increased traffic; and
- CPTED principles should be used to review safety for the design of the proposed park.

Seattle DCI staff also summarized design related comments received prior to the EDG meeting:

- The west façade of the west building should maximize transparency and porosity and locate open spaces at the west edge and to maximize safety of the Pedestrian Pathway, consistent with the Guidelines for Development along Pedestrian Edges and Design for Security;
- The west site includes cantilevered floors above a first floor. The first floor should include large numbers of openings, fenestration, and connection to the Pedestrian Pathway;
- The west site should be designed to respond to the pedestrian scale and mid-rise context adjacent to the Pedestrian Pathway; and
- The proposed design should respond to the context of the 820 Yesler Way design, including the east-facing landscaped courtyard.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION November 4, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3020158) at this website:

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

The packet is 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
s P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

Since the Early Design Guidance meeting, the applicant focused on the “West Site” or “Block 2E” at 123 Broadway (3020158). The “East Site” or “Block 3” at 120 Broadway (3020159) will be presented at another Recommendation meeting.

During the presentation, the applicant described the changes since the EDG meeting including refinements to the stacked bars configuration and further design development of the building frontages and streetscape.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments were offered at the Recommendation meeting:

- Concerned with waste removal occurring off Broadway and potential conflicts with the First Hill Streetcar.
- Would like to see sufficient amount of bike facilities for residents.
- Concerned with security and bike theft.

- Encouraged the project to coordinate with the current efforts of the First Hill Action Plan. Would like to see future locations of street furnishings and exercise devices considered and identified in the site plan.
- Concerned with the long monolithic facades and the lack of modulation on the north and east facades.
- Concerned with the use of tacked-on elements disguising an unmodulated façade. The effect of the bar concept is to rationalize what are really long, monolithic, unmodulated forms as seen from Fir St and Broadway.
- Concerned with windows organized in a way that does not reflect the floor plans.
- Lack of support for the requested departures to increase the maximum width of a regulated façade along Broadway and to extend into required setbacks.

Seattle DCI staff also summarized design related comments received prior to the Recommendation meeting:

- Supported the proposed color palette including the white brick, wood-like siding and black storefront windows.
- Would like to see better streetscape connections.
- Suggested incorporating more wood into the street frontage.
- Supported the proposed community kitchen and would like to see the space designed to be more open and inviting.
- Would like to see retail designed to be adaptable and flexible over time.
- Supportive of the overall building design aesthetic; the façade articulation and proportions fit well with the character and scale of the neighborhood.
- Supported the residential character of the building along Broadway with the stoop like stairs.
- Supported the project; massing is sufficiently scaled and articulated.
- Would like to see better common area connections to the mid-block pathway.
- Concerned with the significant area of blank wall along the parking garage foundation; the related design departure along the pedestrian pathway should not be allowed.

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 May 13, 2015 (For both projects 3020158 “West Site” and 3020159 “East Site”)

- 1. Height, Bulk, and Scale.** The Board approved of the strong massing and design concept, but directed the applicant to work on articulation and efforts to create a residentially scaled building.
 - a. Both sites:
 - i. The Board gave guidance to use decks and articulation to create residential scale, especially facing the pocket park on the east site. (CS2-D, CS3, DC2-D)
 - ii. The Board was supportive of the preferred massing forms and the relationship between the massing forms, but noted that the two buildings should be

distinctly different in appearance. A campus appearance similar to that found in South Lake Union should be avoided in Yesler Terrace. (DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-D, DC4-A)

- iii. The Board approved of the strong proposed corner design and massing response to the intersection at Yesler Way and Broadway. (CS1-C, DC2-A)
- b. East Site: Stressing the importance of the relationship of Block 3 to the pocket park, the Board recommended more porosity at the north edge of the east site. If possible, provide direct access to the park, while still designing the transition between building and park to provide a visual separation between the public park and the private property. (PL1-A, PL1-B, DC3-B)

2. Building Edges and Frontage Conditions. The Board supported the conceptual response to each frontage condition, and gave guidance for the design development in response to the different frontages.

- a. Both Sites:
 - i. Visual and physical connections should be provided between the pocket park on the east site, and the Pedestrian Pathway on the west site, across Broadway. (PL1-A, PL1-B, DC3-B)
 - ii. The south facades of both sites should respond to the neighborhood Park context to the south with activated retail street level uses, consistent with the design intent. (PL1-A, PL1-C, PL3-B)
 - iii. The south edges of both sites should be designed to accommodate high levels of pedestrian foot traffic. Pedestrian areas should be safe and inviting. (CS2, PL4-A)
 - iv. The northeast corner of the west site and the northwest corner of the east site (corners at Broadway and Fir St) should be designed with a strongly residential scale and quieter level of activity, as intended by the applicant. (PL3-A, PL3-B, DC2-C)
- b. West Site:
 - i. The west site should be designed to maximize porosity adjacent to the Pedestrian Pathway. (CS1-C, PL1-A, DC3-B)
 - ii. The southeast corner of the west site and the southwest corner of the east site (corners at Broadway and Yesler Way) should be designed to complement the hub of activity and the main neighborhood park, as intended by the applicant. (PL1-A, PL1-B, PL1-C)
- c. East Site:
 - i. Create a porous design to connect the pocket park on the north edge of the site with the courtyard on the south edge of the site. (PL1-A, PL3-A, DC1-A)
 - ii. The southwest plaza should be designed to accommodate high levels of pedestrian, bike, and transit users, in anticipation for the mixed modes at the intersection of Broadway and Yesler Way. (PL1-C, PL4-B, PL4-C)
 - iii. The upper level courtyard should be designed to be visually and physically connected to the Yesler Way street level. (PL1-A, PL1-C, DC1-A, DC3-C)

3. Landscape Plan. Both sites: The Board was supportive of the thoughtful landscaping approach to the varied adjacent street frontages, creation of small scale pedestrian areas at the edges of the site, and the plan for Broadway. (CS1-D, CS1-E, DC4-D)

4. **Street Level Uses.** The Board gave direction regarding the street level uses at each street frontage.
 - a. Both sites:
 - i. Any leasing spaces adjacent to the street, pocket park, or Pedestrian Pathway should be designed to activate the frontage even in the evening hours. The Board suggested leasing areas could be combined with residential uses that will provide evening activity such as gathering areas, mailboxes, etc. (PL3)
 - ii. The Board noted that retail is critical to making the ground level successful. This area will be predominantly residential. Any nearby retail areas are located down a steep grade or a longer distance away from the site. The large number of new residents will create a need for retail. The design should maximize retail space and flexibility for varied retail uses wherever possible. (PL3-C)
 - iii. The Board noted that ground level residential units along Broadway respond well to the context of that street frontage. (PL3-B)
 - b. East site:
 - i. The Board discussed the proposed live-work uses on Yesler Way, and strongly recommended that these live-work units be designed as retail where possible, for better activation and engagement with the street level. (PL1-A, PL1-C, PL3-B)
 - ii. The Board was concerned that the proposed combination of street level uses (garage, solid waste storage, above grade garage structure) would result in a deadened street edge with safety challenges. The Board directed that the east façade be designed to activate the street and provide visual interest, rather than designed as a ‘back of house’ condition. (CS3, DC1-C)
 - iii. The solid waste should be located and screened to best respond to the adjacent conditions. (DC1-C)
 - iv. The bike storage area should be designed for visual interest and activation. (PL3, PL4-B)
5. **Safety and Security.** Both sites: The Board acknowledged that safety and security are important considerations for these sites. The design should incorporate CPTED principles, consistent with the Yesler Terrace Design Guidelines. (PL2-B, PL3)
6. **Solar Access.** Both sites: The Board discussed the shadow studies and observed that the preferred massing for both sites appears to provide a good overall response to solar access for open spaces and the adjacent pocket park and Pedestrian Pathway. The Board directed the applicant to design the residential open spaces and Pedestrian Pathway with consideration of shading from buildings and trees. (CS1-A, CS1-B, PL1-C, DC3-A, DC4-D)
7. **Aboveground Parking.** Both sites: The Board agreed that the preferred driveway locations appear to be the best options, given the adjacent street activity. Any parts of the parking structure that are visible above grade should be completely masked, designed to be visually interesting, relate to the pedestrian environment and be detailed for passive surveillance. (DC1-C, DC2-B)

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS (November 4, 2015) (For 3020158 only)

- 1. Height, Bulk, and Scale and Design Concept.** The Board discussed the development of the massing and the horizontal and vertical facade expressions.
 - a. The Board deliberated whether the massing articulation is adequate. The majority of the Board agreed that the two-foot variation in depth shown along Broadway is sufficient and declined to recommend a condition. However, the Board unanimously agreed and recommended projecting the interlocking elements out an additional one to four feet and unanimously supported a setback departure, to create more massing shifts along this frontage. (CS2-D, CS3, DC2-A, DC2-D)
 - b. The Board acknowledged that the massing shown at EDG was more dynamic and discussed the interlocking projections. The Board deliberated if the middle projection should move down, similar to what was shown at EDG, or extend up. Ultimately, the Board did not make this a condition, as the majority of the Board found merit in the projection at the height shown helped break up the facade into smaller frontages. (CS2-D, DC2-A, DC2-D)
 - c. For the north façade, the Board supported the material and window treatment shown in the preferred design, which included the two wood-clad vertical water collection features, each three feet in width. (CS1-E, DC2, DC4-A)
 - d. The Board approved of the glazing detailing, the 4-inch fin projections and the horizontal and vertical facade expressions. (DC2-B, DC2-C, DC2-D, DC4-A)

- 2. Building Frontages and Public Space.** The Board supported the design approach along each frontage and gave additional guidance.
 - a. The Board unanimously supported the water collection and bioswale features. (CS1-E, PL1-A)
 - b. The Board encouraged the applicant to coordinate with the First Hill Action Plan activity loop and indicate on the site plan where specific street furnishings and exercise devices can be located in the future. (PL1-A, PL1-B, PL1-C, DC3-B)
 - c. The Board supported the community kitchen and encouraged the applicant to consider other common resident areas along the pedestrian pathway. (PL1-A-2, PL1-C, PL3-B-4)
 - d. The Board approved of the visual connection between the outdoor courtyard space and the pedestrian pathway. (PL1-A, PL1-C, DC3-A)
 - e. The Board discussed the treatment of the parking foundation wall below the outdoor courtyard space. The Board recommended thoughtful detailing of this wall and evergreen planting at this location. (PL1-A, DC2-D, DC3-C, DC4-A)
 - f. The Board supported the p-patch gardens shown roof level and strongly encouraged the applicant consider other urban farming/food production areas along the pedestrian pathway. (PL1-A, PL1-C, DC3-A)

- 3. Materials.** The Board approved of the materials presented at the meeting and strongly supported the rough stone proposed for the sitework.
 - a. Recognizing that the success of the fiber cement board cladding will depend on detailing of the façade, the Board recommended a strategic and thoughtful use of reveals. (DC2-D, DC4-A)

- b. The Board acknowledged that the garage entry appeared lengthened with the adjacent dark material treatment and recommended further development to be visually subdued. (PL1-B, DC1-C, DC2-D, DC4-A)
4. **Security and Safety** The Board encouraged application of CPTED principles throughout the site. The Board generally supported the garage entry design and recognized that the garage door material will be perforated and recessed can lighting will be provided in this area for visibility. (DC1-C, DC2-B)

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

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

CS1-A Energy Use

CS1-A-1. Energy Choices: At the earliest phase of project development, examine how energy choices may influence building form, siting, and orientation, and factor in the findings when making siting and design decisions.

CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

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

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

CS1-B-3. Managing Solar Gain: Manage direct sunlight falling on south and west facing facades through shading devices and existing or newly planted trees.

CS1-C Topography

CS1-C-1. Land Form: Use natural topography and desirable landforms to inform project design.

CS1-C-2. Elevation Changes: Use the existing site topography when locating structures and open spaces on the site.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Topography

- Design buildings to step up and down hillsides, in order to reflect the site context and provide light and air at lower levels
- Coordinate underground parking access with adjacent properties where feasible, in order to minimize the visual and traffic impacts of parking. This guideline is especially relevant where parking extends to a shared property line.

- Provide internal connections such as stairways and terraces, in order to give pedestrians more options for navigating the hills of Yesler Terrace. Where possible, allow access to the public.
- Orient building facades and open space to activate the 9th Ave Pedestrian Pathway location (described in the “Context and Priority Issues” section).

CS1-D Plants and Habitat

CS1-D-1. On-Site Features: Incorporate on-site natural habitats and landscape elements into project design and connect those features to existing networks of open spaces and natural habitats wherever possible. Consider relocating significant trees and vegetation if retention is not feasible.

CS1-D-2. Off-Site Features: Provide opportunities through design to connect to off-site habitats such as riparian corridors or existing urban forest corridors. Promote continuous habitat, where possible, and increase interconnected corridors of urban forest and habitat where possible.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Plants and Habitat

- To protect existing habitat and provide a sense of an established neighborhood, preserve trees designated for protection in the adopted Yesler Terrace Tree Protection Plan.

CS1-E Water

CS1-E-1. Natural Water Features: If the site includes any natural water features, consider ways to incorporate them into project design, where feasible

CS1-E-2. Adding Interest with Project Drainage:

Use project drainage systems as opportunities to add interest to the site through water-related design elements.



Neighborhood gateways + wayfinding kiosks

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.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Location in the City and Neighborhood:

- Gateways: Use signage, street banners, or other placemaking features to highlight routes in and out of the neighborhood, especially at major gateways as identified in the “Neighborhood gateways + wayfinding kiosks” diagram.

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-2. Existing Site Features: Use changes in topography, site shape, and vegetation or structures to help make a successful fit with adjacent properties.

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

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

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Emphasizing Urban Residential:

- Line sidewalks with residential units with views to the street, landscaped setbacks, and, where feasible, ground-level entries.



PUBLIC LIFE

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

PL1-A Network of Open Spaces

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

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

A Network of Public Spaces

- Design open spaces to serve as an outdoor stage for daily life, with designs that maximize social interaction throughout the day and year.
- Program open spaces for multiple functions and uses, combining social, recreational, and ecological functions.
- Provide a mix of passive places (e.g. sitting and watching) and active areas (e.g. play, exercise) to support users of all ages and abilities.
- Incorporate landscape features for visual amenity, cooling, stormwater management, and habitat for birds and insects (CS1: Natural Systems and Site Features: Water).
- Use natural surveillance and other CPTED principles to create safe and secure spaces.
- Select landscape and hardscape materials per the guidelines in DC4: Exterior Elements and Finishes.

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

PL1-B-1. Pedestrian Infrastructure: Connect on-site pedestrian walkways with existing public and private pedestrian infrastructure, thereby supporting pedestrian connections within and outside the project.

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.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Pedestrian Pathways and Access Drives

- Pedestrian pathways and access drives should be located and designed to:
- Improve pedestrian connections, encourage interaction, and mediate the site's topography.
- Incorporate small gathering spaces, outdoor seating, bike racks and/or planting areas.
- Have well-defined entries where they meet a public right-of-way.
- Coordinate with adjacent parks and private residential amenity areas.
- Use landscape buffers at the transition from shared pathways to private residential amenity areas and entries.
- Coordinate plantings with adjacent developments, and consider incorporating edible landscapes or plantings that provide beneficial habitat.
- Incorporate CPTED principles, using clear sight lines and consistent pedestrian lighting.

Where site conditions and adjacent uses allow, pedestrian pathways and access drives should:

- Provide active uses along their edges.

Pedestrian Pathways are similar to access drives, but they do not allow vehicular access.

- Pedestrian pathways may have commercial or residential uses along their edges.
- Pedestrian pathways should be designed to invite and encourage walking.
- See the "Pedestrian Pathway plan and section diagram"


Sloped Pedestrian Pathways:

- Many pedestrian pathways at Yesler Terrace will require a substantial grade change.
- Provide viewpoints, seating opportunities, and solar exposure in addition to other standard pedestrian pathway amenities.

PL1-C Outdoor Uses and Activities

PL1-C-1. Selecting Activity Areas: Concentrate activity areas in places with sunny exposure, views across spaces, and in direct line with pedestrian routes.

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.



Pedestrian Pathway plan and section diagram

PL1-C-3. Year-Round Activity: Where possible, include features in open spaces for activities beyond daylight hours and throughout the seasons of the year, especially in neighborhood centers where active open space will contribute vibrancy, economic health, and public safety.

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

PL2-B Safety and Security

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

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

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Safety and Security

- All streets, open spaces, walkways and connections should be designed with CPTED principles. And to promote safety and security, design buildings so that residents and businesses provide “eyes on the street” to create an active, comfortable, and safe pedestrian environment.
- Maximize the number of ground-related residential entries to create activity along the street edge.
- Concentrate retail uses north of the central park (see PL1: Open Space Connectivity: Neighborhood Park at the Neighborhood Heart).
- To prevent blank facades, conceal aboveground structured parking behind habitable space as required by code.

Lighting for Safety and Vibrancy

- Reinforce the distinct street characters (see CS2: Urban Pattern and Form).

Reflect the Character of the Adjacent Space:

- Design lighting along streets and sidewalks, access drives, pedestrian pathways, and open spaces to reflect and enhance the character of the adjacent space. Use pedestrian-scale lighting to light the sidewalk and provide a consistent vertical design element along the green street loop.

Guidelines for specific areas:

Pedestrian Pathways

- Illuminate pedestrian pathways continuously during nighttime hours with low-intensity, downward-directed lighting.

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

PL3 Frontage

Frontage guidelines address facades, ground-level uses, and qualities of the public space abutting the setback. Frontage generally pertains to the bottom 30' to 50' of buildings, with greatest emphasis at the street-level.

Yesler Terrace has two basic types of frontage: Residential and Non-Residential.

Ensure that all frontage engage the street-level in order to:

- Create a sidewalk environment that's lively and safe.
- Provide visual surveillance of the public realm without compromising privacy and security for ground-floor dwelling units.
- Make urban living inviting and desirable.
- Give the neighborhood a predominantly residential character.

The following conditions are exempt from PL3 street-level frontage guidelines:

- Facades that do not abut a street, pocket park, access drive, or pedestrian pathway.
- Facades set back more than 30' from a lot line or easement line.
- Facades along Interstate 5.

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-2. Ground-level Residential: Privacy and security issues are particularly important in buildings with ground-level housing, both at entries and where windows are located overlooking the street.

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-B-4. Interaction: Provide opportunities for interaction among residents and neighbors.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Residential Frontage: These guidelines apply to buildings with ground-level residential uses or live-work units.

Typical Residential Frontage

(Facing onto streets and pocket parks)

- Articulate individual dwelling units at the ground level and provide opportunities for personalization by occupants.
- Create a ground-level facade with a residential character. Design the front door and entry area to enhance the privacy transition. Provide operable windows for ground-level units.

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.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Non-Residential Frontage

- Non-residential frontage guidelines apply to buildings that have nonresidential uses at street-level, including retail, services, and office.
- Non-residential frontages may also apply to buildings with residential uses at street-level where that use is a residential lobby, live/work unit, or shared residential amenity space. Frontage should:
 - Provide moderate to high transparency at the ground level, consistent with code requirements.
 - Extend the public realm from the right-of-way to the edge of the building. Threshold elements should only be used within a narrow zone to define or enclose outdoor seating areas, or to increase privacy for ground-level office or live/work units.
 - Provide shading, weather protection, and human-scale definition at the street level with canopies, awnings, and/or upper-level balconies.
 - Do not use canopies and awnings with back-lighting, high-gloss finishes, or plasticized fabrics.

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

PL4-A Entry Locations and Relationships

PL4-A-1. Serving all Modes of Travel: Provide safe and convenient access points for all modes of travel.

PL4-A-2. Connections to All Modes: Site the primary entry in a location that logically relates to building uses and clearly connects all major points of access.

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.

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Entry Locations and Relationships

Planning Ahead for Cyclists

- Provide visible, attractive bike racks that meet City standards at entrances to buildings and pedestrian pathways, within courtyards, next to neighborhood parks, and the retail core, as appropriate.

PL4-C Planning Ahead For Transit

PL4-C-1. Influence on Project Design: Identify how a transit stop (planned or built) adjacent to or near the site may influence project design, provide opportunities for placemaking.

PL4-C-2. On-site Transit Stops: If a transit stop is located onsite, design project-related pedestrian improvements and amenities so that they complement any amenities provided for transit riders.

PL4-C-3. Transit Connections: Where no transit stops are on or adjacent to the site, identify where the nearest transit stops and pedestrian routes are and include design features and connections within the project design as appropriate.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Planning Ahead for Transit

- For sites at Yesler and Broadway, help connect retail activity on the north side of the intersection with recreation and social activity at the community center and neighborhood park. This may be done through paving details or other design cues (DC1: Project Uses and Activities and PL1: Open Space Connectivity: Neighborhood Park at the Neighborhood Heart).
- Include weather protection and lean rails or other seating as part of frontage abutting transit stops.

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-C Parking and Service Uses

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Parking and Loading Uses

- To reduce the visual impacts of parking, Land Use Code standards require that onsite parking be underground, or, if aboveground, concealed from streets, parks, access drives, or pedestrian pathways by space dedicated to active uses (residential units, storefronts, etc.). Specific provisions are located in SMC 23.75.180.
- Frontage that wraps structured parking should have dimensions and architectural detailing that create usable, desirable space; occupancy and activity in these frontages is key to truly concealing the parking.

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Massing

- Highly articulated building forms at all levels are desired at Yesler Terrace; development standards are written in part to achieve this variety.
- Foster architectural variety on a block.
- Design massing to reduce shading impacts to public open spaces and shared amenity spaces, where feasible.

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-B-2. Blank Walls: Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Scales of Architectural Composition

Building design at Yesler Terrace should pay particular attention to three scales:

- Human Scale – near the level of the sidewalk and at building openings such as windows and doors where the tactile nature of materials, the subtlety of colors, and well-articulated architectural details or ornament can help establish connections between a building, its occupants, and passersby.
- Neighborhood Scale – at the mid to upper building levels, where the building mass establishes the overall spatial enclosure for the street, park, access drive, or pedestrian pathway; and
- City Scale – at the building tops, where rooftops, highrise forms, and groups of highrises can shape the skyline as viewed statically from afar, or dynamically on approach from the freeway.

Human Scale

Strategies and features to meet this guideline include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Provide places to sit at the base of the building.

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Integrate Modulation Elements: Where individual elements or features are repeated along a facade, vary their spacing, design, rhythm, type, or purpose to support architectural variety within the context of the overall architectural design concept.

- Arrange modulation elements and secondary architectural features on the facade to create a balanced composition integrated with the design of the building.

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.

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Human Scale

Focus on the First Thirty Feet

Strategies and features to meet this guideline include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Provide places to sit at the base of the building.

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

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Building-Open Space Relationship

Private Yards, Patios and Balconies:

Design these areas to:

- Provide refuge and relaxation for residents.
- Integrate with the building design, and with adjacent semi-private or public open spaces.

Courtyards, Gardens and Rooftop Patios: Think of these spaces as shared outdoor rooms. Take advantage of this concept when laying out plots and designing building forms. In stepped buildings, use roofs and terraces for private and communal outdoor patios and gardens. Buildings with courtyards, gardens and rooftop patios should:

- Provide a mix of passive places (e.g. sitting) and active areas (e.g. play) to support residents of all ages and needs. Examples include niches for a single or a few people; larger areas for a crowd; places to sit, cook, garden, play, and exercise; and a variety of levels and materials.

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs: Plan the size, uses, activities, and features of each open space to meet the needs of expected users, ensuring each space has a purpose and function.

DC3-B-2. Matching Uses to Conditions: Respond to changing environmental conditions such as seasonal and daily light and weather shifts through open space design and/or programming of open space activities.

DC3-B-3. Connections to Other Open Space: Site and design project-related open spaces to connect with, or enhance, the uses and activities of other nearby public open space where appropriate.

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

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.

DC3-C-2. Amenities/Features: Create attractive outdoor spaces suited to the uses envisioned for the project.

DC3-C-3. Support Natural Areas: Create an open space design that retains and enhances onsite natural areas and connects to natural areas that may exist off-site and may provide habitat for wildlife.

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

DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes

DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials: Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Building Materials

Preferred Exterior Materials:

- Use materials that have a durability that is appropriate for an urban application. Masonry (such as local rock, cut stone, brick, or ground face concrete masonry units), integral color cement plaster, metal, and concrete are preferred primary façade materials.
- Where wood and heavy timber are exposed to weather, provide appropriate protection to increase their durability.

Street-Level Façade:

- Along streets, access drives, pedestrian pathways, and open space, use the above preferred materials for at least 50% of the street-level façade, excluding areas with glazing.

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-3. Long Range Planning: Select plants that upon maturity will be of appropriate size, scale, and shape to contribute to the site as intended.

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

Yesler Terrace Supplemental Guidance:

Plant Materials:

- In designing private landscape features, complement plantings in adjacent open spaces.

Hardscape Materials:

- Use durable materials that complement the architectural elements of a project.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board’s recommendation was based upon the departures’ potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departures.

1. **Maximum Width of Regulated Façade (SMC 23.75.130):** The Code allows a maximum façade width of 240’. The applicant proposes a façade width of 268’2” along Broadway (east façade) and 304’1” adjacent to the Pedestrian Path (west façade).

The Board acknowledged that the developed design complements the adjacent Pedestrian Pathway, but struggled with the massing articulation along Broadway. Ultimately, four Board members supported the departure, based on the proposal to locate the courtyard to complement the adjacent Pedestrian Pathway and design the courtyard to provide usable residential open space.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines DC3-A, by providing a visual connection between the outdoor courtyard space and the pedestrian pathway and an active use to emphasize human activity.

2. **Upper Level Setbacks (SMC 23.75.140):** The Code requires various minimum setbacks adjacent to certain streets/Pedestrian Paths/public access easements, and a special setback condition at Yesler Way and Broadway. The applicant proposes 2,700 square feet of upper level setback encroachments along Yesler Way, Broadway, E Fir St and the pedestrian pathway.

The Board unanimously supported the departure, based on the proposed massing response to the unusual lot configuration and the strong architectural expression at Yesler Way. The Board further recommended projecting out the interlocking elements along Broadway an additional one to four feet to create more massing shifts, similar to the difference in depth along the pedestrian pathway, but declined to recommend a condition related to this change. This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines DC2-A and DC2-D by providing visual interest and depth, consistent with the overall architectural concept.

3. **Aboveground Parking Uses (SMC 23.75.180.F.3):** The Code allows 20% of aboveground parking without a separated use. The applicant proposes 22.6%.

The Board unanimously supported the departure, as the developed design response to the adjacent frontages better meets the intent of Design Review Guidelines PL1-A and PL1-B, by contributing to a network of open spaces along the building edges.

4. **Aboveground Parking Setbacks (SMC 23.75.180.F.1):** The Code requires various minimum setbacks for aboveground parking, depending on the abutting condition. The applicant proposes reduced setbacks for portions of the parking structure that extend above grade in the southern half of the site.

The Board unanimously supported the departure, based on the minimal impact to the pedestrian realm and the conceptual design response to the adjacent frontages, since the overall design meets the intent of Design Review Guidelines PL1-A and PL1-B, by contributing to a network of open spaces.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated November 4, 2015, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the November 4, 2015 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design with no conditions.

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 SDCI 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.

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 November 4, 2015, the Board recommended approval of the project with no conditions as described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Five of six Design Review Board members were in attendance and provided recommendations 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 results 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, SDCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board.

The Director of SDCI 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 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 APPROVES the proposed design and the requested departures with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision.

II. ANALYSIS - PLANNED ACTION ORDINANCE

The adopted Planned Action Ordinance defines the environmental impacts and required mitigation for redevelopment of Yesler Terrace.

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the Planned Action Ordinance checklist submitted by the applicant dated June 16, 2015. SDCI has analyzed the PAO checklist, reviewed the project plans and additional information in the file and has determined that the proposal is consistent with the scope of the PAO and compliant with the mitigation described in the PAO, as described in the sections below.

Plants and Animals

The PAO identified Tier 1 and Tier 2 trees. There are no Tier 1 trees on the site. All Tier 2 trees are proposed to be removed or have been removed through demolition and site work permits, and replacement trees are proposed as shown on the MUP landscape plan sheets. The proposal is consistent with the adopted Yesler Terrace Tree Protection Plan.

Noise

The applicant has submitted a noise mitigation plan which included steps to limit decibel levels and duration of construction-related noise, as well as procedures for advanced notice to surrounding properties, consistent with the adopted Yesler Terrace PAO. Sound levels and mitigation measures are incorporated into the building design to meet the interior noise threshold, specified in the PAO. The proposal meets the noise section of the PAO.

Light and glare

Proposed exterior lighting, both construction-related and permanent, will be shielded and directed away from adjacent buildings, and from helicopters using Harborview Medical Center's heliport. The MUP plan set notes that all glazing shall have an exterior reflectance rating not to exceed .20 with no first surface reflective coatings. The proposal is consistent with the adopted light and glare section of the PAO.

Historic resources

The proposal does not include any alterations to the exterior of the Steam Plant (now referred to as the Epstein Community Center), a designated City of Seattle landmark. Since the proposal is adjacent to this designated landmark, the proposal was referred to Department of Neighborhoods for review of potential impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.H.2.d. The Department of Neighborhoods approved their review on August 26, 2015.

Transportation

To be consistent with the PAO, development must include through-block public pedestrian access in certain locations, as specified in the ordinance. As shown in the MUP plan set, a pedestrian access pathway is developed at the minimum required width within the platted easement along the west portion of the site. The platted easements are shown in the approved Yesler Terrace Community Plat, under project number 3012996 recording number 20141209001425.

Since the proposal contains more than 20 residential units, the project includes unbundled parking from residential units and parking for car sharing programs as measures to reduce the total amount of parking and the number of drive-alone commute trips.

The proposal is consistent with the adopted PAO Transportation requirements.

DETERMINATION - PLANNED ACTION ORDINANCE

Pursuant to the authority for Type I decisions listed in SMC 23.76.006.B, Seattle DCI has determined that the proposal is consistent with the scope of the PAO and compliant with the mitigation described in the PAO. No further environmental review mitigation is required.

DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

1. 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. (Magda Hogness at magdahogness@seattle.gov or 206-727-8736).
2. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 30-2015 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 (Magda Hogness at magdahogness@seattle.gov or 206-727-8736).

For the Life of the Project

3. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials shown in the MUP plan set. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Magda Hogness at magdahogness@seattle.gov or 206-727-8736).

Magda Hogness, Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: March 3, 2016

MH:drm

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.