



**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:** 3020235  
**Applicant name:** David Foster, David Foster Architects  
**Address of Proposal:** 4801 Fauntleroy Way SW

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL**

Land Use Application to allow a four story 52-unit apartment building. One live-work unit and 2,575 sq. ft. of retail to be provided at grade. Existing parking lot 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)**

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

**SEPA DETERMINATION:**

Determination of Non-Significance

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

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial  
with a 40' Height Limit (NC3-40)

Nearby Zones: North: NC3-85 (4.75)  
South: NC3-40  
West: NC3-40  
East: Low Rise (LR3)

ECAs: None

Site Size: 9,000 sq. ft.



PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on October 28, 2015. Comment(s) were received through the Design Review process. No other comments were received in response to this public comment period.

- Concerned over the lack of parking.
- Concerned over potential construction impacts, including noise and parking.
- Supported the proposed live-work programming along SW Edmunds Street.
- Felt that the project was a unique mix of programming and that the massing was more interesting than a “box”.
- Supported the concept for the corner as a multi-level commercial space.
- Encouraged green building elements.
- Appreciated that the applicant presented three different options.
- Supported the density of the project.
- Felt the massing had the potential to be an attractive building.
- Felt that the massing was aesthetically pleasing.
- Encouraged more live-work spaces, as opposed to retail.
- Supported the option with parking and encouraged the applicant to add additional parking tucked under the upper stories.
- Concerned about the live-work spaces not functioning as such, and becoming dead space at street level.
- Felt that more retail was appropriate, as the immediate vicinity is regarded as very walkable.

**I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW**

**Current Development:**

The site is currently vacant, serving as a construction vehicle staging area for the development in progress directly to the north.

**Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:**

The site is located within the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village, and the West Seattle Triangle planning area. A defining feature of the area is the diverse mix of residential and commercial uses.

Immediately to the south of the site is a two-story multi-family residential building and surface parking lot. To the east across Fauntleroy Way SW is a three-story multi-family building. To the west, across the alley, is a single-story commercial building containing the Bella Mente Early Learning Center. Across SW Edmunds St. to the north, a large mixed use structure with a Whole Foods is under development; the project site contains a pedestrian and vehicular mid-block passage between 40<sup>th</sup> Ave SW and Fauntleroy Way SW. Other new developments in the area include a mixed use structure with a QFC grocery store on SW Alaska, the Mural Apartments, and the Broadstone West Seattle.

***FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE July 23, 2015***

*The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project numbers (3020235) at this website:*

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

*The 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](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)***

<b>PRIORITIES &amp; BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
-----------------------------------------------

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

**EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE July 23, 2015**

1. **Massing, Context Response, and Façade Composition:** The Board generally preferred the massing concept presented in Scheme B as an appropriate response to site characteristics and urban context. (CS1-B, CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-D, DC2-A)
  - a. The Board felt the massing provides an appropriate transition in scale and character from the large scale development to the north to the residential scale of the Lowrise zone to the south. (CS2-D)
  - b. The intended modulation along each street front appears appropriate for the scale and size of the project. The modulation and detailing should respond to the internal programming, as well as to the varying streetscape character. (CS2-D, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-D)

- c. The entry courtyard effectively breaks up the massing along SW Edmunds, contributing to the perceived smaller scale of the development. The Board felt that the break in massing creates the opportunity to express different, but related, design languages on each portion. (CS2-D, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-D)
- d. The corner should be prominent but not overly dramatic, and should incorporate the retail entry. The gesture should be at a pedestrian scale. The Board suggested breaking or altering the design of the overhead weather protection to enhance the legibility of the entry. (CS2-A, CS2-C, DC2-A, DC2-B)
- e. The Board supported the canopy as a unifying feature across the massing, and encouraged the applicant to use a simple design that relates the internal programming. (PL2-C, PL3-A, DC2-C, DC2-D, DC2-A)
- f. The Board requested to see more information regarding the treatment and articulation of the south facing and alley facing façades, noting that any materials and level of articulation on any blank walls should be carefully considered. (CS2-D, DC2-B)
- g. The massing should be refined to provide as much access to light and air as possible. The Board suggested increasing the setback on the south facing units, and possibly creating a courtyard, to allow for more space between the units. (CS1-B, P1-C, DC2-A)
- h. The Board supported the location and configuration of parking presented in Scheme C, and noted that this could be applied to the massing concept in Scheme B. (DC1-B, DC1-C, DC2-A)
- i. The façade composition of the alley should be carefully considered in regards to adjacent uses. (CS2-D, DC2-B)
- j. The Board felt the mews in Scheme C was too narrow and would not be a comfortable or welcoming space. In addition, the Board was concerned about the privacy issues and lack of access to light of the internal units and windows. To make this concept work, more open space and a more substantial entry would be necessary. (PL1-C, PL3-A, DC2-A)

## **2. Street-Level Uses & Pedestrian Experience:**

- a. The live-work units should be designed to support viable commercial uses as to activate the streetscape.  
The Board noted that the units appeared very narrow, and encouraged the applicant to carefully consider the internal layout of the units. (PL3-B, PL3-C)
- b. The location and design of the commercial/retail space and any ancillary space at the corner is critical for engaging and activating the corner and Fautleroy SW. (CS2-C PL1-C, PL2-B, PL3-C, PL3-A, DC2-A)
- c. The location and rhythm of the live-work units appropriately responds to the scale and character SW Edmunds St. (CS3-A, DC2-A)
- d. The Board felt the smaller size of the commercial spaces was appropriate, noting that it may provide an opportunity for neighborhood businesses. The Board suggested making the spaces flexible to accommodate multiple sizes over time. (CS2-A, CS3-A, PL3-C)

<b>RECOMMENDATION February 18, 2016</b>
-----------------------------------------

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3020235) at this website:

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

The 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

<b>PRIORITIES &amp; BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
-----------------------------------------------

**FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS: FEBRUARY 18, 2016**

- 1. Massing and Architectural Composition.** Overall, the Board supported the massing and scale of the building, and felt it was appropriate for the context. The Board discussed additional refinement of the material application and massing composition to improve the clarity of the parti. (CS1.B, CS2.D, CS3.A, PL2.D, PL3.A, DC2.A, DC2.B, DC2.D, DC2.E, DC4.A)
  - a. The Board supported the upper level setback and balconies, as they provide relief to the massing and access to light and air.
  - b. The elevator tower should be kept neutral, simple, and designed to fade into the background.
  - c. The recesses at the residential entries create a gasket that provides intuitive wayfinding and relates to the overall design concept. However, the Board noted that the green panel base color and wood accents surrounding the entry doors compete for attention and diminish the clear expression of the residential entry gasket. The Board conditioned that the green panel at the gasket be changed to wood siding to unite the entry module and fully express the gasket in the articulation of the mass. The Board recommended that a wood siding provides a more appropriate scale of materials, intuitive wayfinding, and residential character.
  - d. The Board supported the differentiated 4<sup>th</sup> story mass in white panel, noting that it reduces the height, bulk and scale of the upper level and results in a clarity of the massing.
  - e. The Board advised particular attention be paid to materials which wrap corners, and be sure that the joints align.
  
- 2. Residential Entries and Street Level Unit on Edmunds.** The Board discussed the location of the single residential unit at ground-level on Edmunds, noting that the relationship of this unit to the residential entry and lobby requires clarification and refinement. The Board offered two directions on how to resolve this issue. (PL2.D, PL3.A, PL3.B, DC4.B)
  - a. Investigate the layout and internal programming at the courtyard. Ideally, this would be an amenity space or create a larger lobby. This change would allow for a more generous entry and for additional transparency at the street level, as well as open up space at the entry sequence.

- b. If the unit remains, revise the layout to further privatize external access and resolve the imbalance of hierarchy between the main residential entry and the unit entry. Explore moving the unit entry to the lobby and instead provide a small patio at grade.

If the entrance remains on Edmunds, set it father back from the pedestrian realm, and revise the appearance to clearly read as a unit entry by appropriately adjusting the balance of mass and voids to make the lobby entry more prominent. The Board supported the bench and paving change at the lobby entry, and suggested widening the entry to incorporate more open space to feel more welcoming.

3. **Base Expression and Corner Massing.** The Board discussed the retail base at length. The Board noted that the truncated massing of the two-story base and material application do not read as a corner site, and should be revised clarify the expression of the base and overall design concept. (CS2.A, CS2.C, CS3.A, DC2.A, DC2.B, DC2.D, DC2.E, DC4.A)
  - a. The Board supported the design of the base on Edmunds, noting the composition and character appropriately breaks down the massing to a pedestrian scale through the use of texture, materials, and fenestration. The Board noted that the tall windows along both streetscapes should remain.
  - b. The Board supported the 3-story mass on Fauntleroy, but noted that the use of large cementitious panel on the entire mass was not adequately evoking a pedestrian streetscape nor indicating the commercial uses at street-level. In addition, the break at the corner diminishes the design of the base. The Board conditioned that the two-story mass on the north façade be revised to a three-story mass, and that this design wrap around the east façade to turn the corner at the south façade and resolve the base as a distinct mass. This design shall be the proposed CMU or a material with comparable texture and scale, such as brick.
4. **South Elevation.** The Board was concerned with the scale of materials and composition on the south façade, noting that it is likely to remain highly visible for some time. (CS2.D, DC2.B, DC2.D)
  - a. The use of green on the south façade is extensive and no longer appears to be an accent color. To this regard, the Board found this application of the green panels to muddle the clarity of the composition by insinuating a relationship that does not exist. The Board recommended revising the color that ties into the façade on Fauntleroy and helps to resolve the massing.
  - b. The Board was concerned that the materials express large, monolithic patterns. The Board conditioned that the materials composition be revised to break down the scale of the façade, and suggested using themes and strategies applied elsewhere on the building, such as demarcating levels with a narrow band, or using finer-grained materials such as wood or CMU.

## 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.

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

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

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

**CS2-D-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.**

**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.

**CS3-A-3. Established Neighborhoods:** In existing neighborhoods with a well-defined architectural character, site and design new structures to complement or be compatible with the architectural style and siting patterns of neighborhood buildings.

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

**PUBLIC LIFE**

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

**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.

**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.

**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.

#### **PL2-D Wayfinding**

**PL2-D-1. Design as Wayfinding:** Use design features as a means of wayfinding wherever possible.

### **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-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.

## **DESIGN CONCEPT**

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

#### **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.

#### **DC1-C Parking and Service Uses**

**DC1-C-1. Below-Grade Parking:** Locate parking below grade wherever possible. Where a surface parking lot is the only alternative, locate the parking in rear or side yards, or on lower or less visible portions of the site.

**DC1-C-2. Visual Impacts:** Reduce the visual impacts of parking lots, parking structures, entrances, and related signs and equipment as much as possible.

**DC1-C-4. Service Uses:** Locate and design service entries, loading docks, and trash receptacles away from pedestrian areas or to a less visible portion of the site to reduce possible impacts of these facilities on building aesthetics and pedestrian circulation.

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

**DC2-A Massing**

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

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

**DC2-B Architectural and Façade Composition**

**DC2-B-1. Façade Composition:** Design all building façades—including alleys and visible roofs— considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all façades 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 façades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

**DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features**

**DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest:** Add depth to façades 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.

**DC2-D Scale and Texture**

**DC2-D-1. Human Scale:** Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building façades, 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.

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

**DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes**

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

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

**DC4-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-B-2. Coordination with Project Design:** Develop a signage plan within the context of architectural and open space concepts, and coordinate the details with façade design, lighting, and other project features to complement the project as a whole, in addition to the surrounding context.

**DC4-C Lighting**

**DC4-C-1. Functions:** Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

**DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare:** Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) 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 departure(s).

At the time of the Recommendation no departures were requested.

**BOARD DIRECTION**

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

1. Replace the green panels at both residential entry recesses and at the live-work units with wood siding.
2. Revise the two-story mass along Edmunds to a three-story mass, with either brick or the proposed CMU. This base shall wrap from the north façade to the east façade and around the corner to the south façade.
3. Revise the material composition on the south facade by removing the green panel and break down the scale and relate to the massing concept and established design language.

## 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 February 18, 2016, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Five members of the Southwest 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.

### Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Condition:

1. The applicant responded with a new plan set on June 29, 2016. The residential entry siding material has been changed to wood. The live-work unit entry panel has not been changed to wood. The applicant has proposed a white hardie panel instead. As a condition of MUP issuance the applicant shall replace the white hardie panels above the live/work unit and the two retail spaces on the northwest quadrant of the façade with wooden panels.
2. The applicant has revised the two-story mass at Edmonds to a two-story CMU mass that wraps from the north to the east façade to the south façade with a three-story

- mass stepped back due to the presence of power lines. The presence of the powerlines was not discussed at the Recommendation meeting.
3. The green panel has been removed and the hardie panels have been configured in a horizontal fashion to break down the scale of the south façade.

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 five members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines.

#### DIRECTOR'S DECISION

The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and [CONDITIONALLY] APPROVES the proposed design.

## **II. ANALYSIS – SEPA**

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated 9/28/2015. 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 construction-related noise, air quality, earth/soils greenhouse gas, construction traffic and parking impacts, 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.F.

### Construction Impacts - Parking and Traffic

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, grading, and construction activity. The area is subject to significant traffic congestion during peak travel times on nearby arterials. Large trucks turning onto arterial streets would be expected to further exacerbate the flow of traffic.

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

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>.

### *Construction Impacts - Noise*

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. The Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08.425) permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with private development construction and equipment between the hours of: 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays.

If extended construction hours are desired, the applicant may seek approval from Seattle DCI through a Noise Variance request. The applicant's environmental checklist does not indicate that extended hours are anticipated.

A Construction Management Plan will be required prior to issuance of the first building permit, including contact information in the event of complaints about construction noise, and measures to reduce or prevent noise impacts. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>. The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance and the CMP are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigation noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

### Earth / Soils

Excavation to construct the residential structures will be necessary. Excavation will remove an estimated 195 cubic yards of material from the development site. Soil, gravel and similar materials may be imported to or exported from the site. Transported soil is susceptible to being dropped, spilled or leaked onto City streets. The City's Traffic Code (SMC 11.74.150 and .160) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that loads be either 1) secured/covered; or 2) a minimum of six inches of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container). The regulation is intended to minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed in route to or from a site. No further conditioning of the impacts associated with the grading/excavation impacts of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies (SMC 25.05.675.D).

### 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; 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, historic resources, 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.F

### 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 historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.G.

### Parking

The proposed development includes 52 residential units with zero off-street vehicular parking spaces. The parking utilization study from William Popp Associates dated January 21, 2016 indicates a peak demand for approximately 30 vehicles from the proposed development. Peak residential demand typically occurs overnight.

The traffic and parking analysis noted that the existing on-street parking utilization rate is approximately 52% within 800’ of the site. The proposed development peak demand of 30 parking spaces would be accommodated by off-street spaces. The proposal therefore would have a potential additional impact to on-street parking utilization, resulting in an on-street utilization of 60%. Total cumulative parking demand of the proposal and other projects in the vicinity would result in a potential on-street parking utilization of 60% within 800’ of the site.

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

### Transportation

The Traffic Impact Analysis from William Popp Associates dated September 17, 2015 indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 319 daily vehicle trips, with 26 net new PM Peak Hour trips and 15 AM 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).
- Mitigated 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 a Master Use Permit*

1. The applicant shall revise elevations to include wooden siding above the live/work unit and the two retail entries at the northwest quadrant of the north elevation.

#### *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 (Joshua Johnson 206-684-8278 and [Joshua.johnson@seattle.gov](mailto:Joshua.johnson@seattle.gov)).

### **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>.

During Construction

4. Construction activities (including but not limited to demolition, grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays from 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays. Interior work that involves mechanical equipment, including compressors and generators, may be allowed on Saturdays between 9am and 6pm once the shell of the structure is completely enclosed, provided windows and doors remain closed. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition. This condition may be modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, required prior to issuance of a building permit as noted in condition #1.

Joshua Johnson, AICP, Land Use Planner  
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: August 25, 2016

JJ:drm

K:\Decisions-Signed\3020235.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](mailto:prc@seattle.gov) or to our message line at 206-684-8467.