



City of Seattle

---

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor  
**Department of Planning and Development**  
D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE  
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR  
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

**Application Number:** 2307655  
**Applicant Name:** Bryan Borchers, CDA Pirscher Architects  
**Address of Proposal:** 1401 Spring Street

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION**

Master Use Permit to establish use for future construction of a 15-story building with 43 dwelling units and 1,407 square feet of ground floor retail. At grade and below grade parking for 57 vehicles provided.<sup>1</sup>

The following approvals are required:

**SEPA - Environmental Determination** - Chapter 25.05, Seattle Municipal Code (SMC)

**Design Review**, Chapter 23.41, Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Development Standard  
Departures from the Land Use Code are requested as follows:

1. Parking within or under structures (SMC 23.47.016D2)

**SEPA DETERMINATION:**  Exempt  DNS  MDNS  EIS

DNS with conditions

DNS involving non-exempt grading, or demolition, or involving another agency with jurisdiction.

<sup>1</sup> Project originally noticed as Master Use Permit to establish use for future construction of a 67,108 sq. ft. 13 story building with 37 dwelling units and 3,478 sq. ft. of retail space at ground level. Parking provided for 48 vehicles on three levels below grade.

## **BACKGROUND DATA**

### Site and Vicinity Description

The subject site is located at the southeast corner of Spring Street and Boylston Avenue in the First Hill neighborhood, in close proximity to Swedish Hospital. The 7,200-sq. ft., rectangular site measures 120 ft. on Spring Street and 60 ft. on Boylston Avenue. Currently, a pay parking lot occupies the relatively flat property. The site is zoned Neighborhood Commercial 3 with a 160-foot height limit (NC3-160') and within a light rail station area overlay zone. A light rail station is planned at Madison Street and Boylston Avenue; although recent news indicates that First Hill might not be served by Sound Transit light rail due to funding and soil problems.

The surrounding area includes a mixture of uses, building scales and styles that comprise a high density, urban neighborhood. Adjacent zoning is Highrise (HR) to the north and west, NC3-160' in the subject block, to the east and the south, and NC3-65' farther to the east. Three quarters of the block fronting on Madison and Harvard is within a pedestrian designated overlay zone (P1); however, the subject site is not within this overlay. Uses include mid to high-rise multi-family, retail, office and medical. The Lutheran church, an institutional use, to the east of the subject property is a designated historic landmark.

### Project Description

The proposed project consists of the construction of a 15 story mixed use building with 3 levels of below grade parking garage. The design shows 43 condominium units, 1,400 square feet of ground level retail and parking for 57 vehicles. The retail would be located in the northwest corner of the site and be accessed from Spring Street. The residential lobby would be accessed off Boylston Avenue. The below grade parking would be accessed via a mechanical parking lift from the alley and another 9 space garage would be located at grade accessed from the alley. Open space and recreation areas for the building would consist of a roof deck and an exercise/community room with outdoor deck on the 2nd floor.

### Public Comment

Public notice was provided for the Early Design Guidance (EDG) Design Review meeting that was held by the Design Review Board on February 25, 2004. The EDG meeting was well attended with 16 members of the public in attendance. A written summary of public comments received during the two previous Early Design Guidance meetings (Project Nos. 9900541 and 2203094) was provided to the public. The applicant addressed many of the previous concerns during the presentation of the design concept and answered questions about the design from the public and the Board. The following comments were made:

- Study the potential noise impacts from the mechanical vents vented through the roof.
- Create some open space in the right of way or on the private property
- Provide active space at the street level- active type of retail, like coffee shop.
- How does the retail meet the sidewalk
- Will there be plantings on Spring Street...need street trees
- Involve landscape architect in the early stages of development.
- Boylston Avenue is used more by pedestrians to access Madison Street corridor.
- Acknowledge that there is a daycare nearby and there could be conflicts with pedestrians.
- Screen service areas
- Likes awnings over entrances since it better demarks the entrances
- Don't use too many different finish materials.

Further notice and public comment opportunity was provided as required with the Master Use Permit application. No written comments were received during the Master Use Permit comment period that ended on November 3, 2004.

Public notice was provided for a Recommendation Design Review meeting that was held by the Design Review Board on June 1, 2005. Six members of the public attended the recommendation meeting. The public comments germane to the building design were as follows:

- likes that pedestrian seating is proposed in the right of way
- likes that the design fits into the traditional style of the neighborhood
- wants to make sure that the garbage and recycling is within the parking garage and screened from view
- likes the water feature in the residential lobby.
- wants to understand how the parking lifts will work.

Other comments and questions not related to the design included a question on the unit count and configuration, and whether Sound Transit was going to acquire this property.

In response to the public the architect indicated that Sound Transit has not contacted him. The unit count as currently proposed is 14 one-bedroom (1000-1100 square feet), 25 two-bedroom (2000+ square feet), 3 three-bedroom (2000+ square feet) and 2 penthouses (3000+ square feet). The garbage and recycling will be screened by a roll up door off the alley.

## **ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW**

### **Early Design Guidance**

#### **PRIORITIES:**

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 siting and design guidance described below and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in the City of Seattle's "*Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings*" of highest priority to this project.

**A: Site Planning**

**A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street. Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.**

Based on the presentation, the Board felt that the residential entry needs more attention and should have grander scale. They would like to see each commercial space having direct access from the street and be clearly identifiable.

**A-4 Human Activity. New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.**

The Board was concerned about how the proposed commercial entrances meet the sidewalk on the Spring Street side in that the site slopes. Particular attention must be devoted to where the commercial entries are provided and their relationship to the floor plates and the sidewalk elevation. The proposed Spring Street sidewalk elevation shows more blank wall moving towards the alley which could reduce the amount of visual interest and human activity. The architect needs to work on this relationship to provide opportunity to enhance the street life. Also, it was noted that selection of a retail tenant is important in providing a vibrant street atmosphere. The board wants the commercial space designed with enough flexibility so potential retail tenants that provide greater human activity will not be dissuaded from leasing the space.

**A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.**

The design proposes open space in three areas, a roof top deck on top of the 4th floor, individual unit decks, and an upper roof top deck on top of the 13th floor. There was concern expressed by a Board member that the upper roof deck open space would be impacted by wind and not be comfortable or utilized. The 4th floor roof deck is proposed between the 2 elevator towers on the southern portion of the building close to the ventilation out-takes. Study the noise impacts from having the garage ventilation close to the roof decks. The Board and the public also focused on the open space to be provided in the residential entry plaza and in the street right of way in that the First Hill

neighborhood has many examples of nicely landscaped streetscapes. Detailed landscape drawings and details should be provided at the next meeting.

**A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties and pedestrian safety.**

Screen the loading space and parking access from Spring Street in that the design proposes setting the building back from the alley exposing the loading space to the street.

**A-10 Corner Lots. Buildings on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.**

The Board did not offer specific guidance, but felt it was important guideline for the project. The proposed building mass is oriented to both street fronts and does offer opportunities to include design elements to address the corner.

**B: Height, Bulk and Scale**

**B-1 Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less-intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.**

See D-2.

**C: Architectural Elements and Materials**

**C-1 Architectural Context. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.**

**C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its façade walls.**

The Board liked the proposed elevation options and details and felt the architect is moving in the right direction based on the presentation.

**C-3 Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements and details to achieve a good human scale.**

At the next meeting the Board needs to see how the building meets the street. Show perspectives from sidewalk elevations. Provide details of canopies and signage.

**C-4 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.**

The Board liked many of the options shown. At the next meeting provide a detail of the proposed window systems in addition.

**D: Pedestrian Environment**

**D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.**

In response to the neighborhood context, provide green space in the right of way and a plaza at the residential entry. Show landscape details of these areas at the next meeting.

**D-2 Blank Walls. Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable, they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.**

It was acknowledged that the zoning is the same south of the site, but the current development is much lower. In light of the current compatibility issue, show the south building elevation in that it could be visible from Madison Street. Propose some appropriate design detailing for the blank wall. Also, avoid blank wall along Spring Street at the sidewalk elevation by reconfiguring the floor plates, providing transparency or otherwise providing a connection to the retail use inside.

**D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.**

See A-8. The service areas need to be internal and not exposed to the public.

**D-7 Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.**

Considering the urban setting, the Board wants the architect to devote some attention to this priority.

**E. Landscaping**

**E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.**

Provide detailed landscape drawings at the next meeting. Explore opportunities to create landscaping in the right of way that provides benches or some creativity in lieu of the standard SDOT requirements.

**Design Review Board Final Recommendations**

The applicant applied for the MUP (Master Use Permit) on September 28, 2004. After initial DPD design, zoning and SEPA review, the Design Review Board was reconvened on June 1, 2005 to review the project design and provide recommendations. The three Design Review Board members present considered the site and context, the previously identified design guideline priorities, and reviewed the drawings presented by the applicant. **The Board recommended conditional approval.**

The Board appreciated the tri-part composition of the building, and that the architect attempted to meet the First Hill architectural context. The Board had a concern about the language of the building which consists of a mixture of traditional styles and contemporary elements in that there was not a clear architectural style. Additionally, the Board had some concerns about the rigid symmetry of the building with respect to how the corner is addressed and how the faux commercial entry is designed.

The Board appreciated the use of quality and durable materials which were described as Arriscraft stone cladding (adobe) at bulkheads, Arriscraft stone cladding (wheat) on the base floors, blue-green tinted glass and red brick masonry on the tower elements and penthouses, Arriscraft stone accents (natural), concrete, precast concrete and black wrought iron deck railings and red accent tiles.

The Board focused their recommendations on how the corner was addressed, safety and security issues, the streetscape and the south façade.

The design presented along the Spring Street ground plane depicted two entry elements that consist of a recessed window or door surrounded by a stone pediment archway. One of the elements denotes the commercial entry but the other element mirrors this feature and is proposed to be a display window. The Board strongly encouraged the architect to eliminate the faux archway entry and pediment since they thought it was confusing. The architect indicated that the element created symmetry. The Board suggested that breaking up the symmetry could strengthen the corner and better denote the commercial space and entry. They recommended using elements such as; operable windows in the commercial space, providing a canopy at the corner, providing a larger canopy at the commercial entry, using more wrought iron at the base of the corner or changing the mass and material. Additionally, the Board indicated that de-emphasizing the eastern portion of the Spring Street façade could create a stronger corner element. The Board recommended that a collection of subtle changes would better address the corner and emphasize the commercial space.

The Board recommended that the commercial entry should provide a gate and appropriate lighting to address the potential security issues related to having a 6 foot deep recessed space adjacent to the sidewalk.

The Board recommended that the display windows proposed on the eastern portion of the Spring Street façade at the ground plane be a minimum of 18 inches in depth and that they be active and dynamic. The Board recommended that a portion of the display windows should be available to the community for display of local issues or interests, and asked DPD to work with the proponents to facilitate this effort.

The Board recommended that the south façade should be more visually appealing considering the façade will be highly visible from Madison Street (until the abutting site is developed). The Board suggested providing more articulation of this façade especially near the base. They recommended adding more color or providing a change in color or by using more accent banding, landscaping at the base or more tiles.

The Board made a general comment about providing as many operable windows as possible to add a dynamic to the structure and a residential amenity.

#### Summary of Development Standard Departures

The applicant identified the following development standard departure.

<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Applicant’s Rationale</i>	<i>Board Recommendations</i>
SMC 23.47.016D2 Parking within or under structures. When parking occupies any portion of the street level frontage of a structure there shall be a 5 foot deep landscaped area along street lot lines	<u>Zero landscaped area</u>	The site is a small urban site with limited potential to develop. Screening of parking can be accomplished by other means. The design includes the placement of display windows which provides pedestrian interest and screens the parking.	The Board felt that a landscape buffer is a dynamic element and wanted the displays to be dynamic as well. Perhaps a display which changed with the season. They also recommended that a portion of the display windows be available for use by the community. The display windows must be a minimum of 18 inch deep to allow for more variety of items to be displayed.

Board Recommended Conditions

1. The Board strongly recommended that the proposed faux archway entry and pediment be eliminated on the eastern portion of the Spring Street façade. The Board suggested that breaking up the symmetry could strengthen the corner and better denote the commercial space and entry. They recommended using elements such as; operable windows in the commercial space, providing a canopy at the corner, using more wrought iron at the base of the corner or changing the mass and material. Additionally, the Board indicated that de-emphasizing the eastern portion of the Spring Street façade could create a stronger corner element (A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street; A-10 Corner Lots)
2. The Board recommended that the commercial entry provide a gate and appropriate lighting to address the potential security issues related to having a 6 foot deep recessed space at the commercial entry. (D-7 Personal Safety and Security)
3. The Board recommended that the display windows proposed on the eastern portion of the Spring Street façade at the ground plane be a minimum of 18 inches in depth and that they be active and change what is being displayed. The Board recommended that a portion of the display windows be available to the community for display of local issues or interests. (D-2 Blank Walls)
4. The Board recommended that the south façade be more visually appealing. The Board suggested providing more articulation of this façade especially near the base. They suggested adding more color or providing a change in color or by using more accent banding, landscaping at the base or more tiles (D-2 Blank Walls).

### Director's Analysis

The Director concurs with the Design Review Board's determination to approve the proposed design with the above conditions. The Design Review Board's recommendation does not conflict with applicable regulatory requirements and law, is within the authority of the Board and is consistent with the design review guidelines.

### **DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW**

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED.**

### **CONDITIONS**

Design Review conditions are listed at the end of this report.

### **ANALYSIS - SEPA**

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated September 28, 2004 and annotated by the Department. The information in the checklist, supplemental information provided by the applicant, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 23.05.665) discusses the relationship between the City's code/policies and environmental review. 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 limitation". The Overview Policy in SMC 23.05.665 D1-7, states that in limited circumstances it may be appropriate to deny or mitigate a project based on adverse environmental impacts.

The policies for specific elements of the environment (SMC 25.05.675) describe the relationship with the Overview Policy and indicate when the Overview Policy is applicable. Not all elements of the environment are subject to the Overview Policy (e.g., Traffic and Transportation, Plants and Animals and Shadows on Open Spaces). A detailed discussion of some of the specific elements of the environment and potential impacts is appropriate.

### **Short-term Impacts**

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected; decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from demolition and building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased dust caused by drying mud tracked onto streets during construction activities; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources.

Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general. Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the City.

Most short-term impacts are expected to be minor. Compliance with the above applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment. However, impacts associated with air quality, noise, construction traffic and parking warrant further discussion.

### Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. These impacts would be especially adverse in the early morning, in the evening, and on weekends. The surrounding properties are developed with multifamily housing uses and will be impacted by construction noise. Pursuant to SEPA authority, the applicant shall be required to limit periods of construction to between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during non-holiday weekdays. This condition may be modified by DPD to allow work of an emergency nature or allow low noise interior work after the exterior of the structure is enclosed. This condition may also be modified to permit low noise exterior work (e.g., installation of landscaping) after approval from DPD.

### Construction Worker Parking

Parking utilization along streets in the vicinity is high and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction could reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity. Some workers will carpool or bus into work and this type of mode should be encouraged. However, the workers could utilize on-street parking and exacerbate the demand for parking in the immediate vicinity. This temporary demand on the on-street parking in the vicinity due to construction workers' vehicles may be adverse. In order to minimize adverse impacts, construction workers will be required to park in the garage as soon as it is constructed for the duration of construction, make efforts to only utilize street parking on the streets abutting the site, carpool or utilize off-street parking lots. The authority to impose this condition is found in Section 25.05.675B2g of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance.

### Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires on site detention of stormwater with provisions for controlled tightline release to an approved outlet and may

require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long term long term impacts, although some impacts warrant further discussion.

### Height, Bulk and Scale

The proposed 15-story project will be located in a Neighborhood Commercial 3 with a 160 foot height limit (NC3-160). The subject site is surrounded by the NC3-160 and Highrise zoning. The Highrise (HR) zone allows a structure height of 160 feet, the same height allowed for the subject site. The HR zone could be considered more restrictive with respect to the bulk standards but is only minimally different. Therefore, the subject proposal is expected to be reasonably compatible with the surrounding anticipated development.

The SEPA Height, Bulk and Scale Policy (Section 25.06.675.G., SMC) states that *“the height, bulk and scale of development projects should be reasonably compatible with the general character of development anticipated by the adopted Land Use Policies...for the area in which they are located, and to provide for a reasonable transition between areas of less intensive zoning and more intensive zoning.”* In addition, the SEPA Height, Bulk and Scale Policy states that *“(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.”*

The proposal was reviewed and approved through the Design Review process and conforms to the Citywide Design Guidelines. Design details, colors and finish materials will contribute towards mitigating the perception of height, bulk and scale in that these elements will break down the overall scale of the building. No further mitigation of height, bulk and scale impacts is warranted pursuant to SEPA policy (SMC 25.06.675.G.).

### Parking

The proposed project will provide a total of 57 parking spaces and the Land Use Code requires 21 parking spaces. Based on Parking Generation manual published by Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, 2004 the project would have a peak parking demand of 63 vehicles in the late evening. This estimate uses a ratio of 1.46 vehicles per unit which is based on suburban ITE data.

The peak parking demands for residential and non-residential occur at different times of the day according to a published study from the Urban Land Institute, *Shared Parking* (Urban Land Institute [ULI], 1983). In other words, the residential component of the project would generate the most demand in the evenings and nighttime when most residents are at home. During the day, when commercial use is open the parking demand generated by this use could be accommodated by a shared parking arrangement with the residential spaces since many of the residents will be at work.

ITE data is typically collected in suburban locations with little or no access to transit, so it's likely that demand will be less in an urban location with excellent access to transit. This site is served regularly by transit with numerous METRO routes operating along Madison Street and Broadway. METRO route 12 operates along Madison adjacent to the site with headways of 15 minutes at noon on a weekday to and from downtown. A Sound Transit link light rail station could be built at the intersection of Madison and Boylston just one block from the project site.

DPD has information based on 2000 census data that vehicles available to households in the First Hill Urban Village is at a rate of 0.56 vehicles per household.. Using this rate to calculate parking demand would result in a demand of 24 vehicles for this project, so using a rate of 1.46 vehicles per unit is very conservative. The City Council recently passed legislation that lowered the code required parking to be .50 per dwelling unit based on the census data.

It is likely based on moderate estimates of parking demand that all parking demand for this project will be met on site; therefore, no SEPA conditioning is needed.

### Traffic

The trip generation from the proposed building is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on traffic conditions or reduce the level of service at nearby intersections. The project consists of mostly residential dwelling units which only minimally contribute towards peak hour vehicle trips. Using average trip rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in *Trip Generation* (7<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2003) for high-rise residential condominium/ townhouse (230) and Shopping Center (820), the project would generate 28 PM peak hour vehicle trips. ITE data is typically collected in suburban locations with little or no access to transit, so it's likely that trip generation will be less in an urban location with access to transit.

The use of a mechanical lift to access parking could cause vehicles to queue up in the alley; however, any queuing is expected to be intermittent and temporary. Additionally, vehicles could access the at grade parking garage if needed. Therefore, no mitigation of traffic impacts under SEPA is necessary for this project.

### Other Impacts

The other impacts such as but not limited to, increased ambient noise, and increased demand on public services and utilities are mitigated by codes and are not sufficiently adverse to warrant further mitigation by condition.

## **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 requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- [X] 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 43.21C.030 2c.
- [ ] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030 2c.

## **CONDITIONS - DESIGN REVIEW**

### **Prior to Issuance of Master Use Permit**

Revise the MUP drawings to document compliance with the following;

1. Strengthen the corner and better denote the commercial space and entry by using elements such as; operable windows in the commercial space, providing a canopy at the corner, using more wrought iron at the base of the corner or changing the mass and material. The Board strongly suggested eliminating the faux archway entry and pediment on the eastern portion of the Spring Street façade and/or breaking up the symmetry (A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street; A-10 Corner Lots)
2. Provide a gate and appropriate lighting to address the potential security issues related to having a 6 foot deep recessed space at the commercial entry. (D-7 Personal Safety and Security)
3. The applicant shall submit a Display Window Management Plan as reviewed and approved by the Land Use Planner. (D-2 Blank Walls) The plan shall address the following:
  - How and when displays will be changed; at least seasonally.
  - Indicate a minimum display window depth of 18 inches to provide flexibility to display 2-dimensional or 3-dimensional objects.
  - Appropriate lighting in the displays
  - Community use; a portion of the display windows must be available to the community for display of local issues or interests. Provide a description of how this will be managed and where the community display will be located.
4. Add more color, provide a change in color, use more accent banding, landscaping at the base or more tiles to address the blank wall on the south facade (D-2 Blank Walls).

### **Prior to the Final Certificate of Occupancy**

1. Install the features described in numbers 1 through 4.

## **NON-APPEALABLE CONDITIONS - DESIGN REVIEW**

### **During construction**

1. All changes to approved plans with respect to the exterior façade of the building and landscaping on site and in the right of way must be reviewed by a Land Use Planner prior to proceeding with any proposed changes.

Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

2. Compliance with the approved design features and elements, including exterior materials, roof pitches, façade colors, landscaping and right of way improvements, shall be verified by the DPD Land Use Planner assigned to this project (Jess Harris- 206-684-7744) or by a Land Use Planner Supervisor (Jerry Suder- 386-4069). Inspection appointments must be made at least 3 working days in advance of the inspection.

**CONDITIONS SEPA**

Prior to Issuance of Master Use Permit

The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall:

During Construction

The following condition(s) to be enforced during construction shall be posted at the site in a location on the property line that is visible and accessible to the public and to construction personnel from the street right-of-way. If more than one street abuts the site, conditions shall be posted at each street. The conditions will be affixed to placards prepared by DPD. The placards will be issued along with the building permit set of plans. The placards shall be laminated with clear plastic or other waterproofing material and shall remain posted on-site for the duration of the construction.

1. The hours of construction activity shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. This condition may be modified by DPD to allow work of an emergency nature or allow low noise interior work after the exterior of the structure is enclosed. This condition may also be modified to permit low noise exterior work (e.g., installation of landscaping) after approval from DPD.
2. Construction workers will be required to park in the garage as soon as it is constructed for the duration of construction, make efforts to only utilize street parking on the streets abutting the site, carpool or utilize off-street parking lots.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: August 15, 2005  
Jess E. Harris, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner