Seattle Department of
Construction & Inspections

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

Record Number: 3018968-LU

Applicant Name: Jeff Walls, Studio 19 Architects

Address of Proposal: 2302 4th Avenue

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow a 25-story tower addition and interior renovations to an existing landmark building (Franklin Apartments). The addition includes 285 apartments and retail sales and service. Parking for 178 vehicles proposed. Existing building at 2306 4th Avenue to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)

SEPA - Environmental Determination (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)

Determination of Non-Significance:

☐ No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.

☒ Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.05.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Zone: Downtown Mixed Residential Commercial (DMR/C 240/125)

Nearby Zones: (North) DMR/C 240/125
(South) DMR/C 240/125
(East) D DMR/C 240/125
(West) DMR/C 240/125

Lot Area: 19,440 square feet

Current Development

The subject site is located on the northwest corner of 4th Avenue and Bell Street. The subject lot and lots to the north, south, east, and west are zoned Downtown Mixed Residential Commercial (DMR/C 240/125). The site contains three parcels with two existing commercial buildings, and one existing City of Seattle Landmark residential structure, the Franklin Apartments. To the northwest is another City of Seattle Landmark, Fire Station #2. To the northeast, across an improved alley, is an existing office building. To the southwest, across 4th Avenue, is a surface parking lot, to the south and southeast are existing residential structures.

The subject lot and lots to the north, south, east, and west are all located in the Belltown neighborhood. The immediate context includes a variety of commercial and residential uses. 4th Avenue is a Class I pedestrian street and a principal arterial street connecting central downtown to Denny Street. Bell Street is a Green Street and has been developed as Bell Street Park between 1st Avenue and 5th Avenue. 4th Avenue and Bell Street both contain a mix of older 1-6 story residential and commercial uses. Turn of the century buildings are generally brick while new structures range from wood construction to concrete, steel and glass construction. Belltown also has a number newer residential and commercial towers including the 2116 4th Avenue apartments and the Insignia Towers. Sites in the immediate vicinity range in size from a single parcel development, to half block and full block construction. The site is generally flat and does not include any existing mature vegetation.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character

The neighborhood includes commercial and residential structures ranging from one to six stories along with newer residential towers. The immediate context includes two landmark structures, one that will be incorporated into the subject development, the Franklin Apartments, and one directly adjacent, Fire Station #2. The predominant material is brick, concrete, masonry, and wood.

Access

Access is available from 4th Avenue, Bell Street, and an improved alley along the north property line.

Environmentally Critical Areas

No environmentally critical areas have been identified on site.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on August 14, 2017. 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 height, bulk and scale of the building, impacts to the historic structures, shadows, views, parking, and traffic. Comments were also received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE October 25, 2016

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Expressed concern that a modern tower located between two landmark buildings would destroy the lowrise neighborhood character.
- Felt the site should be developed with a lowrise structure to provide continuity between the adjacent historic structures.
- Felt the proposed departure should not be granted. Noted that a code compliant building would better meet the intent of the Design Guidelines.
- Would like to see Bell Street maintained as a park.
- Expressed concern regarding light pollution from rooftop decks.
- Expressed concern regarding the alley treatment. Noted that this neighborhood may not be appropriate for an activated alley.
- Felt the Franklin Apartment building should incorporate amenity space at ground level on Bell Street. Noted that units at grand along the street are wired off for safety.
- Expressed concern that proposed building will exceed allowed zoning heights.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: Seattle Services Portal.

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.

1. **Massing**. The Board discussed the massing alternatives at length. The Board noted that the code compliant massing Option 1 would not be supported by Landmark Preservation Board Architectural Review Committee, based on the applicant's admission that any proposed structure over the landmark structure would not be supported. The Board was split on the merits of both Option 2 and Option 4. Ultimately, the Board agreed that a minimum of two additional massing options should be provided: 1) a code compliant option that could be supported by the ARC committee and, 2) a massing alternative that incorporates the positive elements of Option 2 and 4.
   a) The Board expressed support for the following Option 2 concepts:
      i. A strong street wall, with pedestrian scale, that relates both adjacent landmark structures. The Board noted the podium could align with the datum line from the adjacent Fire Station and still be successful (A1.1, B1.1).
      ii. A recess or gasket between the landmark structures and the tower. The recess allows the cornice of the landmark building to be visible (A1.1, B1.1).
      iii. The glass atrium and the gasket showcase the proposed paseo (B4).
   b) The Board expressed support for the following Option 4 concepts:

i. A design parti that gives character to the structure, enhances the skyline. The vertical tower pieces provide a perceived slenderness to the tower. The Board agreed that the design concept could be strengthened with more visible separation between the three tower pieces and lighter material choices (B4).
ii. The base of the tower relates to the Fire Station datum line while also attempting to respond to the Franklin with the multistory glass entry expression (A1.1 and B1).
iii. Two Board members felt the tower massing at the street level destroys the street wall provided by the landmark structures (A1.1 and B1).

c) At the second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board would like to see massing alternatives which articulate a clear design parti and include the following elements:
i. A lightened tower form that incorporates vertical elements to reduce the perceived mass (B4).
ii. A podium that respects both the Fire Station and Franklin Apartment buildings, while continuing a street wall consistent with the neighborhood context (B1).
iii. A recessed gasket to differentiate the tower from the landmarks. The Board noted that the recess did not need to be glass to be effective (B1).
iv. An atrium with ground floor retail uses at the base of the tower spilling into the interior of the Franklin Apartments (B1.1, B4).
v. Continued activation of the alley (C6).
vi. Modern brick material application at the base of the structure (B1).

2. Landmark Structures. At the second Early Design Guidance Meeting the Board requested imagery showing the proposed development in relationship to the landmark structures.
a) Demonstrate how the rooftop deck above the Franklin Apartments would be viewed from the street (B1).
b) Renderings that demonstrate each massing proposal with the adjacent landmarks structures (B1).

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE April 18, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Friends of Historic Belltown supported the design as it relates to the designated landmark building. Noted that the site is surrounded by three important landmark structures, further supporting the notion that Fourth Avenue is an important and historic corridor in the Belltown neighborhood. Noted that the datum line of the setback is important to the design and cautioned against creating an overly glassy, modern expression at this location as out of place in this context. Would like to see distinct point of entry along Fourth Avenue. Very supportive of the atrium concept and bringing retail uses into the interior.
- Concerned with the proposed building height and finds the proposed departure to be egregious. In particular, concerned with the proposed increased rooftop mechanical screening and impacts to views from the neighboring Insignia building to the east. Concerned that the view corridor diagrams were misleading. Also concerned that the proposed material cladding would not age well, Overall, would prefer smaller floor plates at the upper levels.

- Expressed support for additional housing downtown, however not supportive of the departure requests given that the proposed tower is already out of character. Requested clarification of the tower width and floor plate requirements. Consideration for the views of the tower from the east (and not only from the west) are important and the design should be softer.
- Concerned with the height of the proposed tower.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: Seattle Services Portal.

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.

1. **Massing & Architectural Design**.
    a. The Board was supportive of the revised massing shown in Option B resolution shown in Option B in response to the first Early Design Guidance meeting, that combined the strongest aspects of the previous massing Schemes 2 and 4. **(B4, B4.1)**
    b. Overall, the Board agreed that the proposed design and massing was more respectful of the landmark structure to the south than the previous schemes. (**A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II)**
    c. The Board was very pleased with the gasket concept and change in materiality provided between the solid podium and the tower. The Board felt, however, that the gasket expression should be stronger and more legible, particularly on the north end (at the lowest point). This minimal condition is well represented on page 53 of the packet. Echoing public comment, the Board noted that this gasket and "lift" should read clearly from both the east and west. (**B1.III, B4, B4.3)**
    d. The Board appreciated the taller dimension of the gasket on the south side which appears to lift away the mass of the tower away from the landmark structure providing deference in this gesture. (**A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II)**
    e. The Board appreciated the three bays terminating at different levels, however the Board did not reach consensus that this was critical to the success of the design.
    f. The Board was very supportive of the deep vertical notches that run the height of the tower, providing distinct articulation and texture reminiscent of the verticality expressed by the landmark structure on either side of the tower. (**A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II)**
    g. The Board agreed with public comment and strongly supported the consistency of this vertical notch expression on all four building facades, keeping a strong and coherent architectural language as viewed from all directions. **(B1.III, B4, B4.1)**
    h. At the Recommendation phase, the Board would like to review the following:
        i. elevations for all sides of the building (**B4, B4.1C6.III)**
        ii. section view through the Franklin retail space (**A1.1, B1.III and B1.IV)**
        iii. section view through the paseo retail space. (**A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II)**

2. Materials.

a. The Board was very supportive of the glassy, lighter materiality of the tower in contrast to the solidity and brick of the podium base. **(B1.III, B4, B4.3)**
b. The Board noted that the sculptural form of the building was best expressed when the tower glazing is treated uniformly across all three bays as shown. **(B4, B4.1)**
c. The Board was supportive of the crisp and contemporary design concept, but noted that efforts to integrate softer elements through color, sheen, or materials would help keep the building in the context of Belltown and the adjacent historic landmarks. (**A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II)**
d. At the Recommendation phase, the Board would like to see details of the overhead canopy designs, as well as color brick and mortar samples. **(B4.3)**

3. Streetscape.

a. Related to 2c above, the Board would like to see further exploration of materials and texture to pursue a contemporary design but also include fine craftsmanship and detailing (overhead canopies, mullions, etc.) to reflect the Belltown character. (**A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B1.IV)**
b. The Board noted that the glazing scale is critical and should be sized and designed to fit into the Belltown context with proportions that reflect the residential functions. (**A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B1.IV)**
c. The Board noted that the detailing of the podium and gasket feature will be critical. The Board noted that the proportions of the pedestrian as it relates to the podium materials would be helpful to understand in terms of evaluating the response to this guidance. At the next meeting, they would like to see details regarding the tower soffit, all building materials and a conceptual signage plan. (**B1.III, B1.IV, B4.3, D4, D4.4)**
d. The Board noted that the size of the entry vestibule will also be important for the intersection of the atrium and the sidewalk and how this atrium space is visually accessible and interactive with the streetscape. (**B1.III and B1.IV)**
e. The Board was very pleased with the atrium concept. They did caution that the scale of this paseo should correspond to neighborhood retail patterns. (**A1.1, B1.III and B1.IV)**
f. The Board was concerned with the egress stair alcove on the north end of the building and would like further design work to focus on the treatment of this space, including exploration of whether gates are proposed and if so, the design of such gates. (**B1.III, B1.IV, (B4.3)**
g. The Board discussed the lower level of the landmark Franklin Apartment building at the southwest corner, proposed for storage usage. The Board recommended further exploration of these windows to offer more visual interest than frosted glass at this corner. The Board suggested providing a few design solutions at the next meeting. (**A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II)**
h. The Board would like to review alley level detailing and lighting at the Recommendation phase. (**B1.III, B1.IV, B4.3, C6, C6.1, C6.III)**

FINAL RECOMMENDATION April 17, 2018

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Would like to see architectural detail at the upper levels of the structure.
- Expressed concern that the requested design review departures do not better meet the intent of adopted City Design Guidelines. Felt that a uniform building massing rather than a 'wedding cake' massing is not a sufficient justification for the departure request.
- Concerned that the project is not being considered in context with new buildings proposed. Felt the Board should consider the cumulative impacts of all proposals.
- Expressed support for the increased retail in Belltown and the Bell Street Park.
- Expressed concern for the lack of upper level setbacks and the loss of natural light at ground level.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: Seattle Services Portal.

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.

1. **Massing & Architectural Design**.
    a. The Board supported the evolution of the preferred massing alternative and recommended that the tower setback to the north and the glassy gasket/atrium provide a successful transition between the proposed tower and the adjacent City of Seattle Landmark Structures. **(A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II B4, B4.1)**
    b. The Board supported the gasket Option 1 as demonstrated on page 14 of the Recommendation Packet. The Board agreed that Option 1, with the one and two story stepped gasket, successfully balances the need to provide a transition between the proposed structure and the landmarks but also maintains a scale that is representative of the Belltown residential character. **(B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B4, B4.2 B4.3)**
    c. The Board supported the uniform tower bay expression on the east and west façade noting the proportion of the bays made the building appear slenderer. However, the Board expressed concern for the wider center bay on the north and south façade, noting the building appeared heavy. The Board recommended a condition that the north and south bays be updated to be consistent with the proportion of the east and west bays. (**A1.1, B1, B4.1, B4.3, C6.III)**
    d. The Board noted the vertical notch separating the tower bays was integral to the tower form and recommended a condition that the vertical notch be maintained in its current dimensions. (**A1.1, B1, B4.1, B4.3, C6.III)**

2. **Materials**.
    a. The Board supported the contemporary material palette, which includes off-white metal panel with a punch window expression in the tower, glass within the recessed tower notch, gasket and atrium, and iron oxide brick at the podium base. The Board agreed the punched window expression and patterning clearly reads as a residential use, consistent with the Belltown Neighborhood character. The Board recommended

a condition that the tower punched windows maintain a minimum 4-inch depth. **(A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.III, B4, B4.1, B4.2, B4.3)**

b. The Board recommended approval of the location of the mechanical louvers within the tower's vertical notch, which maintains a clean material application on the tower walls. **(B4.3)**

c. Board supported the grand atrium concept but conditioned that one glazing material be used for the atrium, reveal and notch. Alternatively, the two glazing materials could be used if a reveal or change in plane is utilized at the glazing material transition. **(A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.III, B4, B4.1, B4.2, B4.3)**

3. Streetscape.

a. The Board was very supportive of the podium resolution, noting the two-story scale of the building, the regular rhythm of ground level bays, and the ground level commercial uses, respond well to the neighborhood's residential and commercial character. The Board was also very pleased with the transition from ground floor storage to residential loft spaces within the Franklin. The Board agreed that the material detailing discussed in the meeting, including use of blackened steel in the podium soffit and lentil, as a counterpoint to the brick, was very successful and recommended those materials should be maintained. The Board recommended the following conditions to further resolve the podium material application.

I. Update the steel canopy to feel less bulky, to create a lighter accent next to the delicate landmark structures. **(B1.I, B1.II, B4.3)**

II. Update the atrium fenestration mullion pattern to provide a finer grain of detail and to exhibit the residential character and fine craftmanship of the Belltown Neighborhood. (**B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B1.IV)**

III. Provide additional texture to the atrium's structural columns visible from the street. (**B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B1.IV)**

IV. Utilize the blackened steel in the recessed exit stair between the podium and the fire station. (**B1.III, B4.3)**

The Board also recommended the following conditions:

V. Consider a smaller frit pattern for the canopy so that the opaque areas disappear when viewed from below. (**B1.III, B4.3)**

VI. Consider the use of steel street furniture in the right-of-way consistent with material application in the remainder of the building. (**B1.III, B4.3)**

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) were 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 the following departures were requested:

1. **Floor Area Limit (SMC 23.49.158 B):** The Code requires that for structures in the DMR zone portions of structures above 125 feet shall have a maximum gross floor area of 8,000 sq. ft. The applicant proposes floor area of 9,800 sq. ft.

At the Recommendation, the Board unanimously approved the departure request. The Board was generally pleased with the evolution of a more uniform mass, rather than a wedding cake stepped massing. The Board agreed the massing executed through the nine tubes, as conditioned, provides a unified and well-proportioned building. The Board appreciated that the building design and materiality included respectful gestures towards the presence of the landmark structures on either side and was very supportive of the setback on the north side of the building which both defers to the landmark fire station building, but also enhances the legibility of the tower and design concept. **(B1.I Compatible Design, B1.III. Visual Interest and B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)**

2. **Rooftop Features (SMC 23.49.008 D2)** The Code requires a maximum coverage of 35% for all rooftop features. The applicant proposes a maximum rooftop coverage of 42%.

At the Recommendation, the Board did not support the requested departure. The Board felt the request did not result in a building design better meeting the intent of adopted Design Guidelines.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Downtown and Belltown Neighborhood design guidelines identified as Priority Guidelines are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the Design Review website.

SITE PLANNING AND MASSING

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

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

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

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

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

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

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

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

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

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

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

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE STREETSCAPE

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

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

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

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

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

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

C6.I. Address Alley Functions:

a. Services and utilities, while essential to urban development, should be screened or otherwise hidden from the view of the pedestrian.
b. Exterior trash receptacles should be screened on three sides, with a gate on the fourth side that also screens the receptacles from view. Provide a niche to recess the receptacle.
c. Screen loading docks and truck parking from public view using building massing, architectural elements and/or landscaping.

d. Ensure that all utility equipment is located, sized, and designed to be as inconspicuous as possible. Consider ways to reduce the noise impacts of HVAC equipment on the alley environment.

C6.II. Pedestrian Environment:

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

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

C6.III. Architectural Concept:

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

PUBLIC AMENITIES

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

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

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

D3.III: Street Furniture/Furnishings along Specific Streets: The function and character of Belltown's streetscapes are defined street by street. In defining the streetscape for various streets, the hierarchy of streets is determined by street function, adjacent land uses, and the nature of existing streetscape improvements.

d. 4th Avenue: Street furnishings on 4th Avenue should be "off-the-shelf"/ catalogue modern to reflect the high-rise land uses existing or permitted along that corridor.

D4 Provide Appropriate Signage: Design signage appropriate for the scale and character of the project and immediate neighborhood. All signs should be oriented to pedestrians and/or persons in vehicles on streets within the immediate neighborhood.

D4.4. Discourage Upper-Level Signage: Signs on roofs and the upper floors of buildings intended primarily to be seen by motorists and others from a distance are generally discouraged.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, April 18, 2018, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, April 18, 2018 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design with the following conditions:

1. Modify the north and south bays to be consistent with the proportion of the east and west bays. (A1.1, B1, B4.1, B4.3, C6.III)
2. Maintain the vertical notch separating the tower bays in the same dimensions described at the design Recommendation meeting. (A1.1, B1, B4.1, B4.3, C6.III)
3. Maintain a minimum 4-inch depth at the tower punched windows. (A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.III, B4, B4.1, B4.2, B4.3)
4. Use one glazing material for the atrium, reveal and notch. Alternatively, the two glazing materials could be used if a reveal or change in plane is utilized at the glazing material transition. (A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.III, B4, B4.1, B4.2, B4.3)
5. Update the steel canopy to feel less bulky, to create a lighter accent next to the delicate landmark structures. (B1.I, B1.II, B4.3)
6. Update the atrium fenestration mullion pattern to provide a finer grain of detail and to exhibit the residential character and fine craftmanship of the Belltown Neighborhood. (B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B1.IV)
7. Provide additional texture to the atrium's structural columns visible from the street. (B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B1.IV)
8. Utilize the blackened steel in the recessed exit stair between the podium and the fire station. (B1.III, B4.3)

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.

Subject to the recommended conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines.

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting held on April 18, 2018, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Five members of the Downtown Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project's overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis

of the Board's recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3).

The Director agrees with 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, SDCI 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. Modify the north and south bays to be consistent with the proportion of the east and west bays. (A1.1, B1, B4.1, B4.3, C6.III)

The north and south bays have been modified to be consistent with the proportion of the east west bays as represented on Sheet A2.13-A2.16 of the Master Use Plan Set. All bays are 30-feet wide. The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. The bay width will be shown on the construction plans, and the final construction will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

2. Maintain the vertical notch separating the tower bays in the same dimensions described at the design Recommendation meeting. (A1.1, B1, B4.1, B4.3, C6.III)

The vertical notch separating the tower bays has been maintained at a 3-foot dimension as represented on Sheet A2.13-A2.16 of the Master Use Plan Set. The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. The vertical notch will be shown on the construction plans, and the final construction will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

3. Maintain a minimum 4-inch depth at the tower punched windows. (A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.III, B4, B4.1, B4.2, B4.3)

The 4-inch depth for the tower punched windows has been represented on Sheet A5.01 of the Master Use Plan Set. The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. The window detail will be shown on the construction plans, and the final construction will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

4. Use one glazing material for the atrium, reveal and notch. Alternatively, the two glazing materials could be used if a reveal or change in plane is utilized at the glazing material transition. (A1.1, B1, B1.1, B1.III, B4, B4.1, B4.2, B4.3)

One glazing material is used for the atrium, reveal and notch as represented on Sheet DR1.01-DR1.02, and A3.03 of the Master Use Plan Set. The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. The materials will be shown on the construction plans, and the final material installation will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final

Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

5. Update the steel canopy to feel less bulky, to create a lighter accent next to the delicate landmark structures. (B1.I, B1.II, B4.3)

The applicant responded with a memo on September 14, 2018 noting, "The steel canopies along the front of the building have been updated to feel less bulky. The design has changed to an inverted "T" shape detail as opposed to the tube steel original design. Additionally, the glass in now hung below the metal "T" shape steel to make the canopy feel lighter from the pedestrian vantagepoint. See updated colored elevations on Sheets DR1.01 and DR1.02, updated renderings on Sheets DR1.03-DR1.05, and updated partial wall sections on Sheet A5.01." The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. These items shall be shown on the construction plans, and the installation of this item will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

6. Update the atrium fenestration mullion pattern to provide a finer grain of detail and to exhibit the residential character and fine craftmanship of the Belltown Neighborhood. (B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B1.IV)

The atrium fenestration mullion patter was updated to provide a finer grain of detail as represented on Sheet DR1.01-DR1.05 of the Master Use Plan Set. The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. The window mullion pattern will be shown on the construction plans, and the final construction will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

7. Provide additional texture to the atrium's structural columns visible from the street. (B1, B1.1, B1.I, B1.II, B1.III, B1.IV)

The applicant responded with a memo on September 14, 2018 noting, "Blackened Steel panels have been added around the columns in the atrium to add texture per the Board's recommendation. This will match the blackened steel panels that are being used on the exterior of the building along the front façade. See updated renderings on Sheet DR1.05, in the floor plan on Sheet A2.07 and the partial wall section in detail 1, Sheet A5.01 showing the blackened steel panels wrapping the columns in the atrium." The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. These items shall be shown on the construction plans, and the installation of this item will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

8. Utilize the blackened steel in the recessed exit stair between the podium and the fire station. (B1.III, B4.3)

Sheet DR1.01 has been updated to show Blackened Steel Metal Siding in the recessed exit stair between the podium and the fire station. The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. The materials will be shown on the construction plans, and the final construction will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

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 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 the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

DIRECTOR'S DECISION

The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and CONDITIONALLY APPROVES the proposed design with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision.

II. ANALYSIS – SEPA

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated 6/30/2017. The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) 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, 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, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

Construction Impacts - Parking and Traffic

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed 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 10:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 10:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays.

If extended construction hours are necessary due to emergency reasons or construction in the right of way, the applicant may seek approval from SDCI through a Noise Variance request. 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.

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, public view, shadows, parking, and traffic warrant further analysis.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with 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, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

Historic Resources

The site includes a designated City of Seattle historic landmark, the Franklin Apartments, addressed at 2302 4th Avenue. Modification of this landmark requires a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board, prior to MUP issuance. The applicant has applied for this Certificate and is proceeding through the Landmarks Board review and process, per the requirements of the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance.

An application for a Certificate of Approval was submitted to the Historic Preservation Program Coordinator to construct an addition on the existing building. The proposal has been reviewed at multiple meetings with the Architectural Review Committee. Ultimately, the full Landmarks Board will decide upon whether to issue a Certificate of Approval to allow modifications to the Franklin Apartments.

The other existing structure on site, addressed at 2306 4th Avenue, located beside the Franklin Apartments, is more than 50 years old and proposed to be demolished. This structure was reviewed for potential to meet historic landmark status. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and indicated the structure on site was unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Category 4 on the Downtown Historic Resources Survey and Inventory of 2007).

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 no further conditioning is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.H.

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. Pursuant to the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate height, bulk and scale impacts are adequate and additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.G.

Public View

The SEPA Public View Policies (SMC 25.05.675.P) state that "it is the City's policy to protect public views of significant natural and human-made features: Mount Rainer, the Olympic and Cascade Mountains, the downtown skyline, and major bodies of water including Puget Sound, Lake Washington, Lake Union and the Ship Canal, from public places consisting of the specified viewpoints, parks, scenic routes, and view corridors."

There are no identified public viewpoints identified in Attachment 1 of SMC 25.05.675 in the vicinity that would be affected by the proposed development.

The development, as a whole, will be keeping with the scale of development anticipated by the goals and policies for the Downtown Mixed Residential zone and the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed development does not block views of any nearby historic landmarks from public places specified in the Public View Protection SEPA policy (SMC 25.05.675 P).

Additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.P.

Shadows on Public Open Space

SMC 25.05.675.Q provides policies to minimize shadow impacts to designated public open spaces in areas downtown. No protected areas are located near enough to the site to be impacted by shadows from the proposed development.

No impacts of shadows on designated public open spaces are anticipated and mitigation is not warranted per SMC 25.05.675.Q.

Parking

The proposed development includes approximately 285 apartment units and 6,750 square feet of retail use. The proposal includes 178 parking spaces in an underground garage. The traffic and parking analysis (Transpo Group Memorandum dated February 20, 2018) indicates a peak demand for approximately 150 vehicles from the proposed development. The number of proposed parking spaces accommodates all of the anticipated parking demand, and no additional mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.M.

Transportation

A Memorandum Traffic and Parking Study (Transpo Group Memorandum dated February 20, 2018) was prepared. The Study indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 385 daily vehicle trips, with 37 net new PM peak hour trips and 32 AM peak hour trips. The additional trips are expected to distribute on various roadways near the project site, including 5th Avenue and Bell Street and would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections and on the overall transportation system. The SDCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that no 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 Final Inspection

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 (Lindsay King, (206) 684-9218 or Lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

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 (Lindsay King, (206) 684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

3. 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 (Lindsay King, 206-684-9218, Lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

CONDITIONS – SEPA

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

4. 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.

Lindsay King, Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: November 13, 2018

LK:drm

K\Decisions-Signed\3018968-LU.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 SDCI 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.