Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections

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

Project Number: 3036725-LU

Applicant Name: Runberg Architecture Group

Address of Proposal: 1700 12th Ave

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow an 8-story, 134-unit apartment building with retail. Parking for 83 vehicles proposed. Existing buildings to be demolished. Design Review Early Design Guidance done under 3035745-EG

The following approvals are required:

Design Review with Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)*
**Departures are listed near the end of the Design Review Analysis in this document*

SEPA - Environmental Determination (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)

SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-significance

☐ No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.

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

BACKGROUND

The site was granted relief on steep slope development by the SDCI Geotechnical Engineer on February 05, 2021.

Environmentally Critical Areas (ECAs) geotechnical review for this project is required. Both topographic survey and geotechnical report are required for the building permit Intake.

This project is described as "Construction of a mixed-use residential building". Based on a review of the submitted information and the City GIS system, the portion of project that encroaches the steep slope area appears to quality for criteria established in ECA Code, SMC 25.09.090.B2a. Specifically, the portions of the project that encroach upon the ECA will be limited to areas of existing development. For this reason, the required ECA Steep Slope Variance associated with subsequent SDCI building application is waived.

The top of this image is North. This map is for illustrative purposes only.
In the event of omissions, errors or differences, the documents in SDCI's files will control.

The approval of building permit application is conditioned upon a design that demonstrates that the proposed development will be completely stabilized in accordance with the geotechnical engineer's recommendations and provisions of the ECA Code and Grading Code. All other ECA Submittal, General, and Landslide-Hazard development standards still apply for this development.

Site and Vicinity

Site Zone:	Neighborhood Commercial 3-75 (M1) [NC3-75 (M1)]
Nearby Zones:	(North) Neighborhood Commercial 3-75 (M1) [NC3-75 (M1)] (South) Neighborhood Commercial 3P-75 (M) [NC3P-75 (M)] (East) Lowrise 3 (M) [LR3 (M)] (West) Neighborhood Commercial 3-75 (M1) [NC3-75 (M1)]
Overlays:	First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center Capitol Hill Station Area Overlay District Capitol Hill Design Review Guideline Area

Current Development:

The subject site is comprised of five existing tax parcels and slopes downward west to east approximately 12 feet. The site is currently developed with three commercial structures built in 1900 and 1979 and a surface parking lot.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The subject site is located on the northeast corner of 12th Ave and E Olive St in the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center. Adjacent to the site are a mixed-use residential structure to the north, multifamily and single-family residences to the east, single-family residences to the south, and mixed-use and multifamily residential structures to the west. Cal Anderson Park is located one block to the west, adjacent to Seattle Central College. 12th Ave is a minor arterial which intercepts E Madison St three blocks to the south. The area was rezoned from Neighborhood Commercial 3-40 to Neighborhood Commercial 3-75 (M1) on 4/19/19.

The subject site is located between the Capitol Hill Urban Village north of Olive Way and the Pike Pine Urban Village to the south. Residential developments of varying typologies are prominent in the Capitol Hill neighborhood, including multifamily, mixed-use, and single-family. The neighborhood is characterized by tree-lined streets and greenspaces. Recent development trends have seen multifamily housing styled by monolithic patterns, metal panel facades with accent colors, and natural material detailing. A stronger commercial presence is found south of Olive Way in the Pike Pine neighborhood. This area is a conservation district marked by older brick storefronts and a warehouse and industrial character. Newly developed mixed-use structures have reflected similar proportions and character to the existing historic structures. Structures in

the vicinity are low- and midrise. Multiple projects in the vicinity are currently in review or under construction for proposed development, including 1013 E Republican St.

Access: Vehicular access is proposed from the alley, pedestrian access from 12th Ave.

Environmentally Critical Areas: Two mapped steep slope areas are located on the subject site.

Public Comment:

The public comment period ended on July 27, 2021. Comment(s) were received through the Design Review process. No other comments were received in response to this public comment period.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

ADMINISTRATIVE* EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE May 27, 2020

The design packets include materials that are available online by entering the record number at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at SDCI:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

SDCI staff received the following design related comments:

- Requested another massing option that is distinctly different than those already presented.
- Appreciated that the preferred concept mirrored the courtyard of the adjacent property.
- Concerned about reduced solar access to the adjacent property's courtyard, roof garden, and upper roof solar panel array.
- Recommended exploring a transition at the northeast corner similar to the northwest corner that allows the east and west facades to minimize reduced solar access.
- Suggested the east side could step back to capture open space and provide windows to the northeast and northwest.
- Concerned about the height of the project at the alley where it abuts smaller existing structures.
- (Multiple comments) Concerned about how active the large private lobby proposed at the street will be on this important and quickly evolving street and requested a reduction in its size and replacement with additional commercial space.
- Noted the rapid growth of this area and increase in pedestrian volumes and requested careful consideration of this in the design of the streetscape.
- Concerned that the viability and vitality of commercial spaces in this neighborhood was not accurately reflected in the EDG packet.

- Concerned that the blocks to the north were under represented in the context documentation and analysis and a request that this be included and considered.
- Concerned about height bulk and scale and by how much bigger this proposed project is than the existing buildings in the neighborhood.
- Concerned about the lack of transition between this project in the smaller scale structures across the alley.
- Concerned about the shadows that will be created by this very large project on neighboring structures.
- Concerned about safety in the alley.
- Concerned that the proposed project does not adequately respect the historic character of the surrounding neighborhood.
- Noted the importance of the historic St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Cathedral, and the negative impacts on light and air this project will have on it.
- Concerned by how much bigger this project will be then everything else around it
- Concerned about impacts on the alley for safety and services.
- Concerned that the new project is not designed to fit into the existing neighborhood.
- Concerned about impacts on privacy light and air on neighboring structures and the diminishment of sunlight on the many neighborhood gardens.
- Requested careful consideration of Guideline CS3 and the revision of the design to decrease the impact of this large structure.
- (multiple) Concerned about the lack of public meetings to discuss this project.
- Concerned that the smaller scale of the existing neighborhood is not accurately represented in the EDG documents, particularly on the blocks further to the north.
- Requested upper level setbacks and lighter colored materials to mitigate the scale of the project.
- Concerned about impact to safety and neighbor privacy at the alley.
- Concerned about impacts created by solid waste storage and collection at the alley.
- Concerned about impacts of move-in and move-out activity for so many new apartments.
- Requested the provision of a loading zone to serve commercial delivery trucks, food deliveries and rideshare vehicles.
- Requested the provision of shared public open space along 12th Ave.
- Concerned that context documentation inaccurately depicts neighboring structures at a larger scale than they actually are.
- Concerned that the early outreach process may have intentionally avoided providing notice to near neighbors.
- Concerned about the lack of public input in the process, misleading elements in the EDG packet and lack of adherence to the design guidelines for the city and for the Capitol Hill neighborhood.
- Concerned about an apparent lack of attention to the design of the alley facade.
- Concerned about the lack of an appropriate transition to less intensive zoning across the alley.
- Concerned about impacts on privacy, diminished sunlight, the degradation of greenspace and habitat, and the loss of character and personality on this block due to this poorly designed project.
- Concerned to find the statement “Site does not abut nor is it across alley from any residential zone” in the packet.
- Concerned about the character of this project and apparent disregard for the Design Guidelines and cited Guideline CS3-A-1 Fitting Old and New Together: *Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic*

and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

- Requested a public meeting to review the project.
- Noted that the precedent images provided in the packet were uniformly well designed and clad in high quality materials and that this proposal did not meet those standards.
- Concerned that the relationship of this building to its surroundings is entirely focused on the south and west with no connection to the residential areas of the neighborhood.
- Concerned by the lack of connection between the architectural character of the proposal and the existing established neighborhood, citing Guidelines CS3-4-A, DC2-3 and CS2-1.
- Concerned to see only monolithic massing expressions and the lack of a scheme that would be an assembly of smaller elements.
- Noted that this project would be appropriate in the Pike/Pine neighborhood but not in this more diversely and smaller scaled area.
- Concerned that the project will not be reviewed by the Design Review Board and that the project will not receive fair and transparent external review and evaluation.
- Concerned that Community Outreach Meeting notices were posted only in areas to the south and west of the site and that no one in their neighborhood had notice of this meeting.
- Concerned about the lack of communication and public engagement that has accompanied this project so far.
- Requested a unified design clad in masonry.
- Requested distinct expressions for each of the retail spaces and the inclusion of operable windows.
- Noted the positive qualities of the alley as a greenspace and requested careful design.
- Cited Guideline CS1 Natural Systems and Site Features, and noted that the proposed building will significantly reduce sunlight from the west, negatively impact habitat and the existing urban canopy growing along the residential zone to the east and north, and that the EDG packet referenced habitat only along the sidewalks at 12th and Olive.
- Concerned about the preservation of existing trees, citing Guideline CS1.4.e Tree Canopy.
- Concerned by the lack of alternative options for the development that would allow for through-block connections, open courtyards and on-site green space that connects to the neighborhood, citing Guideline PL1-1 Enhancing Open Spaces.
- Concerned about the height and bulk of the proposed project relative to the existing neighborhood and noted that only the existing narrow alley separated this project from a lower zone and that better transition is required, citing CS2-D Height Bulk and Scale.
- Concerned about loss of privacy, diminished sunlight and skylight, loss of habitat and greenspace and loss of the unique character and personality of this neighborhood.
- Supported the size and character of the proposed project.
- Supported higher density in this neighborhood.

*On April 27, 2020, the Seattle City Council passed emergency legislation Council Bill 119769 which allows projects subject to full design review to opt into Administrative Design Review temporarily. As one of the projects impacted by Design Review Board meeting cancellations, this project elected to make this change.

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning community outreach and public notice, criminal activity and illegal dumping in the alley, congestion in the alley, support for density in the neighborhood, the increased height limit, and housing affordability.

One purpose of the design review process is for the City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number: http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/

PRIORITIES & RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, Staff provides the following siting and design guidance.

ADMINISTRATIVE EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE

1. **Process:** Staff agrees that the applicant's preferred massing option does not adequately respond the Design Guidelines and that the three schemes together provide insufficient exploration of massing options for this site. Staff therefore recommends that the project return for another meeting in response to the guidance provided below.

2. **Massing and Context:**
    a. This site is located on 12th Avenue on Capitol Hill in an area with a rich and diverse building stock. This is apparent at a diagrammatic level in the image on page 46, in the grayed-out forms representing the context surrounding the site. This drawing also points up a critical gap in the massing and scale explorations provided in the packet. This neighborhood is largely platted as smaller lots and has been developed over time with a wide variety of building types, scales and styles. However, the response to context shown in the massing options seems to be largely focused on the 12th Avenue Arts building a block south, which is a large and singular structure that is atypical in this neighborhood. (CS2-D, DC2-A)
    b. Although the three massing schemes shown in the packet provide some modulation of form, that modulation is insufficient to legibly tie this new structure to the scale of the existing context or allow it to be read as other than a large singular object. The limited scale mitigation of these schemes is exacerbated by the proximity of the 12th Avenue Arts building on the block to the south. The scale of that building combined with the proposed massing has the potential of creating a 600-foot section of 12th Avenue that is dominated by two large structures on the east side of the street. The resulting scale doesn't reflect the immediate context of 12th Ave or this area of Capitol Hill. (CS2-D)
    c. SDCI also acknowledges and agrees with public comments concerned with the height bulk and scale of this project, and the lack of sufficient response to the nearby context. (CS2-D)
    d. For the next EDG review, provide further exploration of massing options that fully respond to the entire existing context. Those explorations should include massing and modulation schemes that recognize historical development patterns and respond to existing smaller-scale development patterns on this block. Cues for scale and

modulation may be discerned from the structures surrounding this site as shown in the foreground and background on page 46. (CS2-D, DC2-A)

e. Noting public comment and Staff concern, provide shadow studies of the massing options at a higher level of scale and with greater detail to clearly indicate impacts on neighboring structures and gardens. (CS1-B-2, CS2-D)

3. Zone Transition:

a. In all of the proposed schemes, the modulation at the alley occurs horizontally, resulting in large uninterrupted vertical faces that extend to the height limit. The guidelines call for scale mitigation and a step in the perceived height and bulk at this zone transition, which will likely require both vertical and horizontal stepping that is tied to existing development patterns to the east. (CS2-D-3, DC2-A-2)

b. SDCI also acknowledges and agrees with public comments concerned with the height bulk and scale of the proposed project, which fails to effectively respond to the zone transition and nearby context. (CS2-D)

c. It may be helpful to include precedent images of recent projects that have successfully mitigated the scale of a larger project where it abuts a less intensive zone.

4. Street Edge:

a. Staff supports the programming of active commercial uses along 12th Ave. In agreement with public comment, Staff recommends further development of a porous and engaging street edge with pedestrian amenities, landscaping, and a design that responds to the commercial context nearby. (CS1-4.e, PL3-B, PL3-C)

b. In agreement with public comment, Staff are concerned about the large residential lobby proposed at the street front and how it will encourage human interaction and activity. This concern may be mitigated by some combination of the reduction in its size and the careful programming and detailing (activity areas, operable windows, etc.) of the space. (PL3-C, PL3-B)

c. Staff notes that both the Citywide and Capitol Hill Guidelines call for the strong expression of primary residential entries and encourage the development of this element as an architectural focal point that is obvious, identifiable, and distinctive, and welcoming and recognizable to visitors. (PL3, PL3-1-b, PL3-A-4)

5. 2nd EDG Packet: To demonstrate response to the Design Guidelines and this report, please include or revise the following graphics and analysis in the 2nd EDG packet:

a. The comparison of schematic options is a central component of the EDG process. On page 50 of the EDG packet these comparative images are provided, but at varying levels of scale and with differences in rendering. At 2nd EDG, show massing schemes at the same level of scale, from the same viewpoint and identically rendered.

b. The use of color-coding for different programmatic elements is appropriate in schematic plans (e.g. page 55). But the three dimensional drawings (p. 51, e.g.) are intended to show the massing, and any use of color or texture that is not tied to a significant change in expression will make these images less valuable in the review process (p. 51-65). If the colors are used to represent changes in expression, the degree of contrast between them should be scaled to the difference in expression (likely resulting in significantly lightening and desaturating the colors).

c. Birds-eye views are helpful in understanding the massing and modulation schemes. To better demonstrate how these moves will be perceived, please provide additional street level views, including views from the alley. (CS2-D, DC2-A)

d. Horizontal lines showing floor levels are acceptable in massing models but should read as tertiary information and not cloud the representation of form. The renderings on pages 63-65 accomplish this (versus those on pages 51-53 and 57-59).
e. Revisit the drawings and notes documenting the existing context and amend or add as necessary to insure they are complete and accurate.
f. Acknowledging public comment, demonstrate how the alley will function for loading, services, and be designed for safety. (DC1)
g. Acknowledging public comment, include conceptual landscape plans demonstrating how any proposed landscape and open space responds to context and Design Guidelines. Include the location and specification of existing and proposed street tress as well as existing trees on site that will be removed or retained and how these choices respond to the applicable Design Guidelines. (CS1-1, DC4-D, DC3-C) (DC3)
h. In response to public comment, provide additional drawings and/or notes that specifically address privacy impacts on existing development nearby and how those impacts will be mitigated, e.g. window locations, wall angles, balconies, etc. (CS2-D, PL3-B)
i. On constrained infill sites such as this with limited massing options, a deeper exploration of the character of the three required schemes will be helpful, including schematic ideas about cladding, fenestration patterns, texture, and compositional order, and how they are tied to those modulation choices. (DC2, DC4)
    i. The development of Option C meets and exceeds this expectation, but the lack of development in the other schemes makes it difficult to make the like-for-like comparison that this stage of the review process requires. For the next meeting, provide three schemes that show the same level of development (per the notes above; more than A and B, likely less than C). Additional development and detail for a preferred scheme may also be included.

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE December 16, 2020

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered prior to this meeting:

- Concerned by the height, bulk, and scale of the project relative to the existing neighborhood. Noted the applicants references the 12th Ave. Arts building but disputed its appropriateness as a comparison given that it is also out of scale with the neighborhood. Suggested breaking the project in to a series of smaller masses. Noted similar guidance in the previous EDG report and the lack of response in this proposal. Noted the narrow width of the alley and the large zoning change and lack of appropriate response.
- Noted that the previous EDG report had echoed public comment that the project was out of scale with the neighborhood. Noted concern expressed by staff in the previous report regarding the combined effect of this proposal with the 12th Ave. Arts building and the lack of response to that concern in the proposal. Noted the Code requirement that new projects enhance the character of existing neighborhoods. Cited the Seattle Municipal Code section allowing for additional reviews for projects with a meeting cap and the associated criteria.
- Noted two principal issues: the transitional qualities of this site including a difficult zone transition on the alley, the great length of that transition, the change in Pedestrian designation of 12th Avenue at this block, the denser and more urban character of the blocks to the south. Noted that the Design Guidelines speak specifically to each of these issues and that their combination at one project required significant accommodation to create a successful transition. Noted that this is not a pedestrian zone-designated street and not part of the denser urbanism to the south that the 12th Ave Arts building is part of.

Noted the Citywide Guideline regarding architectural presence and evaluation of appropriateness and the lengthy border with the lower scale L-3 zone to the east. Identified Design Guidelines Respecting Adjacent Sites and Fitting Old and New Together and that their conjunction stated that if there has ever been a site that this neighborhood have not been addressed, nor issues of architectural presence. Questioned the appropriate degree of architectural presence. Noted the historically smaller plat sizes in this neighborhood and the fine-grained character of the existing context and that the modulation proposed for this project is scaled to the large size of this site rather than the existing context and results in modulation that is disconnected from context. Noted that the design is out of step with the City's Design Guidelines and asked the Board to bring the project back for another Early Design Guidance meeting.

- Echoed the previous concerns about the height, bulk, and scale of the project and the lack of transition to this beautiful and historic neighborhood.
- Appreciated the outreach from the developer and changes to the massing of the project and requested further reduction in massing at the north by moving mass to the south. Noted the abrupt change in height from four to seven stories at this edge. Supported the evolution of the design since the previous review and expressed confidence that the design would continue to positively evolve.
- Appreciated the outreach from the developer of this thoughtful appropriate design that will fit well into the neighborhood. Supported the ground floor design for providing commercial vibrancy. Noted that the upper floor modulation and setbacks are thoughtful to the neighbors and supported the preferred option as designed.
- Thanked the developer for outreach, supported the project for bringing life and vitality to 12th Avenue and noted that the project is taking promising shape. Would like to see a rhythm of small retail and restaurants continued on this site, and more of the ground floor as commercial space rather than residential lobby. Noted that it would be better to plan for 2030 when the neighborhood will be much denser rather than 2020.
- Appreciated the outreach by the developer and the city's need for density but noted that the lack of three distinct massing options had limited the process to one of subtraction from the largest possible mass and that those subtractions had little effect. Suggested a design process that was concept driven rather than reductive.
- Supported Option 3 as it best provides solar access to the community garden beds to the north.
- Noted that the first guidance report called for the exploration of additional massing options but that no significantly different approach was proposed.

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned by overall mass and overall size of the building relative to the neighborhood, the use of the 12th Ave Arts building to the south as a reference point because this building is out of scale with the adjacent neighborhood, noted the border between LR3 and NC3-75 as an abrupt and drastic change and the lack of an appropriate transition that will create a massive presence overshadowing the smaller existing buildings, and suggested breaking the project into smaller volumes with varying roof lines to better make this transition.
- Noted Capitol Hill neighborhood guideline CS2-1.B which speaks to the character of 12th Ave as being transitional and the lack of an appropriate response in the proposed design. Noted the proposals conceptual connection to the 12th Ave Arts building which is not reflective of the neighborhood in which it exists. Noted guideline CS3-1.A Fitting Old and New Together and that this design did not incorporate traditional patterns, materials or architectural styles from the neighborhood, particularly the fenestration

pattern in which windows appeared as a lack of wall rather than an articulated window opening as could be found in this neighborhood. Noted the projects' inadequate response to guideline DC2-1.B Fit with Neighboring Buildings, particularly at the alley where the design reflects none of the existing residential character. Expressed concern that graphics were presented to the Board that were not available in the packet the public had access to. Noted the analysis of existing context misrepresents the scale of the existing neighborhood to be larger than it in fact was. Noted that the renderings of how the project would appear the alley appeared to be inaccurate.

- Identified self as a neighboring homeowner with no intention to develop their property and therefore disputed the justification of the project's scale based on this assumption. Concerned with the bulk and mass being completely out of scale with this neighborhood and the transition at the alley inadequately resolved. Noted that the full height of the southeast and northeast corners limited the scale mitigating effect of the setbacks in the middle of the project.
- Requested consideration of bird friendly design elements per the Capitol Hill Neighborhood Design Guidelines DC4-2 and CS1-4.
- Noted the current lack of conceptual clarity in the proposed design and the importance of developing that clarity in such a large project.
- Expressed concern regarding solar access for the garden and solar collectors on the project directly north of this proposal.
- Expressed support for the expressive qualities shown in the proposal and support for the large scale of the structure as it will provide more housing options.
- Requested additional pedestrian scale detail and more small retail spaces.
- Assurance that the development team would not trim any landscape plantings on neighboring private property.
- Pointed out that the gasket that occurs above the 2nd floor does not in fact separate commercial from residential, the residential uses begin on the second floor and that this breakdown in the project's conceptual logic weakened the design. Noted that the design concept of this project is the inverse of the 12th Ave Arts building where the undulation and height at the street edge is human scale with the simple upper level residential massing significantly setback from the first floor which minimizes the perception of the project's size.
- Concerned that this project would block sunlight to the roof garden on the structure to the north.
- Noted that the size and density of this project is a great example of smart urban growth particularly given its location close to the light rail station.
- Expressed appreciation for the continued engagement and response to feedback from the developer. Concerned about impact to the rooftop garden and solar panels on the structure to the north.

SDCI staff also summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Felt the overall height of the building is not in context with the existing adjacent properties.
- Stated the massing of the building is not in context with the existing adjacent properties and will result in overwhelming the neighborhood by the sheer heft and mass of the building.
- Suggested breaking the mass into several individual buildings with walkways and open spaces that would connect the building to the neighborhood and would create more connectivity with other developments to the north, east, and west.
- Observed the relationship between the upper floors and the two lower floors was inspired by 12th Avenue Arts. (CS2)

- Concerned the project places the most dynamic masses on the upper floors where they will not be appreciated by pedestrians, whereas the negative spaces created by those massing undulations have an opportunity to create pockets of pedestrian-oriented spaces if placed on the ground level. (PL2)
- Recommended flipping the massing so the undulated portions are on the lower floors, or to make the entire building reflect the more dynamic massing. (D3)
- Felt the design of the first two floors is too visually heavy and formal for 12th Ave and offer too much contrast to the more whimsical upper floors above, articulating that the columns are too large, the brick too dark, and the recesses too deep to support the emerging, northerly trending street life along 12th Ave in a contextual manner. (CS2, PL2).
- Encouraged exploring more vibrant colors to reflect the symbolism typically associated with the LGBT community that is centered on Capitol Hill. (CS3)
- Stated that retail on the ground floor is not suitable everywhere but would be inclined to support that approach if the active resident spaces were further developed to be highly visible and include an outdoor presence and dedicated street entrances. (PL3, DC3)
- Encouraged individual expression of the ground floor uses and tenants, through variation in canopy design, signage, glazing type, color, or other means. (CS3)
- Requested minimizing impacts to the northern adjacent property's central courtyard and rooftop vegetable garden. (CS1, CS3)
- Encouraged thoroughly vetting the use of metal panels to avoid poor execution. (DC4)
- Stated that the updated design still fails to respond to the scale of the surrounding neighborhood and fails to provide a reasonable zone transition. (CH Guideline CS2 1b, Citywide Guidelines CS2 D1, D3, D4, D5)
- Opposed to focusing the design on its relation to the 12th Ave Arts building as that is not representative of the neighborhood as a whole.
- Stated the over-scaled modulation and window pattern on the 12th Ave façade is inappropriate along Olive, where the character is smaller and more residential in scale than 12th. (CH Guideline CS2 2)
- Concerned that the patterns found in nearby single-family homes and lowrise apartment buildings are not reflected in the proposed design, including window size, pattern, and detailing, materials, fenestration patterns, roof forms, and cornice detailing. (CH Guidelines CS3 1a, DC2 3b)
- Concerned about reduced sunlight to the east due to the narrow alley and to the north due to the zero-lot line condition. (Citywide Guideline CS1 C2)
- Suggested a quality design that contributes to the block as a whole instead of high-profile design as this is a transitional site. (Citywide Guideline CS2 C3)
- Noted this building will be a precedent for future development. (Citywide Guideline CS3 A1, A4)
- Concerned by solar impacts to the community garden and photovoltaic array located on the structure to the north and a request to revise the massing of the project in two upper floor areas to allow solar access to these important community assets.
- Concerned by the lack of response to comments from the previous review and noted that the new design is very similar to the previous proposal.
- Noted the importance of the existing historic character of these blocks, including their own home that was built in 1894 and the damage that this project will do to the livability of this and other important character structures due to its excessive height bulk and scale.
- Noted that Option C.1 lacked the conceptual clarity that is needed for such a large building and as is required in the Design Guidelines, specifically DC2 Develop an

architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings. Noted that the best solution could be the base of Option A with the principle building envelope of Option C, as this would provide a contextually appropriate street edge and the eclecticism and whimsy befitting a large project on Capitol Hill.

- Noted that by maintaining the full 7 story towers on the southeast and northeast corners, the impact of the upper level setbacks in the middle is lost.
- Described the proposal as thoughtfully designed and a welcome addition to the neighborhood that fits in nicely with the neighborhood and surrounding buildings. In addition, the design shows sensitivity to the neighboring buildings.

SDCI also received non-design related comments concerning parking, construction impacts, community outreach and public notice, criminal activity and congestion in the alley, support for the increased height limit and additional density in the neighborhood, and housing affordability.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number: http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/

PRIORITIES & RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Massing Schemes and Height, Bulk, and Scale**
    a. The Board recognized the large volume of public comment with concerns regarding the height, bulk, and scale of this project relative to recent up-zoning changes, the existing context and the adjacent lower intensity zone and agreed that these issues were of critical importance in developing the design of the project. (CS2, CS3, DC2)
    b. The Board expressed similar concern as Staff at EDG regarding the narrow exploration of massing options demonstrated in this proposal and regret that some other possibilities, including the development of the project as an assembly of differently scaled elements, had been abandoned early in the process, but agreed that of the four options proposed, C and D were the most likely to result in a project that would meet the criteria of the Design Guidelines. (CS2-D, CS3-A, DC2-A, CS2-2)
    c. The Board noted that Options C and D provided larger setbacks and upper level modulation, which the Board supported for their potential to help mitigate the large size of the project on a zone edge. (CS2-D, CS3-A, DC2-A, CS2-2)
    d. The Board supported the continuity of the design concept in shown in Option D, with the upper level expression continuing from 12th Ave to the alley but agreed that Option C demonstrated a greater degree of modification in response to public concern regarding height, bulk, and scale. The Board agreed that Option C was therefore the most likely to result in a project that would meet the criteria of the Design Guidelines and encouraged greater continuity of design concept. (CS2-D, CS3-A, DC2-A, CS2-2)

e. The Board supported the upper-level setbacks at the northeast corner in Option C and agreed that this erosion of the massing could be employed at the other three corners to help mitigate height bulk and scale and better fit into context. (CS2-D, DC2-A, CS2-2)

2. **Response to EDG Guidance:** The Board was divided on the question of how well this proposal had responded to previous guidance. While none of the board members expressed strong support for any of the schemes, some felt that the further development of each of the schemes and the adjustments made to the preferred option could be seen as responsive, while other board members felt that the materials seemed to be making a case for the original analysis of site conditions and context in support of a preferred option that had not changed significantly since the previous review. This general frustration led to a divided vote on next steps.

3. **Design Concept, Scale Mitigation and Context**
   a. Similar to Staff comments provided at EDG, the Board noted that although a degree of modulation existed on the 12th Avenue façade, it all occurred horizontally, creating a very long uniformly articulated expression that overly dominates the street. The Board agreed that the introduction of horizontal modulation and perhaps the articulation of multiple massing elements demised with (a) gasket(s) could be a successful approach. (DC2, DC2-B, DC2-A, CS3-1)
   b. The Board noted that on the E. Olive Street facade the perceived mass of the building is broken down through the creation of legible elements of different scale and supported this approach. (DC2-A, CS2-D)
   c. Echoing public comment, the Board agreed that all facades require additional depth and texture, high quality exterior materials, and secondary architectural features and detailing to mitigate the scale of this proposal and help it fit with neighboring buildings. (DC2, DC2-D, DC2-3)
   d. The Board noted that the relationship between this project and the 12th Ave Arts building to the south was conceptually interesting however, echoing Staff guidance at EDG and public comment, noted that the 12th Ave Arts building, unlike the proposed massing, offers more dynamic massing elements at street level where they create a variety of pedestrian experiences, and that the upper levels were set back significantly from the base which helped mitigate the project's scale. (CS3-A, CS2-D, DC4)

4. **Zone Transition**
   a. The Board recognized that that the Guidelines direct them to consider the scale of both future development and existing context when evaluating the appropriateness of a design response. (CS2-D)
   b. Repeating guidance provided at EDG, the Board noted the significant change in zoning from NC3-75 to LR3 at the alley, the length of this transition relative to the smaller platted lots to the east and echoed public comment in identifying this as a critical issue that would require further consideration and refinement to meet criteria in the Guidelines. (CS2-D, DC2-B)
   c. The Board noted the setbacks provided at the northwest corner and agreed that a similar approach on the alley facade could help make a better transition to the less intensive zone and mitigate the scale of this significantly larger structure. (CS2-D, DC2-A, DC2-B)

5. **The Street Edge**
    a. The Board expressed appreciation for the continued development of the street edge and recognized the intent to tie this development to existing context. The Board noted that the uniformity of expression in the current design however did not seem to reflect the character of existing context or the exhibits and analysis provided in the packet documenting that context. Similar to Staff guidance at EDG, the Board agreed these street edge elements should be further broken down to provide greater variation in scale and expression to better fit into context, and encouraged the development of more outdoor space and seating areas (CS2-B, CS2-1, CS3-A, CS3-1, PL1, PL3).
    b. Echoing public comment, the Board noted the transitional character of this block, between the denser and more commercial fabric to the south and the more residential character to the north, noted that a careful calibration of these influences would be required and agreed that porosity and activation of this edge is critical for a successful design. (CS2-1.b, CS3-A, PL3-C)
    c. The Board questioned the choice to allocate such a significant length of the street frontage to residential amenity area, but agreed that at this stage in the review process they would simply provide guidance to design and program these areas in a manner that physically engages the street and generates activity, offers porosity and opportunities for human interaction. (CS2, PL3)

6. **Design Concept**
    a. While some of the Board members appreciated the playfulness of the upper level undulations and noted its appropriateness on this Capital Hill site, other Board members were concerned by the repetition of a structure of this scale and, echoing public comment, the comparatively inverted organization of static elements in the pedestrian realm and more dynamic elements at the upper levels. The Board agreed that a clear, strong design concept needs to be evolved and realized on all elevations. (DC4, CS2, CS3)

7. **The Alley**
    a. The Board recognized public comment regarding the development of the alley, and concerns with safety and impacts from building services. (DC1, PL2-B)
    b. The Board agreed that the design should include additional windows and occupiable areas overlooking the alley to increase pedestrian safety and strive to minimize service impacts, ideally by managing all solid waste onsite without the need to stage collection in the alley. (DC1, PL2-B)

RECOMMENDATION July 28, 2021
PUBLIC COMMENT

SDCI staff summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Felt the previous iteration had an interesting design concept which has since become fussy and sterile.
- Stated that the gaskets make the design busy instead of breaking down the massing.
- Suggested changes in color or texture at different massings would be a more successful strategy to break down the massing.
- Asked why the building height was increased from 7- to 8-stories.
- Concerned the adjacent properties will experience a loss of sunlight and skyscape.

- (multiple comments) Concerned by the large amenity space at the street front which will not be an active use and does not accord with Capitol Hill Design Guidelines which direct projects to enhance and activate the pedestrian environment.
- Felt the project does not meet the intent of the Seattle Design Guidelines, which describe how architectural designs should strive to fit into existing neighborhoods
- Felt this design does not fit old and new together, or contribute to the architectural character of the neighborhood or create compatibility between new projects and existing architectural context.

The following design-related public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Appreciated outreach effort by architect and developer, thought the building had improved, requested a more sensitive transition to the structure to the north.
- Supported the development of the 12th Avenue street edge.
- Supported the erosion of the massing at the northeast corner, the development of the southwest corner, and the use of gaskets, particularly at the entry.
- Noted the excellent presentation by the architect and asserted that the design had responded to the Board's concerns.
- Suggested moving building mass to the south to preserve solar access for rooftop gardens to the north.
- Suggested that rather than a stack of boxes the project design should be informed by the surrounding architecture, a high standard in Capitol Hill but one that should result in an attractive design that relates to context.
- Supported the traditional option and suggested that the owner be allowed to determine how much retail should be provided.
- (multiple comments) Stated that this project would fit in to the neighborhood well.
- Concerned with the large lobby that's being proposed on 12th Avenue; stated that it is completely out of the scale of the neighborhood and additional retail space should be provided instead. Noted the PL3 Guidelines call for active retail edges and the presence of many active retail businesses to the north.

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning (multiple) housing affordability, (multiple) support for additional density, support for the increased height limit, concern regarding the review process, sustainability, climate change, and parking quantity.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number: http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/

PRIORITIES & RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, The Board provided the following recommendations.

1. **The Two Options**
    a. The Board noted the unusual proposal at the Recommendation phase of two design options in the packet but stated both had been fully developed and agreed that they could consider both.
    b. A majority of the Board (3 of 4) recommended approval of the angled facade option (labeled Option C.2A in the packet), agreeing that the more dynamic composition of the upper-level massing and reference to the 12th Avenue Arts building to the south was more contemporary and a better response to context. (CS2, CS3-A-2, DC2-B)

2. **12th Avenue and Olive Street Corner**
    a. Echoing public comment, the Board supported the composition of this corner, noting in particular the additional height of the corner element, the fully glazed two-story expression, and the integration of outdoor seating for the restaurant, and recommended approval of this aspect of the design. (CS2-C, DC2-B, DC1-A, PL3)
    b. The Board noted the importance of this south-facing corner and recommended further development of pedestrian amenities to encourage active use of the outdoor open spaces at this corner (conditioned at 3.c., below). (PL1-A, PL1-C, PL3, DC3)
    c. The Board noted the lack of entry points on Olive Street and encouraged the applicant to add entries on this street to create activity and provide eyes on the street. The Board agreed that the significant grade made this challenging and declined to recommend this as a condition. (CS2-C, DC2-B, DC1-A, PL3)

3. **12th Avenue Streetscape**
    a. The Board recognized public comment discouraging the significant allocation of street front to residential amenity space but agreed that it would likely be heavily used and thus active and recommended approval of this aspect of the design. (CS2-B, PL3-B, PL3-C)
    b. The Board noted that the porosity called for in the guidelines should be physical as well as visual and encouraged (but declined to make a condition) adding additional doors and operable windows to the street edge. (PL3-C.1, PL3-4)
    c. The Board recommended a condition to provide additional pedestrian amenities and particularly seating to encourage active use at the street edges on 12th Avenue and the lower portion of Olive Street. The Board recognized that these improvements would have to meet the code requirements enforced by the Seattle Department of Transportation. (PL3-C, PL1-B)
    d. The Board stated that the depth of retail space was not a concern and if a departure were later required that they would support it. (CS2-1-b, PL3-4) *(Staff notes that the addition of departure requests after this Recommendation meeting would require an additional Recommendation meeting).*
    e. The Board was surprised that overhead weather protection was not required on 12th Avenue and encouraged (but declined to make a condition) adding this to the design, particularly over building entrances. (PL2-C, PL2-3)

4. **The Alley and Zone Transition**
    a. Echoing public comment, the Board noted that further erosion of the building massing was not necessary. (CS2-D, DC2-A)
    b. The Board noted that the design of this edge was better than it had been in the past and agreed that the central setback of the building mass helped mitigate its scale and recommended approval of this aspect of the design. (CS2-D, DC2-A)

c. The Board recommended a condition to retain the lush and vibrant landscape elements shown on the alley podium including the large caliper trees. (CS1-D, CS2-D, DC4-D)

5. **Building Facades**
   a. The Board recognized public comment both in support of and critical of the response to context, noted that the gaskets did a good job breaking up the massing and accenting the entries, and recommended approval of the design. (CS2-D, DC2-B, DC2-A)
   b. The Board recommended that the more regular composition and traditional materials of the street front responded well to existing context (the old) while the dynamic form and refined materials of the upper-level massing responded to more recent projects (the new). (CS3-A-1)
   c. The Board recognized the project's location in the Arts District and encouraged (but did not condition) the applicant to work with future tenants to provide responsive signage. (DC4-3).

6. **Landscape**
   a. The Board noted a discontinuity in the packet between the representation of landscape elements in the inspirational precedent images and how they appeared in the perspective renderings. The Board asked for clarification and heard that the precedent images were accurate and that the landscape elements in the renderings were placeholders.
   b. The Board recommended a condition to provide a landscape design that reflects the character of the precedent images rather than that of the perspective renderings. (CS1-D, CS1-E, DC4-D)

7. **Overall Design**
   a. The Board recommended a condition to maintain the appearance of the project as shown in the Recommendation packet. (CS1, CS2, CS3, PL1, PL2, PL3, DC1, DC2, DC3)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

At the time of the RECOMMENDATION review, no departures were requested.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines recognized by Staff as Priority Guidelines are identified above. All guidelines remain applicable and are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website.

CONTEXT & SITE

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

CS1-A Energy Use

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

CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

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

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

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

CS1-C Topography

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

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

CS1-D Plants and Habitat

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

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

CS1-E Water

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

CS1-E-2. Adding Interest with Project Drainage: Use project drainage systems as opportunities to add interest to the site through water-related design elements.

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

CS1-1 Energy Choices

CS1-1-a. Influence the Building Form: Consider how opportunities to provide and integrate high performance, regenerative design opportunities such as external direct heating/cooling systems and renewable energy generation, individual meters for each residential unit, and public sharing of energy can influence the building form. When possible, include sustainability measures/energy use that can be viewed from the public realm.

CS1-1-b. Site Configuration: Take advantage of site configuration to invest in new technologies to harvest onsite energy beyond minimum code requirements. Suggestions: photovoltaic arrays, wastewater heat recovery (plumbing heat waste), reverse cycle chiller to harvest heat energy from below-grade garage levels.

CS1-2 Sunlight, Shade and Natural Ventilation

CS1-2-a. Passive Ventilation: Provide passive ventilation through operable windows (in both residential units and commercial spaces) to reduce the need for mechanical ventilation, where possible.

CS1-2-b. Consider Interior Spaces: Encourage louvers, projecting sunshades, or other design details that provide shading (to reduce solar heat gain) while still optimizing daylight for interior spaces.

CS1-3 Topography

CS1-3-a. Step Facades: Respond to local topography with stepping facades or floorplates so that commercial and/or shared residential entrances and ground floors roughly match the street grade.

CS1-3-b. Pedestrian Amenities: Include pedestrian amenities and open space that provide respite, such as seating, in areas adjacent to the public realm along steep slopes.

CS1-4 Plants and Habitat

CS1-4-a. Wildlife Corridors: Enhance urban wildlife corridors by creating new habitat and/ or preserving or expanding existing habitats for insects and birds through design and plantings for green roofs, walls, and gardens.

CS1-4-b. Enhance Habitat: Encourage the use of pollinator friendly and other native/naturally growing plant species to enhance habitat for birds and insects. Use vertical layers of plants to provide habitat for a variety of species.

CS1-4-c. Landscape Variation: Encourage the use of diverse planting palettes to create variety in landscapes at the block and neighborhood level.

CS1-4-d. Natural Wood: Consider opportunities to incorporate natural wood elements such as snags and nurse logs, which provide habitat to invertebrates, into landscape design.

CS1-4-e. Tree Canopy: Maximize preservation of the area's existing tree canopy. Encourage the integration of any exceptional trees or heritage trees, or other mature plantings, into the project design. Mature street trees have a high value to the neighborhood. Protect the health and longevity of existing mature street trees when designing the footprint of a new building.

CS1-5 Water Features

CS1-5-a. Sustainability: Consider sustainable design opportunities such as shared water systems for rainwater harvesting, greywater reuse, and blackwater processing/reuse. Reduce flows into the municipal stormwater system through stormwater management, green roofs and walls, and swales. Consider other functional solutions for sustainable water reuse and/or drainage that work well with the neighborhood's soil condition and topography.

CS1-5-b. Irrigation: Design landscapes that reduce potable water use for irrigation such as via the following strategies:

- Reuse captured stormwater, greywater, HVAC blowdown or condensate for irrigation.
- Specify plants, soils, and other features to be self-sustaining with natural precipitation only.
- Design planting zones so that plantings no longer require irrigation once established.

CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.

CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-1. Sense of Place: Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists, and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-1. Site Characteristics: Allow characteristics of sites to inform the design, especially where the street grid and topography create unusually shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm.

CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

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

CS2-C-2. Mid-Block Sites: Look to the uses and scales of adjacent buildings for clues about how to design a mid-block building. Continue a strong street-edge and respond to datum lines of adjacent buildings at the first three floors.

CS2-C-3. Full Block Sites: Break up long facades of full-block buildings to avoid a monolithic presence. Provide detail and human scale at street-level, and include repeating elements to add variety and rhythm to the façade and overall building design.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

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

CS2-D-2. Existing Site Features: Use changes in topography, site shape, and vegetation or structures to help make a successful fit with adjacent properties.

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

CS2-D-4. Massing Choices: Strive for a successful transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone.

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

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

CS2-1 Sense of Place; Distinctive Streets: New buildings should support and enhance distinct corridors, nodes, open spaces, and places as they continue to grow. Buildings along distinct corridors should reinforce and activate the street edge. Buildings should also incorporate pedestrian scale materials, modulation, and façade detailing at the street level. The following design guidelines apply to all buildings along the respective street:

CS2-1-a. Broadway: Broadway, the largest and longest retail corridor in the CHUCV, includes smaller storefronts as well as larger-scale buildings of Seattle Central College. Broadway's 80-foot wide right-of-way accommodates transit, vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians. The gap created by light rail station construction weakened the corridor, but new development will return Broadway to a more continuous retail and pedestrian experience.

- Reinforce the character of Broadway as one of Capitol Hill's most prominent and vibrant shopping and public main streets. Encourage the design of pedestrian scaled, intimate storefronts on facades facing Broadway.

- Consider active pedestrian transition areas between the street level building façade and sidewalk for outdoor café seating and walk-up windows.
- Enhance visual connections and pedestrian flows to and from the Capitol Hill light rail station as well as the Seattle Central College campus.

CS2-1-b. 12th Avenue: 12th Avenue is the only retail corridor within the CHUCV that is not a designated principal pedestrian street. Thus, more residential uses occur at street level than in other corridors. Commercial zoning and retail activity end just north of Denny Way, and the street quickly assumes a residential character. The 12th Avenue Arts development, just outside the CHUCV, has brought new affordable housing, retail and cultural uses to the corridor, and created strong connection to the more prominent retail corridor on E Pine Street.

- Enhance the character and pedestrian experience along 12th Ave as it evolves into a mixed-use corridor between E Denny Way and E Olive St.

CS2-1-c: 15th Avenue Corridor: 15th Avenue E is known for its lively mix of locally-owned businesses, larger format grocery stores that serve multiple neighborhoods, and the Kaiser Permanente campus. Despite the street's narrow sidewalks, many businesses have outside seating or displays that add vitality to the street.

- Encourage façade detailing at the street level that contributes to the street's existing intimate retail character and variety of pedestrian scaled storefronts.
- Consider design approaches that visually integrate the street level façade with existing buildings. Use upper level setbacks to reinforce the street-scale retail character.
- Improve the walkability along 15th Ave while maintaining the street's positive intimate pedestrian character.
- On half block or full block developments break up long facades to avoid a monolithic presence and to add to the existing character of the corridor.
- Enhance visual connections and pedestrian flows to and through the Kaiser Permanente campus.

CS2-1-d. E John Street/E Olive Way Corridor: John Street/E Olive Way is a major east/west link between CHUCV, downtown and South Lake Union. The sloping, curving corridor is dotted with older buildings housing eclectic small-scale retail and restaurants, as well as newer, taller mixed-use buildings. The topography of the corridor offers views from the public right-of-way of downtown, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains.

- Emphasize Olive Way as a commercial corridor and gateway to the neighborhood from Downtown.
- Encourage better east/west connections for pedestrians traveling to and from the Capitol Hill light rail station between Broadway and 15th Ave E.
- Encourage street level commercial activity and the addition of pedestrian amenities along the street edge between 13th Ave and 15th Ave.
- Enhance the walkability between Melrose Ave and Broadway with the addition of accessible open space and pedestrian amenities along this distinctive curving street edge.

CS2-1-e. E Madison Street: E Madison Street is a major retail and transit corridor. These three blocks within the CHUCV represents the highest elevation along the corridor as well as a break in the principal pedestrian street designation. This short stretch includes the iconic, green-built Bullitt Center, the revitalized McGilvra Place, two grocery stores (Trader Joe's and Central Co-op), both pedestrian and auto-oriented retail, and a radio tower.

- Encourage a pedestrian orientation to complement adjacent blocks.
- Explore ways to celebrate this high point on Madison Street.

CS2-1-f. Melrose Avenue: Recognize and reinforce Melrose Avenue as the "front porch" of Capitol Hill. Encourage the addition of open space, bicycle, and pedestrian amenities along the street edge, and strengthen pedestrian connections to other parts of Capitol Hill and adjacent neighborhoods.

CS2-1-g. Neighborhood Nodes: Recognize and strengthen the small neighborhood commercial areas located at Summit Ave. E and E Mercer Street, and at Bellevue Ave and Bellevue Place which bring a unique sense of place to the large residential quarter.

CS2-2 Response to Different Streets: For buildings that are either located on a corner site or span the full block and "front" on two or more streets, each street frontage should receive individual and detailed site planning and architectural design treatments that complement any positive, respective, established streetscape character.

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

CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes

CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together: Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

CS3-A-2. Contemporary Design: Explore how contemporary designs can contribute to the development of attractive new forms and architectural styles; as expressed through use of new materials or other means.

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

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

CS3-B Local History and Culture

CS3-B-1. Placemaking: Explore the history of the site and neighborhood as a potential placemaking opportunity. Look for historical and cultural significance, using neighborhood groups and archives as resources.

CS3-B-2. Historical/Cultural References: Reuse existing structures on the site where feasible as a means of incorporating historical or cultural elements into the new project.

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

CS3-1 Fitting Old and New Together

CS3-1-a. Reference Character Buildings: In areas with observable patterns of traditional materials and architectural styles, design new contemporary buildings to reference the scale, proportion, fenestration pattern, massing, and/or materials of character buildings. Encourage the use of pedestrian scaled materials that complement and take cues from historic buildings but do not try to mimic or copy existing structures.

CS3-1-b. Block and Neighborhood: Foster the eclectic mix of architectural design and forms on the block and throughout the neighborhood. Encourage the use of new architectural concepts, as they emerge.

CS3-2 Placemaking: The Capitol Hill Neighborhood is a designated arts and cultural district. Art and culture should reflect the local history and values of the neighborhood and should be

well integrated with future developments. Art should be designed for human delight and the celebration of culture, spirit, and place appropriate to its function. Capitol Hill strongly values the intact and positive examples of its physical heritage.

CS3-2-a. Street-Facing Spaces: Encourage and support street-facing cultural open and indoor spaces to provide flexible spaces for art performances and art installations and increase interaction with the street.

CS3-2-b. Art Integration: Encourage the integration of art into the building design and associated open space.

CS3-2-c. Design Concept: Consider engaging with a local artists or arts organization to develop a design concept rooted in the culture of Capitol Hill.

CS3-3 Historical and Cultural References

CS3-3-a. Preservation: Where possible, preserve and incorporate existing historical elements and character structures into project design, such as sites along Capitol Hill's commercial corridors, near designated landmarks, adjacent to notable Anhalt buildings or locations bordering the Harvard Belmont Historic District.

CS3-3-b. Tell the Story: Include interpretation (through visual art, signage, exhibits etc.) that tells the story of the neighborhood's history and culture to the general public in engaging ways.

CS3-3-c. Cultural Elements: Encourage the incorporation of historic and current cultural elements that express and explain how the neighborhood has transitioned over time including, but not limited to, LGBTQ community, Arts District, and EcoDistrict priorities.

PUBLIC LIFE

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

PL1-A Network of Open Spaces

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

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

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

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

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

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

PL1-C Outdoor Uses and Activities

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

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

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

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

PL1-1 Enhancing Open Space

PL1-1-a. Parks: Design buildings facing a park or P-patch to enliven and enhance the safety of the open space. Orient entries, windows, balconies, decks and other amenity spaces to face the park. Design buildings facing Cal Anderson Park with active street level uses to support and reinforce its role as the "front yard" and civic square for Capitol Hill.

PL1-1-b. Right-of-way – Enhance open space connections

1. Greening: Create small pocket gardens within the adjacent street right-of-way (ROW) to enhance and energize the pedestrian experience. Consider locations that may be appropriate for growing food, serve an ecological function, or enhance any adjacent habitat corridors.
2. Design sidewalk ROW and private space adjacent to the ROW to prioritize both pedestrian circulation (comfort and safety), and environmental sustainability. Use planters, seating, and landscape to provide an inviting, attractive, and safe streetscape for pedestrians while ensuring adequate space for pedestrian circulation. Special attention should be paid to Summit and Belmont (from E. Olive St. to E. Howell St.), on Bellevue (from E Loretta Place to E Harrison Street) and along the Melrose Promenade.

PL1-2 Adding to Public Life

PL1-2-a. Street Wall: Maintain a continuous street wall along retail corridors to contribute to the area's pedestrian-oriented, urban character. Minor variations in the street wall such as recessed entries and inset window bays are acceptable if they help contribute to the pedestrian scale.

PL1-2-b. Open Spaces: On major retail streets, locate any large open spaces in the interior of the block, where it would not disrupt the continuity of retail street frontages and maintain the desired intensity of commercial activity in the area. Provide clear visual access to the interior open space from the public sidewalk.

PL1-3 Walkways and Connections

PL1-3-a. Through block connections: On large project sites, consider using pedestrian connections to break up longer blocks and provide enhanced connectivity, particularly on sites near key public parks, the light rail station, or intersections where the street grid shifts. Use through-block pedestrian connections to add more permeability to retail corridors along 15th Ave E and Broadway. Design walkways with minimal grade changes and line the walkways with retail/business spaces, where possible.

PL1-3-b. Pedestrian Volumes: Provide ample pedestrian space along retail corridors and key pedestrian corridors that provide access to light rail facilities and the downtown core, such as E Olive Way, E John St., and E Denny Way. Use minor voluntary ground-level setbacks, structural setbacks, building overhangs, and high-quality hardscape finishes at the pedestrian level to ensure adequate space and durability for pedestrians, while maintaining the street wall and providing adequate space for sidewalk amenities that contribute to public life.

PL1-3-c. Pedestrian Amenities:

1. Enhance the quality of the pedestrian environment through art and other placemaking features. Art should interpret or acknowledge specific ecological aspects of the site or location, provide site-specific wayfinding or "centering the viewer", provide a greater understanding of where the person is standing, and/or intend to delight passers-by and celebrate Capitol Hill's culture and spirit.
2. Provide functional pedestrian amenities such as benches (that enrich and enhance pedestrian flows). Amenities should be frequent and spaced at similar intervals as street trees. Where street trees are not possible due to underground utilities, benches and planters should be provided. Right-of-way improvements should be consistent with all City standards and reviews.

PL1-4 Outdoor Uses and Activities: Design any larger ground-level open spaces adjacent to the sidewalks for informal community events and gatherings, including: temporary art installations, live music and dance performances by community and social organizations, as well as independent artists. Provide features and amenities necessary to ensure that spaces are versatile and functional, such as power outlets, flexible seating, sight lines, acoustic materials, and community poster or bulletin boards. Site spaces to allow visibility from the sidewalk without impeding pedestrian flow.

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

PL2-A Accessibility

PL2-A-1. Access for All: Provide access for people of all abilities in a manner that is fully integrated into the project design. Design entries and other primary access points such that all visitors can be greeted and welcomed through the front door.

PL2-A-2. Access Challenges: Add features to assist pedestrians in navigating sloped sites, long blocks, or other challenges.

PL2-B Safety and Security

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

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

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

PL2-C Weather Protection

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

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

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

PL2-D Wayfinding

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

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

PL2-1 Universal Access: Design the public realm and shared private spaces to encourage intergenerational use and maximize accessibility for all people regardless of ability, background, age, and socioeconomic class. Incorporate universal design strategies to ensure that the common realm is accessible to all. Walkways should include adequate lighting, slip-resistant hardscape finishes, and terraces, benches, and other places of respite for pedestrians. This is especially important near light rail stations, in steeply-sloped areas, and along Denny, John, and other pedestrian corridors that connect to major employment centers.

PL2-2 Inclusive Neighborhood: Consider design features that visibly represent and promote the neighborhood's LGBT+ culture and identity, contribute to a more welcoming, supportive, and safe public realm, and remind everyone that Capitol Hill is an inclusive neighborhood.

PL2-3 Weather Protection

PL2-3-a. Sidewalk Coverage: When providing overhead weather protection, ensure the waterproof covering extends far enough over the sidewalk to provide adequate protection for pedestrian activity. Provide backslopes, drip edges and/or gutters to prevent rain runoff onto the middle of the sidewalk. Weather protection should extend all the way to the building edge without a gap between the coverage and the facade. In order to provide adequate protection from wind-driven rain, the lower edge of the overhead weather protection should be no more than 15 feet above the sidewalk.

PL2-3-b. Residential Entries: On less intense commercial streets, focus overhead weather protection around residential entries. Extend from the building far enough to provide shelter for 4-6 people to comfortably gather near common building entries.

PL2-3-c. Tree Canopy: Where narrow sidewalks create conflict between providing weather protection and tree canopy, indent canopy portions at trees. Prioritize tree canopy retention and new large tree plantings over full width weather protection that would impact or eliminate trees.

PL2-3-d. Green Roofs: In areas with good access to sunlight, consider using canopies as an opportunity to provide green roofs.

PL2-3-e. Operable Awnings: Optionally, consider using operable/retractable, but still durable, awnings that can be removed or reduced in good weather to allow greater sunlight to the street.

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

PL3-A Entries

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

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

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

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

PL3-B Residential Edges

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

PL3-B-2. Ground-level Residential: Privacy and security issues are particularly important in buildings with ground-level housing, both at entries and where windows are located overlooking the street.

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

PL3-B-4. Interaction: Provide opportunities for interaction among residents and neighbors.

PL3-C Retail Edges

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

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

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

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

PL3-1 Entries

PL3-1-a. Commercial Areas: In pedestrian-oriented commercial areas, provide frequent entrances, coupled entries, or other demarcation at regular intervals of 25-30 feet, to accommodate and encourage smaller retailers, community-oriented businesses, and flexible uses over time. Consider features such as shallow recesses at entries to add depth and pedestrian variety.

PL3-1-b. Residential Buildings: Identifiable common entries to residential buildings: Design primary entries to multi-family buildings to be an architectural focal point, using clear, pedestrian-scale signage, architectural enhancements such as heavy or contrasting trim, distinctive materials, large doors, canopies, and seating.

PL3-1-c. Ground-Floor Units: Individual entries to ground-related housing units:

1. Provide exterior access to all ground-floor residential units. This interior/exterior connection should occur frequently with entrances coupled or placed at regular intervals. Slightly raised stoops with direct entries to the street are preferred, particularly when alternate entries provide ADA accessibility.
2. Define entries to individual units with physical “threshold” features such as a canopy, fin walls, landscape, lighting, railings and/or transition in hardscape materials, to demarcate and bridge the boundary between public and private.

PL3-2 Residential Edges

PL3-2-a. Ground-Floor Units: Design ground floor residences for security and privacy, while still contributing to an active streetscape. Use vegetation/landscape screening, modest setbacks, and/or vertical modulation to create a layered transition from the privacy of the house to the public space of the street and sidewalk. Avoid tall fences, fully obscuring barriers, and large setbacks (greater than 15 feet) that detract from the quality of the street-experience and reduce the number of eyes on the street. Use grading variation to provide a visual and physical transition between the street level and individual residential entrances.

PL3-2-b. Windows: Provide operable windows for ground-level units. Locate windows and/or translucent glass so that pedestrians on the sidewalk cannot see directly into the lower half of the ground floor space. Create a layered transition using landscape or window treatments to prevent direct eye contact between pedestrians and residents in interior spaces, while still ensuring adequate natural lighting into units. Window shades that raise from the bottom and windows that open at the top are encouraged.

PL3-2-c. Outdoor Spaces: Provide stoops, porches, patios, and balconies to create opportunities for social interaction among residents and neighbors, particularly along the street-edge. Private outdoor spaces should be large enough to accommodate seating for 2-4 people, and clearly delineated using landscape. This space should be at the same level as the interior of the unit where feasible and should be designed for some privacy from adjacent units. Where possible, raise outdoor spaces slightly above sidewalk level.

PL3-3 Live/Work Edges: Design live-work units to provide truly flexible space that can successfully accommodate different commercial uses over time.

PL3-3-a. Arts-Relation Use: Support future arts-related use, such as artist studios, by providing arts-friendly features such as wall-sized operable/garage doors and high ceilings at the ground level.

PL3-3-b. Location: Where possible, locate live-work units on side streets, mid-block passages, and alleys, not on major pedestrian or retail corridors.

PL3-3-c. Privacy Screening: Consider including some level of adaptive privacy screening, such as landscape tubs, window films and window shades that raise from the bottom, while still emphasizing the high transparency and commercial needs of these spaces.

PL3-4 Retail Edges

PL3-4-a. Permeable storefronts: Design the ground floor retail edge to enhance street level activity and promote social mixing. Features may include large operable windows and doors, outdoor dining, and artistic detailing that provides visual interest. Design spaces to function year-round, including during the summertime when windows and doors will be open fairly frequently. Use clear/un-tinted glass, preserve oblique sightlines into retail spaces, and minimize mullions and the height of any stem walls. Consider setting the height of canopies at approximately 10 feet.

PL3-4-b. Highly-Individualized: Design retail frontages to contribute to the small-scale, pedestrian-oriented character of Capitol Hill retail. Provide an architectural framework that tenants can personalize and individualize with custom signs, window treatments, and programming. Use a variety of materials and architectural features to break up individual spaces while maintaining transparency.

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

PL4-A Entry Locations and Relationships

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

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

PL4-B Planning Ahead for Bicyclists

PL4-B-1. Early Planning: Consider existing and future bicycle traffic to and through the site early in the process so that access and connections are integrated into the project along with other modes of travel.

PL4-B-2. Bike Facilities: Facilities such as bike racks and storage, bike share stations, shower facilities and lockers for bicyclists should be located to maximize convenience, security, and safety.

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

PL4-C Planning Ahead For Transit

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

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

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

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

PL4-1 Connections to All Modes: For buildings along corridors that provide direct pedestrian access to light rail station entries and other key transit access points - including: Broadway, 15th, E John St, E Olive St, E Denny Way, E Howell St, E Nagle Place, and 10th Ave E below Thomas – locate primary entries to conveniently access transit and consider that secondary entries may also be required to maximize pedestrian access to transit.

PL4-2 Planning Ahead for Bicyclists

PL4-2-a. Bicycle Parking: Bicycle use and parking should be encouraged to promote a healthy and active neighborhood and to support local businesses. Bicycle parking should be plentiful and should be an approved design from the Seattle Department of Transportation's bike parking program. The bicycle racks and bike share hardscape areas may also be an opportunity for placemaking, such as having a uniform color within the Capitol Hill EcoDistrict or Arts District, or having distinctive place names or references designed into them.

PL4-2-b. Parking Location: Locate short-term parking bike racks and bike share hardscape areas near the intended uses, but maintain clear pedestrian movement along desire lines, and maximize sidewalk activation opportunities along the storefronts. Locate bike racks within sight lines of front doors, windows, or areas with visual security. In areas where bicycle parking is anticipated to be high, consider whether an on-street bike rack or corral may be appropriate.

DESIGN CONCEPT

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

DC1-AArrangement of Interior Uses

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

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

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

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

DC1-B Vehicular Access and Circulation

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

DC1-B-2. Facilities for Alternative Transportation: Locate facilities for alternative transportation in prominent locations that are convenient and readily accessible to expected users.

DC1-C Parking and Service Uses

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

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

DC1-C-3. Multiple Uses: Design parking areas to serve multiple uses such as children's play space, outdoor gathering areas, sports courts, woonerf, or common space in multifamily projects.

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

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

DC1-1 Location and Design of Uses

DC1-1-a. Flexibility: Maximize flexibility over the building's life, for all street-level spaces in commercial or residential use. Design space to accommodate either retail or arts and cultural uses, and different scales of tenants. For example: do not include structural or concrete stem walls or bulkheads protruding above grade level (which inhibit future modifications) along any sidewalk/street frontages.

DC1-2 Parking and Service Uses

DC1-2-a. Visual Impacts: When it is necessary to locate parking entrances and service uses on street frontages, or in highly visible locations, use artistic treatments (e.g. murals or decorative metalwork on garage doors and adjacent walls) or lush landscape screening to reduce visual impacts. This is especially important in locations where commercial uses extend to streets with residential character (e.g. Nagle Place, Harvard Avenue E, 14th Avenue).

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

DC2-A Massing

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

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

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

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

DC2-B-2. Blank Walls: Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are

unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features

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

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

DC2-C-3. Fit With Neighboring Buildings: Use design elements to achieve a successful fit between a building and its neighbors.

DC2-D Scale and Texture

DC2-D-1. Human Scale: Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building facades, entries, retaining walls, courtyards, and exterior spaces in a manner that is consistent with the overall architectural concept

DC2-D-2. Texture: Design the character of the building, as expressed in the form, scale, and materials, to strive for a fine-grained scale, or "texture," particularly at the street level and other areas where pedestrians predominate.

DC2-E Form and Function

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

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

DC2-1 Facades at Setbacks and Corners: Where buildings have side setbacks adjacent to other buildings, materials and design treatments should intentionally 'wrap the corner' of window and door openings, and at building corners, so cladding materials and treatments appear substantial, and not two-dimensional or paper thin.

DC2-2 Integrating Art: Use art to animate the pedestrian realm including blank walls, sidewalks, entrances, walkways, etc. Engage artists early in the design process to integrate art into the building design, rather than simply applying art onto a finished design. Consider themes and artists that represent the Capitol Hill community. See CS3.2, Placemaking, for additional guidance on integrating art into projects.

DC2-3 Secondary Architectural Features

DC2-3-a. Visual Depth and Interest: Projecting balconies, recessed decks, and legibly-recessed, well-detailed windows are desirable.

DC2-3-b. Fit with Neighboring Buildings: Selectively include design elements or proportions that reflect Capitol Hill's historic character such as streetscape rhythm, historic parcel widths, fenestration patterns and/or material treatments.

DC2-4 Scale and Texture: Texture at Street Level: Emphasize pedestrian scale, durability, and texture at the street level based on positive local characteristics such as storefront mullion width and materiality, entrance details, and building materials with a handcrafted appearance. Building components that are small enough to hold such as brick, are desirable. Uniform facades composed of flush glass or large expanses of panels (metal, cement board, etc.), without the relief of frequent and highly-detailed entrances/framing treatments, detract from the desired human scale and texture at the street level.

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

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

DC3-A-1. Interior/Exterior Fit: Develop an open space concept in conjunction with the architectural concept to ensure that interior and exterior spaces relate well to each other and support the functions of the development.

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

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

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

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

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

DC3-C Design

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

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

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

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

DC3-1 Open Space Uses and Accessibility

DC3-1-a. Ground Level Open Space: Consider providing multi-use open space (generous corner landscape treatments; courtyard entries) that can be viewed, used, and enjoyed from the adjacent sidewalk. Design ground level common open spaces, or certain portions of them, that are accessible to the broader community.

DC3-1-b. Residential Open Space: Include areas for multi-generational use and social interaction. Locate children's play space to where they can be seen by guardians and incorporate seating areas for community members to congregate.

DC3-1-c. Healthy Open Space: Incorporate planting beds to grow food or other features that will support physical activity. Design landscapes to provide ecological and social benefits.

DC3-2 Design

DC3-2-a. Existing Open Space Patterns: When present in the project vicinity, reiterate any existing positive open space patterns characteristic of Capitol Hill such as large canopy street and yard trees, high bank front yards, and extra wide planting strips.

DC3-2-b. Public Realm Plans: For development adjacent to City-adopted or community-generated public realm plans (e.g. Neighborhood Green Street, Street Concept Plan, Melrose Promenade), the development should implement or support the identified public realm concept.

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

DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes

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

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

DC4-B Signage

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

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

DC4-C Lighting

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

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

DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

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

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

DC4-D-3. Long Range Planning: Select plants that upon maturity will be of appropriate size, scale, and shape to contribute to the site as intended.

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

DC4-E Project Assembly and Lifespan

DC4-E-1. Deconstruction: When possible, design the project so that it may be deconstructed at the end of its useful lifetime, with connections and assembly techniques that will allow reuse of materials.

Capitol Hill Supplemental Guidance:

DC4-1 Exterior Finish Materials: Consider each building as a high-quality, long-term addition to the neighborhood. Exterior finish materials should exhibit permanence and quality appropriate to Capitol Hill.

DC4-1-a. Building Concept: Integrate exterior detailing and materials into the building concept by relating to the structural expression of the building, and/or intentionally expressing the joints and transitions of the building materials and components.

DC4-1-b. Quality: Choose traditional or modern materials that are durable, proven, high quality, maintainable, that employ or complement more traditional materials such as brick, cast stone, architectural stone, terracotta details.

DC4-1-c. Texture: Materials that have texture, pattern, or color and are attractive even when viewed up close or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.
DC4-1-d. Panels: If panels (cement, metal, etc.) are used, they should be carefully-detailed, well-designed and combined with other materials to provide patterns, scale, and visual interest, particularly on lower levels. If used, panels should be of sufficient thickness to prevent warping or deformations.

DC4-2 Sustainable and Environmental Choices

DC4-2-a. Salvage and Reuse: Maximize the reuse of nontoxic salvaged building materials. Consider de-construction if building(s) to be demolished contain high value reusable materials (e.g. tile, flooring, old growth beams). Reuse salvaged materials in the new development as visible building components.
DC4-2-b. Local and Regional Materials: Choose local or regional building and landscape materials to reduce transport energy when possible.
DC4-2-c. Bird Friendly Design: Employ bird friendly design strategies for the upper floors of buildings with extensive glass, such as decorative screens, or louvers, or patterns integrated into the glass to warn birds before they collide. Locate landscape carefully to not create reflected greenery which attracts/confuses birds.
DC4-2-d. Lighting: Use directional down-lighting and other dark-sky friendly lighting strategies to enhance the perception of safety and minimize light pollution. Avoid outdoor lighting with high blue light content or other attributes that could adversely affect wildlife behavior and reproduction. Use low-wattage, warm tone lighting wherever possible and diffuse exterior light to make it more consistent with the context.
DC4-2-e. Heat Island: Design the building and open space to reduce the urban heat island effect. Use roofing materials with a high solar reflectance index or install a vegetated roof. Minimize the area of asphalt, concrete, and other hardscape. When used, consider coatings and colorants to achieve a lighter colored surface. Integrate plantings into passive design strategies for the building, e.g. use large canopy deciduous trees or a vine covered trellis to shade and cool a south-facing facade.

DC4-3 Signage: In addition to all requirements found in the Sign Code, the following guidelines also apply.

DC4-3-a. Pedestrian Oriented: Design areas on the building façade for individual business signs that are pedestrian-oriented (generally 20 feet maximum above grade) and integrated with the design concept and architectural details.
DC4-3-b. Building Identification: Design building identification signs to be well-integrated with the building's architectural elements.
DC4-3-c. Tenants: Incorporate unique, hand-crafted tenant signs to add visual interest to the simple building form. Signage design and placement should be well integrated with the design and style of the structure. Signs should not appear mass-produced.
DC4-3-d. District Signage: Use signs to reinforce the unique identity of the Capitol Hill as an Arts District and an EcoDistrict. Consider including district-branded signs, on-site interpretive panels or art installations that connect the building/site to these districts.

DC4-4 Plant Materials and Hardscapes

DC4-4-a. Beneficial Plants: Use plant species that are suitable for site condition, climate, and design intent. Maximize the use of native and/or naturally growing (non-invasive) plants that are self-sustaining, low maintenance, drought and pest resistant, and durable in urban conditions. Encourage the use of pollinator plants and those that provide wildlife and avian habitat appropriate to the region. Avoid invasive species that may jeopardize local ecosystems, or species that require the use of petrochemical fertilizer or pesticides.

DC4-4-b. Diversity: Plant diversity provides resistance to insect and diseases pests. As a general guide for larger sites, plant not more than 10 percent of any species, no more than 20 percent of any genus, and no more than 30 percent of any family. For smaller sites select species that contribute to plant diversity of the community.

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

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, July 28, 2021, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, July 28, 2021 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, three of the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design with the following conditions:

1. Provide additional pedestrian amenities and particularly seating to encourage active use at the street edges on 12th Avenue and the lower portion of Olive Street. (PL3-C, PL1-B)
2. Retain the lush and vibrant landscape elements shown on the alley podium including the large caliper trees. (CS1-D, CS2-D, DC4-D)
3. Provide a landscape design that reflects the character of the precedent images rather than that of the perspective renderings. (CS1-D, CS1-E, DC4-D)
4. Maintain the appearance of the project as shown in the Recommendation packet. (CS1, CS2, CS3, PL1, PL2, PL3, DC1, DC2, DC3)

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director's Analysis

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.008.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 July 30, 2021, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Five members of the East 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 Conditions:

1. Additional seating and landscape elements have been added to encourage active use at the street edges on 12th Avenue and the lower portion of Olive Street. (PL3-C, PL1-B)
2. The lush and vibrant landscape elements shown on the alley podium including the large caliper trees have been preserved in the approved MUP drawings.
3. The landscape design reflects the character of the precedent images rather than that of the perspective renderings in the approved MUP drawings.
4. The appearance of the project has been maintained as shown in the Recommendation packet in the approved MUP drawings.

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 5 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 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 1/11/2021 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 greenhouse gas, construction traffic and parking impacts, construction noise, and environmental health

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

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

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted and a Construction Management Plan is required, which will be reviewed by Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). The requirements for a Construction Management Plan include a Haul Route and a Construction Parking Plan. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: Construction Use in the Right of Way.

Construction Impacts - Noise

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

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: Construction Use in the Right of Way. The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance and the CMP are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore, no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigation noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

Environmental Health

The applicant submitted studies regarding existing contamination on site:
Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment and Subsurface Exploration for 12th and Olive Property, 1714 and 1718 12th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98122 by G-Logics dated June 2019. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment and Subsurface Exploration for 12th and Olive Property, 1208 E Olive Street, Seattle, WA 98122 by G-Logics dated October 2018. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment and Environmental Site Investigation for The Car Tender Property, 1706 12th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98122 by Whitman Environmental Sciences dated April 2016. Geotechnical Report, Geotechnical Engineering Study for 1700 12TH Avenue, Seattle WA by PanGEO Inc. Testing completed April 2016 by Geotech Consultants, Inc., November 2012 by The Riley Group, Inc., December 2011 by Associated Earth Sciences, Inc, and June 1999 by Geotech Consultants, Inc. (uploaded updated October 2020 report by PanGEO Inc). Environmental Media Management Plan, G-Logics, May 17, 2021

If not properly handled, existing contamination could have an adverse impact on environmental health.

As indicated in the SEPA checklist and the Phase I reports, the applicant will comply with all provisions of MTCA in addressing these issues in the development of the project.

If the recommendations described in the Environmental Media Management Plan, Phase I and Geotechnical reports are followed, then it is not anticipated that the characterization, removal, treatment, transportation or disposal of any such materials will result in a significant adverse impact to the environment. This conclusion is supported by the expert environmental consultants for the project, whose conclusions are also set forth in the materials in the MUP file for this project.

Adherence to MTCA provisions and federal and state laws are anticipated to adequately mitigate significant adverse impacts from existing contamination on site.

Mitigation of contamination and remediation is in the jurisdiction of Washington State Department of Ecology ("Ecology"), consistent with the City's SEPA relationship to Federal, State and Regional regulations described in SMC 25.05.665.E. This State agency program functions to mitigate risks associated with removal and transport of hazardous and toxic materials, and the agency's regulations provide sufficient impact mitigation for these materials. The City acknowledges that Ecology's jurisdiction and requirements for remediation will mitigate impacts associated with any contamination.

The proposed strategies and compliance with Ecology's requirements are expected to adequately mitigate the adverse environmental impacts from the proposed development and no further mitigation is warranted for impacts to environmental health per SMC 25.05.675.F.

Long Term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including the following: greenhouse gas emissions; parking; possible increased traffic in the area. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, greenhouse gas, historic resources, height bulk and scale, parking, and transportation 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 existing structures on site are more than 50 years old. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and indicated the structures on site are unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Landmarks Preservation Board letters, reference number LPB LPB 78/21). 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 completed 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.

Parking

The proposed development includes 134 residential units with 83 off-street vehicular parking spaces. The traffic and parking analysis (Heffron Transportation, Transportation Impact Analysis December 22, 2020) indicates a peak demand for approximately 59 vehicles from the proposed development. Peak residential demand typically occurs overnight.

The traffic and parking analysis noted that the peak parking demand for this development is 59 vehicles. 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

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Heffron Transportation, Transportation Impact Analysis December 22, 2020) indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 190 daily vehicle trips, with 11 net new PM peak hour trips and 7 AM peak hour trips.

The additional trips are expected to distribute on various roadways near the project site, including 12th Avenue E., E. Pine Street and E. Denny Way 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).

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

For the Life of the Project

1. The building and landscape design shall be 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 (Joseph Hurley, joseph.hurley@seattle.gov, 206-561-3432.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

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

2. 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: Construction Use in the Right of Way

Joseph Hurley, Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: March 7, 2022

JH:rgc
3036725-LU Decision.docx