Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections

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

Project Number: 3034353-LU

Applicant Name: Bumgardner Architects

Address of Proposal: 2550 32nd Ave W.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow a 7-story, 146-unit apartment building with retail (Safeway). Parking for 221 vehicles proposed. Existing building to be demolished. Early Design Guidance conducted under 3034348-EG.

The following approvals are required:

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

SEPA - Environmental Determination (SMC 25.05)

SEPA DETERMINATION
:

Determination of Non-significance

☐ No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed with the DNS but are recommended for consideration by City Council.

☒ Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.06.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

BACKGROUND:

This proposal intends to participate in the Living Building Challenge. In exchange for meeting a combination of Living Building Challenge and Seattle-specific requirements, the City of Seattle's Living Building Pilot (LBP) program provides local land use incentives that offer building area and height bonuses.

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 2-55 (M) (NC2-55 (M))

Nearby Zoning: North - Single Family 5000 (SF 5000)
South - NC2-55 (M)/NC2P 55 (M)
East - SF 5000
West SF 5000

Project Area: 41,125 square feet (sq. ft.)

Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA): There are no mapped environmentally critical areas located on the subject site.

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 file will control.

Current and Surrounding Development; Neighborhood Character; Access:

The subject site is located midblock on 32nd Ave W between W Raye St and W Smith St in the Magnolia neighborhood. A portion of the block was rezoned from Neighborhood Commercial 2-40 to Neighborhood Commercial 2-55 (M) on 4/19/19 allowing for a potential height increase from 40 feet to 55 feet. Adjacent to the site are multifamily residential structures to the north and south, single-family homes across the alley to the east, and Lowery C. "Pop" Mounger Pool immediately to the west. 32nd Ave W, a collector arterial, is lined with commercial uses leading south to the Magnolia Village commercial area. An Albertsons grocery store, constructed in 1955, and a surface parking lot occupy the proposal site. The site has a descending slope of approximately 10' from east to west.

The neighborhood is anchored by the recreational and educational institutions including Magnolia Playfield, Magnolia Community Center, Blaine Jr High School, and Catharine Blaine K-8 school, which fall immediately north of Magnolia Village. Surrounding uses are largely single-family residential homes. 32nd Ave W is characterized by sidewalks and neat rows of mature street trees, interjected by the occasional surface parking lot. Traveling south of W Raye St, the character transitions to small businesses clustering together to form a strong street edge. Buildings are lowrise, ranging from one to three stories in height. No one architectural style dominates amongst the mixed-use and multifamily residential structures in the vicinity, although boxy forms, flat roofs, and masonry materials are found throughout. North of W Raye St are single-family homes characterized by gabled roofs and vegetated setbacks. Multiple projects in the vicinity are currently in review or under construction for proposed development, including 2412 32nd Ave W.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on January 25, 2021, and extended to February 8, 2021. In addition to the comments received through the Design Review process, other comments were

received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to the following concerns:

- There is no public bike parking on site;
- the project is too large and will block sun and light; shade on immediate residential structures needs to be addressed;
- Raye St. will become more dangerous due to increased traffic;
- the project must meet the Living Building Pilot Program,
- concerns about toxic fumes from the loading zone and exhaust vents;
- the transportation analysis does not adequately consider the cumulative impacts of other projects in the vicinity; and
- aesthetic impacts including the scale of the building should be further addressed.

There were also several comments that did not directly relate to the project proposal including concerns about property values, area flooding and ground water, usage of the community center and associated playfields.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE January 8, 2022

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the record number 3034348-EG at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx
Any recording of the Board meeting is available in the project file. This meeting report summarizes the meeting and is not a meeting transcript.

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

Mailing Address of Proposal:	**Public Resource Center** 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000 P.O. Box 34019 Seattle, WA 98124-4019
Email:	PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Disappointed in the lack of diversity in the schemes in that the three schemes seem to be an evolution of just one scheme when there should have been more of difference between the three schemes.

- Didn't support the proposal because it provides parking access off 32nd Ave W while proposing a midblock crossing due to the potential for conflicts between automobiles and children walking in the area.
- Suggested that the design needs to address the large number of bicyclists in the area.
- Supported the sunken plaza area.
- Supported access off 32nd Ave W. as it supports the public plaza and would allow the alley to be maintained for residential use.
- Supported a midblock pedestrian crossing because the block is very long which forces people to jaywalk.
- Supported the project as it will revitalize buildings that owners do not reside in and revitalize the general area.
- Supported the project as it will bring more density to the area which will be a first step in revitalizing the community.
- Suggested that the project will afford opportunities for homeowners to downsize and stay in the community without having to move downtown.
- Suggested that the Living Pilot Program building is important as it will provide major health benefits for residents in the building and the Magnolia neighborhood that surrounds it.
- Stated that the project does not provide enough parking.
- Suggested that the alley will not be able to accommodate semi-trucks.
- Stated that the proposed 70-foot-tall building will block the sun to the residences to east.
- Excited to see the quality of exterior finishes, size of windows and final fenestration because the project will be the best type of architecture to be seen in the city.
- Asked if there will be any retail interaction with the proposed plaza and suggested that the design team should develop ways of activating it.
- Suggested that if the building is allowed to take advantage of the additional height afforded by the living building pilot program, then it should be introduced in a neighborhood that already has buildings of a similar height rather than placing it immediately adjacent to a lower single-family zone.
- Suggested that the single-family residences located to the east will have stadium seating to a blank façade.
- Urged the design team to design a project that is for how individuals will get around in the future opposed to 'right now', including electric cars and bikes and electric cargo bikes, especially if there are concerns about automobile exhaust.
- Suggested that the scale and the massing of the proposed building compared to structures located around it is drastically different and the proposal site is not the civic center of Magnolia where this kind of scale exists.
- Requested that the design team think further about the solar impacts of the project on the adjacent swimming pool and so that it does not block the massive amounts of sunlight to residences.
- Said that they would like to see the building come down by one story because they do not think the building needs to be seven stories.
- Asked if the upper story terrace will be only for use by residents of the building.
- Stated that they are not opposed to the building but rather opposed to the height of the building.

- Asked why not make the proposal a living building at a maximum height of 54 feet.
- Stated that other large developments are separated from residential uses by large streets while this project will be separated from residences by a 24-foot-wide alley.
- Encouraged the Board to look further at the design guidelines for height, bulk, and scale even though the project has done a good job providing substantial setbacks which are not required.
- Supported the curb cut along 32nd Ave W. as the local neighbors are used to this existing condition.
- Supported the surface parking lot because it is so convenient.
- Supported the plaza and suggested that if it were moved to the north, it would be in shadow.
- Urged the design team to use more natural building materials that will last for a long time.
- Supported the preferred option and access off 32nd Ave W. for its convenience.
- Supported the amount of collaboration between the community and the development team.

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

- Several comments supported the project.
- Several comments favored Option 3.
- Several comments supported revitalizing Magnolia Village.
- Most comments supported locating residential and grocery parking access on 32nd Ave W instead of the alley to minimize impacts to adjacent properties.
- Most comments supported a sitting and gathering area to encourage social and retail interactions. Noted the proposed area would be smaller if the parking entrance is located on the alley.
- Stressed the importance of an attractive design for pedestrians with a pleasant plaza and connection to the park and pool.
- Most comments were concerned about pedestrian safety if parking is accessed from the alley.
- Suggested moving the proposed bike lane from 32nd Ave W to 34th Ave W.
- Noted the project will set a precedent for future development.
- Most comments supported Green Built or Living Building design.
- Unsupportive of the 6’ setback requested by SDOT intending to widen 32nd Ave. Suggested variation in the overall massing and elevations to improve the relationship to adjacent structures.
- Requested screening and covering the loading dock along the alley for aesthetic reasons and soundproofing.
- Requested keeping two curb cuts instead of just one.
- Noted this is the first structure built under the new NC2-55 zoning in Magnolia.
- Multiple comments concerned the proposed structure appearing out of place in the neighborhood due to height and size.
- A couple comments felt the impact of the proposed height on neighboring structures was underrepresented in the design proposal.
- Discouraged adding another coffee shop in the neighborhood.

The Seattle Department of Transportation offered the following comments:

- Supported the code-compliant options which consolidate vehicle access and truck loading functions to the alley.
- Conditionally supported reducing the 6' Right-Of-Way setback requirement on 32nd Ave W to 0'.
- Stated SDOT won't approve a new mid-block crossing on 32nd Ave W unless the project can verify that pedestrian and vehicle volumes warrant a marked crosswalk.
- Encouraged developing a concept that allows solid waste containers to be staged on private property on collection day.

One purpose of the design review process is for Staff 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. Concerns with building height calculations and bicycle storage standards are addressed under the City's zoning code 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 Project Number: http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Massing:**
    a. The Board stated that Options 1 and 2, did not receive the same amount of study as the preferred option, Option 3 which shouldn't automatically become the defacto preferred option as a result. The Board continued by stating that Options 1 and 2 are simply not viable options as they appeared to be duplications of Option 3 with less detail, including no detail about the public plaza, no discussion about the secondary retail space, no detailed discussion about the residential entries. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1)**
    b. In reviewing the preferred option, the Board observed a third massing element depicted in a vignette sketch shown on page 76 of the EDG packet not included in the preferred option depicted in earlier pages of the packet and ask if the move should be inferred as an element of the preferred massing option. The Board stated that the design team shall depict massing moves or volume changes into the massing diagram at 2nd EDG. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1)**

c. Discussing the northern building volume in the preferred option, the Board noted it was set 4 feet below the southern volume and asked for details on how it will meet the street.
d. The Board requested additional views of the building mass from the northwest corner and demonstration of how the proposed height will be experienced from a pedestrian viewpoint. **(CS1-B-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-5)**
e. The Board stated that there was not enough information about the how the scale of the building will be broken down and that if the design team is considering elements like sloped roofs, indentations, or other elements, then this information needs to be presented in an EDG massing option. **(CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5, PL3-A-1, DC2-A-2, DC2-B)**
f. The Board stated because there was not enough information in the preferred option, the design team should return for a second EDG to provide more options and further studies depicting how the height, bulk and scale will be broken down. The massing options should clarify whether the shifts in the volumes are in the center of the mass, at the corner or are the corners carved in subtle manner, or another approach. **(CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5, DC1-A-4, DC2-A-2)**
g. While acknowledging that setback relief had been given to the adjacent building to the south, the Board was concerned that not much relief had been given to the building to the north. **(CS1-B, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5)**
h. The Board stated that Design Guideline CS2-D3 discusses zone transitions but could not see how the guideline had been used to inform the three-massing option. As such the Board asked for additional study that clearly shows the transitions with adjacent buildings in a neighborhood context. **(CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5)**
i. The Board stated that the massing moves depicted in the thumbnail sketch imagery depicted on page 76 of the EDG packet should be reflected in the massing options. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**
j. For the next EDG meeting, the Board asked to see three updated massing options with access off 32nd Ave W. The massing options could include one option characterized as a partial block shift, and an option with a lantern or tower element as seen in the concept sketch on page 76 of the EDG packet. **(CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5, DC2-A-2)**

2. Design Concept:

a. The Board stated that they did not understand how the massing options presented at EDG were indicative of a recognizable design concept. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-D-1)**
b. The Board directed the team to demonstrate responses to the following issues in the Second EDG packet, to clarify proposed access into the site and the pedestrian realm.
    i. What is the design rationale for providing parking access off 32nd Ave W. to the surface parking lot? **(PL1-B-1, PL1-B-3, PL1-C-2)**
    ii. Why is the public plaza so highly integrated with the greatest amount of traffic into the project site? **(DC3-A-1, DC3-B, DC3-C-2)**
    iii. Why is there parking outside of the garage and adjacent to pedestrian plaza?
    iv. Why not place all the parking within the garage? **(DC3-A-1, DC3-B, DC3-C-2)**

c. The Board observed that the location of the surface parking lot significantly detracts from the public plaza area. Study alternate parking/plaza locations in the second EDG packet. **(PL1-B-1, PL1-B-3, PL1-C-2)**
d. In the Second EDG packet, demonstrate how the grades work in relationship to the plaza area as depicted on page 74 of the EDG packet dated January 8, 2020. **(CS1-C-2, DC2-D)**
e. The Board stated that the design guidelines talk about using topography to inform design concepts. In response to these guidelines, the Second EDG packet should demonstrate how the design will take advantage of the sloping conditions by stepping with the grade, especially as it relates to an east-west direction. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, DC2-A-1)**
f. The proposed massing is larger than nearby existing context. In the Second EDG packet, demonstrate how the design will further the urban experience of the nearby context. **(DC2-B, DC2-D-1, DC2-E-1, DC4-D-4)**
g. The Board stated that there is no architectural design concept reflected in any of the massing options presented in the EDG packet. As such the Board requested that the design team devote further study in developing a design concept and rationale for an updated EDG 2 presentation. **(CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-B)**

3. Articulation:

a. The Board observed that proposed design consists of three very similar massing approaches which includes two shifting volumes, a southern volume set back from 32nd Ave W and a northern volume shifting west away from the alley which the Board felt was not yet fully resolved. Additional massing options should be provided in the Second EDG packet. **(CS1-B-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-A-2)**
b. The Board stated that comparative massing imagery page 53 of EDG packet depicts three massing options with facades that emulate sheer walls that go all the down to grade with some windows. The Board continued by saying that the massing options should be further developed with reveals or other elements designed to break down the scale, like the thumbnail sketch on page 76 of the EDG packet. **(CS1-B-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-A-2, DC2-C-1)**
c. The Board stated that the massing volumes should be further articulated. The Board agreed with the conceptual idea of incorporating elements like biophilia and lantern forms into the design were positive. Provide clear information on how all these things would be incorporated into a cohesive design approach, with the information at the 2nd EDG meeting. **(CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5 DC2-C-1)**
d. The Board requested additional studies showing how the design will transition to lower existing heights north side the building, and provide a north façade that, relates to a design concept.,. **(CS1-B-2, CS2-D-5)**
e. The Board stated that it will be important to see how the building will look from both west and east sides and requested additional studies depicting how the building will be perceived from those vantage points. **(CS2-D-5, DC2-A-2, DC2-B-1)**
f. The Board requested additional information depicting how the scale of the massing volumes will be further broken down and how Living Building Pilot elements will be incorporated into the design. **(DC2-C-1, PL3-A-1)**

g. The Board requested an elevated perspective view of the project from surrounding neighborhoods which would aid in showing the building in a broader context. **(CS3-B-1, CS1-B-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-A-2)**

4. Circulation and Parking Access:

a. While this is a Type I Decision with the final determination made by the SDCI Director, the Board expressed scepticism about the proposed parking access being taken from the street instead of from the alley. The Board stated that there are several other supermarkets throughout Seattle that take parking access off the alley. **(PL2-A-1, PL2-A-2, DC1-B-1, DC1-C)**
b. The Board stated that they did not believe that the 'SeaTac Ramp' depicted in Option 2 in the EDG packet is the only way to bring parking off the alley. **(DC1-B-1, DC1-C)**
c. The Board noted the applicant's statement that taking parking access off 32nd Ave W would reduce the impacts to the single-family residences located to the east of the project. **(PL2-A-1, PL2-A-2, DC1-B-1)**
d. In discussing the auto circulation patterns presented at EDG, the Board stated that the design scheme depicting access of 32nd Ave W seemed to be most developed, but not completely resolved. **(PL2-A-1, DC1-B-1)**
e. The Board stated that the preferred option with automobile access off 32nd Ave W needed more analysis to demonstrate that this is approach will be a successful response to Design Guidelines and the context. **(PL2-A-1, DC1-C)**
f. The Board requested additional information related to automobile access off 32nd Ave W and demonstration of how the design function without a midblock pedestrian crossing. SDOT comments noted they do not support a midblock pedestrian crossing at this time. **(CS2-B-2, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**
g. The Board asked for more detailed information at the podium level including section views of the plaza and its relationship with the access point off 32nd Ave W. **(CS2-B-2, PL4-A, DC1-B-1)**

5. Public Life:

a. The Board was concerned that the public plaza is located immediately adjacent to the surface parking area. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-C-2, PL2-B-3)**
b. The Board stated that in similar situations, other sites have benefited from intervening sidewalks or a change in elevation separating pedestrian activities from automobile traffic. Seeing how other sites approached the use of a public plaza, the Board stated that this proposal needs more study in way of separating the plaza from the surface parking area and automobile movement. **(CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, CS2-C-2, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**
c. The Board supported the concept for the public plaza designed to support the programming needs of the supermarket but stated that design of the space was not yet clear. Demonstrate how the plaza design will enhance this concept. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

d. The Board requested section studies taken through the plaza and the sidewalk to demonstrate the pedestrian experience along the sidewalk and the building frontage. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**
e. The Board asked for more detail depicting/describing the indoor-outdoor relationship of the public plaza, the store entry, and the pedestrian experience. **(PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3, DC3-A-1, DC3-B-1)**
f. The Board requested additional information detailing the location and amount of transparency along the store frontage and the type of textures, rhythms, or places of pause along the very long storefront facade. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

6. Living Building Pilot:

a. Discussing the three massing options, the Board suggested that the option with the least amount of concrete is the best for the environment. As such the preferred option seemed to be the most carbon sensitive opposed to a large parking ramp seen in other options. **(DC2-B-1, DC3-C-2)**
b. The Board supported the Living Building Pilot approach, suggested that the living building design approach needs to be embodied in the massing and that sustainability goals should be legible in the building design, potentially achieved through building articulation and other design moves. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**
c. The Board stated that a large 7-story building will be very visible within the lower height Magnolia neighborhood. The design should clearly read as a Living Building as seen from the top of the hill and surrounding areas. **(DC2-C-3, DC2-D, DC2-E)**
d. The Board asked the team to demonstrate how integrating the parking and the pedestrian biophilia will be consistent with the values of the Living Building Challenge, given that pedestrians will be subjected to automobile exhaust with the driveway next to the pedestrian realm. **(DC3-B-1, DC3-C-2, DC4-D-4)**
e. The Board requested additional information depicting how the living building challenge is reflected in the massing through further study of the fifth/roof elevation. **(CS3-B-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-E, DC4-D-4)**

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE June 1, 2020

**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 for EDG 2. Staff asked that the project return for an EDG 3 which went in front of the online Design Review Board during the Covid 19 pandemic.*

PUBLIC COMMENT

During the comment period for the Administrative Recommendation phase, the following design review comments were provided:

- Concerned the alley will be unable to support the proposed grocery store's trucks in addition to the existing traffic and uses.
- Opposed to the proposed development.
- Stated that a four-story height would be more in keeping with the existing neighborhood character. Felt the proposed 65-foot height would tower over adjacent buildings. (Design Guideline CS2, A-D)
- Expressed safety concerns for pedestrians using the sidewalks along W Raye St and W Smith St if trucks were to access the alley. (Design Guideline PL4)
- Stated that the proposed design is beautiful.
- Supported the proposed development.
- Supported the project's participation in the Living Building Pilot Program.
- Supported garage access along 32nd Ave, noting that taking access from the alley would negatively impact a proposed public plaza that would be created by the entrance on 32nd Ave.
- Supported option 3.
- Stated that the Concept of "Eroded Bluff" is only at building's entry.
- Stated that cantilevered eroded bluffs may trigger negative reactions especially at main entry.
- Requested a scale model and/or drawings showing the project together with a two-block area on all sides.
- Felt the zone transition is unsuccessful considering the proposed height. (Design Guideline A2)
- Asked if the proposed route of Magnolia's bike paths would be on 32nd Ave W and if so, how it would be impacted by the proposed development.
- Requested retaining or moving the existing street trees.
- Suggested incorporating bay windows, decks, and attractive big windows.
- Concerned about reduced sunlight to the Pop Mounger Swimming Pool and adjacent single-family residences.
- Questioned the location of waste storage and collection.
- Suggested a break or breezeway along the 32nd Ave W and the alley facades to increase solar access.
- Encouraged setting back the upper floors to provide visual relief.
- Suggested incorporating a belvedere walk and arcade on the roof edge facing 32nd Ave W.
- Suggested building a rock-climbing wall on the west façade and a zip line from the roof to the grassy knoll south of the Pop Mounger Swimming Pool.
- Requested a physical buffer between the proposed development and adjacent residences to minimize privacy impacts.
- Suggested reducing the building height by sinking the building 10-12' into the ground and reducing the interior store height to less than 20.'
- Observed that the proposed design has long facades and harsh edges, as opposed to being soft and green like the local parks and mature greenspaces.
- Encouraged a cladding material that eases into the treed residential hill behind the site instead of clashing with a bright urban color scheme. (Design Guideline B1)

- Preferred frequently changed artwork as opposed to the proposed biophilic design.
- Concerned that future development will block sunlight to the proposed plaza.
- Preferred a bar, restaurant, cinema, or gaming salon over a grocery store use.
- Expressed there is a lack of set-back adjustments for the topography.
- Opposed to solar panels, skylights, and screened mechanical elements extending above the LBP code compliant height of 76'6".
- Encouraged continuing the biophilic design theme through all major visible facades.
- Encouraged more visible aspects of the Living Building Design Pilot to adjacent neighbors and to the public.
- Felt the Board's guidance from EDG1 was unaddressed, including lack of zone transitions, lack of recognizable design concept, public plaza concept invalidated by a parking lot, lack of set-back adjustments for topography, lack of massing options, and lack of living building design elements.

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning EPA, EIS, construction impacts, zoning, parking, density, revitalization, housing affordability, public comment period, traffic, views, property value, and community outreach.

There were other comments received that are not related to Design Guidelines.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Staff and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable citywide 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. Concerns related to seismic conditions and retaining wall engineering will be reviewing under the Building Code as part of the building permit application.

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

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Massing:**
    a. Staff agrees with EDG 1 Board guidance that Options 1 and 2 did not receive the same amount of attention as the preferred option, Option 3. Staff also believes that all three options are still very similar having evolved from an earlier single design scheme that features the same mid-block shift of two massing blocks oriented in the same direction, with the same building height and depth. Staff directs the design team to revisit their three massing options as shown and create options that are not dependent on the same midblock horizontal shift, the same building orientation, the

same ground level, the same building height (possibly introducing a reduced height option), and design treatment. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5)**

b. In agreement with public comment, Staff believes that the three massing options represented in the EDG 2 packet are voluminous and more needs to be done to break down the scale and create more relief between the single-family residential zone to the east and the existing buildings located to the north and south. The massing options should also be designed to better aid in the pursuit of biophilia as described in the EDG 2 packet. This could include the greater use of 'nooks and crannies', balconies, and other areas for various types of planting. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5)**

c. A third EDG is required, to allow the design team to continue to develop three unique massing options. These could include varying bay heights and further exploration of the strike slip or verticality of a normal fault action, which could create interesting variations in building height and façade depth. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5)**

2. Design Concept:

a. Staff recognizes that a singular massing strategy based on two shifting volumes, one set back from 32nd Ave W and a second that shifts the mass to the west away from the alley, was committed to early in the design process. The result as seen in the EDG 2 packet is three very similar massing forms that react to the development site in a similar manner, with the same orientation, similar overall volume, length, and heights. In agreement with public comment, Staff requests that the design team devote further study in developing three distinct massing options that have a readily identifiable design concepts and rationales. **(CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-B)**

b. Legibility of Design Concepts:

i. In the massing option identified as Grid/Step/Slip, Option #1, the idea behind the design concept is unclear and doesn't appear to translate into what the design team is calling a strike slip, a kind of horizontal geologic movement of two tectonic plates slipping past each other. By virtue of the title 'step' there should also be vertical stepping, in addition to the horizontal slipping which the option does appear to have. Further, the horizontal placement of the two boxes that are supposed to emulate the slipping motion do not read as such because images do not denote energy of movement or tension. If there was a juxtaposing of horizontal bands that emulate a displacement of layers, it would read much more as a shift or slip. As such Staff directs the design team to modify and emphasize this design approach, and to develop a clear design concept that can be carried through the entire building and reflected in the massing moves and articulation choices. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**

ii. The massing option relationships to the massing concepts as seen on page 48 of the EDG 2 packet are unclear. Option 2 called 'Forest Walk' (formerly

Forest Stair) features a cube that shifts mid-block in a horizontal direction, when the notion of a walk as seen in images denote a feeling of connecting to nature, meditative, and movement or shifts in a vertical direction. Further, the idea of a forest elicit an idea of lush vegetative, tall, and linear elements void of predictability. Option 2 doesn't seem to elicit any of these characteristics. Revisit the approach to this concept and either include elements of the forest walk in the massing approach or find a different more recognizable design concept that is more indicative of concepts and design inspirations presented in the packet. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**

iii. The design concepted called Eroded Bluff appears to have several design metaphors and or elements attributed to it. As seen in the design imagery and written description in the EDG 2 packet, this concept relies on ideas associated with the historic grid of the former military use at Discovery Park, imagery related to West Point Light House, organic forms associated with an eroded shoreline bluff and seashells, old growth forest forms, in addition to the concept of biophilia. When reviewing the massing option 3 it is difficult to see how these elements have been used to create an overall comprehensive design concept. Alluded to in public comments, the concept of the eroded bluff could conjure up images of cliff failure and property destruction which some members of the public are less than enthusiastic about. As such Staff directs the design team to revisit this design approach and develop a clear design concept that can be carried through the entire building and reflected in the massing moves and articulation choices. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**

3. Articulation:

a. At EDG 1 the Board said the packet consisted of three very similar massing options made up of two shifting volumes, one to the south set back from 32nd Ave W and a second that shifts to the west away from the alley. In reviewing the EDG 2 packet Staff has a similar assessment. In addition, Staff observed that each option uses a similar approach or language to its building articulation, relying heavily on long vertical eroded areas of similar depth and rhythm placed along the building façade which emphasis the building's verticality and height verbalized in several public comments. Develop alternative articulation schemes that reveal how the parts fit into a cohesive whole by emphasizing each part separately. **(CS1-B-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-A-2)**

b. It appears that all three massing options treat the ground plane and connection the street in a singular fashion. The result appears to be a building facade that has a same scale and limited variety along the street and north of the public plaza. Revisit the current approach to create more than one design approach to create a fine-grained, pedestrian scale environment along the street edge. **(CS1-B-2, CS2-D-5)**

c. In studying image number 1 on pages 44, 51, 58, perspective views from 32nd looking south, each option appears to be monolithic with no horizontal moves or articulation

or upper-level setbacks. Develop alternative approaches to the articulation schemes that include horizontal elements and upper-level setbacks. This guidance is for all four elevations, especially the east facing elevation located along the zoning transition with the single-family residential zone. **(CS1-B-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-A-2, DC2-C-1)**

4. Circulation and Parking Access:

a. While this is a Type I Decision with the final determination made by the SDCI Director, a design review departure may be possible if the proposal doesn't meet the Type I criteria. At the first EDG review, the Board expressed scepticism about the proposed parking access taken from 32nd Street instead of from the alley. After reviewing the EDG 2 packet, Staff has similar concerns. It was suggested at EDG 1 that other supermarkets throughout Seattle have successfully taken parking access off the alley. As such Staff requests a comparative analysis of how parking at other locations has been taken off the alley to determine if this strategy is physically possible for this site. **(PL2-A-1, PL2-A-2, DC1-B-1, DC1-C)**

b. Staff has reviewed the Design Cue imagery depicted on page 41 of the EDG 2 packet captioned, 'The Magnolia Safeway's design modulation relates to the single-family zone across the alley' …a similar condition where the mixed-use building is modulated and scaled appropriate to the single-family homes across the alley'. Staff disagrees with this characterization as the proposed design will include two bays that are open to the alley designed to accommodate delivery trucks and solid waste removal vehicles pulling forward and backing in at varying hours of the day. Staff acknowledges public comment listing concerns with the design and location of loading and solid waste storage/collection areas. This design appears not to provide relief to the single-family homes across the alley in terms of visual, auditory, or olfactory impacts. Revisit this aspect of the proposal and develop a design scheme that provides ways of reducing these impacts to the single-family zone across the alley. **(CS2-B-2, PL4-A, DC1-B-1)**

5. Public Life:

a. Staff agrees with EDG 1 Board concerns and public comment that the public plaza is located immediately adjacent to the surface parking area which seems contrary to the pursuit of the idea of biophilia. Echoing the Board's sentiment, Staff agrees that the proposal requires additional study in ways of connecting the rest of the street frontage to the plaza and ways of separating the plaza from the surface parking area and automobile movement. The team should consider ways of minimizing the potential for errant automobile incursion into the plaza area by creating elevation changes or inclusion of physical barriers. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

b. Staff has reviewed the Landscape Architecture Design Inspiration imagery depicted on page 73 of the EDG 2 packet which depicts various approaches to the pedestrian courtyards and outdoor plaza use. In comparing the imagery on page 73 with the proposed pedestrian courtyard design, what is most notable is the conspicuous absence of cars. Staff suggests that the design team revisit their proposal and develop a plaza alternative that creates buffers, reduces the presences, or eliminates the cars from such proximity to the pedestrian courtyard. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

c. Staff requests further investigation into the possibility of removing the surface parking and entry altogether or moving the automobile access point further to the north, potentially taking advantage of the existing curb cut. **(CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, CS2-C-2, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

d. In its current configuration, the building frontage is approximately 300 feet in length, a large portion appearing not to engage street. Staff requests additional information depicting the pedestrian experience along the sidewalk and the building frontage, from the public plaza toward W Raye St. In agreement with public comment, enhance the design so that educational, biophilic and other elements are used to engage the street and support the pursuit of the Living Building Challenge. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

6. Living Building Pilot:

a. In agreement with EDG 1 Board guidance and public comments, Staff supports the pursuit of the Living Building Pilot program but directs the design team to do more to incorporate the targeted pilot program elements into the massing moves and design concept of the proposed design so that they have greater legibility. As one generic example, if the project is designed as a tight building with exposed stair wells, then the massing diagrams should show areas being eroded away. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**

b. Staff supports the conceptual idea of incorporating elements like biophilia into the overall building design concept. However, the current massing options lack a clear understanding of how the architecture is connecting the long-term building occupants to nature and the idea of biophilia. Further, the current design approach of integrating the surface parking and the pedestrian plaza seems contrary to the idea of biophilia and the Living Building Challenge, given that pedestrians will be subjected to automobile exhaust due to the proximity of both elements. Reassess the current approach and develop better strategies for bringing the outdoors inside for the long-term users, and create a better, non-toxic environment for the short-term users of the pedestrian plaza. **(DC3-B-1, DC3-C-2, DC4-D-4)**

c. As part of the Living Building Challenge, this project extols the virtues of the public plaza as being biophilic in nature. Unfortunately, due to the extreme length of the entire street façade and sidewalk, the current the design approach appears to lack a connection between the interior and exterior space or interaction between the lower levels of the project and the street. The design team needs to continue the exploration of creating a sense of place not only for the pedestrian plaza, but also along the lower level of the building and at the street. Public comment included several suggestions for artwork, design to encourage physical activity, relationship to the natural environment, and landscaping. The team should find additional opportunities for creating educational and biophilic experiences using varied textures, rhythms, and other elements. **(CS2-B-2, CS3-B-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-E, DC4-D-4)**

PUBLIC COMMENT

During the comment period, the following design review comments were submitted:

- Suggested that neighborhood groups seek to make the proposed building work well within the neighborhood context rather than trying to make it go away.
- Supported how the project has evolved over time.
- Initially concerned about the proposed height of the building but has a better understanding of how some of the massive building pieces are being mitigated.
- Concerned that if the taller Living Building Pilot massing option is pursued, questioned how the project guarantees be an achievable Living Building Pilot Program project rather than something less.
- Supported the curvature of the hinge element.
- Suggested that the project will set a standard for other future development to follow.
- Suggested that the conceptual design will have an opportunity to create an educational model for environmental awareness and responsibility.
- Suggested that the design encourages an active relationship to its neighbors and the community
- Repeated previous comment that the building should be designed from all four sides which they felt had been achieved.
- Suggested that access from 32nd Ave is important and not access from the narrow alley way.
- Stated that the quiet 90-degree truck parking approach is the most neighborly approach for bringing delivery trucks into the alley.
- Stated that the southwest plaza is essential to community gathering.
- Supported a fully enclosed 90-degree service entry.
- Verbalized that they are looking forward to having one of the first Living Building Pilot Program Projects Magnolia.
- Supported an earlier DRB comment that the building should be a legible living building pilot structure that can potential be a designation building for people to see that has more than just a sign identifying the project as a Living Building Pilot Program project.
- Suggested that this project will help Magnolia maintain its vital commercial core.
- Applauded the collaborative process that ensued between the development team and the public.
- Suggested that the design imagery and inspiration that centers on the concept of the bluff is indicative of the coast and applauds the idea of taking an organic form associated with water whether seashell or bluff and made it a central part the building which is unique to Seattle the site and the community.
- Urged the Board to support the project which looks good from 360-degrees around.
- Asked building design plans to take into consideration the areas infrastructure limitations and impacts to Magnolia bridge when it is no longer viable.
- Supported the goal of meeting the Living Building standards which will make Magnolia just one of a hand full of communities with a Living Building.

- Stated that if the building cannot meet LBPP standards then they advocate for a revised 55-foot option that includes many of the design elements presented in the hybrid option such as the southwest plaza.
- Suggested that most of the comments in support of the project are focused on the projects located across the street from the school, community center, outdoor pool, and park, while there is another side of the building which the design team has acknowledged through their 'edge package'.
- Stated that the Living Building design should be extremely mindful of the single-family homes on the east side of the project and design elements such as height, setbacks and terraces will have a significant impact on homeowners.
- Requested that provisions are in place to correct any deficiencies identified during the certification process and resources are available to maintain long term conformance to the Living Building Pilot Program standards.
- Stated that the proposed project is precedent-setting in Magnolia as the first building of its kind due to its proposed height and it will be highly visible if the building exists.
- Stated that the developer has done a good job making a 67-foot height version that is inclusive of community feedback as possible helping to break up the verticality of helping the building fit better into the surrounding neighborhood.
- Stated that if the 67-foot height version is not achievable then a 55-foot height version that immolates many of the living building pilot attributes should be pursued.
- Suggested that it is a false narrative to say that we can have a good-looking building at 67 feet in height or a bad looking building at 55 feet in height.
- Supported the apartment and grocery store development and requested that some of the units be set aside for lower income residents, especially for those individuals over the age of 60 or in need of accessible units and suggested that the public space and alignment of the delivery area are suitable for the neighborhood.
- Suggested that fencing or other elements should be added to block and sound impacts to adjacent neighbors.
- Applauded the design team's pursuit of the Living Building Pilot Program and doing it with mixed uses including a grocery store.
- Agreed that parking access should be off 32nd Ave and not the alley which 'fights' the grade and a great deal of ramp would be required and having both the loading and parking access off the alley would place too much noise and traffic against the nearest neighbors.
- Suggested that the preferred alternative does a good job buffering the plaza from the parking entrance and supports the how the loading bay has been resolved to minimize impacts to the east.
- Believed the current design addressed the design review comments from EDG 2 in terms of massing, respect to adjacent properties, entry into the parking or the south plaza.
- Suggested that pushing the building massing toward 32nd Ave is the most respectful to the adjacent neighbors to the east.
- Suggested that the open plaza area will provide an anchor for encouraging the revitalization of the urban village as it moves north. Along 32nd.

- Suggested that the current hybrid design still does not quite fit into the street and the abutting single-family housing and the Magnolia Village style.
- Concerned with the viability of the Living Building Pilot Program approach and questioned the viability and robustness of the biophilia design elements.
- Wished the building project would include affordable housing.

SDCI received a number of written design related comments prior to the EDG 3 public meeting summarized below:

- Opposed to the proposed development.
- Concerned about the proposed six-story height.
- Several comments objected to increasing the height to seven-stories.
- Concerned about shadow, privacy, and view impacts to adjacent single-family residences.
- Suggested covering the outdoor area at the entrance to make it usable during all seasons.
- Felt the plaza design is crucial to the success of the project.
- Stated the main façade is abrupt as it is one continuous streetscape wall. Suggested a volume distinction between store and apartment building would help articulate the building sidewalk base.
- Proposed having two parking entrances open to both sides of the lot, on 32nd and the alley, to create fluidity.
- Concerned the proposed scale is inappropriate for the Magnolia Village.
- Several comments supported the Hybrid Option with garage access off 32nd Ave and the southwest-facing public plaza.
- Pleased that the project includes many placemaking attributes.
- Several comments supported a seven-story Living Building.
- Noted that this building will set a precedent for future development.
- Preferred a 55’ building height with all the elements of the Hybrid option, including
- green features, setbacks, and a well-designed and unique look and feel.
- Several comments preferred the parking entrance be located on 32nd Ave W instead of the alley.
- Supported advancing the project to the Recommendation phase.
- Concerned the proposed discovery alcoves and seating may promote loitering.
- Suggested lowering the interior height of the grocery store from 21’ to 18’ to reduce the
- overall height of the building.
- Desired for the project to resemble a legible Living Building with a unique design and visible design statements.

SDCI also received other comments concerning potential traffic impacts, construction impacts, zoning, views, property value, community outreach and other comments not directly related to Design Guidelines.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Staff and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable citywide 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. Concerns related to seismic conditions and retaining wall engineering will be reviewing under the Building Code as part of the building permit application.

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

PRIORITIES & STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, the Board provided the following siting and design guidance.

1. **Massing:**
   a. The Board unanimously supported the design team's preferred massing alternative identified as Option H - Hybrid which features the three-part massing approach with upper-level step backs for the northern mass, a 90-degree loading dock, "stair-stepping" decks and landscaped terrace at the alley edge, which provides a better transition with the neighboring properties to the east. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5)**

   b. The Board unanimously supported the garage entry off 32nd Ave given the amount of community support and the logistical and topographical challenges of the alley as well as the 90-degree loading dock configuration.

   c. The Board discussed several aspects of the three-part building mass as well as provided specific guidance for improvements per the following comments:

      i. The Board discussed at length the overall relationship between the project's driving design concept and how that concept had not been fully reflected in the proposal's overall massing.
      ii. The Board supported how the southern building mass had been set back from the street edge along 32nd Ave as means of breaking down the overall building scale but were concerned that the northern portion presents a large wall -like feature.
      iii. The Board suggested that the large mass of the northern building element could be broken down further through materiality and subsequent detailing.
      iv. The Board supported the larger massing moves associated with the northern building element setback away from the alley and closer to 32nd Ave, in addition to the deep setback of the plaza open space along 32nd and the setback of the southern element away from 32nd but stressed that smaller massing moves were needed to make the project successful.

v. The Board verbalized confusion about the relationship of the organic form of the center hinge/lantern element and its relationship with the harder lined southern element and suggested that the southern element could potentially be designed to be much softer as it currently does not read as a third element.

d. After a very robust discussion of the project as a whole and the applicant's efforts in dealing with a very long building site, the Board unanimously supported the larger massing moves including: **(CS2-A-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5)**

i. Two primary massing elements and a hinge or third connecting massing element,
ii. Significant sets back for the two primary massing elements; the south, setback 32nd and the northern set back from the alley, and
iii. Setbacks at the top two or upper levels of the massing elements

e. The Board stated that the secondary massing moves as they relate to the hinge and the southern massing element are still unclear in terms of underlying conceptual approach and their relationship to one another and therefore directed to applicant team to provide more design concept clarity at the Recommendation phase). **(CS2- D-5, CS3-A, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-B)**

f. The Board stated that the design language and materiality and breaks between materials will need to be cohesive around the whole building, echoing public comment that the building needs to be designed from 360-degree viewpoint. **(CS2-D-5, CS3-A, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-B)**

g. Echoing public concern regarding the bulk and scale of the proposed building, the Board stated that the secondary massing elements including the upper-level setback, the vertical notches and protruding balconies, and the ground floor discovery alcoves for the northern massing element are not strong enough to accomplish the desired design concept. There needs to be a more cohesive/comprehensive smaller scale massing concept and rationale applied to the upper, middle, and lower pedestrians massing moves when the project returns at the Recommendation phase. **(CS2-D-5, CS3-A, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-B)**

2. Design Concept:

a. The Board in their overall discussion had difficulty understanding the driving force behind the project's design concept as reflected on the following comments: **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**

i. The Board heard public comment regarding a desire for a unique building design and suggested that the central massing elements 'lantern feature', which was originally presented at EDG 1 in sketch form was itself a unique design feature, however, it still had not been nailed down in terms of a driving design concept that informs the entirety of the building.

ii. The Board suggested that centralized design element does not communicate with the northern side of the building structure.
iii. In trying to understand the design concept and coherence throughout the proposed development, the Board felt that the idea of biophilia was more successfully expressed in the middle massing element and entryway solely and not clearly expressed in the northern or southern portions of the building.
iv. The Board was concerned with what they heard during the presentation of how the concept of the central element was vaguely described and gave the impression that the design concept is still undecided.
v. The Board stated that it is unclear if the project is a three-part building or two main parts attempting to rely on a hinge element as connective piece which could be a strong design move.
vi. The Board in discussing the views of the massing elements seen on page 60 of the EDG packet, suggested that central curvilinear element could be made less intimidating and less of a wall with more articulation and fenestration.
vii. The Board was unclear about the southern massing element and its relationship to the central element, as the southern piece seemed to share some of the same curvilinear form but also appeared to be made up of too many elements. Members stated that southern element should have greater clarity of design by potentially using more curvilinear and less rigid forms as seen in the northern massing piece and gave further direction indicated below.
viii. In discussing the center element, the Board referred to as a lantern or beacon, designed to be seen from different views from around the area reflected the public concern about its potential height impacts could be problematic but were not sure how to reconcile and gave no further direction in terms of its height.
ix. The Board was concerned that the northern massing element presents itself as a very large feature wall that the smaller massing moves should do more to break down it scale. The Board suggested that there is an opportunity for the north and south elements to 'communicate' in terms of a similar tactile approach which would aid in the further clarification of a design concept for the southern massing element. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**

b. The Board supported the southern building mass and how it is set back from the street edge along 32nd Ave as means of breaking down the overall building scale. However, the Board was concerned with the lack of a clear design concept which currently uses large- and small-scale elements, rectilinear and curvilinear elements, primary and secondary elements and directed the design team to develop connect all these elements in a comprehensive cohesive and unifying approach. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**
c. The Board directed the design team to develop a clear differentiation (greater clarity) of the different scales of each design element, notably the vertical slots which they supported, along with other elements. This might be achieved through use of materiality which can reinforce the specific design concepts. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C- 2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**

d. The Board directed to design team to bring the curvilinear form of the lantern or hinge element through to the alley side of project. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3- B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**
e. The Board supported the two-story window patterning approach which they felt aided in breaking down the scale of the building façade. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**
f. The Board supported the angled balcony expression and efforts to provide vegetative screening along the east side of the building. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B)**

3. Street Level Interaction

a. In strong agreement with public comment, the Board supported the development of the outdoor plaza and the removal of some of the parking spaces for additional pedestrian use, in addition to the general orientation and the programming of the space. **(DC3-B-1, DC3-C-2, DC4-D-4)**
b. Reflect public comment regarding the desire for more expression of the participation in the Living Building pilot, the Board stated that the plaza is an area where the biophilia design concept could be highlighted to a greater extent, which was not evident in the EDG 3 presentation. Further, the Board suggested that in its current form, the plaza represents a large amount of hardscape and not a lot of natural elements or nature potential using Discovery Park as an inspirational example. The Board directed the development team to lean more into the concept of biophilia and use more natural elements and less cementitious hardscape. The Board also suggested this should be extended to the proposed community billboard as well. **(DC3-B-1, DC3-C-2, DC4-D-4)**
c. The Board supported/directed the design to proceed with the secondary north entry regardless of whether it would be locked off or not, as it offers a more welcoming elevation and provides the added porosity necessary for the extreme length of this street frontage. The Board agreed that this minimal porosity, in conjunction with the interactive 'Discovery Alcoves' shown in the preferred streetscape design, needed to tie in better with the plaza area and concept of biophilia, i.e., engaging comfortable for pedestrians in addition to more overhead weather protection. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**
d. Hearing public concern regarding the highly visible alley elevation, the Board stated that the applicant should continue to work with the community to further develop the alley side of the development and mitigate the 200-foot-long blank concrete wall, so that it is engaging, creates some level of interaction and porosity and interest. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**

RECOMMENDATION June 23, 2021

PUBLIC COMMENT

At the Recommendation meeting the following public comments were provided:

- Concerned with the overall height of the proposed of the building.

- Supported the pursuit of the living building pilot program
- Suggested that the proposed scale, mass and seven story building height are disproportionate to the surrounding neighborhood.
- Requested that the project not be allowed to progress past SEPA review or be awarded additional building height until it can demonstrate that it can meet Living Building Pilot Program requirements.
- Concerned about shadow impacts to adjacent properties and requested more shade impact studies.
- Encouraged that the project takes into consideration the nearby historic stream.
- Opposed to allowing the additional two stories of building height.
- Asked if there is enough bicycle parking and if it is in an appropriate location.
- Stated that the project would benefit the nearby commercial area, however it will have a negative impact to nearby low-rise residential areas and community facilities.
- Concerned that the size and scale of the proposal do not transition into the neighborhood context well.
- Requested that the building have real, robust, visual, and beautiful natural elements that make it a true example of a living building.
- Noted that this building will set a precedent for future development.
- Appreciated the innovative and high-quality design.
- Observed that with the additional height the building can be sculpted and set back at various levels to create modulation and break up the mass.
- Opposed the proposed development.
- Supported the inclusion of the public plaza.
- Appreciated the mixed-use designation and grocery store use.
- Appreciated the commitment to meeting the living building standards.
- Requested that the lights of the beacon inspired lighthouse be shut off at night to minimize light impacts.
- Applauded the applicant team's high degree of public outreach.
- Appreciated the design team's attention and study of materiality and form to help inform the project's architectural character and how it relates to the neighborhood context.
- Supports that the building is part of the living building challenge which allows for the extra floor height and the expensive green aspects of the project.
- Suggested that the lantern element reads as very light and should be muted color wise.
- Stated that the project should be held accountable in terms of meeting all the Living Building Pilot Program requirements.
- Suggested that the project should have a little more landscaping around the building.
- Suggested that the angular design of the Southeast building element is not cohesive and feels like a completely different building design.
- Stated that there should be better walking paths around the building

- Was not in support of a north entry way.
- Suggested that the Living Building Pilot Program criteria demonstrated in the Recommendation packet needs further clarification on how each will be met, e.g., healthy interior environments, beauty and spirit, inspiration, and education, and biophilic environments.
- Concerned with the increased traffic volumes that the project will bring.
- Suggested that the height transition of the proposed building to the surrounding neighborhood needs greater consideration.
- Concerned about the overall height, bulk, and scale of the project and that is why LBPP accountability is so important.
- Suggested that there will be significant traffic impacts at the plaza and single-entry area and asked if that further consideration could be given to ways of separating the plaza from vehicular traffic to alleviate congestion in that area.
- Suggested that the public should have the appropriate context of the development in that the living units will be luxury condominiums and not affordable housing units.
- Asked how the development will meet specific Design Review guidelines that would allow for easy and direct sidewalk access into the development.
- Stated that they do not support the 67-foot multi-family development and believe that the living building challenge benefits will not outweigh the detriment of the 7-story building in an area where most properties are one and two stories.
- Concerned about the neighboring property's privacy and a 7-story building looming over the public swimming pool.

SDCI also received other comments concerning public notices, traffic safety and congestion, housing affordability, environmental regulations and impacts, density, parking, property values, infrastructure impacts, green building incentives, construction impacts, SEPA and other comments not directly related to Design Guidelines.

SDCI received written comments from Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) consisting of the following;

- Requested clarification about the loading berth and ride hailing/sharing loading area.
- Supported taking vehicle access from the alley.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Staff and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable citywide 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. Concerns related to seismic conditions and retaining wall engineering will be reviewing under the Building Code as part of the building permit application.

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

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Street Level Interaction:**
    a. The Board noted the unanimous guidance provided at EDG 3, stating that the design should provide a secondary north entry for the purposes of activating the street edge along 32nd Ave and for porosity. The Board raised the following concerns **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**:
        i. The Board suggested that the north entry as presented in the recommendation packet is not consistent with the architectural concept and care and materiality of the rest of the project.
        ii. The Board characterized the latest iteration of the north entry as a blank wall with a sign on it, an egress gate, and a dark alley (entry) leading to an unmarked door.
    b. The Board stated that there might be confusion about the gate and north entry as it has the appearance of a front door, while the primary entry where people can enter the building is 'hidden back in the shadows' or at least not as visually prevalent. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**
    c. The Board encouraged the applicant to incorporate the design the north entry gate into the living building education element, to clarify its intended design and use. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**
    d. In their final recommendation, the Board was split on whether a northern entrance should be included in the design. The Board suggested that it might be more important to draw pedestrians across the property to the south entry and plaza and therefore did not recommend a condition to require a north entry. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**:

2. **Discovery Alcoves:**
    a. The Board was troubled by the design team's solution for creating porosity along the 200-foot-long street frontage and the proposed interactive 'Discovery Alcoves,' which seemed to have limitations in engaging pedestrian traffic. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**
    b. The Board specifically mentioned that the standing alcove represented on page 38 of the recommendation packet appeared to be too shallow, not kid friendly and not likely to be used when there is a park located across the street. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**
    c. The Board had concerns with signage depicted on page 38 of the recommendation packet advertising delicatessen and flower shop at the alcoves intermixed with

Living Building Pilot educational elements, which seemed to create confusion. However, the Board did not ask for specific changes in this aspect of the design. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**

d. The Board supported the two types of overhangs associated with the alcove signage and recommended a condition that the two types of overhangs associated with the alcove signage including the design, dimensions, and depths as rendered in the Recommendation Packet, shall remain as a design element. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E, DC4-B, DC4-D-4)**
e. The Board verbalized their skepticism about repeating the same thing five times in the discovery alcove for 200 feet along the 32nd Ave frontage as the most effective way of activating the street. The Board suggested that the alcoves could be more distinctive with a consistent rhythm achieved possibly with depth or height. The Board recommended a condition to design the discovery alcoves to be more like a discovery room that incorporates a consistent depth from the street bench height datum. This design can incorporate a playful design, integrated re-designed hardscape where possible and approvable by SDOT, and the adjacent landscaping elements. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-C1, DC2-E, DC4-D-4)**

3. Central Lantern Element:

a. Board members recommended approval of the use of balcony elements on the lantern as a way of further breaking down the visual scale of the building. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5)**
b. The Board recommended approval of the refined lantern or beacon element which features a curvilinear element while retaining some of its rectilinear form. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5)**
c. The Board was concerned with any excess lighting associated with the lantern and roof area mechanical spaces. The Board recommended a condition that there should not be any artistic lighting or feature lighting for the 'lantern' roof area mechanical or other roof feature, beyond what would be required for mechanical access or maintenance purposes. **(PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-4)**

4. South Building Element ('Crashing Wave'):

a. The Board recommended approval of curvilinear form of the southern building mass inspired by the 'crashing wave' form which is now less rigid than images seen at EDG 3. **(CS2- D-5, CS3-A, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-B)**
b. The Board also discussed the use of the double height spandrel glass and the color of the wave which some members of the public suggested might be too light. Some Board members verbalized their support of the lighter wave color in conjunction with the more contrasting upper-level rectilinear form set back from the wave. Ultimately, the Board recommended approval of the use of the glass and 'light' color for the wave element as appropriate to the design. **(CS2- D-5, CS3-A, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-B)**
c. The Board was concerned about the stairwell that is now rotated and sticks up higher than the EDG 3 packet version, potentially causing a visual impact to neighbors up the hill. The Board recommended a condition to study and implement ways of reducing the visual impact of the south stairwell and overrun. Strategies could

include reducing the height to the bare minimum needed, potentially rotating its orientation, explore using different materials or color, or shrouding and reducing the amount of lighting needed, to the minimum for safety purposes. **(CS2- D-5, CS3-A, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-B)**

5. **Alley:**
    a. The Board commended the Design Team's design approach to the alley façade, the colors and materials as rendered in the packet and how the design respects the adjacent neighboring properties. The Board recommended approval of these aspects of the design. **(CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC2-3)**
    b. The Board recommended approval of the design of the updated loading dock and truck delivery system which they felt would set a new precedent for grocery stores located within an urban environment. **(PL2-A-1, PL2-A-2, DC1-B-1, DC1-C)**

6. **Plaza Area:**
    a. The Board was concerned that the proposed shared light pavers designed as wayfinding did not appear to be effective and recommended a condition to design these pavers intentionally as a wayfinding element. The Board was not in favor of up lighting that would potentially contribute to light pollution. **(PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-4)**
    b. The Board recommended a condition to design the signage for the primary residential entry to be more readily identifiable and distinctive. **(PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-1, PL3-A-4)**

7. **Materials:**
    a. The Board unanimously recommended a condition that the materials as rendered and shown in the recommendation packet shall be used as such. **(PL1-B-3, CS3-PL2-B, DC4-A, DC4-D**

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure was based on the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departures. At the time of the Recommendation meeting the applicant requested the following departure:

1. **Parking Location and Access (SMC 23.47A.032.A.1a)** The Code states that access to parking in NC zones shall be from the alley if the lot abuts an alley improved to the standards of subsection 23.53.030.C, or if the Director determines that alley access is feasible and desirable to mitigate parking access impacts. If alley access is infeasible, the Director may allow street access.

   The applicant is requesting a departure from this requirement to allow for vehicular access off 32nd Ave W instead of the alley, while maintaining service access via the alley.

The applicant team stated that due to the grade change at this site, providing a parking ramp from the alley to the below grade garage would not allow for the proposed plaza at 32nd Ave W. With the departure, the design includes a large south-facing, open space/plaza that extends the programmatic uses of the ground plan and creates a better indoor-outdoor space connection.

The Board agreed with this rationale during the earlier EDG phase of the review and continued to support it during the recommendation meeting. The Board recommended approval of the departure, agreeing that it better meets the intent of Design Guidelines **CS1-C-2. Elevation Changes, CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street, PL1-A-1 Enhancing Open Space, PL1-A-2 Adding to Public Life, PL2-C-3 People-Friendly Spaces, PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements.**

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

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

CONTEXT & SITE

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

CS1-A Energy Use

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

CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

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

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

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

CS1-C Topography

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

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 non-residential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

PL2-C Weather Protection

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

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

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

PL2-D Wayfinding

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

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

PL3-A Entries

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

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

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

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

PL3-B Residential Edges

PL3-B-1. Security and Privacy: Provide security and privacy for residential buildings using 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.

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.

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-BVehicular 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-CParking 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.

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-AMassing

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. 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 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.

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-CDesign

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

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

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

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

DC4-AExterior 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-BSignage

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-CLighting

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-DTrees, 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated May 26, 2021, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, June 21, 2021, Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departure with the following conditions:

1. The two types of overhangs associated with the alcove signage including the design, dimensions, and depths as rendered in the Recommendation Packet shall remain as a design element. (CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E, DC4-B, DC4-D-4)
2. Design the discovery alcoves to be more like a discovery room that incorporates a consistent depth from the street bench height datum. This design can incorporate a playful design, integrated re-designed hardscape where possible and approvable by SDOT, and the adjacent landscaping elements. (CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-C1, DC2-E, DC4-D-4)
3. There shall be no artistic or feature lighting for the 'lantern' roof area mechanical or other roof feature, beyond what would be required for mechanical access or maintenance purposes. (PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-4)
4. Study and implement ways of reducing the visual impact of the south stairwell and overrun which could include reducing the height to the bare minimum needed, rotating the stair orientation, use different materials or colors, and shrouding and reducing the amount of lighting needed for minimum safety purposes. (CS2- D-5, CS3-A, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-B)
5. The light pavers designed as wayfinding shall be designed to be more effective as a wayfinding element and avoid light pollution. (PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-4)
6. Design the primary entry residential signage to be more readily identifiable and distinctive. (PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-1, PL3-A-4)
7. The materials as rendered and shown in the recommendation packet shall be used as such. (PL1-B-3, CS3-PL2-B, DC4-A, DC4-D)

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 June 23, 2021, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Four (4) members of the four 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. The applicant responded with a memo dated March 16, 2022, noting, that the MUP plan set was updated to be consistent with the recommendation packet and conditions of approval provided by the Board. The updates consist of the following items that were added to the MUP set.

1. The two types of overhangs associated with the alcove signage including the design, dimensions, and depths as rendered in the Recommendation Packet shall remain as a design element. (CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E, DC4-B, DC4-D-4)

RESPONSE: The final design of the building will include the two types of overhangs associated with the alcove signage and/or art as presented in the meeting with more thoughtful refinements and details. Canopies are shown on 1/A3-1.1

2. Design the discovery alcoves to be more like a discovery room that incorporates a consistent depth from the street bench height datum. This design can incorporate a playful design, integrated re-designed hardscape where possible and approvable by SDOT, and the adjacent landscaping elements. (CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-C1, DC2-E, DC4-D-4)

   RESPONSE: A collaborative design proposal by the projects Art Curator Bill Gaylord with BONEFIRE Galleries, along with a proposal by the Landscape Architect for expanded discovery "alcoves" that reach out to the adjacent planters was presented to the planner on December 8th. Please see attached Item 2 Discovery Alcoves. Final Art selections will be made during the construction phase of the project and will be presented to the planner at that time. Each "Discovery Room" will be unique and playful; however, the storefront mullions, bulkhead, and concrete curb below will be a consistent elevation creating the continuous datum as requested by the Broad. This datum is shown on 1/A3-1.1

3. There shall be no artistic or feature lighting for the 'lantern' roof area mechanical or other roof feature, beyond what would be required for mechanical access or maintenance purposes. (PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-4)

   RESPONSE: Confirmed and removed from the building design. Please see sheet A3-1.1 on the latest MUP drawings submitted to the City on 12/22/2021

4. Study and implement ways of reducing the visual impact of the south stairwell and overrun which could include reducing the height to the bare minimum needed, rotating the stair orientation, use different materials or colors, and shrouding and reducing the amount of lighting needed for minimum safety purposes. (CS2- D-5, CS3-A, CS3-B-1, DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-B)

   RESPONSE: Studies rotating the stair were presented to the planner on September 28th. It was agreed that rotating the stair increased the visual impact to the adjacent neighbors (see attached South Stairwell and Overrun study). To soften the design, it was proposed to clad the vertical recess at the stair in the same vertical wood siding used along the alley, see 4/A3-1.1. The overruns are the minimum height and width needed to meet code & screen the mechanical systems. This is also reflected in the current submitted MUP drawings. As recommended the lighting at stair overruns will be minimal. See 1/A3-1.1 & 4/A3-1.1

5. The light pavers designed as wayfinding shall be designed to be more effective as a wayfinding element and avoid light pollution. (PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-4)

   RESPONSE: Confirmed, light pavers will be re-aligned from a random pattern to one that leads pedestrians to the entries.

6. Design the primary entry residential signage to be more readily identifiable and distinctive. (PL2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL3-A-1, PL3-A-4)

   RESPONSE: Acknowledged. The final signage design will be sent to the planner for review before installation or fabrication.

7. The materials as rendered and shown in the recommendation packet shall be used as such. (PL1-B-3, CS3-PL2-B, DC4-A, DC4-D)

   RESPONSE: The applicant team confirmed.

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 four (4) members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendation and conditions seven and seven shall be required.

DIRECTOR'S DECISION

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

I. 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 12/2/2020 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 emissions, construction parking/traffic and noise, mud and dust, Environmental Health, Air Quality impacts as well as mitigation.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

Construction Impacts - Parking and Traffic

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed 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 some un-regulated on street parking on both the north and south bound lanes of 32nd Ave W interspersed with two 30-minute loading zones. In addition, 32nd Ave W is also a designated 20 mph school zone between W. Raye Street to the north and W. Smith Street to the south. West Smith has some back in diagonal commercial parking and limited parallel residential parking while W. Raye which is very narrow has some parallel on-street residential 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 increased noise levels 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 10:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays in Neighborhood Commercial zones.

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

A Construction Management Plan will be required prior to issuance of the first building permit, including contact information in the event of complaints about construction noise, and measures to reduce or prevent noise impacts. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: 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 mitigate noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

Construction Impacts – Mud and Dust

Approximately 35,000 cubic yards of material will be excavated for foundation piles and removed from the site with 2,000 cubic yards of fill material will be brought to the site as fill. Transported soil is susceptible to being dropped, spilled, or leaked onto City streets. The City's Traffic Code (SMC 11.74.150 and .160) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that loads be either 1) secured/covered; or 2) a minimum of six inches of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container). The regulation is intended to minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed en route to or from a site.

No further conditioning of the impacts associated with these construction impacts of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies (SMC 25.05.675.B).

Environmental Health

The applicant submitted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by GeoEngineers, dated April 26, 2019, in which the assessment has revealed the following recognized environmental conditions (RECs) in connection with the proposal site. Uncontrolled fill has been documented at the subject property, which represents a potential source of contamination. However, GeoEngineers did not observe evidence of contamination during drilling and sampling

completed for what they identified as their concurrent geotechnical investigation. The report goes on to say that while the presence of undocumented fill soils has some risk of random/buried contamination, it is likely that the fill was placed for construction of the existing site development in 1955. Further no other likely use or storage of significant quantities of hazardous materials or petroleum products has been identified at the subject property. Based on the available information, no nearby or adjacent properties are considered RECs for the subject property.

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.

Compliance with Ecology's requirements would be expected to adequately mitigate any adverse environmental impacts from the proposed development and no further mitigation would be warranted for impacts to environmental health per SMC 25.05.675.F.

Environmental Health (Air Quality)

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. The City acknowledges PSCAA's jurisdiction and requirements for remediation will mitigate impacts associated with any contamination. No further mitigation under SEPA Policies 25.05.675.F is warranted for asbestos impacts.

Should lead be identified on the site, there is a potential for impacts to environmental health. Lead is a pollutant regulated by laws administered by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), including the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (Title X), Clean Air Act (CAA), Clean Water Act (CWA), Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) among others. The EPA further authorized the Washington State Department of Commerce to administer two regulatory programs in Washington State: the Renovation, Repair and Painting Program (RRP), and the Lead-Based Paint Activities Program (Abatement). These regulations protect the public from hazards of improperly conducted lead-based paint activities and renovations. No further mitigation under SEPA Policies 25.05.675.F is warranted for lead impacts.

Long Term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including greenhouse gas emissions; parking; potential blockage of designated sites from the Scenic Routes nearby; 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 gases, historic resources, height bulk and scale, public views, shade and shadows, 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 structure on site is more than 50 years old. The structure was reviewed for potential to meet historic landmark status. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and indicated the structure on site is unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Landmarks Preservation Board letters, reference number LPB 3187/21). 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 has gone through the design review process described in SMC 23.41. Design review considers mitigation for height, bulk and scale through modulation, articulation, landscaping, and façade treatment.

Section 25.05.675.G.2.c of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance provides the following: "The Citywide Design Guidelines (and any Council-approved, neighborhood design guidelines) are intended to mitigate the same adverse height, bulk, and scale impacts addressed in these policies. A project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review Process shall be presumed to comply with these Height, Bulk, and Scale policies. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that height, bulk, and scale impacts documented through environmental review have not been adequately mitigated. Any additional mitigation imposed by the decision maker pursuant to these height, bulk, and scale policies on projects that have undergone Design Review shall comply with design guidelines applicable to the project."

The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development and relationship to nearby context have been addressed during the Design Review process. Pursuant to the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes, and regulations to mitigate impacts to historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.G.

Public Views

SMC 25.05.675.P provides policies to minimize impacts to designated public views listed in this section, including Mount Rainer, the Olympic and Cascade Mountains, the downtown skyline, and major bodies of water including Puget Sound, Lake Washington, Lake Union, and the Ship Canal, from various public locations.

The applicant provided an Aesthetics - Viewshed Analysis prepared by EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC, dated November 2020 for the purpose of evaluating view-related impacts to City designated public viewpoints and parks, Space Needle viewpoints, views of historic landmarks, and scenic routes resulting from the proposed project. The report states that the City has officially designated 89 public viewpoints, of which only one Ella Bailey Park is in proximity to the project site. The park is located approximately 0.3 miles to the southeast of the proposal site. As demonstrated in the report, the proposed Magnolia Safeway building would not be visible from Ella Bailey Park as the development site is 0.3-mile northwest of this public viewpoint and therefore would not impact protected views from the project location. In addition, the project will not impact views of the Seattle skyline, designated water bodies or mountains or have a significant adverse effect to any other public views as well.

The impacts to public views from the locations listed in SMC 25.05.675.P are anticipated to be minimal and additional mitigation is not warranted per SMC 25.05.675.P.

Shade and Shadows

Seattle's SEPA policies aim to "minimize or prevent light blockage and the creation of shadows on open spaces most used by the public. Areas outside of Downtown to be protected are as follows: i. Publicly owned parks, ii. Public schoolyards. Catharine Blaine K-8 School, Magnolia Community Center and Magnolia Playfields are located to the west of the site, on the west side of 32nd Avenue W. Potential shadow impacts to these parks and schoolyards are discussed in this analysis.

The applicant provided a Shadow Analysis prepared by EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC. The report states that the proposed Magnolia Safeway Development would contribute to shading of the Mounger Pool in the morning at 8 AM (9 AM during the winter solstice) on all four key solar times of year. Mounger Pool contains two heated outdoor pools and associated pool deck and facilities. The pool operates only in the summer, generally from early May to early September. At 8 AM, the analysis indicates that the pool would be largely shaded during the vernal and autumnal equinoxes, and approximately one-half in shade during the winter solstice at 9 AM. During the summer solstice, approximately less than 10 to 25 percent of the pools would be shaded at 8 AM with the most extensive shading occurring during the vernal and fall equinoxes and winter solstice, with less in the summer when highest use of the outdoor pools would be anticipated. The highest use of these outdoor pools would be anticipated in the summer, and later in the day as temperatures rise. The majority of the Mounger Pool would not be affected at 8 AM during the summer solstice.

The analysis also indicates that the project would contribute to some shading of the Catharine Blaine K-8 schoolyard in the morning during the vernal equinox, autumnal equinox, and winter solstice. The schoolyard is used for outdoor play by children attending the school. Approximately 25 percent or less of the schoolyard would be shaded during the vernal equinox, 10 percent or less would be shaded during the autumnal equinox, and 70 percent would be shaded during the winter solstice. Overall, these shading impacts would not be considered significant as the majority of the schoolyard would not be affected during the vernal and autumnal equinoxes, and shading in the winter would occur during a time of year when the weather is typically cold, overcast and/or rainy.

The report also states that a small portion of the Magnolia Playfield (approximately less than 10 percent) would be shaded, during the winter equinox. The majority of the playfield would not be affected at this time of day and the playfield would not be affected during the vernal equinox, summer solstice or the autumnal equinox, when the highest use of this outdoor recreational space would be expected.

The impacts related to light blockage and the creation of shadows listed in SMC 25.05.675.Q are anticipated to be minimal and additional mitigation is not warranted per SMC 25.05.675.Q.

Parking

A Transportation Impact Analysis prepared by Transpo Group date November 2020 discusses potential parking related impacts to the surrounding street network associated with the proposed Safeway redevelopment.

Per the report, the project is proposing to provide a 221-stall parking garage. Peak parking demand for the project is anticipated to be 191 vehicles for the project's targeted for a projected 146 units with peak usage occurring overnight. The report suggests that ample parking is provided for the grocery use which could also accommodate peak residential parking demand overnight if needed. As noted, the project will supply 146 stalls to be reserved for the residential use with an additional supply of 75 stalls provided for the Safeway store. The parking rate used to estimate the peak parking demand for the grocery store is based on the ITE Parking Generation suburban rates for a supermarket which identified the peak demand of 48 vehicles for the 25,000 square foot store. A peak parking demand of 48 vehicles could be accommodated in the proposed supply of 75 stalls which would result in a surplus of 27 stalls. If there ever is a need for overflow parking, once Safeway has closed there is plenty of additional parking available for overnight use.

It is reported that the grocery loading activity is anticipated to be accommodated on-site in the loading bay provided adjacent to the alley. Further residential related loading activity is anticipated to be minimal and accommodated by nearby on-street load/unload zones.

The number of proposed parking spaces accommodates all the anticipated parking demand, and no additional mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.M.

Transportation

The traffic analysis prepared by Transpo Group date November 2020 analyzes potential transportation related impacts to the surrounding street network associated with the proposed Safeway redevelopment. The report indicates that the project is expected to generate 1,314 net new weekday daily trips with 48 trips occurring during the weekday AM peak hour and 69 occurring during the weekday PM peak hour. The report goes on state that with the addition of project trips, the off-site study intersections are forecasted to operate at LOS B or better under both access scenarios.

It is anticipated that there will be limited adverse impacts to traffic operations, transit or non-motorized facilities will occur as a result. Further the project will meet the City's concurrency requirements. 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

Prior to MUP issuance.

1. The light pavers shall be re-aligned from a random pattern to one that leads pedestrians to the entries to improve wayfinding.

Prior to Construction Permit Issuance

2. Final Art selections for the "discovery alcoves" will be made during the construction phase of the project and will be presented to the planner at that time. The land use planner will evaluate each "Discovery Room" for uniqueness and playfulness. The storefront mullions,

bulkhead, and concrete curb below will be a consistent elevation creating the continuous datum as requested by the Design Review Board.

3. Design the primary entry residential signage to be more readily identifiable and distinctive. The final signage design will be sent to the planner for review and approval before installation or fabrication.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

4. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (David Landry, david.landry@seattle.gov) or a Seattle DCI assigned Land Use Planner.

For the Life of the Project

5. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (David Landry, david.landry@seattle.gov) or a Seattle DCI assigned Land Use Planner.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

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

1. Provide a Construction Management Plan that has been approved by SDOT. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/permits-and-services/permits/construction-use-in-the-right-of-way (P)

David Landry, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: September 8, 2022

DL:adc
3034353-LU Decision.docx