Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections

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

Record Number: 3035616-LU

Applicant: John Anderson

Address of Proposal: 8300 Aurora Ave N

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to a allow a 5-story, 117-unit apartment building with 9 live-work units. No parking proposed. Existing buildings to be demolished. Design Review Early Design Guidance done under 3035673-EG.

The following approvals are required:

I. Design Review with No Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)

II. SEPA - Environmental Determination (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)

SEPA DETERMINATION

Determination of Non-significance (DNS)

☐ No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.

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

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Zone: Commercial 1-55 (M) [C1-55 (M)]

Zoning Pattern: North: Neighborhood Commercial 3P-75 (M1) [NC3P-75 (M1)]
South: Commercial 1-55 (M) [C1-55 (M)]
East: Neighborhood Residential 3 [NR3]
West: Commercial 1-55 (M) [C1-55 (M)]

Environmentally Critical Areas: No mapped environmentally critical areas are 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 files will control.

Current and Surrounding Development; Neighborhood Character; Access: The subject site is comprised of two existing tax parcels currently developed with two single-story commercial structures built in 1945 and 1948 and a surface parking lot. The site slopes downward northeast to south approximately six feet.

The subject site is located on the northwest corner of Aurora Ave N and N 83rd St in the Green Lake neighborhood. Adjacent to the site are a gas station to the north, two single-family residences to the east, a four-story mixed-use structure and a surface parking lot to the south, and a single-story commercial structure to the west. The site is situated at one of the entry locations of the Green Lake neighborhood. North-south connector Aurora Ave N is a principal arterial, transecting northwest Seattle including the Licton Springs neighborhood to the north and sweeping past the west side of Green Lake to the south. Two blocks to the north, N 85th St provides east-west circulation. The site is located midway between the Greenwood commercial core to the west and Interstate 5 to the east. To the south, Green Lake Dr N provides connection southeast to the north end of Green Lake.

The immediate area maintains an industrial and auto-centric character defined by the broad arterial Aurora Ave N and multitude of surface parking lots. Developments adjacent to Aurora Ave N include older lowrise commercial, hospitality, restaurant, retail, and service uses. Larger scale multifamily residential and townhouses structures are concentrated near N 85th St. There is a transition to single-family and lowrise multifamily residential areas moving away from the arterials. A few mixed-use residential and commercial structures are located along Green Lake Dr N. Closer to Green Lake, newer midrise multifamily structures in the vicinity have introduced a contemporary architectural style with prominent vertical modulation and strong connection to the street at the pedestrian level. The area was rezoned from Commercial 1-40 to Commercial 1-55 (M) on 4/19/19. Multiple projects in the vicinity are currently in review or under construction for proposed development, including 8610 Aurora Ave N, 905 N 92nd St, and 927 N 92nd St.

Pedestrian access is proposed from N 84th St to the north, Aurora Ave N to the west, and N 83rd St to the south.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The public comment period ended on January 22, 2022. 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 air quality, housing, cultural resources, shadows, trees, and density.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the record number 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.

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE September 28, 2020

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned about the zone transition.
- Noted that the wall would be just 2.5 feet from a non-conforming single family property next door.
- Concerned about impacts to emergency egress from the single-family structures to the east.
- Requested a setback at the zone transition.

SDCI staff did not receive any design related comments in writing prior to the meeting, however non-design related comments were received concerning parking and security of the vacant site.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design.

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

PRIORITIES & 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 Study**
    a. The Board stated they would like to see a new massing option built off of the positive attributes of Option 3. (**CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence, CS2-C-1. Corner Sites, CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning, CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions, CS2-D-4. Massing Choices, CS2-I-ii. Entry Locations, CS2-II-i. Zone Edges, CS2-III-i. Aurora Avenue North, CS3-A-4. Evolving Neighborhoods, PL2-I-i. Make Aurora More Pedestrian Friendly, PL2-I-ii. Streetscape Amenities, DC1-A-2. Gathering Places, DC2-II-iii. Surface Lots, DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest, DC2-D-1. Human Scale, DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility, DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs)**
        i. The Board stated that the Aurora frontage on Option 3 addressed the street well and had positive features that should be included as the project develops, including the following:
            1. Preserve the lobby space location as a much needed “moment of modulation” in the project.
            2. The ground corner location of the community room worked well to address the designated Green Lake neighborhood gateway location and the massing evolution should build on this configuration.

ii. The Board was concerned that Option 3 did not adequately address the zone transition on the eastern edge of the property. Thus, the zone transition shown in Option 3 was not supported and should not be carried into the next massing iteration.

iii. The Board stated that the width of courtyard proposed in Option 3 was too narrow and shaded to be a functional amenity space. They encouraged the applicant instead move the amenity space to one of the edges of the property and create an open space that is visible to and potentially shared with the public.

b. The Board felt that the massing modulation located along the eastern edge of the lot best addressed the lower density zone abutting the property and suggested that the applicant use this as a starting point for further developing this portion of the massing proposal. (**CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence, CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions, CS2-D-4. Massing Choices, CS2-II-i. Zone Edges, CS3-A-1)**

c. The Board noted that the jogs in massing between the podium and the tower results and inconsistent zig-zagging in the massing. They would like these features to be clarified further by the applicant as the massing design evolves. (**DC2-B-1. Façade Composition and DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility)**

2. Zone Transition

a. The large wall and zone-transition abutting lower density zones to the east of the property were the subject of much discussion by the Board and in public comment. They noted that the 13 foot high wall along the entire length of this transition was not in keeping with guidelines that specifically request the applicant soften the zone transition and better respond to neighborhood context. (**CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence, CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning, CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions, CS2-D-4. Massing Choices, CS2-II-i. Zone Edges, CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together, DC1-A-2. Gathering Places, DC2-II-iii. Surface Lots, DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest, DC2-D-1. Human Scale, DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility, DC2-II-iii. Surface Lots, DC1-II-ii. Screen Type, DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs)**

b. The Board offered several suggestions for the applicant to mitigate the zone transition issue and would like to see a combination of them explored and presented when they next see the project. Explore options to mitigate the zone transition include but are not limited to:

i. lowering the massing by ten feet;

ii. utilizing a green roof on the wall to visually soften the feature when viewed from smaller nearby structures;

iii. moving the entire development away from transition by taking space away from the live-work units and potentially using a departure to achieve this;

iv. studying whether the Code will allow for the drive aisle and other features covered by the wall to be open air.

c. Be prepared to use the next design review proposal to explain which of these options listed above were chosen by the design team and why the chosen strategy best meets the Seattle and Green Lake Neighborhood Design Guidelines. (**CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence, CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning, CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions, CS2-D-4. Massing Choices, CS2-II-i. Zone Edges, CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together, DC1-A-2. Gathering Places, DC2-II-iii. Surface**

Lots, DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest, DC2-D-1. Human Scale, DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility, DC2-II-iii. Surface Lots, DC1-II-ii. Screen Type, DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs)

d. If, in the future, a wall is proposed at the zone transition, the design should include a lot of detail about the materiality of the wall. They stated a preference for warmer and less stark materials. (**CS2-II-i. Zone Edges, CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together, DC1-A-2. Gathering Places, DC2-B-2. Blank Walls, DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest, DC2-D-1. Human Scale, DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility, DC2-II-iii. Surface Lots, DC1-II-ii. Screen Type)**
e. The Board stated that modulation and open space were more important than privacy when responding to the zone transition. They made it clear that they would rather see amenity spaces at the eastern façade of the property even if it meant some amount of activity from building users near the zone edge. (**CS2-II-i. Zone Edges, CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together, DC1-A-2. Gathering Places, DC2-B-2. Blank Walls, DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest, DC2-D-1. Human Scale, DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility, DC1-II-ii. Screen Type)**
f. The Board requested a privacy study of how the uses and windows overlap with neighboring properties so that they can understand the impact of the lower density property to the east. (**CS2-II-i. Zone Edges, CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together, DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest, DC2-D-1. Human Scale)**

3. Street Edge and Gateway Location

a. The corner of Aurora and 83rd is designated as an "entry" point to the Green Lake neighborhood by the neighborhood design guidelines and they suggested inclusion of a visual marker to identify entry into the neighborhood should be explored. The Board reiterated that aspects of the Option 3massing was strong and locating the community room at this corner was a positive step but that the proposal needed further development to realize the intent of the guidelines. **(CS2-A-1. Sense of Place, CS2-C-1. Corner Sites, CS2-I-ii. Entry Locations and DC4-B-1. Scale and Character)**
b. The Board requested that the applicant use the programming of the building to help make a distinction between the commercial and live work uses and the residential uses and use the break between these uses to make a visual cue that responds to the gateway location. (**CS2-III-i. Aurora Avenue North, PL3-A-1. Design Objectives, DC2-B-1. Façade Composition, DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest, DC2-D-2. Texture DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility and DC2-I-i. Modulate Facade Widths)**
c. The Board further clarified that the 83rd façade, not just the corner, was a gateway and that this should be reflected in the materials of the proposal.
d. The Board requested that the gateway location be identifiable to passersby at multiple levels and speeds. The gateway should be legible to cars transiting by as well as pedestrians. The Board suggested a vertical element of some kind may help in achieving this goal. **(CS2-A-1. Sense of Place , CS2-C-1. Corner Sites, CS2-I-ii. Entry Locations and DC4-B-1. Scale and Character)**
e. The Board requested a study of how the proposal might be configured if trash and utility uses were moved to 84th. (**DC1-C-4. Service Uses)**
    i. The Board further clarified that regardless of which street they are located, service uses will need to be screened and they would like to see more detail of what this may look like.

f. The Board noted that the units along the street, regardless of their use, must activate the street and the Board requested studies of how the live-work units will function. **(PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities, PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street, PL2-C-1. Locations and Coverage, PL2-I-i. Make Aurora More Pedestrian Friendly, PL3-A-1. Design Objectives; PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements, PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses, PL3-C-1. Porous Edge, DC2-C-2. Dual Purpose Elements and DC2-D-1. Human Scale)**
    i. Include sections and illustrations that demonstrate how the units use their massing to activate the street.
    ii. Include a sections and illustrations that show how the second-floor overhang functions and where its drip line is located.
    iii. The Board suggested the use of small awnings may be helpful in making the live work units legible and providing modulation.
    iv. Provide a study of the transition from public to private space and how this is achieved in the live-work units

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE January 11, 2021

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Of the three options for zone transition they would like to see planter at property line zone transition but with a solid garage wall
- Felt planter at property line option at the zone transition provided better airflow, access to maintenance of neighboring house
- Preference for bio-retention planter as it is likely to have live organic matter year-round as opposed to a green roof.
- A neighbor stated that overall, they would prefer a greater setback at the zone transition to slightly smaller wall height.
- Would like to see "lower wall with setback option" and "planter at property line" options combined to create a 10-foot wall and a setback greater than 1-foot.
- Neighbor stated that though the planter on the property line would require maintenance and access, and they were confident that an agreement for access could be reached with the property owners.

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

- Desire to see something responding better to low-rise zone
- Preference for wood cladding matching lower density neighborhood
- General support for the project
- Happy to see mixed uses in the project
- Concern that live-work units will not activate street with enough patrons
- Support for street access off of Aurora
- Concern about wood planking at sidewalk

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning parking and support for it inclusion in the project.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design.

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

PRIORITIES & 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. **Massing and Zone Transition**
    a. The Board stated that the applicant's option #4 did a good job of responding to their guidance from EDG1. However, while the new option was responsive to their previous comments it did not have any strong massing moves and they looked forward to its further development following the guidance in this report. (**DC4-I-i., DC2-I-ii, DC2-A-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-III-iii, CS2-II-I, CS2-D-3)**
    b. The Board was very happy with the simple clean lines depicted in the massing diagrams. They recommended a restrained pallet of high quality and durable materials, especially at the ground plane and at the zone transition to the east. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-3, and DC4-A)**
    c. The setback on the east façade was cited by the Board as a positive feature. They indicated that they would like this to remain at the recommendation phase and that they wanted the applicant to demonstrate how this feature is visible from the pedestrian level. The zone transition was the subject of much of the Board's guidance at EDG1 and the Board said they were generally happy with the applicant's responses to their guidance. They specifically cited the upper-level setbacks as a positive response to the zone transition and stated that these should be carried forward. They suggested that the applicant use wood or another material that reflects the qualities and character of the nearby low density residential areas. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, and DC4-A, DC4-I-i.)**
    d. The Board encouraged the applicant's outreach to a neighbor whose home is set close to the property line with the zone transition. They requested that the applicant continue to work with the neighbor and the SDCI planner to resolve the guidance related to the close-proximity of the house to the east at the property line. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, and DC4-A, DC4-I-i.)**
        i. After reviewing the applicant's response to their guidance from EDG 1 guidance the Board agreed with the applicant and neighbors that an open garage was not a successful approach.
        ii. They echoed the public comment and recommended that a blended option of approaches should be used, making the setback as large as possible as well as including structured or unstructured planting.
2. **Streetscape and landscape**
    a. The Greenlake supplemental guidelines designate the corner of 84th and Aurora a "entry" to the Greenlake neighborhood and the Board agreed that the applicant was headed in the right direction, creating a response to this feature that worked at the

pedestrian and vehicular speed and scale. They looked forward to further development of this feature at Recommendation review and seeing how the applicant creates a monument and treatment that works for both cars and pedestrians. (**CS2-A-1, CS2-I-ii, CS3-B-1)**

i. They specifically cited the precedent images on pages 24-26 of the EDG packet for the ground plane treatment as positive. The Board cautioned that the plaza should relate to the building interior rather than being set off on its own. The design should create an indoor/outdoor space with the residential amenity as well as providing a visual gateway for passersby. (**CS2-A-1, CS2-I-ii, CS3-B-1)**

ii. Board members requested the applicant provide a detailed study of how the indoor/outdoor presence of the amenity would function. The applicant should be prepared to illustrate how an operable storefront and the space would be programed in this location in a way that supports use by the residents and while activating the streetscape. However, they did state that placement of the amenity at the corner did articulate the building and mark the gateway. (**CS2-A-1, CS2-I-ii, CS3-B-1 PL2-B-1, and PL2-B-3)**

b. The Board had concerns about the viability of patios on the ground floor on N 84th St, given the noise and conditions on Aurora. Since patios that are always empty do not create an active streetscape the Board suggested the applicant consider placing thoughtful landscaping in this place instead of the patios.

c. Canopies were specifically cited as a positive feature on the proposal that the Board expects to see included in the recommendation phase. They said that this project should set a new positive precedent for canopies and street-life along Aurora. Be sure to further develop this feature and be prepared to explain how their design supports an active streetscape while integrating into the larger design of the building. (**PL1-B-1, PL2-C-1, PL2-C-2, PL2-C-3 and DC2-D-2)**

d. Replace the north-facing green-wall on N 83rd St. The Board suggested they were concerned that it would be unsuccessful in this low light location creating a blight that would exacerbate the blank wall at this location. They suggested something bright and aesthetically pleasing but permanent, as a mitigation strategy for the blank wall. (**DC4-A-2 and DC2-B-2)**

FINAL RECOMMENDATION March 21, 2022

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Felt the proposed building is extremely responsive to all the design reviewed guidelines, especially those related to public life and open space concepts.
- Felt the building is a fantastic example of how textures and material changes can break up massing.
- Expressed support for the proposed bike storage as it is fantastic amenity and plans ahead for bicyclists. This project should be advanced without delay.
- Stated interest in seeing the lighting and hoped that the lighting closely resembles the rendering as an entry point into this neighborhood area off of Green Lake.
- Requested a non-glare roofing on the lower roof facing the property to the east.

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

- Many comments supported the proposed development.
- Felt the design fits with the neighborhood context and would be an excellent addition.
- Opposed to the proposed development due to scale.
- Emphasized the need for secure bicycle parking that is enclosed or protected from weather.
- Requested including horizontal bicycle parking in addition to vertical storage.
- Questioned where bicyclists would go after leaving the building and if there was easy and safe access to bike lanes.

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning environmental regulations, WSDOT coordination, density, parking, housing demand, housing affordability, and zoning.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design.

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

PRIORITIES & 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. **Massing and Zone Transition:**
   a. The Board recommended approval of the overall massing as presented at the Recommendation meeting with the erosion of the massing on the east side, the vertical slot on the north side, and the large notch towards the south end of the building on Aroura Ave N. that breaks down the massing into discernable parts and responds to the change in site geometry. (**DC4-I-i., DC2-I-ii, DC2-A-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-III-iii, CS2-II-I, CS2-D-3)**
   b. The Board appreciated the applicant's development of the design as it related to the zone transition to the east and agreed that the removal of the parking on the ground level and the additional setback at the center of the building successfully mitigated the height, bulk, and scale of the building. The Board recommended approval of the massing with the setbacks and private amenity decks shown on page 19 of the Recommendation packet. **(CS2-A-2., CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, and DC4-A, DC4-I-i.)**

2. **Façade Articulation and Materiality:**
   a. The Board appreciated the simple and straight forward articulation and material application on the south and east facades, which very clearly enhances the overall legibility of the architectural massing strategy. The Board was concerned however, with the rather complicated and contrasting façade articulation and material application on the northwestern mass, and how well the horizontal oriented window groupings and white window frames related to the rest of the building. The Board recommended a condition of approval to study ways to simplify the north end of the Aurora Ave N facade and the

west end of the N 84th St façade by using elements such as dark window frames, better integrated venting solutions that match the siding panel behind them, intentional introduction of accent materials, and other elements that were successful on the south and east facades. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, and DC4-A, DC4-I-i.)**

b. The Board recommended approval of the overall simple material palette as shown on page 37 of the Recommendation packet, specifically; the use of high-quality thin brick at the ground level facades; the ceramic coated cement panel at the southern end of the building, residential lobby alcove, and paired live/work entries; the glass railings shown at the roof deck and other terraces; and the fritted glass canopies as shown on page 22 of the Recommendation packet. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-3, and DC4-A)**

c. The Board discussed at length whether the level of articulation and material application on the southern mass, as shown on page 38 of the Recommendation packet, was adequate to provide the level of visual interest and depth needed at the end of the building facing the 'gateway' into the Green Lake neighborhood identified in the Green Lake Design Guidelines. After deliberation, the Board acknowledged that there would be more shadow and depth between the windows and wood-like material but encouraged the applicant study providing additional depth in the façade. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-3, and DC4-A)**

d. The Board appreciated the applicant's proposed articulation and material application on the ground level of the building and strongly recommended approval of the use of high-quality thin brick along Aurora Ave N, N 83rd St, N 84th St, and portions of the façade on east side of the building. The Board was concerned, however, with the lack of perceived depth between the brick and storefront, the extent of brick and its alignment with other architectural elements on the east facade, and the appropriateness of the orange-colored fiber-cement panel at the paired live/work units and main residential entry. The Board recommended a condition of approval to study the relationship of these materials in their various conditions to ensure that there is adequate depth to provide visual interest, the accent material/color compliments the subtle tones of the other materials, and the transitions between the materials are rational and enhance the overall composition of the facades. Provide architectural details including head, sill and jambs at doors and storefront, and material transitions on the façade. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-3, and DC4-A)**

3. Street Level Uses and Landscape Design:

a. Although the Board appreciated the overall massing approach on the east side of the building in response to the zone transition, the Board had a hard time understanding how the various spaces and uses proposed along the east property line related to each other. The Board deliberated at length whether the covered bike storage and electrical meters were the right uses for the setback area considering they are seen from the various terraces above and the second floor of the adjacent buildings in the SF-5000 zone to the east. The Board therefore recommended a condition of approval to study better screening the electrical meters, adding a landscape buffer between the bike storage and the east property line, or internalizing the bike storage and electrical meters within the building to allow for additional common amenity area, larger patios, and greater landscape buffer between the two zones. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, and DC4-A, DC4-I-i.)**

b. The Board recommended approval of the proposed paired live/work unit entries on N 84th St and Aurora Ave N as the recesses allow for some relief and separation from the activity along the street frontages. Although the Board recommended approval of the larger setback with landscape transition between the sidewalk and the units on N 84th St and acknowledged that spill-out space for retail would not be beneficial, the Board recommended a condition of approval to study providing landscaping in front of the

live/work units along Aurora Ave N to provide a softer transition between the sidewalk and unit storefronts. (**PL1-B-1, PL2-C-1, PL2-C-2, PL2-C-3 and DC2-D-2)**

c. Although the Board understood that the hardscape associated with the large right-of-way at the intersection of Aurora Ave N, Green Lake Dr N, and N 83rd St has been finalized by the Seattle Department of Transportation, the Board was underwhelmed with the 'entry' design proposed for this important location identified in the Green Lake Design Guidelines. The Board was concerned that there appeared to be no connection between the corner residential amenity space, the various sitting opportunities along the sidewalk, and the landscape design within the right-of-way from the residential entry and south. The Board recommended a condition of approval to continue to study and develop the design of the storefront at the corner, the various seating opportunities, and the landscape design, to further promote more active interaction where possible and to enhance the perceived 'entry' into the Green Lake area. (**CS2-A-1, CS2-I-ii, CS3-B-1)**

d. In conjunction with item 3.c. above, the Board recommended a condition of approval for the applicant to include the right-of-way planting area along Aurora Ave N, that starts at the main residential entry, into the overall design of the 'gateway' node to the south. (**CS2-A-1, CS2-I-ii, CS3-B-1)**

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

At the time of the Recommendation meeting no departures were requested.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

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

CONTEXT & SITE

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

CS1-A Energy Use

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

CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

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

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

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

CS1-C Topography

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

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

CS1-D Plants and Habitat

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

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

CS1-E Water

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

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

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

CS1-I Responding to Site Characteristics

CS1-I-i. Lakefront Orientation: In areas adjacent to Green Lake Park the building should be sited to acknowledge and orient to the lake and park.

CS1-I-ii. Views of Lake: Numerous streets offer views of, and pedestrian access to, the lake. Consider siting the building to take advantage of these views and to enhance views from the public right-of-way. Methods to accomplish this include setting the building back from lake views, placing landscape elements and street trees to frame views rather than block them, and providing pedestrian spaces with views of the lake.

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.

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

CS2-I Responding to Site Characteristics

CS2-I-i. Curved and Discontinuous Streets: The community's street pattern responds to the lake by breaking with the city's standard north-south and east-west grid pattern. This creates numerous discontinuous streets, street offsets, and curved streets, which are an aspect of the community character. New development can take advantage of such street patterns by providing special features that complement these unique spaces.

CS2-I-ii. Entry Locations: Within the Green Lake Planning Area, certain locations serve as entry points into neighborhood and commercial areas. Development of properties at these "Entry Locations" should include elements suggesting an entry or gateway. Examples include a clock tower, turret or other architectural features, kiosks, benches, signage, landscaping, public art or other features that contribute to the demarcation of the area. For Entry Locations, see Map 1 on page 5 of Green Lake Guidelines.

CS2-I-iii. Heart Locations: Development at Heart Locations should enhance their central character through appropriate site planning and architecture. In addition to promoting pedestrian activity, these sites have a high priority for improvements to the public realm. A building's primary entry and facade should face the intersection. Other amenities to consider are: special paving, landscaping, additional public open space provided by curb bulbs and entry plazas. For Heart Locations see Map 1 on page 5 of Green Lake Guidelines.

CS2-II Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility

CS2-II-i. Zone Edges: In such cases where a property with more-intensive zoning is adjacent to a property that contains such split zoning, the following design techniques are encouraged to improve the transition to the split-zoned lot:

a. Building setbacks similar to those specified in the Land Use Code for zone edges where a proposed development project within a more intensive zone abuts a lower intensive zone.

b. Techniques specified in the Seattle Design Guidelines regarding height, bulk, and scale; and relationship to adjacent sites.
c. Along a zone edge without an alley, consider additional methods that help reduce the potential 'looming' effect of a much larger structure in proximity to smaller, existing buildings.
d. One possibility is allowing the proposed structure's ground floor to be built to the property line and significantly stepping back the upper levels from the adjacent building (see sketch in the left column). The building wall at the property line should be designed in a manner sympathetic to the existing structure(s), particularly regarding privacy and aesthetic issues.

CS2-III Streetscape Compatibility

CS2-III-i. Aurora Avenue North: A continuous street wall is less of a consideration on Aurora Avenue N, where numerous parking lots punctuate the streetscape. In this area, a more pleasant and consistent streetscape can be achieved by reinforcing the rhythm of alternating buildings and well landscaped vehicle access areas. Parking lots should be placed at the rear and to the sides of buildings, and the buildings should be located near the street. Parking lot landscaping and screening are particularly important in improving the appearance of the Aurora Avenue North corridor.

CS2-III-ii. Multifamily Residential Areas: Landscaping in the required front setbacks of new multifamily development is an important siting and design consideration to help reinforce desirable streetscape continuity.

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.

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

CS3-I Architectural Context

CS3-I-i. Aurora Avenue North Corridor: Recognize Aurora's 1920-1950 commercial character while making the area more friendly to the pedestrian. Specific architectural

cues include creative and playful signage, simple post-WW II and flamboyant architecture.

CS3-I-ii. Residential Urban Village: Build on the core's classical architectural styles (e.g., community center, library, Marshall School, VFW building). Also, many of the existing buildings are simple "boxes," with human scale details and features (i.e., building at the NE corner of E. Green Lake Dr. and NE 72nd Street). Brick and detailed stucco are appropriate materials.

CS3-I-iii. Tangletown and 65th/Latona: Build on both commercial areas' human scale elements, particularly the traditional storefront details and proportions of early 1900s vernacular commercial buildings. A mix of traditional and contemporary forms and materials is appropriate provided there is attention to human scale detailing in elements such as doors, windows, signs, and lights.

CS3-I-iv. Facade Articulation of Multi-family Residential Structures: The façade articulation of new multifamily residential buildings (notably in Lowrise zones) should be compatible with the surrounding single-family architectural context. Architectural details similar to those found on single-family homes in Green Lake from the early 1900's can add further interest to a building, and lend buildings a human scale. Consider the following features:

a. Pitched roof
b. Covered front porch
c. Vertically proportioned windows
d. Window trim and eave boards
e. Elements typical of neighborhood house forms

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.

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

PL1-I Residential Open Space

PL1-i. Required Open Space: The amount of open space required by the Land Use Code may be reduced if the project substantially contributes to the objectives of the guideline by:

a. Creating a substantial courtyard-style open space that is visually accessible to the public and that extends to the public realm.
b. Setting back development to improve a view corridor.
c. Setting upper stories of buildings back to provide solar access and/or to reduce impacts on neighboring single-family residences.
d. Providing open space within the streetscape or other public rights-of-way contiguous with the site. Such public spaces should be large enough to include streetscape amenities that encourage gathering.

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

PL2-A Accessibility

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

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

PL2-B Safety and Security

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

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

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

PL2-C Weather Protection

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

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

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

PL2-D Wayfinding

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

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

PL2-I Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances

PL2-I-i. Make Aurora More Pedestrian Friendly: Although Aurora Avenue North is likely to retain its automobile-oriented character, new development should make the entire Aurora corridor more friendly to pedestrians by encouraging:

a. Street-fronting entries.
b. Pedestrian-oriented facades and spaces.
c. Overhead weather protection.

PL2-I-ii. Streetscape Amenities: New developments are encouraged to work through the Design Review process and with interested citizens to provide features that enhance the public realm. Code departures, as set forth at SMC 23.41.012, will be considered for projects that propose enhancements to the public realm. The project proponent should provide an acceptable plan for, but not limited to, features such as:

a. Curb bulbs adjacent to active retail spaces
b. Pedestrian-oriented street lighting

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

PL3-A Entries

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

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

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

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

PL3-B Residential Edges

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

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

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

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

PL3-C Retail Edges

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

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

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

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

PL3-I Entrances Visible from the Street

PL3-I-i. Entrance Orientation: On Mixed Use Corridors, primary business and residential entrances should be oriented to the commercial street. Secondary and service entries should be located off the alley, side street or parking lots.

PL3-I-ii. Walkways Serving Entrances: In residential projects, except townhouses, it is generally preferable to have one walkway from the street that can serve several building entrances. At least one building entrance, preferably the main one, should be prominently visible from the street. To increase security, it is desirable that other entries also be visible from the street; however, the configuration of existing buildings may preclude this.

PL3-I-iii. Courtyard Entries: When a courtyard is proposed for a residential project, the courtyard should have at least one entry from the street. Units facing the courtyard should have a porch, stoop, deck or seating area associated with the dwelling unit.

PL3-I-iv. Fences: In residential projects, front yard fences over 4 feet in height that reduce visual access and security should be avoided.

PL3-II Human Activity

PL3-II-i. Recessed Entries: On Mixed Use Corridors, where narrow sidewalks exist (less than 15' wide), consider recessing entries to provide small open spaces for sitting, street musicians, bus waiting, or other pedestrian activities. Recessed entries should promote pedestrian movement and avoid blind corners.

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-A Arrangement of Interior Uses

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

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

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

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

DC1-B Vehicular Access and Circulation

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

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

DC1-C Parking and Service Uses

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

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

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

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

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

DC1-I Parking and Vehicle Access

DC1-I-i. Driveway Width: In Lowrise residential developments, single-lane driveways (approximately 12 feet in width) are preferred over wide or multiple driveways where feasible.

DC1-II Design of Parking Lots Near Sidewalks

DC1-II-i. Views to Businesses: Screening of surface parking lots should allow views of businesses.

DC1-II-ii. Screen Type: On Mixed Use Corridors, walls rather than shrub screens are generally preferred because walls require less space and landscaping can be difficult to maintain in congested areas. If walls are provided, they must be made of "permanent" materials such as masonry.

DC2-II-iii. Surface Lots: When adjacent to residential zones, surface parking lots adjacent to sidewalks should be screened with shrubs and double rows of street trees for a more sheltered, residential feel.

DC2-III Visual Impacts of Parking Structures

DC2-III-i. Ground-Level Commercial Use: The preferred solution for parking structures is to incorporate commercial uses at the ground level. Below-grade parking is the next best solution.

DC2-III-ii. Access to Street Network: There should be careful consideration of the surrounding street system when locating auto access. When the choice is between an arterial and a lower volume, residential street, access should be placed on the arterial.

DC2-III-iii. Residential Area Consideration: Structured parking façades facing the street and residential areas should be designed and treated to minimize impacts, including sound transmission from inside the parking structure.

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

DC2-A Massing

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

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

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

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

DC2-B-2. Blank Walls: Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features

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

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

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

DC2-D Scale and Texture

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

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

DC2-E Form and Function

DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility: Strive for a balance between building use legibility and flexibility. Design buildings such that their primary functions and uses can be readily

determined from the exterior, making the building easy to access and understand. At the same time, design flexibility into the building so that it may remain useful over time even as specific programmatic needs evolve.

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

DC2-I Architectural Elements and Materials

DC2-I-i. Modulate Facade Widths: On Mixed Use Corridors, consider breaking up the façade into modules of not more than 50 feet (measured horizontally parallel to the street) on Greenlake Way and 100 feet on other corridors, corresponding to traditional platting and building construction. (Note: This should not be interpreted as a prescriptive requirement. Larger parcels may characterize some areas of the Greenlake Community, such as lower Roosevelt.)

DC2-I-ii. Fine-Grained Architectural Character: Buildings in Lowrise zones should provide a "fine-grained" architectural character. The fine grain may be established by using building modulation, articulation and/or details which may refer to the modulation, articulation and/or details of adjacent buildings. To better relate to any established architectural character encountered within the community, consider the following building features:

a. Pitched roof;
b. Covered front porch;
c. Vertically proportioned windows;
d. Window trim and eave boards;
e. Elements typical of common house forms.

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

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

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

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

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

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

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

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

DC3-C Design

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

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

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

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

DC3-I Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances

DC3-I-i. Plaza Location: Plazas should be centrally located, on major avenues, close to bus stops, or where there are strong pedestrian flows on neighboring sidewalks.

DC3-I-ii. Plaza Proportioning: Plazas should be sensitively proportioned and designed. For example: not more than 60 feet across and no more than 3 feet above or below the sidewalk.

DC3-I-iii. Seating: Plazas should have plenty of benches, steps, and ledges for seating. For example: at least one linear foot of seating per 30 square feet of plaza area should be provided; seating should have a minimum depth of 16 inches.

DC3-I-iv. Plaza Frontage: Locate the plaza in a sunny spot and encourage public art and other amenities. For example: at least 50% of the total frontage of building walls facing a plaza should be occupied by retail uses, street vendors, building entrances, or other pedestrian-oriented uses.

DC3-I-v. Planting Beds: Provide plenty of planting beds for ground cover or shrubs. For example: one tree should be provided for every 200 square feet and at a maximum spacing of 25 feet apart. Special precaution must be taken to prevent trees from blocking the sun.

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.

Greenlake Supplemental Guidance:

DC4-I Exterior Finish Materials

DC4-I-i. Desired Materials: See full Guidelines for list of desired materials.

DC4-I-ii. Relate to Campus/Art Deco Architecture: Sculptural cast stone and decorative tile are particularly appropriate because they relate to campus architecture and Art Deco buildings. Wood and cast stone are appropriate for moldings and trim.

DC4-I-iii. Discouraged Materials: See full Guidelines for list of discouraged materials.

DC4-I-iv. Anodized Metal: Where anodized metal is used for window and door trim, then care should be given to the proportion and breakup of glazing to reinforce the building concept and proportions.

DC4-I-v. Fencing: Fencing adjacent to the sidewalk should be sited and designed in an attractive and pedestrian oriented manner.

DC4-I-vi. Awnings: Awnings made of translucent material may be backlit, but should not overpower neighboring light schemes. Lights, which direct light downward, mounted from the awning frame are acceptable. Lights that shine from the exterior down on the awning are acceptable.

DC4-I-vii. Light Standards: Light standards should be compatible with other site design and building elements.

DC4-II Exterior Signs

DC4-II-i. Encouraged Sign Types: The following sign types are encouraged, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors:

a. Pedestrian-oriented shingle or blade signs extending from the building front just above pedestrians.
b. Marquee signs and signs on pedestrian canopies.
c. Neon signs.
d. Carefully executed window signs, such as etched glass or hand painted signs.
e. Small signs on awnings or canopies.

DC4-II-ii. Discouraged Sign Types: Post mounted signs are discouraged.

DC4-II-iii. Sign Location: The location and installation of signage should be integrated with the building's architecture.

DC4-II-iv. Monument Signs: Monument signs should be integrated into the development, such as on a screen wall.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Monday, March 21, 2022, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Monday, March 21, 2022 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members recommended the following conditions and requested that the project return for a second Recommendation meeting to review the applicant's resolution of the conditions listed below.

1. Study ways to simplify the north end of the Aurora Ave N facade and the west end of the N 84th St façade by using elements such as dark window frames, better integrated venting solutions that match the siding panel behind them, intentional introduction of accent materials, and other elements that were successful on the south and east facades. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, and DC4-A, DC4-I-i.)**
2. Study the relationship of between the thin brick masonry, storefront, and the accent material in the live/work entries along N 84th St and Aurora Ave N, as well as the main residential entry, to ensure that there is adequate depth to provide visual interest, the accent material/color compliments the subtle tones of the other materials, and the transitions between the materials are rational and enhance the overall composition of the facades. Provide architectural details including head, sill and jambs at doors and storefront, and material transitions on the façade in the Master Use drawing set and the Building Permit set. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-3, and DC4-A)**
3. Study better screening at the electrical meters, adding a landscape buffer between the bike storage and the east property line, or internalizing the bike storage and electrical meters within the building to allow for additional common amenity area, larger patios, and greater landscape buffer between the two zones. (**CS2-A-2., CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, and DC4-A, DC4-I-i.)**
4. Study providing landscaping in front of the live/work units along Aurora Ave N to provide a softer transition between the sidewalk and unit storefronts. (**PL1-B-1, PL2-C-1, PL2-C-2, PL2-C-3 and DC2-D-2)**
5. Continue to study and develop the design of the storefront at the southwest corner, the various seating opportunities, and the landscape design, to further promote more active interaction where possible and to enhance the Green Lake Design Guidelines designated 'entry' into the Green Lake area. (**CS2-A-1, CS2-I-ii, CS3-B-1)**
6. In conjunction with Condition #5 above, include the right-of-way planting area along Aurora Ave N that starts at the main residential entry into the overall design of the Green Lake 'entry' node to the south. (**CS2-A-1, CS2-I-ii, CS3-B-1)**

The Board acknowledged that the project is not requesting any development standard departures, therefore, there is a meeting cap at having a maximum of two EDG meetings and one Recommendation meeting, and only the Director may require a second Recommendation meeting. The Board stated that if a second Recommendation meeting was not required by the Director, that the Board recommends approval of the project subject to conditions, and with the expectation that the applicant will work closely with the Planner to resolve the Board's conditions listed above.

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 March 21, 2022, the Board recommended the project return for a second Recommendation meeting, but acknowledged the maximum number of meetings had been conducted pursuant to SMC 23.41.008 (Table A). Therefore, the Board alternatively recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above, should an additional meeting not be required by the Director. The Director did not require an additional meeting (SMC 23.41.008.E.4).

Five members of the Northeast 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 recommended conditions noted by the Board.

Following the Recommendation meeting, SDCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Condition(s):

1. The applicant responded to condition 1 with a Recommendation Response Plan set uploaded July 1, 2022, noting, "Following the suggestions from the board, the design team further studied the relationship between the articulation and material application along the street facing facades. While maintaining the simple material palette, the street facing facades have been modified to create a simple cohesive look. All window frames are consistent in color with dark frames, and the accent "orange" color has been toned down to a muted orange. Hood vents along street facing facades have been replaced with grill vents to portray a

cleaner look. As requested, various section cuts along the live-work street frontages have been provided to portray the architectural details.". Refer to the Recommendation Response Plan set and see sheets G4-43, A2-10, A5-10, A5-20DR, and A5-21DR of the revised MUP drawing set. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.

2. The applicant responded to condition 2 with a Recommendation Response Plan set uploaded July 1, 2022, noting, "Following the suggestions from the board, the design team further studied the relationship between the articulation and material application along the street facing facades. While maintaining the simple material palette, the street facing facades have been modified to create a simple cohesive look. All window frames are consistent in color with dark frames, and the accent "orange" color has been toned down to a muted orange. Hood vents along street facing facades have been replaced with grill vents to portray a cleaner look. As requested, various section cuts along the live-work street frontages have been provided to portray the architectural details.". Refer to the Recommendation Response Plan set and see sheets G4-21, G4-43, A2-10, A5-10, A5-11DR, A5-20DR, A5-21DR, and A10-50 of the revised MUP drawing set. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.
3. The applicant responded to condition 3 with a Recommendation Response Plan set uploaded July 1, 2022, noting, "Along the neighboring property, decorative fencing and green roofs were added create a visual buffer between the private amenity areas and the electrical meters.". Refer to the Recommendation Response Plan set and see sheets G4-20, G4-43, A2-10, A5-11, A6-10, and A7-10 of the revised MUP drawing set. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.
4. The applicant responded to condition 4 with a Recommendation Response Plan set uploaded July 1, 2022, noting, "Metal planters are placed between live-work entries and various windows along Aurora Ave N have been recessed 2 feet to provide opportunities for planters to soften the transition between the sidewalk and live-works.". Refer to the Recommendation Response Plan set and see sheets G4-21, G4-43, A1-10, A2-10, and A5-21DR of the revised MUP drawing set. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.
5. The applicant responded to condition 5 with a Recommendation Response Plan set uploaded July 1, 2022, noting, "An enhanced landscaped Green Lake Entry has been proposed and coordinated between SDCI, SDOT, Civil and Landscaping.". The Green Lake Entry Concept is further discussed on sheet G4-44. Refer to the Recommendation Response Plan set and see sheets G4-44, L3.0, L13.0, and A1-10 of the revised MUP drawing set. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.
6. The applicant responded to condition 6 with a Recommendation Response Plan set uploaded July 1, 2022, noting, "An enhanced landscaped Green Lake Entry has been proposed and coordinated between SDCI, SDOT, Civil and Landscaping.". The Green Lake Entry Concept is further discussed on sheet G4-44. Refer to the Recommendation Response Plan set and see sheets G4-44, L3.0, L13.0, and A1-10 of the revised MUP drawing set. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. This response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.

The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents, details, and specifications are shown and constructed consistent with the approved MUP drawings.

The Director of SDCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the five members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director is satisfied that all the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

DIRECTOR'S DECISION

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

II. ANALYSIS – SEPA

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant signed March 4, 2021. The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) has annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the project file submitted by the applicant or agents; and any pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information, and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, and certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states in part: "*where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation*" subject to some limitations.

Under such limitations/circumstances, mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

SHORT TERM IMPACTS

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, a small increase in traffic due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Several construction-related impacts are mitigated by existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project such as: the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The following analyzes construction-related noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, construction traffic 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 - 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.

However, the amount of excavation and size of construction will result in a small and temporary increase in truck trips. Any closures of the public right of way will require review and permitting by Seattle Department of Transportation. Additional mitigation is not warranted per SMC 25.05.675.B.

Construction Impacts - Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. The Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08.425) permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with private development construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 10:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays in Commercial zones.

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

The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts and no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigate noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

Environmental Health

Construction activity has the potential to result in exposure to lead and asbestos. 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 the following: greenhouse gas emissions; possible increased traffic in the area. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, greenhouse gas emissions, historic resources, height bulk and scale, 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 Preservation – Architectural Resources

The existing structures on site are more than 50 years old. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and indicated the structures on site are unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Landmarks Preservation Board letters, reference number LPB 463/22). 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.

Historic Preservation – Cultural Resources

Information on file (Public Comment Letter, Duwamish Tribe, October 22, 2022) suggested the project site is in an area the Duwamish Tribe considers culturally significant and has a high probability to have unknown archaeological deposits. This information was revised by the Duwamish Tribe (Public Comment Letters, Duwamish Tribe, March 9, 2023) stating that an Inadvertent Discovery Plan should be prepared. The Tribe requested the opportunity to be notified and invited to be present on site should any archaeological work or monitoring be performed.

Since the information showed there is probable presence of archaeologically significant resources on site, Section B of Director's Rule 2-98 applies. As a condition of this decision, an Inadvertent Discovery Plan shall be prepared and the Duwamish Tribe shall be notified and

invited to be present on site if any archaeological work or monitoring is performed, consistent with Section B of Director's Rule 2-98.

The following conditions are also warranted to mitigate impacts to potential historic resources, per SMC 25.05.675.H consistent with Section B of Director's Rule 2-98:

Prior to Issuance of Master Use Permit:

1. The owner and/or responsible parties shall provide SDCI with a statement that the contract documents for their general, excavation, and other subcontractors will include reference to regulations regarding archaeological resources (Chapters 27.34, 27.53, 27.44, 79.01, and 79.90 RCW, and Chapter 25.48 WAC as applicable) and that construction crews will be required to comply with those regulations.

During Construction:

2. If resources of potential archaeological significance are encountered during construction or excavation, the owner and/or responsible parties shall:

- Stop work immediately and notify SDCI Land Use Planner and the Washington State Archaeologist at the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). The procedures outlined in Appendix A of Director's Rule 2-98 for assessment and/or protection of potentially significant archeological resources shall be followed.

- Abide by all regulations pertaining to discovery and excavation of archaeological resources, including but not limited to Chapters 27.34, 27.53, 27.44, 79.01 and 79.90 RCW and Chapter 25.48 WAC, as applicable, or their successors.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The proposal completed the design review process described in SMC 23.41. Design review considers mitigation for height, bulk and scale through modulation, articulation, landscaping, and façade treatment.

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

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

Transportation

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Gibson Traffic Consultants, December 2021) indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 39 daily vehicle trips, with 2 net new PM peak hour trips and 16 AM peak hour trips.

The additional trips are expected to distribute on various roadways near the project site, including SR-99/Aurora Ave N, I-5, N 85th St, and NE Northgate Way and would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections and on the overall transportation system. The SDCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that no mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.R.

DECISION – SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

☒ Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21.030(2) (c).

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355 and Early review DNS process in SMC 25.05.355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

For the Life of the Project

1. The building and landscape design shall be 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.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

Prior to Issuance of Master Use Permit

2. The owner and/or responsible parties shall provide SDCI with a statement that the contract documents for their general, excavation, and other subcontractors will include reference to regulations regarding archaeological resources (Chapters 27.34, 27.53, 27.44, 79.01, and 79.90 RCW, and Chapter 25.48 WAC as applicable) and that construction crews will be required to comply with those regulations.

Prior to Issuance of Demolition, Grading, or Construction Permit

3. Submit an Inadvertent Discovery Plan prepared by a qualified professional.

4. Provide a note on the plans that the Duwamish Tribe – as identified in the letter dated March 9, 2023 – shall be notified and invited to be present on site if any archaeological work or monitoring is performed.

During Construction

5. Notify and invite the Duwamish Tribe – as identified in the letter dated March 9, 2023 – to be present on site if any archaeological work or monitoring is performed.

6. If resources of potential archaeological significance are encountered during construction or excavation, the owner and/or responsible parties shall comply with the Inadvertent Discovery Plan and:

    - Stop work immediately and notify SDCI (Land Use Planner) and the Washington State Archaeologist at the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). The procedures outlined in Appendix A of Director's Rule 2-98 for assessment and/or protection of potentially significant archeological resources shall be followed.

    - Abide by all regulations pertaining to discovery and excavation of archaeological resources, including but not limited to Chapters 27.34, 27.53, 27.44, 79.01 and 79.90 RCW and Chapter 25.48 WAC, as applicable, or their successors.

David Sachs, Senior Land Use Planner Date: April 20, 2023
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections