



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

Record Number: 3032404-LU
Applicant: Steve Bull, Workshop AD
Address of Proposal: 6817 Greenwood Ave N

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow a 6-story, 24-unit apartment building. No parking proposed. Existing building to be demolished. Early Design Guidance Review conducted under 3032679-EG. This project is participating in the Living Building Pilot Program.

The following approvals are required:

- I. Design Review with Departures (SMC Chapter 23.41)***
**Any departures are listed near the end of the Design Review Analysis section of this decision.*
- II. SEPA Environmental Determination (SMC Chapter 25.05)**

SEPA DETERMINATION

- Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS)
 - Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.05.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts.
 - No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.
- Determination of Significance (DS) – Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
- Determination made under prior action.
- Exempt

BACKGROUND

This project is participating in the Living Building Pilot Program, allowing additional height and floor area in exchange for meeting the International Living Future Institute’s Living Building Challenge Petal Certification. The Living Building Pilot Program is meant to create replicable projects that are visible models of what is possible to meet the City of Seattle’s clean energy and climate goals. The Living Building Challenge is a certification program, advocacy tool, and philosophy defining the most advanced measure of sustainability in the built environment. In addition to the ten Core Imperatives required for certification, the project proposes to achieve the Energy, Equity, and Beauty Petals.

SDCI’s Green Building team continues to work closely with the development team to monitor progress and was part of the permit review process to ensure program compliance. The International Living

Future Institute is responsible for reviewing and auditing the project and provides a certification report to SDCI after at least 12 months of occupancy and measurement of the building's performance. The Living Building Challenge is unique in that many of the requirements are performance based for environmental goals to be validated. As such, final SDCI approval cannot be given until the performance period is completed. If program requirements are not met, penalties may be up to 5% of construction value depending on the extent of non-compliance.

Lastly, notable requirements to achieve the proposed Petals and the City's pilot program requirements include that the project meet 105% of its annual energy demand, be zero ready, demonstrate a 20% reduction in embodied carbon of primary materials, and allow equitable access to and protections from negative impacts resulting from its development. Other notable requirements are to work with project teams with a Just Label and provide educational components of the project. Finally, the project will reduce potable water demand by using non-potable water to meet demands for toilet flushing and irrigation.



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.

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Description: The subject site is currently developed with a single-family residence built in 1905. The site is rectangular in shape and slopes downward east to west approximately two feet.

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 2-55 (M) [NC-55 (M)]

- Zoning Pattern:* (North) NC-55 (M)
- (South) NC-55 (M)
- (East) NC-55 (M)
- (West) Neighborhood Residential 3 [NR3]

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

Current and Surrounding Development; Neighborhood Character; Access: The subject site is located on the west side of Greenwood Ave N, midblock between NW 70th St and N 67th St, in the Greenwood-Phinney Ridge Residential Urban Village. Surrounding development includes a religious institution to the north, an office building to the east, a multi-family residential structure to the south, and a child-care center to the west.

The north-south connector Greenwood Ave N is a minor arterial, transecting northwest Seattle. Greenwood Ave N intersects the Greenwood Town Center commercial area at N 85th St three-quarters of a mile to the north. One block to the south, Greenwood Ave N jogs east, merging with Phinney Ave N. The subject site is located a half mile from Green Lake Park to the east and the Woodland Park Zoo to the south. Additional points of interest in the vicinity include the John B Allen School, which is a historic City Landmark structure, and the Greenwood branch of The Seattle Public Library.

Greenwood Ave N is a neighborhood commercial corridor bordered by single-family structures, which have been converted to commercial uses, one- to two-story commercial structures, two- to three-story multi-family residential structures, and four- to five-story mixed-used residential and commercial buildings. One block to the southeast, the neighborhood character transitions to primarily residential uses of varying scales. Established single-family residential areas extend east and west of the Greenwood Ave N corridor. Residential structures in the vicinity are frequently characterized by modest setbacks and recessed entries. A strong street edge is present along Greenwood Ave N.

The area was rezoned from Neighborhood Commercial 2-40 to Neighborhood Commercial 2-55 (M) on April 19, 2019. A recent development trend has been for midrise mixed-use residential and commercial structures to replace lowrise developments. New structures commonly include a strong street edge, defined podium level, and large glazing at the pedestrian level.

There is no existing or proposed vehicular access. Existing and proposed pedestrian access occurs from Greenwood Ave N.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The public comment period ended on January 19, 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:

A request for confirmation that the 5' setback from the north property line will be incorporated into the building plans, encouraged creating a comfortable presence by including lots of plant life, a preference massing Option C because it has the cleanest silhouette and an attractive façade with many windows, and felt the staggered setbacks in massing Option A make for a crazy train of a building, although the code-required wonkiness has been softened with smart design. Other comments included an observation that each massing option had been carefully thought through, taking the characteristics of the neighborhood and surrounding buildings into consideration, a need for housing and density in the area, concern the project will not meet the Living Building Challenge requirements, concern the requirements of the Living Building Challenge are not rigorous enough for the benefits the project receives, and support for the project from multiple parties.

Comments were also received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis per SMC 23.41 and 25.05.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

The design review packets include information presented at the meetings and are available online by entering the record numbers at this website:

<http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx>

The meeting reports and any recordings of the Design Review Board meetings are available in the project file. The meeting reports summarize the meetings and are not transcripts.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned that the building feels obtrusive to the neighborhood.
- Noted that the height of the structure needs to be scaled down; the form of Massing Option B does not appear as tall and would better bridge the existing structure heights with the additional height allowed under the Living Building Pilot Program.
- Concerned that the building looms over the sidewalk and stated that a setback over the commercial space would be a better response to the street.
- Preferred Massing Option C as it provides a uniform 5' setback along the north property line, which allows the church access to their south façade to make needed repairs in the future, and reduces the perceived height of the building on its west façade.
- Did not support massing options A and B, which eliminate access to the church's southern façade and bring up concerns around drainage and lighting.
- Requested shadow studies of a Code complaint building in order to compare the shadow studies shown of the proposed 6 story building.
- Noted the adjacent north property is a split zone and treating that parcel as a single-family zone is not a unique condition within the City of Seattle.
- Encouraged consideration of the treatment of the single-family zone transition as it relates to access to natural light, air, and privacy.
- Noted the residential entry lacks distinction and appears utilitarian.
- Noted a continuation of the awnings on the Fini building would make for a more coherent streetscape.
- Would like to see the bus stop improved since this building provides no parking.
- Stated the project should add to the existing pedestrian infrastructure, such as by creating a new crosswalk.
- Stated the design team should show how they will meet the Living Building Pilot Program requirements and suggested using the south façade for energy generation above the adjacent Fini building.
- Concerned about the project's ability to meet the requirements of the Living Building Pilot Program and requested verification of the requirement that 75% of the roof area is devoted to solar panels.
- Questioned why the first floor is 13' high.
- Requested clarification on whether the existing power lines in front of the structure will be removed.

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

- Objected to the proposed building height, noting the smaller scale of existing structures in the neighborhood.
- Concerned the design is out of character with the surrounding architectural context.
- Concerned about blocked access to sunlight and air and impacts to the view corridor caused by the increased height, bulk, scale, and setback departures.

- Requested stepping back the west façade on the fourth level – similar to the adjacent Fini development – to respect the adjacent single family residential zone and minimize shadow impacts.
- Encouraged converting the roof top social area into a green roof for ecological benefits and to reduce noise pollution and heat.
- Suggested reducing window size on the west façade to minimize light pollution and privacy impacts to the residential zone.
- Concerned about the proximity of the proposed development to the adjacent church, including impacts to church access and blocked sunlight; requested setting back from the church and articulation on the north façade to reduce shadow impacts.
- Opposed to solid waste staging in the public right-of-way.
- Supported Option C, which does the most to mitigate the relationship between the new and existing structures.
- Opposed to removing the two mature trees in front of the property.
- Encouraged the design and exterior materials to be consistent and harmonize with the existing surrounding buildings.

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning parking, unit size, housing affordability, zoning, displacement, density, and construction impacts.

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) offered the following comments:

- Stated that a 6’ sidewalk and 5.5’ planting strip are required to the extent these improvements can be accommodated behind the existing curb line.
- Stated that the existing street tree likely needs to be preserved.
- Requested clarification regarding the solid waste collection plan.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with building height calculations and bicycle storage standards are addressed under the City’s zoning code and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number-EG: <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 Options & East Façade Treatment

- a. The Board directed further development of a hybrid massing option that combines the articulation and concept of the east façade of Option B with the setbacks of Option C.

(CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-3, CS3-A-4, CS3-I and CS3-II of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)

- b. The Board stated that Massing Option B's east façade is a more appropriate response to the character of the neighborhood. Its solid appearance and reduced glazing at the upper levels creates a street facing façade that better fits into the surrounding context of the Greenwood-Phinney neighborhood. (CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-3, CS3-A-4, CS3-I and CS3-II of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)
- c. In agreement with public comment, the Board stated that the marriage of setbacks proposed in Massing Option C results in a more compatible structure to the adjacent church to the north and the surrounding context and character. Specifically, the Board would like to see the 5 foot setback from the north property line maintained. (CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-3, CS3-A-4, CS3-I and CS3-II of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)
- d. The Board supported the bay concept on the east façade of Massing Option C as it is in keeping with the context of bays seen along Greenwood Avenue North. The Board encouraged maintaining the bay concept as the design evolves, but noted it is not crucial to the success of the design concept. (CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-3, CS3-A-4, CS3-I and CS3-II of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)

2. North and South Facades

- a. The Board supported the composition and backdrop tapestry concept of the north and south facades of Massing Options B and C. The Board noted that the semi-random pattern of window openings and panel widths complement the overall design concept and the building's context within the neighborhood. The Board recommended maintaining these facade expressions as the design evolves. (CS2-A, DC2-B-1)

3. West Façade & Zone Transition

- a. The Board supported the light and open quality of the balconies on the west façade of Massing Option C as they appear to be floating and better assist in the transition to the single-family zone to the west. (DC2, DC2-C)
- b. The Board preferred the balcony configuration of Massing Option C; however, they acknowledged that evolution of the mass in response to guidance may affect the design resolution of the west façade. (DC2, DC2-C)

4. Street Level Character

- a. The Board noted it is not necessary to set the building back at the street level as it would be out of character with the architectural context and further constrain the narrow frontage. (CS2-A, CS2-B)
- b. The Board supported the alternative ground level plan shown on page 49 of the EDG packet and noted that relocating the solid waste storage room and exit to the north façade reduces the blank wall condition along the street frontage. The Board requested a high level of glazing and transparency along the street. Additionally, if the location of the penthouse, elevator, and stair core is contributing to the blank wall condition, it would be acceptable for it to be moved to the south property line. (PL3-A, PL3-C, DC2-B-2)

- c. The Board deliberated on the requested departure from blank façade requirements, as discussed in the departure section of the report below. If the request is maintained and a portion of east façade is blank at the ground level, the Board requested further study of treatment options that provide texture and engagement. (PL3-A, PL3-C, DC2-B-2)
- d. In response to public comment, the Board noted the importance of providing a high-quality pedestrian experience through transparency and materiality. (PL1-B-3, PL2-B-3, PL3-C, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-I of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)

5. Materials

- a. The Board recognized that materiality is an important part of the character of the Greenwood-Phinney neighborhood, particularly the use of brick and high-quality, long lasting materials. The Board recommended the use of these types of materials and stated that the material palette should be supported by in-depth contextual material studies at the Recommendation phase. (CS3-A-3, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-I of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)
- b. The Board noted the pedestrian experience, especially on such a narrow frontage, will be dictated by the material treatment. (CS3-A-3, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-I of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)

RECOMMENDATION JULY 25, 2022

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- General support for the project.
- Urged the Board not to make a final recommendation for the project because the departures and additional height are dependent on whether the project meets the requirements of the Living Building Pilot Program.
- Concerns about how the project will meet the requirements of the Living Building Pilot Program.
- Concern the building will block light into the north adjacent church sanctuary.
- Concern the project is not providing any on site parking.

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

- Requested confirmation that the 5' setback from the north property line will be incorporated into the building plans.
- Encouraged creating a comfortable presence by including lots of plant life.
- Preferred Option C because it has the cleanest silhouette and an attractive façade with many windows.
- Felt the staggered setbacks in Option A make for a crazy train of a building, although the code-required wonkiness has been softened with smart design.
- Observed each massing option has been carefully thought through, taking the characteristics of the neighborhood and surrounding buildings into consideration.

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning housing affordability, demand, and density.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable

Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number-LU: <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

- a. The Board noted approval for the design development of the project from the Early Design Guidance. Specifically, the Board approved the ground floor development, the base/middle/top massing typology and the proposed setbacks. (CS2-A, CS2-D5, PL3-A, PL3-B, DC1-A, DC2-B-1 and CS3, DC2 of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)
- b. The Board discussed the pushing and pulling of the street facing façade and the idea of pulling the middle gray portion toward the street by one foot or allowing the upper level to recess by one foot. Ultimately, the Board members agreed that the proposed façade treatment had enough variation in scale, color palette, and tapering of walls for the street facing façade and declined to recommend a condition. (DC2-A-2)

2. West Façade and Zone Transition

- a. The Board approved the design of the balconies on the West façade that are residential in scale. (DC2-C and DC2-I of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)
- b. The Board approved of the applicant's approach to the single-family zone transition to the west. (CS2-D-3 and CS2-II of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)
- c. The Board briefly discussed adding a green wall feature along the south façade for the residents of the adjacent Fini Condominiums to view and provide a green element in the single-family zone transition. The Board acknowledged potential maintenance concerns regarding a green wall and ultimately agreed that the clean lines and variation in the metal panels created the best composition. (DC2-B-1)

3. Street Level Character

- a. The Board noted approval for the use of brick and its installation to enhance the street level. The light-colored wood and ample transparency are positive aspects of the design. The Board specifically commended the applicant on the level of effort and creativity in working with Seattle Public Utilities to push the solid waste storage back into the building to remove it from the street facing façade. (PL2-B-3, DC1-A, DC1-C-4, DC4-A and DC4-II of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)
- b. The Board approved of the development of the landscaping at the rear of the project site, and stated that a similar level of landscaping design should be applied at the street, where landscaping is lacking. The Board recommended more robust landscaping along

the street that would better tie into the project and help insulate pedestrians from traffic along Greenwood Avenue North. Thus, in addition to the proposed stones in front of the building, the Board recommended a condition that the applicant work with the planner to add additional plantings at the street and natural barriers along the road. (DC4-D and DC4-III of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)

4. Materials

- a. The Board recommended approval of the proposed high-quality materials that have precedent in the neighborhood and tie into the existing context. (DC4-A and DC4-II of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)
- b. The Board approved of the transition details, emphasizing the importance that the transition details be constructed as rendered and for the transitions to appear crisp and clean. (DC4-A and DC4-II of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based on the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s). The Board's recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

At the time of the **FINAL** Recommendation meeting the following departures were requested:

1. **Upper-level Setback (SMC 23.47A.014.B.3):** The Code states that for a structure containing a residential use, a setback is required along any side or rear lot line that abuts a lot in a single-family zone as follows; a. 15 feet for portions of structures above 13 feet in height to a maximum of 40 feet; and b. for each portion of a structure above 40 feet in height, additional setback at the rate of 3 feet of setback for every 10 feet by which the height of such portion exceeds 40 feet. The applicant proposes to allow a portion of the structure to intrude within the required setback above 40 feet, resulting in a 15-foot 5-inch minimum setback on the west façade.

The Board agreed that the reduced setback allows for a design that maintains an open space at ground level between the subject lot and adjacent west lot, allows space for landscaping and screening elements at the ground level, provides a consistent west façade expression and allows for balconies to act as scaling elements. The Board recommended approval of this departure, as it results in a design better meeting the intent of Design Guidelines CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood, CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale, CS3-A-3 Established Neighborhoods, CS3-A-4 Evolving Neighborhoods, CS3-I Architectural Concept and Consistency and CS3-II Compatibility of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines.

2. **Upper-level Setback (SMC 23.47A.014.B.3):** The Code states that for a structure containing a residential use, a setback is required along any side or rear lot line that abuts a lot in a single-family zone as follows; a. 15 feet for portions of structures above 13 feet in height to a maximum of 40 feet; and b. for each portion of a structure above 40 feet in height, additional setback at the rate of 3 feet of setback for every 10 feet by which the height of such portion exceeds 40 feet. The applicant proposes to allow a 5-foot minimum setback from the entire north lot line.

The Board recommended approval of this departure. The Board agreed that the reduced upper-level setback of the building's north façade provides daylight into the sanctuary of the adjacent church to the north, allows the church to access and maintain their south façade, and creates a cohesive north façade, better meeting the intent of Design Guidelines CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood, CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale, CS3-A-3 Established Neighborhoods, CS3-A-4 Evolving Neighborhoods, CS3-I Architectural Concept and Consistency and CS3-II Compatibility of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines.

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.

Greenwood/Phinney Supplemental Guidance:

CS1-I Responding to Site Characteristics

CS1-I-i. Views: Numerous east-west streets offer excellent views of Green Lake, Puget Sound and the Olympic and Cascade Mountains from Greenwood Avenue North. Where possible, buildings should be located to take advantage of these views and to enhance views from the public right-of-way. Examples of methods to do this include setbacks from view corridors, landscape elements and street trees to frame views rather than block them, and pedestrian spaces with views of the water and mountains.

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.

Greenwood/Phinney Supplemental Guidance:

CS2-I Streetscape Compatibility

CS2-I-i. Reinforcement of Commercial and Residential Development Patterns:

a. Build commercial development up to the sidewalk where possible. Along North/Northwest 85th Street, new commercial buildings should be set back sufficiently to provide 12-foot minimum sidewalks (including street trees and other plantings). Commercial buildings may be setback off the street if pedestrian-oriented space is provided that is enhanced with humanizing components such as trees and other plants, site furnishings and high-quality, well detailed pavements between the sidewalk and the building.

b. Residential buildings (on Greenwood Avenue North and North/Northwest 85th Street) should be setback where possible five to 15 feet from the sidewalk to provide extensive landscaping in the front yard. When possible, first floor residential units facing Greenwood Avenue North or North/Northwest 85th Street should be located at least three feet above the sidewalk level to provide a sense of privacy and surveillance over the street.

CS2-I-ii. Treatment of Side Streets: Some treatment of side-streets off of Greenwood Avenue North and 85th Street is important to create an effective transition to residential neighborhoods. Some options to consider include:

- a. setbacks with view-framing landscaping (see CS1)
- b. arbors with hanging plants
- c. small outdoor spaces with trees and landscaping.

CS2-II Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility

CS2-II-i. Impact of New Buildings on the Street: Consider the setback of upper stories of new mixed-use development on Greenwood Avenue North and North/Northwest 85th Street to reduce the dominance of new buildings on the street. Also, new commercial development should respect the small-scale historical pattern of storefronts on Greenwood Avenue North. Typically, the older storefronts are about 50 feet in width and feature brick, stone or other masonry units. Some also feature architectural details that provide interest and a human scale to the buildings.

CS2-II-ii. Zone Edges: Careful siting, building design and massing are important to achieve a sensitive transition between more intensive and less intensive zones. Consider design techniques including:

- a. increasing the building setback from the zone edge at the ground level;
- b. reducing the bulk of the building's upper floors nearest to the less intensive zone;
- c. reducing the overall height of the structure; and
- d. using extensive landscaping or decorative screening.

CS2-II-iii. Design departures: If alternative techniques are used to successfully achieve a sensitive transition between these zones, the following departures, as set forth at SMC 23.41.012, are suggested for consideration in the Design Review process, to offset the loss of any development opportunity within the Greenwood/Phinney neighborhood:

- a. relax the minimum size limit for nonresidential uses—allow up to a 15 percent reduction in the required commercial area

- b. relax the residential amenity or setback requirements.
- c. allow for a building's ground floor to be built to the property line of the less intensive zone as long as the building wall is less than a single story, contains no windows and upper floors are stepped back appropriately.

CS2-II-iv. Surrounding Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces. Evaluate adjacent sites, streetscapes and open spaces for how they function as the walls and floor of outdoor spaces or "rooms" for public use to determine how best to support those spaces through project siting and design.

CS2-III Architectural Context/Building Entrances

CS2-III-i. Entrances: Even when the principal off-street parking areas are located on the side of the building, a primary building entrance should be located at the corner. This concept is consistent with traditional neighborhood commercial designs and important in facilitating pedestrian activity at the street corners.

CS2-IV Mid-Block Connections

CS2-IV-i. Mid-Block Crossings: Where relevant, consider incorporating and enhancing the mid-block connection concept. Mid-block connections should be visually open and activated by pedestrian lighting, landscaping and human scaled, pedestrian-oriented architectural features and details. Inclusion of public art and neighborhood signage is encouraged. These connections should align with the mid-block crosswalk and may vary in width.

CS2-V Street Pattern

CS2-V-i. Continuity: New development should respond to the existing street pattern to create pedestrian and visual continuity.

CS2-VI Structure Orientation

CS2-VI-i. Orientation: Buildings should generally be built to the edge of sidewalks without setbacks so that ground floor uses are visible and accessible from the pedestrian circulation system. The impacts of new structures on solar exposure should be considered. Buildings located on corners should be oriented to the corner and include entries, windows, canopies or other special architectural treatment. Automobile access, circulation or parking should not be located at the intersections of public streets. Blank walls should be avoided where possible and mitigated with architectural treatment where they are unavoidable.

CS2-VII Mass and Scale

CS2-VII-i. Reducing Visual Mass: Consider reducing the impact or perceived mass and scale of large structures by modulating upper floors; varying roof forms and cornice lines; varying materials, colors and textures; and providing vertical articulation of building facades in proportions that are similar to surrounding plat patterns.

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.

Greenwood/Phinney Supplemental Guidance:

CS3-I Architectural Concept and Consistency

CS3-I-i. Architectural Styles: The Greenwood Avenue North/Phinney Avenue North and North/Northwest 85th Street corridors are characterized by their utilitarian, non-flamboyant, traditional architectural styles (except for churches). Some important points to consider in making new development consistent and compatible with existing development include:

- a. small-scale architectural details at the ground level, including color, texture/ patterns, materials, window treatment, sculptural elements, etc
- b. landscaping is an important component of the overall character, particularly for residential development
- c. personalization of individual businesses is a key feature of both corridors.

CS3-II Compatibility

CS3-II-i. Existing Pattern: Consider using the human-scale historical pattern of storefronts on Greenwood Avenue North as a guide in developing new structures abutting TownCenter streets. New development should respond to Greenwood’s existing context by matching window and opening proportions, entryway patterns, scale and location of building cornices, proportion and degree of trim work and other decorative details, and employing a variety of appropriate finish materials.

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.

Greenwood/Phinney Supplemental Guidance:

PL1-I Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances

PL1-I-i. Pedestrian Open Spaces: Small, usable open spaces are an important design objective. Open spaces incorporating the following features are encouraged with new commercial and mixed-use development:

- a. Good sun exposure during most of the year
- b. Located in areas with significant pedestrian traffic
- c. Storefront and/or residential windows face onto open space, at or above the ground level
- d. There are a variety of places to sit
- e. Pedestrians have something to look at, whether it is a view of the street, landscaping, a mural, etc.

PL1-II Open Space

PL1-II-i. Urban Plaza: Encourage a publicly accessible urban plaza, potentially incorporated into one of the north-south streets and any proposed midblock connection. This adjoining street could be temporarily closed to traffic for special public gatherings. The plaza could include seasonal landscaping and year-round green, seating walls, benches or other street furniture, and public art.

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.

Greenwood/Phinney Supplemental Guidance:

PL2-I Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances

PL2-I-i. North/Northwest 85th Street Corridor and Greenwood Avenue North Corridor, North of North 87th Street: New development should enhance the pedestrian environment and encourage pedestrian activity along the North/Northwest 85th Street corridor and the Greenwood Avenue North corridor, north of North 87th Street. The following measures should be encouraged:

- a. Building entries facing the street
- b. Pedestrian-oriented facades
- c. Weather protection
- d. Below-grade parking, when possible

PL2-I-ii. Pedestrian Amenities: When possible, new development should integrate pedestrian amenities including but not limited to street trees, pedestrian lighting, benches, newspaper racks, public art and bike racks to maintain and strengthen pedestrian activity.

PL2-II Pedestrian Lighting

PL2-II-i. Safety and Comfort: Pedestrian street lights should conform to the existing Greenwood lighting design plan (Lumec Z-14 Green finish GN8TX). New buildings are encouraged to incorporate custom lighting fixtures along sidewalks and public pathways. Special care should be made to not over-illuminate.

PL2-III Street Elements

PL2-III-i. Public Art: Small signs— especially blade signs that hang over sidewalks—should be incorporated. Signage for way-finding, especially parking, is encouraged. Coordinate signage plans with the Greenwood/Phinney Neighborhood Plan.

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.

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.

Greenwood/Phinney Supplemental Guidance:

DC1-I Blank Walls

DC1-I-i. Storefronts: Storefronts are encouraged to be located at the sidewalk edge, particularly in neighborhood commercial districts, and should be continuous, minimizing blank walls. Where unavoidable consider treating blank walls with one or more of the methods suggested in the Seattle Design Guidelines, including:

1. installing vertical trellis in front of the wall with climbing vines or plant material;
2. employing small setbacks;
3. employing different texture, colors, or materials;
4. providing art or murals.

DC1-II Parking and Vehicular Circulation

DC1-II-i. Parking adjacent to a public street: Consider mitigating the visual impacts with street trees, landscaping or other design features.

1. Curb cuts along North/Northwest 85th Street should be consolidated where feasible.
2. Entrances to parking could include special paving and other sidewalk treatments and amenities, such as additional landscaping, signage or art.
3. Access to off-street parking around Palatine Avenue North, First Avenue North and Third Avenue North should be consolidated where feasible.
4. Access at Second Avenue Northwest's alignment is also acceptable to reinforce the grid pattern.

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.

Greenwood/Phinney Supplemental Guidance:

DC2-I Architectural Context

DC2-I-i. Residential: Façade articulation and modulation in the Greenwood/Phinney Ridge Planning Area are most critical in multi-family residential buildings. Use of façade articulation and architectural elements is encouraged to make new construction compatible with the surrounding architectural context. Architectural features such as those listed below can add further interest to a building, and lend buildings a human scale:

1. Pitched roof
2. Covered front porch
3. Vertically proportioned windows
4. Window trim and eave boards

DC2-I-ii. Commercial and Mixed-Use: Façade modulation and articulation are less critical in commercial or mixed-use structures as long as appropriate levels of detail are present to break up the façade. Many of these structures are simple boxes that are well fenestrated and contain a number of details that add interest at the ground level and lend buildings a human scale. Modulation of commercial and mixed-use structures at the street level is discouraged unless the space or spaces created by the modulation are large enough to be usable by pedestrians.

DC2-II Human Scale

DC2-II-i. Building Composition: New multi-story developments should consider methods to coordinate a building's upper and lower stories. The parts should function as a composition—not necessarily requiring the top and bottom to be the same or similar.

DC2-III Mass and Scale

DC2-III-i. Perceived Mass: Consider reducing the impact or perceived mass and scale of large structures by modulating upper floors; varying roof forms and cornice lines; varying materials, colors and textures; and providing vertical articulation of building facades in proportions that are similar to surrounding plat patterns.

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

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

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

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

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

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

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

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

DC3-C Design

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

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

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

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

DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes

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

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

DC4-B Signage

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

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

DC4-C Lighting

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

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

DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

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

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

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

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

DC4-E Project Assembly and Lifespan

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

Greenwood/Phinney Supplemental Guidance:

DC4-I Architectural Context

DC4-I-i. Signage: The design and placement of signs plays an important role in the visual character and identity of the community. Key aspects of this effort are to ensure that the signs are at an appropriate scale and fit in with the building’s architecture and the local district. Small signs are encouraged in the building’s architecture, along a sign band, on awnings or marquees, located in windows or hung perpendicular to the building façade. The following signs are generally discouraged:

1. Large illuminated box (back-lit “can”) signs, unless they are treated or designed to be compatible with the character of surrounding development. Back-lit awnings should be limited to one horizontal-mounted lighting tube. Small neon signs are an alternative as long as they are unintrusive to adjacent residences.
2. Pole-mounted signs. Small monument signs are encouraged as part of low walls screening parking and abutting pedestrian-oriented space. Design should not present a visibility problem to a driver, pedestrian or bicyclist.

RECOMMENDATIONS

BOARD DIRECTION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet uploaded to the project record on July 22, 2022, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Monday, July 25, 2022 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures with the following condition:

1. Work with the planner to add additional plantings at the street and natural barriers along the road. (DC4-D and DC4-III of the Greenwood-Phinney Neighborhood Design Guidelines)

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

DIRECTOR’S ANALYSIS

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.008.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describes the content of the SDCI Director’s decision 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 condition, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable design review guidelines.

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting held on July 25, 2022, the Board recommended approval of the project with the recommendations described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Four members of the Northwest Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the design review 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.F.3).

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 (SMC 23.41.010) and accepts the recommendation noted by the Board.

Following the Recommendation meeting, SDCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendation of the Design Review Board. The applicant's response to the recommended design review condition is as follows:

1. The applicant responded to the condition with a memo from the landscape architect dated September 19, 2022 stating, "The board recommended more robust landscaping and natural barriers such as boulders in the planting strip. We contacted Ben Roberts with SDOT UF and Christina Legazpi with SDOT Transportation Operations who determined boulders were not permitted in the planting strip as we do not have a large enough planting strip to meet the required clearances. In place of boulders, we have proposed the addition of 5-gallon vaccinium ovatum in the middle of the planting strip surrounded by mahonia repens and sword fern. The density of the plants has also been increased to produce the desired robustness, without causing a hazard with blocked sight lines. We hope that these modifications will satisfy the board." The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. The updated landscape plans are reflected in the MUP and construction permit plans. The installation of the landscaping will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

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

The Director of SDCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four 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 and the requested departures 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 (RCW 43.21C), Washington Administrative Code (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. 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 considered any pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action. The information in the environmental 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) 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 impacts due to construction related vehicles, exposure of hazardous materials, 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. Short term impacts, as well as mitigation, are identified in the environmental checklist annotated by SDCI with additional analysis provided below.

Air Quality – 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 (Air Quality Policy).

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. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities.

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 pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy).

Construction Impacts – Noise

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

If extended construction hours are necessary due to emergency reasons or construction in the right of way, the applicant may seek approval from SDCI through a Noise Variance request. The applicant's environmental checklist does not indicate that extended hours are anticipated.

The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts and no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigate noise impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy).

Environmental Health – Asbestos and Lead

Construction activity has the potential to result in exposure to 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 is warranted for asbestos impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.F (Environmental Health Policy).

Construction activity has the potential to result in exposure to lead. 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 is warranted for lead impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.F (Environmental Health Policy).

LONG TERM IMPACTS

Long term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal. 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. Long term impacts, as well as mitigation, are identified in the environmental checklist annotated by SDCI with additional analysis provided below.

Air Quality – 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.

Greenhouse gas emissions will be generated but will be considerably less as compared to other comparable buildings because the use of fossil fuels will be limited and energy will be generated via renewables. While these impacts are adverse, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A (Air Quality Policy).

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The proposal completed the design review process described in SMC Chapter 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 (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 pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.G (Height, Bulk and Scale Policy).

Historic Preservation – Architectural Resources

The existing structure on site is 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 structure on site is unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Landmarks Preservation Board letter,

reference number LPB 466/22). 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 pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.H (Historic Preservation Policy).

Light and Glare

SMC 25.05.675.K (Light and Glare Policy) provides policies to minimize or prevent hazards and other adverse impacts created by light and glare. The proposed project includes exterior lighting that will be shielded and directed away from properties, per SMC 23.45.534.A. Additionally, no reflective coated glass or highly reflective material shall be used in the facades per SMC 23.47A.002.E.

Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts from light and glare are presumed to be sufficient, and additional mitigation is not warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.K (Light and Glare Policy).

Traffic and Transportation

The transportation analysis (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, Volume 2) indicated that the project is expected to generate a total of 131 net new daily vehicle trips, nine net new AM peak hour trips and 11 net new PM peak hour trips.

The additional trips are expected to distribute on various roadways near the project site, including Greenwood Avenue North, North 70th Street, and North 65th Street and would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections and on the overall transportation system. The SDCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that no mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.R (Traffic and Transportation Policy).

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 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS).** This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(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.

Ellen Aebischer, Green Building Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: September 11, 2023

3032404-LU Decision.docx