

November 5, 2021

APPROVED PRESUB NOTES

ELEMENTS AT GEORGETOWN

3038593-LU - 402 S LUCILE ST SEATTLE
Seattle, WA

MEETING DATE: October 13, 2021

DISTRIBUTION/MEETING MINUTE:

Allen Dauterman	(AD)	Katrina Nygaard -brief	(KN)
Andrew Sandberg	(AS)	Kelsey Timmer	(KT)
Ben Rankin	(BR)	Matt Laase	(ML)
Bernard Morris	(BM)	Megan Adams	(MA)
Bruce Rips	(BR)	Ray Ramos	(RR)
Charles Mason	(CM)	Ryan Broms	(RB)
Christopher Courtney	(CC)	Sonja Brown	(SB)
Daryn Johnson	(DJ)	Stephen Fesler	(SF)
David Huang	(DH)		
Greg Johnson	(GJ)	Angela Wallis -via email	(AW)

Overview of meeting:

- SDCI (GJ) – introduction to SDCI process, will be point person for MUP.
 - Meeting notes will be issued 2 weeks after this meeting or soon
 - Send all notes and issues discussed to city for assimilation
- JMA (ML) – presented overview of project, intent, project goals, schematic drawings...
 - Project to be built on 4 combined parcels, 8-stories, 152 Affordable Units
- City Light (RR) – discussed low & high voltage line feeds around site, clearances, requirements
 - 14' clearance required from high voltage (26kV) lines, 5' horizontal clearance from overhead secondary lines
 - 5th Ave S, potentially main service point
 - 3-phase power (high voltage/14-ft clearance required)/ underground primary service
 - High voltage clearances could potentially be an issue.
 - 4th Ave S has secondary lines & Lucile St high voltage along the south side of street
 - Tree replacement and species can be affected by power lines
 - Recommended team clearly note project as CITY FUNDED AFFORDABLE HOUSING on submittal/application (will get priority review by City Light)
 - ML inquired about overhead high voltage lines and 14' radius - tree conflicts.
 - 4th Ave S & Lucile St are ok
 - Additional study of pole lines and guy wires along 5th Ave S will be needed
 - RR – if new trees proposed (per L.U.), Urban Forestry will provide recommended species
 - City Light can provide "Sag Calc" of power lines to assist in line/pole locations

- Team to provide survey to confirm location of existing lines / poles
- City Light may agree to relocate poles due to right-of-way requirements; maintaining alignment and with proper anchoring if it lends us additional setback space
- AL – how much leeway is there to line locations; TBD after application and pre-app meeting with SCL Engineering.
- RR – City Light will provide guidance on underground services to transformer vault (above or below grade), standards will be in the PAR
- Link to SCL application: <http://www.seattle.gov/city-light/construction-services/apply-for-new-or-upgraded-service>
- SDOT Review (KT) – provided basic overall development requirements:
 - Street frontage basics: 6" curbs, 6' sidewalks, minimum tree planter strips (5.5') between curb and sidewalk with street trees.
 - Required to close any existing, unused curb cuts along frontages with new curb and planting strip
 - A SIP (Street Improvement Permit) will be required, SDOT will coordinate with team at 30% SIP plan submittal (also at 30, 60, 90%)
 - Please reach out to me directly with a survey once you have it, and I can provide additional details prior to your initial 30% SIP submittal to ensure a quick and efficient transition to 60% review. You can reach me at kelsey.timmer@seattle.gov.
 - 2 existing ADA curb ramps (at 4th Ave S and S Lucile St) may not be compliant, will need assessment by civil engineers. Coordinate with civil / survey. Existing Curb Ramp Policy Memo:
https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/SDOT/Services/PolicyMemo_ExistingCurbRamps_Final.pdf.
 - A new curb and street trees are required on 4th Ave S.
 - On S Lucile St, Urban Forestry would like to see the existing street trees (purple plums) removed and replaced
 - The existing ADA curb ramps at S Lucile St and 5th Ave S appear to be compliant, but a civil engineer should confirm this per the Existing Curb Ramp Policy Memo:
https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/SDOT/Services/PolicyMemo_ExistingCurbRamps_Final.pdf
 - Any removal/replacement of trees (esp. along Lucile) will be reviewed as part of the SIP. Coordinate with Urban Forestry.
 - On 5th Ave S a new curb, sidewalk, and planting strip with street trees is required.
 - Vehicle and solid waste access should be from the alley
 - A 5' dedication is required on the alley, and the project is required to pave the width of the alley along the full length of the parcel AD – as 4th Ave S widen north of site, what happens to the designated required setbacks & clearances, is there opportunity for street parking?
 - KT – presence of existing bus stop may make on-street parking infeasible, but this can be discussed during SIP.
 - Although existing poles could be removed in near future, streetlights not currently slated for removal/replacement.

- Vehicle access and solid waste services from alley
 - ML – can address Angela’s email (Solid Waste) separately as she was not present
- SPU/Water (CC/BM) - introduced Bernard (who attended on behalf of SPU)
 - Stated there is 8” distribution main along S. Lucile St and 5th Ave S.
 - Team to coordinate which to utilize during WAC request/process.
 - Apply for water service as soon as possible (full service) when project is further developed. Process is lengthy.
 - Also noted to clearly state that project is for AFFORDABLE HOUSING in application.
 - Most likely 3000 GPM fire flow capacity present at hydrant, will be reviewed in WAC.
 - ML – asked for clarification on permit time, CC confirmed it is valid for 36 months.
- Solid Waste
 - Team - Trash truck operation requirements, can trash truck lift and tip dumpsters in the alley?
 - AW - If all safety and code requirements are met, YES.
 - Collection will be from the alley.
 - The site plan shows a solid waste storage room off alley WITH “tuck under parking” along alley. SPU cannot support this parking if it’s the only location for solid waste to be collected.
 - The LWs can share solid waste services with residential portion if they are rented and not sold individually.
 - Services levels for Residential (does not include LW services – maybe increased after better understanding commercial use/# of LWs):
 - Recycle: 23 CY/wk
 - Garbage: 15 CY/wk
 - Compost: 3, 96-gal carts weekly
- Complete the Checklist for Designers and submit a solid waste storage room detail and truck access/collection plan to SPU_SolidWastePlanReview@seattle.gov. Please note “Affordable Housing” in the subject line.
- Office of Housing (CM)
 - Will review application as it is submitted, nothing to add at this point
 - Confirmed project with Affordable Housing
 - Asked if other projects on-going in adjacent area.
 - BR - about five additional sites with this one that will be in future development phases with Georgetown Community Development Authority and associated developers; there is a meeting scheduled soon to convene a City staff “summit” on global issues for all the development phases together.
- SDCI (AS) – will be facilitator of this project for Affordable Housing
 - Stated that each individual building will require “separate” demolition permits
 - ML – asked as development will span 4 parcels, can we be assigned one (1) master address number for submittal.
 - AS – address can be assigned at intake
 - Cultural review will be done through Land Use or Historical Review - SEPA
 - Current intake for MUP/Design Review roughly 2 weeks out, but early intake still possible.

- When PAR is issued, community outreach can commence
- Can set up dates now for submittal/intake if we have that in mind.
- ML - with a submittal date assigned, can we submit into system ahead of schedule?
 - AS – yes
- AD – with demolition, will historical/cultural review be required
 - GJ – project will require SEPA, which would then trigger historical, and MUP would be required before demolition permit can be issued.
 - Any potential landmarking would go through DON and would be relatively straightforward
- CC is contact for Stormwater, Drainage (?) refer Q&A online.
- Zoning/LU (SB) -
 - GJ reiterated project will require SEPA, but there might be exemptions from Design Review based on certain factors
 - Avenue for exemption from DRB – will depend on tree analysis (significant)
 - ML – inquired into on-site parking, that our assumption was parking NOT required, (back/forth conversation regarding parking reduction/exemption)
 - BR - noted section in Title 23 which designated that if project provided housing to those at 80% below AMI, parking would not be required)
 - SB – concurred/confirmed (per 23.54.015, table B, item P)
 - ML – requested clarification on setbacks/building modulation requirements
 - AD – asked if we could request for departure from requirements
 - SB – 75’ height limit, anything above 65’ required 8’ setback’
 - 8’ setback is average entire run of each individual façade/side
 - Departures from LU possible, but will require ADR review
 - Street level residential is allowed on all streets/sides, due to low-income housing status and by not being in a pedestrian zone.
 - Team to hold 10’ setback along 5th Ave S to maintain clearance, U.N.O.
 - ML – as alley is 10’ with 5’ additional setback, will not conform, thus how do we comply with 22’ requirement?
 - SB - Parking may need to be set further into the building to gain the full 22’ of backing distance required.
 - AD – inquired if alley is considered 1 or 2-way access (answer was 2, although only 1 vehicle could pass at a time).
 - AD – proposed angled parking as way to be compliant (SB – concurred)
 - GJ – indicated that project would require an arborist’s report to determine condition of existing trees – whether to remove, replacement, or remain.
 - Noted large trees on site (406, 416 S Lucile), if “exceptional” will be required to go through design review, likely either streamlined or administrative.
 - Proposed project square footage puts it in “full DRB”
 - Per SMC 23.41.004.A5, could be Administrative Review
 - Per SMC 23.41.004.e states if project is Affordable Housing status then exempt from DRB, Streamlined internal staff review might the option if

exceptional trees are proposed for removal and there are no needed departures.

- Exemption from Design Review was also discussed, implemented due to current covid times.
- All review paths to be further clarified prior to submittal.

This ends the minutes of the meeting of October 13, 2021. All parties are requested to review the minutes and if there are any questions, please contact the writer; otherwise, the minutes will stand as written.

Minutes Prepared by: David Huang, JMA