

DATE: March 23, 2016
BY: Chris Davidson, Studio Meng Strazzara

**We believe the following record to be an accurate summary of decisions and related discussions.
We would appreciate notification of exceptions to this record within five (5) days of its receipt.**

PRESENT

City of Seattle:

	Name:	Job Title/Location:	Contact Information:
X	Katy Haima (KH)	Dept. of Planning & Development Land Use Planner	katy.haima@seattle.gov 206-684-4193
X	Art Pederson (AP)	Dept. of Planning & Development Land Use Planner	katy.haima@seattle.gov 206-684-4193
X	Ray Ramos (RR)	Seattle City Light Senior Capitol Projects Coordinator	ray.ramos@seattle.gov 206-615-1193
X	Alan Hall (AH)	Seattle City Light Planning Engineer	alan.hall@seattle.gov 206-615-0670
X	Emily Ehlers (EE)	Seattle Department of Transportation	emily.ehlers@seattle.gov 206-233-2644

Development Team:

X	Charles Strazzara (CS)	Studio Meng Strazzara President	cstrazzara@studioms.com 206-587-3797
X	Chris Davidson (CD)	Studio Meng Strazzara Project Manager	cdavidson@studioms.com 206-587-3797
X	Joe Taflin (JT)	Pacland Project Engineer	joe@pacland.com 206-587-3797
X	F. Geza de Gall (GG)	The Velmeir Companies Vice President of Real Estate	fgdegall@velmeir.com 206-678-2696
X	Jerry Kesselring (JK)	The Velmeir Companies Director of Construction	jkesselring@velmeir.com 206-459-5972

CITY OF SEATTLE LAND USE PRE-SUBMITTAL CONFERENCE

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The project site is located at 2939 East Madison at the north-west end of the NC2P-40 zone. According to DCI's GIS map, the property is within a "Pedestrian Area" and has "P" designated zoning. The applicant is proposing an approximately 25,000 square foot, specialty grocery store and 75 apartments at the site.

The applicant's position is that access to site parking should be from Madison Street pursuant to SMC 23.47A.032.A.b because access cannot be provided from an alley, and while the rear of the property technically abuts Dewey Pl., access from Dewey Pl. is infeasible for reasons of site typography, traffic safety, and operations. Access to parking in NC zones is regulated under 23.47A.032 (A.1 and A.2 are relevant, as the site is a P zone). Applicant can apply for a Type I decision based on the criteria listed in this section and/or request a departure. The publication referenced does not supersede the Land Use Code, and is only meant to be an informational publication.

Topographic Constraints

The attached DCI GIS map evidences that the project site is located on a plateau that is level with, and abuts, Madison. There is a dramatic, 30-foot, elevation change running from east to west across the property, with a vegetated, 20-foot precipitous drop from the back of the property down to level of the Dewey Pl. right-of-way. This site topography is a constraint for the use of Dewey Pl. for the customer and commercial vehicle access. *(Include this site feature in the documentation when requesting a Type I decision. KH)*

Traffic Safety Constraints

Dewey Pl. is a local residential (non-arterial) U-shaped street, with approximately 18 feet of pavement width. It has intermittent sidewalks. There are no planter strips. In several places, the sidewalk is in poor shape where the curb is almost nonexistent. There are retaining block walls on the west side of Dewey Pl., immediately behind the sidewalk, that limit the sight distance for any driveways entering the roadway. Currently, Dewey Pl. serves only residential uses and there are several residential driveways on the east side of Dewey. Additionally, there are a significant number of parked vehicles on the west side of Dewey, which narrows the effective pavement width to approximately 12 feet in places. E. Republican, which would also be implicated in making a connection from Dewey Pl., is also a local residential street. Because there is parking on both sides of the E. Republican, there is only 12 feet of effective pavement width.

Although the applicant's traffic study has not been completed, preliminary indications are that neither Dewey Pl. nor Republican can safely accommodate the project's projected traffic volume. The project's anticipated traffic is appropriate for the arterial, Madison. Additionally, many of the Madison trips would be pass-by or considered existing from the existing commercial use to be removed, whereas access from E. Republican/Dewey Pl. would result in all new traffic and a significant increase in trip volume on what are currently low volume residential streets. Finally, Dewey Pl. is not a standard grid system type road—it is an effective dead end with a loop road that would create confusion for the anticipated retail traffic.

Currently, Madison is an arterial with sufficient capacity and with 44 feet of pavement width that allows for a 30-foot travel lane, even with parked cars both sides. There are several commercial driveways located on both sides of Madison, and there are wide sidewalks with clear sight lines. An access to Dewey would introduce a significant increase of daily trips onto a residential roadway while an access to Madison would result in adding less daily trips to an existing arterial because of pass-by and existing use credits.

Based on these constraints, the applicant's position is that side-street project access is infeasible, thus allowing a two-way curb cut on the principal pedestrian street, Madison, that has the width, lane capacity, sidewalks and sight-lines to safely accommodate the project traffic.

(Again, include this information in the documentation for a Type I determination or Design Review Departure. No determination can be made at this time, and including this opinion in the meeting minutes does not indicate that the issue of access has been analyzed by SDCI. KH)

SEATTLE CITY LIGHT DEPARTMENT

1. SCL suggested that design team setup separate meeting with SCL staff as soon as possible to discuss vault sizing, best location for power access and service size for project.
2. AH reviewed current options for access to power. There is overhead 3-phase high voltage lines along the north side of E Madison St., along Dewey Pl there is overhead single-phase high voltage lines, and along the (unopened) E Mercer St there are overhead 3-phase high voltage lines. The Dewey Pl option would not be most economical solution to provide power access for the project because the existing single-phase service would need to be upgraded to 3-phase power at the customer's expense.
3. RR and AH recommended providing 14'-0" horizontal clearance from all of the high-voltage lines. AH was specifically concerned about the north property line along the (unopened) E Mercer St ROW.
4. RR stated that a single power connection will be allowed for the entire site, inclusive of grocery store, retail, and residential apartments.
5. RR closed SCL comments by suggesting to project team to submit SCL application early.

STREET IMPROVEMENT

1. EE stated that a SIP is required for street frontage along Dewey Pl. This work will require a 5'-0" ROW dedication. Due to existing condition of sidewalk adjacent to street along Dewey Pl, SDOT will accept locating planting strip adjacent to building.
2. EE stated that project fronts along three ROW E Madison St, Dewey Pl and E Mercer St. E Mercer St is an unopened ROW.
3. Project team will need to file a Right-of-Way Improvement Exception Request Form for E Mercer St. CD noted that per CAM 205 project meets many of the allowed exceptions. EE noted exception would still be required and that SDOT would most likely not require street improvement but would instead require a stair climb with pedestrian lighting.

ZONING

1. AP had no comments regarding zoning of project.

LAND USE DEPARTMENT

1. KH expressed concern over the location of vehicular access off of E Madison due to Pedestrian designation. CD stated that E Madison is not labeled a Pedestrian street via GIS mapping. KH to look into it. *Update 4/19/2016: SDCI's GIS mapping system does show that the area is within a P zone, though E Madison is not a designated Principal Pedestrian street. KH*
2. KH stated that locating vehicular access off of E Madison instead of Dewey Pl would require a departure or a Type I determination per the criteria in SMC 23.47A.032. EE said that the curb cut location decision is SDCI's call and not SDOT's. Both acknowledged the reasoning behind not locating vehicular access off of a non-through street that serves single family residential. GD questioned whether we could get a preliminary read on the feasibility of locating the curb cut off E Madison. KH said we could submit a Type I request to SDCI but the final determination will not be made until the Decision is

published. In addition, the DRB can weigh in on the location of parking access at it relates to the design guidelines. Design team questioned whether locating curb cut off E Madison would require a departure since previous projects have moved vehicular access to arterial from side streets without a departure as mandated by the community and the DRB. (If SDCI determines that the criteria for an exception as listed in SMC 23.47A.032 are not met, a departure would be required.

3. KH stated an Arborist Report should be prepared prior to EDG meeting. If any trees on site are Exceptional, one massing option will need to retain the Exceptional trees to be code compliant.
4. KH stated that a traffic report is required with MUP submittal.
5. KH recommends applying for steep slope exception as soon as possible.
6. KH stated it is required to provide (3) separate options for the EDG packet draft, of the three options (1) is required to be a code compliant option. All concepts should be viable options for development, and should be designed to a comparable level of detail for a meaningful comparison.
7. KH requests that design team carefully consider and adequately explain project design where adjacent to residential neighborhoods, this will be a point of emphasis for DPD and the DRB.
8. Preliminary landscape design should be provided for the preferred scheme, inclusive of ROW plantings, rooftop deck, podium level and buffers along single family adjacency. KH recommended paying particular attention to buffers with neighboring single family homes.
9. Provide character delineation of preferred scheme with architectural sketches and diagrams. CS stated that in his experience the boards appreciate the additional information and has seen many projects have to come back due to a “lack of a complete design”. Design team will provide a thorough and well considered design with EDG package. KH reminded the applicant that all schemes should be developed to a comparable level of detail, and that showing the general design intent of character is recommended—this should include materials, precedent studies, or early design concepts to explain how the materials will relate/reinforce the massing, how the massing will be further broken down, or how the design will relate to context.

END OF MEETING MINUTES

Approved 4/19 by Katy Haima, Emily Ehlers, and Ray Ramos.