



Department of Planning and Development
D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3005619
Applicant Name: Matt Driscoll for Dick Mulhair
Address of Proposal: 4047 8th Ave NE

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application for a three story, 30 room congregate residence. Parking for seven vehicles will be located at and below grade. Existing structures to be removed.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review pursuant to Chapter 23.41 Seattle Municipal Code, with Departures:

Development Standard Departure to increase allowable lot coverage (SMC 23.45.010.A.2).

Development Standard Departure to increase allowable structure depth (SMC 23.45.011.A).

Development Standard Departure to reduce the required front setback (SMC 23.45.014.A).

Development Standard Departure to reduce the required rear setback (SMC 23.45.014.B).

Development Standard Departure to reduce the required amount of open space (SMC 23.45.016.A.3).

SEPA - Environmental Determination - Chapter 25.05, Seattle Municipal Code.

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS
 DNS with conditions
 DNS involving non-exempt grading, or demolition, or another agency with jurisdiction.

SITE & VICINITY

The 5,000 square foot mid-block site is located on 8th Ave NE between NE 42nd St and NE 40th St. Two existing structures are located on the site, a multifamily structure and a shed. The building was built as a single family structure in 1908 and has been extensively modified over the years to divide and add residential units.

The site slopes to the west and south, and is zoned Multifamily Lowrise 3 (L-3). L3 zoning continues to the north, south, east, and west.



Surrounding uses are primarily multi-family residential, with the exception of a large Qwest utility building on the southeast corner of NE 42nd St and 8th Ave NE. The buildings are mostly older single family construction that has been modified to multi-family dwelling units over the years. A few nearby 3-5 story apartment buildings consist of mid-century to 1980's nondescript architectural styles. The Qwest building was constructed in 1962 and exhibits typical mid-century brutalism commercial architecture.

The area includes sidewalks and nearby transit stops. One bus stop is located on NE 42nd St at the intersection of 8th Ave NE. Parking is predominantly on-street, with limited parking located in front and behind residential buildings. There are no nearby street trees on either side of the street. Some trees and vegetation are located inside property lines adjacent to the sidewalk. The west side of 8th Ave NE includes a planting strip with grass. There is no alley between 8th Ave NE and 7th Ave NE.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed development includes demolition of the existing buildings and construction of a new three story building above structured and partially sub-grade parking for seven vehicles. The proposed structure would include approximately 30 congregate residences. The proposed parking area would be accessed from 8th Ave NE.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public notice of the proposal was issued on March 22nd, 2007. Five public comments were offered during the review period, either in writing or at the design review meetings.

I. DESIGN REVIEW

DESIGN GUIDELINE PRIORITIES:

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING (October 30th, 2006)

At the Early Design Guidance meeting held on October 30th, 2006 and after visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in the City of Seattle's "*Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings*" and "*University Community Design Guidelines*" of highest priority to this project:

- A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics
- A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street
- A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites
- A-6 Transition Between Residence and Street
- A-7 Residential Open Space
- B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility
- C-1 Architectural Context
- C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency
- C-4 Exterior Finish Materials
- C-5 Structured Parking Entrances
- D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances
- D-2 Blank Walls
- D-3 Retaining Walls
- D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures
- D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities and Service Areas
- D-7 Personal Safety and Security
- E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites
- E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site
- E-3 Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions

The primary guidance from EDG included:

- Proposed residential open space design near the west property line should respond to potential noise and privacy impacts on adjacent residences, and/or the applicant should examine other options for shared open space
- Street front façade should be compatible with existing development by incorporating the external staircase architecturally into the building
- Building entrance at 8th Ave NE should be clearly identifiable and include weather protection
- Incorporate planting, special paving, trellis, and/or other treatments near the driveway entrance at 8th Ave NE
- Use landscaping to enhance setbacks at all property lines
- Proposed building scale should reflect context of scale nearby existing residential structures (windows, door placement, etc)
- Consider referencing nearby contextual building materials
- Provide appropriately scaled design treatment for any blank walls
- Trash should be located away from the street-facing façade
- Provide lighting and landscaping at side setback areas for safety

On March 2nd, 2007, the applicant submitted for a Master Use Permit. On June 18th, 2007, the Northeast Design Review Board convened for a Recommendation meeting. After hearing the applicant presentation and the public input, the Board deliberated and determined that additional design modifications were needed before the project could meet the design guidelines found in the City of Seattle's "*Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings*" and "*University Community Design Guidelines*."

The Board directed the applicant to address the following issues and return for a second recommendation meeting to address remaining guidelines (applicable guidelines in parentheses):

- Reduce the scale of the building and provide light and air to the structure to the north. Possible methods include upper story setbacks, roof modulation, façade modulation, additional fenestration and east and west facades, sun shades, and increased setbacks from property lines (A-5, B-1, C-1, C-2)
- Revise the front entry (A-3, A-6, A-7, D-1):
 - The front entry should be clearly visible and directly accessible from the sidewalk
 - Landscaping, open space, and connection to front entry should be better integrated
 - Incorporate additional lighting at the front entry
- Reduce the number and extent of departures (A-5, B-1)
 - The Board supports departures necessary to cover the parking
 - Where departures are requested, demonstrate project better meets the intent of the design guidelines through techniques such as averaging setbacks, bulk, etc.
- Clarify how the trash area will function and trash receptacles will not be located in the sidewalk area (D-6)

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY **(AUGUST 20TH, 2007)**

On July 13th, 2007, the applicant met with DPD to discuss design revisions to meet the direction from the preliminary recommendation meeting. On August 10th, 2007, the applicant submitted revised packets for the Design Review Board. On August 20th, 2007, Northeast Design Review Board convened for a final Recommendation meeting. Additional materials presented for the Board members' consideration included revised perspective graphics, revised design departure requests and explanatory diagrams, site plans, revised entry courtyard details, elevations, materials and colors, lighting information, and landscape plans.

DESIGN PRESENTATION

Hugh Schaeffer of Driscoll Architects gave the applicant presentation. He explained that the design had evolved after a series of communications with DPD. In response to the direction from the first recommendation meeting, proposed changes included the following:

- The building scale has been reduced by 9%
- The front entry area has been modified to propose additional building modulation, additional landscaping, the front door faces the sidewalk, additional landscape lighting, and a direct pedestrian connection is proposed between the sidewalk and entry.

- The floor plan has been modified to propose a lounge area adjacent to the front of the building, including mail area
- More windows are proposed at the front and rear elevations
- The north and south facades are now proposed within the required setbacks, but an additional concrete slab would be needed for structural weight distribution. The concrete slab would intrude into the side setbacks.
- Materials have been revised to include 9” wide siding panels
- Reduced proposed departure requests:
 - The front façade meets setback requirements except in areas that protrude for additional modulation
 - The proposed upper area of building depth is 72’3” max at areas of protruding modulation and under 65’ in other areas. The proposed depth including garage areas is 84’
 - The reduced front setback would be off-set by an increased rear setback to respond to concerns of privacy relative to adjacent residents to the west
 - The proposed open space has been increased to 14%

BOARD QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

The Board had the following questions and clarifying comments, with responses from the applicant:

- How many bicycle parking spaces are proposed?
 - Nine. Seven are required by the Land Use Code.
- Are there any covered outdoor areas proposed?
 - No, that would have required more departures.
- Would there be any signage on the building?
 - No, just an address
- Are the proposed materials more accurately represented in the graphics or on the materials/colors board?
 - The materials and colors board is accurate
- Why does the applicant think that the energy calculations aren’t related to design review?
 - They will use low E glass on the windows and do not believe it will be an issue. If a materials change is needed after doing energy calculations, the applicant will come back to the Design Review Board if DPD deems it necessary.
- The windows appear to be proposed sliders on the south façade. Is this wise, considering the direction of most inclement weather (from the southwest)?
 - The graphics don’t show details, but there are areas on the windows that can swing out to allow a little ventilation, or the entire slider can open for more ventilation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Two members of the public attended the Recommendation meeting, but declined to enter information on the sign-in sheet. The following comments were offered:

- The neighbor across the street likes the proposal and thinks it’s better than townhouses, which would be the likely alternative. Affordable housing is important for the City, and this is an attractive project. She knows the developer and vouches for his integrity as a builder.

- The neighbor from a block away notes that the existing dwelling units on site have no historic value and are in poor condition. The proposed development will provide more quality living opportunities than currently found nearby. The tall apartment building to the west blocks much more sunlight than this proposal would, and the proposed project doesn't look too imposing or bulky.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

After considering the proposed design and the project context, hearing public comment and reconsidering the previously stated design priorities, the four Design Review Board members came to the following conclusions on how the proposed design met the remaining identified design objectives from City of Seattle's *Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings* and *University Community Design Guidelines*.

A. Site Planning

- A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street. Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.**
- A-6 Transition Between Residence and Street. For residential projects, the space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors.**
- A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.**

University Community Guideline #1 (augmenting A-7). The ground-level open space should be designed as a plaza, courtyard, play area, mini-park, pedestrian open space, garden, or similar occupiable site feature. The quantity of open space is less important than the provision of functional and visual ground-level open space. Successfully designed ground level open space should meet these objectives:

- Reinforces positive streetscape qualities by providing a landscaped front yard, adhering to common setback dimensions of neighboring properties, and providing a transition between public and private realms
- Provides for the comfort, health, and recreation of residents
- Increases privacy and reduce visual impacts to all neighboring properties

The Board noted that the proposed modifications to the front entry improve the accessibility and open space in that area. The modified proposal meets this guideline.

- A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.**

The applicant has modified the proposal to provide increased setbacks from the side and rear property lines and additional modulation at the front façade. The rear deck has been eroded and screened to provide privacy for adjacent residents. The number and extent of proposed departures have been reduced and the applicant has provided modulation and

façade treatment to enhance the design of the proposed structure. The modified proposal meets this guideline.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.

Comments reflect the response to guideline A-5. The modified proposal meets this guideline.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

C-1 Architectural Context. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

University Community Guideline #1 (augmenting C-1). Although no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction in the University Community, project applicants should show how the proposed design incorporates elements of the local architectural character especially when there are buildings of local historical significance or landmark status in the vicinity.

University Community Guideline #5 (augmenting C-1). Buildings in Lowrise zones should provide a “fine-grained” architectural character. The fine grain may be established by using building modulation, articulation and/or details which may refer to the modulation, articulation and/or details of adjacent buildings. To better relate to any established architectural character encountered within the community, consider the following building features:

- Pitched roof
- Covered front porch
- Vertically proportioned windows
- Window trim and eave boards
- Elements typical of common house forms

C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.

In addition to the comments found in the response to guideline A-5, the Board noted that providing more contrasting colors would enhance the building. The Board encouraged the applicant to work with DPD to modify the proposed color scheme (providing more contrast between the south building bay and the north building bay on the east façade).

The modified proposal meets this guideline, subject to the condition listed below.

D. Pedestrian Environment

D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

Comments reflect the response to guideline A-5. The modified proposal meets this guideline.

D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

The developer noted that they will manage the building after construction. Trash will be brought to the curb and stored inside the building, as in other project they own and manage. The proposal meets this guideline.

E. Landscaping

E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites. Where possible, and where there is not another overriding concern, landscaping should reinforce the character of neighboring properties and abutting streetscape.

E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

E-3 Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions. The landscape design should take advantage of special on-site conditions such as high-bank front yards, steep slopes, view corridors, or existing significant trees and off-site conditions such as greenbelts, ravines, natural areas, and boulevards.

The Board responded positively to the proposed landscape plans. The landscaping appears to be appropriately selected for each area, and noted that the proposed planting scheme should include mature and/or substantial plants at installation. The proposal meets these guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendations summarized below were based on the recommendation packet date stamped August 10th, 2007 and materials presented at the August 20th, 2007 meeting. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plan set and other drawings from the August 10th, 2007 and materials presented at the August 20th, 2007 public meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below). The Board recommends the following CONDITION for the project. (Authority referred to via letter and number in parenthesis):

1. The applicant shall work with DPD to increase the contrast in the color palette to enhance the building design prior to issuance of a Master Use Permit. (C-2)

Response to Design Review Board Recommended Conditions:

1. The applicant submitted a revised color scheme to the Land Use Planner on 8/21/07. The proposed color scheme satisfied the recommended design review condition.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

Departure Summary Table

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUES T	APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION	BOARD RECOMMENDATION
Lot Coverage in L3 zones SMC 23.45.010.A.2	45% maximum lot coverage (2,250 SF)	55% at level P1, 58% at level L1, 48% at level L2 and L3	Most of the departure is to cover the parking; the rest is to enclose the stairwell inside the building.	Recommended approval by 5 Board members
Structure Depth SMC 23.45.011.A	65% of lot depth (65' maximum)	84'5" at P1 and 64'8 to 72'3" for L1-L3	Most of the depth is to enclose the parking at P1 level; the rest is from enclosing the stairwell inside the building.	Recommended approval by 5 Board members
Front Setbacks in L3 zones SMC 23.45.014.A	Average of setbacks on either side (15')	10' on the north portion of the east façade	Enclosure of the stairwell and modulation of the front façade, in exchange for increased rear setback above	Recommended approval by 4 Board members

			deck	
Rear Setbacks in L3 zones SMC 23.45.014.B	15% of lot depth (15')	5'	The only structure in the rear setback is the parking covered with roof deck	Recommended approval by 5 Board members
Open Space SMC 23.45.016.A.3	25% of lot area (1,250 SF)	14% (694 SF) split between L1 level deck and front yard	Well landscaped and usable open space, as opposed to sloped open space at grade	Recommended approval by 5 Board members

The proposed design and Development Standard Departures are **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

II. SEPA

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the annotated environmental checklist (March 2, 2007), and supplemental information in the project file submitted by the applicant's agent. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information, and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, 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 (SMC 25.05.665 D1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short-term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: decreased air quality due to increased dust and other suspended air particulates during demolition and construction; increased noise and vibration from construction operations and equipment; and increased traffic and parking demand from construction personnel. These impacts are not considered significant because they are temporary and/or minor in scope.

Compliance with existing ordinances, such as the Street Use Ordinance and the Noise Ordinance will provide sufficient mitigation for most impacts. The other impacts not noted here as mitigated

by codes or conditions are not sufficiently adverse to warrant further mitigation by conditioning. These impacts are not considered significant; however some of the impacts warrant further discussion and review.

Air Quality

Demolition and transport will create dust, leading to an increase in the level of suspended particulates in the air, which could be carried by winds out of the construction area. The Street Use Ordinance (SMC 15.22) requires watering the site, as necessary, to reduce dust. In addition, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA regulation 9.15) requires that reasonable precautions be taken to avoid dust emissions. Demolition could require the use of heavy trucks and smaller equipment such as generators and compressors. These engines would emit air pollutants that would contribute slightly to the degradation of local air quality. Since the demolition activity would be of short duration, the associated impact is anticipated to be minor, and does not warrant mitigation under SEPA.

Noise

Excavation will be required to prepare the building sites and foundations for the new building. Additionally, as development proceeds, noise associated with construction of the building could adversely affect the surrounding residential uses. Due to the proximity of neighboring residential uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675 B), mitigation is warranted. The hours of construction activity shall be limited, subject to the conditions listed below.

Traffic

The subject property is located in an area with existing traffic congestion and narrow streets with restricted traffic flow patterns. On-street parking is also very limited in the vicinity of the project. Due to these existing conditions, the Street Use Ordinance is found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential construction traffic and parking impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Traffic and Transportation Policy (SMC 25.05.675.R), mitigation is warranted. The applicant shall be required to obtain a Construction Transportation Management Plan, as conditioned below.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area; increased demand for parking; and increased demand for public services and utilities.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires on site collection of stormwater with provisions for controlled tight line release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies, except as noted below.

Height, Bulk and Scale

There will be increased height, bulk and scale on this site due to the proposed project. The proposed structure has gone through the Design Review process as noted above and has been conditioned accordingly. The proposed development is allowed in this zone and no additional height, bulk, or scale SEPA mitigation is warranted pursuant to the SEPA height, bulk and scale policy.

Historic Preservation

There is one existing duplex structure on the subject property, built as a single family residence in 1908. This structure has been reviewed for potential historic significance and landmark status and does not meet the criteria for historic landmark designation. No further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies.

Parking

There will be increased parking demand created by the project. Four existing parking spaces on site will be removed. Parking for 7 vehicles will be provided in an enclosed surface parking area, accessed from a curb cut at 8th Ave NE. Additional bicycle storage would be provided adjacent to the garage area inside the building. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Manual indicates that the residential use would generate peak demand for approximately 10 vehicle parking spaces (1.46 spaces per residential unit peak demand).

Given the proposed use of congregate residence, and the proximity to the University of Washington and available transit options, and the urban nature of surrounding development, it is expected that the proposal would not generate demand for additional parking beyond that provided. Data indicates there will be sufficient parking at peak demand times, and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies.

Traffic

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual indicates that the proposed use would generate approximately 6.7 peak hour trips. The proposed development is located in the University District Urban Center Village and is subject to higher volumes of existing traffic. In consultation with DPD's Transportation Planner it was determined that no additional trip generation and distribution information was required and the anticipated number of vehicle trips has been determined not to have a significant adverse impact on the existing traffic patterns in this area. Thus, the noted traffic-related impacts of the proposed completed project are not considered significant and no further mitigation is warranted under SEPA (SMC 25.05.675.R).

Summary

The Department of Planning and Development has reviewed the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file; and any comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered. As indicated in the checklist and this analysis, this action will result in probable adverse impacts to the environment. However, due to their temporary nature and limited effects, the impacts are not expected to be significant.

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 requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- [X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.
- [] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

For the Life of the Project

1. Design, siting or architectural details shall remain as presented in the plan set and other drawings from the design recommendation meeting. Colors shall remain as provided to the Land Use Planner on the colors and materials board marked August 21, 2007.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

Prior to Building Permit Issuance

2. The applicant shall obtain a Construction Transportation Management Plan (CTMP), to be approved by both SDOT and DPD prior to issuance of a building permit. The plan shall address:
 - Hours of truck operation. Due to existing high traffic volumes on surrounding streets, truck traffic to and from the site shall be prohibited before 7 am or after 3:30 pm on non-holiday weekdays, and at any time on weekends.
 - Location of construction worker parking. Use of on-street parking by construction workers shall be prohibited.

During Construction

3. All construction activities are subject to the limitations of the Noise Ordinance. Construction activities (including but not limited to demolition, grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays from 7am to 6pm. Interior work that involves mechanical equipment, including compressors and generators, may be allowed on Saturdays between 9am and 6pm once the shell of the structure is completely enclosed, provided windows and doors remain closed. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.

Construction activities outside the above-stated restrictions may be authorized by the Land Use Planner (Shelley Bolser 206-733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov) when necessitated by unforeseen construction, safety, or street-use related situations. Requests for extended construction hours or weekend days must be submitted to the Land Use Planner at least three (3) days in advance of the requested dates in order to allow DPD to evaluate the request.

Signature: _____ (signature on file) Date: March 27, 2008
Shelley Bolser AICP, Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

SB:lc