



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

Project Number: 3010954  
Applicant: Rico Quirindongo of DKA Architects  
Address: 160 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION**

Land Use Application to allow two, 3-story structures containing a total of 16 low income residential units. Project includes 1,250 cu. yds. of grading.

The following approvals are required:

**Design Review (no departures) (SMC Chapter 23.41)**

**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 involving another agency with jurisdiction.

**Current Development:**

The site is part of a larger development site that includes a two-story early 20th century building used as a private school, and a vacant two-story mid-century office building. The parcel proposed for development is currently occupied by surface parking.



Access:

Vehicular access to the site is from curb cuts at 20th Ave. There are no alleys adjacent to the site. Pedestrian access to the private school building is from 20th Ave and E. Spruce St.

Surrounding Development:

The private school building and vacant office building are located on this site, north of the parcel proposed for development. A four story early 20th century apartment building is located to the east. One to two story residential buildings are located to the south and across the street to the west.

ECAs: There are no Environmentally Critical Areas on or adjacent to the site.

Neighborhood Character:

The site is located near the center of the 23rd Ave and S. Jackson-Union Residential Urban Village in the Central District.

Uses in the area include single family and multi-family (stacked flats and townhouses) residential, institution, and park. Some nearby institutions include Tolliver Temple at 20th Ave and E. Fir St, New Hope Missionary Baptist Church at 21st Ave and E. Fir St, and Yat Sen Cultural Center at 21st Ave and E. Spruce St.

Building heights range from one to four stories. Existing development represents a wide range of ages and styles of construction. The area slopes down to the east. The subject parcel is relatively flat with only an 8 foot difference in grade across the site. The entire private school development site has a difference of 32 feet in grade from west to east. The site is not mapped with any environmentally critical areas in the City of Seattle mapping system.

Open space in the area includes Spruce Street Mini Park, bordered by 21st Ave, E. Fir St and E. Spruce St. Other open space includes Pratt Park near E. Yesler Way and 20th Ave (approximately two blocks to the south) and Dr. Blanche Lavizzo Park near S. Washington St. and 21st Ave (approximately three blocks to the south).

The adjacent and nearby streets are all non-arterials. The nearest arterial is E. Yesler Way, a minor arterial approximately two blocks to the south. Parking in the area is located mostly on-street or in surface parking lots.

**EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: April 6, 2011**

**DESIGN DEVELOPMENT**

Three alternative design schemes were presented. All of the options include structure(s) with pedestrian connections between the First Place School building and the proposal.

The first scheme (Option A) showed a single 4-story apartment building, built to the maximum zoning allowed under the new Lowrise Residential section of the Land Use Code. No parking was proposed with this option. Open space was located at the northeast corner, and amenity space for the residents was located on the roof.

The second scheme (Option B) showed two four-story buildings with a long wall on the east-west axis. The south building was reduced to three stories, east of the street front module. The roof of this building included a green roof with resident access. Open space was located between the buildings, at the southeast corner, and in two narrower areas between the buildings and adjacent to the private school building. The courtyard between the two proposed buildings also included open stairwell and landings for residents to access the units. Residents would access the units from a secure entry point at the north side of the building. Community space would be provided at the east side of the north building.

The third scheme (Option C) showed a very similar design as the second scheme, with one less story of building height and reduced stairways and landings between the buildings. The north building and the west portion of the south building were 3 stories tall, and the east portion of the south building was 2 stories tall. This was intended to provide additional light and air to the interior courtyard and the private school classrooms, as well as respond to the lower height buildings in the nearby context. The north walkway to the building entry was framed by a portico structure adjacent to the sidewalk.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Approximately 4 members of the public signed in at this Early Design Review meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Appreciated the preferred concept, compared to the other options, but had concerns about the unclear entry point and the narrow spaces between the buildings
- Stated that the front setback should be consistent with the buildings on either side
- Concerned with the removal of parking spaces from the site, given the private school busses and employees, and the proposed residents to be added (DPD staff responded that no parking is required for residential development under the new Land Use Code sections, and parking demand comments should be separately addressed to the Land Use Planner, outside of the Design Review meeting)
- Concerned with the tall staircase protruding into the interior courtyard and the narrow pedestrian paths between the north building and the Private school building; light and air is needed to activate these areas.

### **FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: September 28, 2011**

### **DESIGN DEVELOPMENT**

Changes to the proposal since EDG include relocation of the primary entry to the west façade at 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue, centralizing the open space areas, using the community room in the north building to connect the outdoor open space areas in the courtyards via roll up doors, and removing the parking space from the proposal.

The proposed open space scheme includes an internal courtyard area, a teaching garden and young children's play area near the southeast corner, a barbeque area and basketball court near the east property line, and an outdoor classroom between the north building and the private school. The outdoor classroom included patio level with the ground floor of the north building and a set of steps leading down to the ground floor of the private school building. The basketball court would be accessed via this area and would be separated from the barbeque area by a retaining wall and grade change. The outdoor classroom could be connected to the interior courtyard by two sets of roll up doors on either side of the community room in the north building. The outdoor classroom area was shown approximately 5' below the sidewalk at 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue. A fence and brick gate structure and set of stairs separated the outdoor classroom from the sidewalk.

The applicant explained that the grade changes across the site were designed to allow ADA access from the southwest corner of the site to the primary residential entry and the ground floor of the private school. The green roof was also removed from the open space plan to allow for more consolidated areas of open space and reduce stair cases in the courtyard area. The remaining stair cases were designed to maximize light and air to the courtyard area. Open spaces were oriented for maximum sun exposure and ventilation.

The east edge of the site also included a trash and recycling area, which would be collected from the adjacent parking lot to the west under an agreement.

The proposed materials included cementitious board planks, refurbished wood, and brick. The patios and retaining walls were shown as concrete.

No departures were requested.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Approximately 12 members of the public signed in at this Final Recommendation meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Support for affordable housing
- The design will address neighborhood concerns (noise, trash collection, parking)
- 2-3 bedroom units should be located in the north building, and 1-bedroom units should be located in the south building, since the noise from play areas would then just be toward the units with families.
- Sustainable strategies such as solar panels, cisterns, LED lights should be included in the design.
- The garage doors at the courtyards could create a security concern. Consider some other type of access doors.

### **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. The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines & Neighborhood specific guidelines (as applicable) of highest priority for this project.

## A. Site Planning

- A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.**

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board noted that the location, height, and appearance of retaining walls at the edges of the property are unclear at this stage of review. The applicant should provide detailed information about these items at the Recommendation stage of review.*

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the Board discussed the amount and location of the proposed retaining walls. The walls are shown as concrete and are located throughout the site, including the play areas, basketball area, and retaining walls at the south and east property lines. The Board was concerned about the amount of sound reflection that could be generated by the concrete walls and hard surface siding on the building walls.

The Board recommended a condition to design the materials of the retaining walls, patios, and vertical wall surfaces to reduce sound reflection. Possible methods could include gabion walls, wood siding, articulation of siding and wall materials, pervious patio surfaces, and landscaping. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

- A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.**

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed the context of nearby building entry design in relation to the proposed entry to this site. The Board noted that nearby residential design incorporates some front setback with a gradual transition to the front door (stairs, porch, etc.). Nearby “urban” development usually includes a strong street wall adjacent to the sidewalk, with a high degree of glazing and an entry directly from the sidewalk.*

*The Board explained that the proposed entry point is set back too far from the street, in combination with a strong street wall. The entry isn't obvious and the street façade doesn't create an active urban street front. The proposed design should be more wholly residential in feel (clearly identifiable entry, with a front façade setback and less street front glazing), or more urban in feel (minimal front setback with high degree of glazing and entry directly from the sidewalk).*

*If the applicant chooses the residential street front design, the entry should be clearly identifiable from the street. Possible techniques to enhance the entry point include combining the surface with the school entry path for a wider ‘entry court,’ special paving, landscaping, and vertical architectural gateway elements.*

*The Board directed the applicant to design a front façade and entry that relates to both the character of the overall design, and the context of nearby development.*

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the Board expressed appreciation for the development of the street facing façade in context with nearby residential structures and the entry location in the center of the front façade. However, the Board felt that the design of the two-story entry bay was inconsistent with the design of nearby residential entries and the design concept of the proposed development.

The Board recommended a condition to redesign the entry element to clearly express the break between the two three-story buildings. The two-story entry bay should be simply designed, utilize design cues from the two three-story buildings, and create a more welcoming ‘front door’ appearance.

Possible methods to achieve this result could include a two-story ‘gate’ element similar to the courtyard entry gate to the north, redesign of the two-story entry bay to express a simple two-story volume with a shed roof or gabled roof and awning, and a centrally located door with larger windows to either side.

The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

**A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street. Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guideline A-2. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

**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.**

*In addition to the comments in response to Guideline A-2, the Board directed the applicant to carefully design the separation between the two buildings, where that separation will be visible from the street front. This design should unify the two buildings and enhance the street facing façade. Possible solutions could include a wall connecting the two buildings, the stairs as an architectural expression, or a green wall.*

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the Board recommended a condition as described in response to Guideline A-2. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

**A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.**

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board described this as the largest challenge for the project. The Board noted that an overall design concept is needed to unify the residential open spaces for the proposal, including the interior space, the east ‘backyard’, the NE ‘outdoor classroom,’ and the entry court between First Place School and the proposed new building entry. The outdoor spaces should accommodate the building program and promote an overall unified open space design concept.*

*The Board was concerned with the character of the space between the two buildings. This space requires careful design to maximize light and air, visually integrate the external stair and walkways, and create human scale in the interior building facades. The applicant should provide shadow studies, floor plans demonstrating the relationship of units to the courtyard, and interior elevation drawings at the Recommendation stage of review.*

*The Board was also concerned with the narrow corridors for the proposed north building entry and the First Place School entry, in relation to the northeast outdoor classroom area. These areas should be combined to create the greatest usability and visibility for all users.*

*The Board further advised the applicant to examine how the eastern 'backyard' area for the apartments will serve the building program, given the location of any community room, main entry, etc. One possibility is to combine this space with the outdoor classroom space.*

*The Board directed the applicant to demonstrate how the green roof relates to the open space program as well.*

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with how the residential open space will allow for clear sight lines and usable open space shared between the residents and the private school. The Board was concerned about the potential for reflected sounds from the concrete retaining walls, concrete patios, and hard surface siding, and recommended a condition as described in response to Guideline A-1.

The Board noted that the retaining walls on the south and east sides of the site will be very visible to residents to the south and east. The Board recommended a condition to design the retaining walls at the south and east property lines to present a residential scale to the adjacent development.

The lighting plan didn't include fixture information at the Recommendation meeting. The Board recommended a condition to use consistently design light fixtures, and locate fixtures to follow ramps and pedestrian circulation.

The Board also discussed the pedestrian path to the electrical boxes on the south side of the development. The Board recommended a condition to change the appearance of this path to discourage pedestrians from using this area, which is only for utility and maintenance personnel. The path could be crushed rock, stepping stones, or some other material. The Board recommended that a gate should be added at the sidewalk to further discourage use of that area and enhance safety at the edges of the site.

The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

- A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.**

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board directed the applicant to work with Seattle Department of Transportation to see if it might be possible to place the ADA accessible stall in the on-street parking, rather than create a curb cut for one parking stall on site.*

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the Board approved of the removal of the parking space from the site. The applicant noted potential plans to ask Seattle Department of Transportation for an on-street ADA parking space designation, following construction of the development. The proposed development 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.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guidelines A-2 and C-2. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

- 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.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guidelines A-1, A-2, and A-7, as related to the design of the vertical surfaces on site and the two-story entry bay.

The Board also recommended a condition to use color to reinforce the building volumes and overall design concept, and relate to the context of nearby residential buildings.

The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

- C-3 Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guidelines A-2 and A-7. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

- C-4 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.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guidelines A-1, A-2, and A-7. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions 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.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guidelines A-1, A-2, and A-7. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

- D-3 Retaining Walls. Retaining walls near a public sidewalk that extend higher than eye level should be avoided where possible. Where higher retaining walls are unavoidable, they should be designed to reduce their impact on pedestrian comfort and to increase the visual interest along the streetscapes.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guidelines A-1 and A-7. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

- D-7 Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.**

*Early Design Guidance comments reflected those in response to Guideline A-1, A-2, A-6, and A-7. The Board noted that 'eyes on the street,' a clearly identifiable entry, and clear sight lines will add to safety and security for residents. Multiple narrow paths and open spaces with retaining walls, blind corners, and lack of natural light will create challenges for safety and security.*

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the Board recommended conditions related to the entry design, as discussed in response to Guideline A-2. The Board also recommended adding a gate at the south electrical box path and adding appropriate lighting, as discussed in response to Guideline A-7. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

## **E. Landscaping**

- 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.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guidelines A-1 and A-7. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

**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.**

Guidance and recommendation reflect comments in response to Guidelines A-1 and A-7. The proposed development meets this Guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

### **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

No development standard departures were requested.

### **BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

**The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated September 28, 2011, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the September 28, 2011 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and initial recommendation conditions, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design. The Board recommended the following CONDITIONS (Authority referred in the letter and number in parenthesis):**

1. The applicant shall modify the materials of the retaining walls, patios, and vertical wall surfaces to reduce sound reflection. (A-1, A-7, C-4, D-1, D-3, E-2, E-3)
2. The retaining walls at the south and east property lines shall be designed to present a residential scale to the adjacent development. (A-1, C-1, C-2)
3. The applicant shall redesign the entry element to clearly express the break between the two three-story buildings, should be simply designed, and create a more welcoming 'front door' appearance. (A-2, A-3, A-6, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-1, D-7)
4. The south path to the electrical boxes shall be surfaced in a material to discourage casual pedestrian use, and a gate shall be added close to the sidewalk to prevent casual pedestrian use of that area. (A-7, D-7, E-2)
5. The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed color palette reinforces the building volumes and overall design concept, and relate to the context of nearby residential buildings. (C-1, C-2)
6. The applicant shall demonstrate use of consistently designed light fixtures, and shall locate fixtures to follow ramps and pedestrian circulation. (A-7, C-4, D-7)

Response to Design Review Board Recommended Conditions:

1. An EPDM recycled tire rubber sound absorbing safety surface is proposed at the play area at the Northeast corner of the site and all seating areas at the outdoor classroom. In addition, the concrete retaining wall at the east perimeter of the site has been omitted and replaced with a metal fence to minimum the number of hard reflective surfaces. The sound reflection problem is mitigated at the highest "child-traffic" areas with these design revisions. Recommended condition #1 has been satisfied.

2. The proposed retaining wall along the east property has been reduced in height and is no more than 12" higher than the existing concrete wall facing the parking lot of the adjacent property. The gated entry at the midpoint of the retaining wall and the green wall that rise above the retaining wall are visual and experiential improvements to the existing condition. Scale of retaining wall and fence are intended to provide privacy to the proposed residential development while maintaining a low elevation at the adjacent property. Recommended condition #2 has been satisfied.
3. The entry element is proposed as a design of a masonry clad frame around a metal gate system. The proposed gate has some metal mesh panels proposed in a random pattern, with a metal mesh tree symbol to the right of the entry and signage and a metal mesh logo above the entry. The proposed vertical bars and metal mesh panel do not yet achieve the 'welcoming front door' appearance recommended by the Design Review Board. Prior to MUP issuance, the front gate design should be revised to present a more welcoming front door appearance. (A-2, A-3, A-6, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-1, D-7)
4. The south path to the electrical boxes is proposed as a narrow path with a gate separating the area from the sidewalk and a green screen shielding the view of the electrical boxes from the sidewalk. Recommended condition #4 has been satisfied.
5. The color palette has been revised to include a range of soft blues, greens and cream color, accented by natural wood siding and brick veneer, with gray shingle roofs. Recommended condition #5 has been satisfied.
6. The applicant has demonstrated use of consistently designed light fixtures, and light fixtures are proposed at ramps and steps, as shown on the MUP plan set. Recommended condition #6 has been satisfied.

## **DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW**

The proposed design and Development Standard Departures are **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**, subject to the conditions listed below.

## **SEPA**

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated July 11, 2011. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed and annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file; and pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered. As indicated in the checklist, this action may result in adverse impacts to the environment. However, due to their temporary nature and limited effects, the impacts are not expected to be significant.

Codes and development regulations applicable to this proposed project will provide sufficient mitigation for most of the impacts. Further discussion and mitigation of some impacts is warranted, as listed below.

### Short Term Impacts

#### Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. These impacts would be especially adverse in the early morning, in the evening, and on weekends. The Seattle Noise Ordinance permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 10:00 PM on weekends. Some of the surrounding properties are developed with housing and will be impacted by construction noise. The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance are not sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore, pursuant to SEPA authority, the applicant shall be required to limit periods of construction activities (including but not limited to grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) to non-holiday weekdays from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM, unless modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, to be determined by DPD prior to issuance of a building permit.

### Long Term Impacts

#### Parking and Traffic

The applicant submitted traffic study information, including a report (“Traffic Study and Parking Utilization Study” Prepared by William Popp Associates for LDC, Inc. October 3, 2011).

This report indicates that the proposed development would not generate vehicular trips, since the proposal is extremely low income units targeted at populations that don’t tend to own motorized vehicles. The traffic study assumed a worst case potential scenario of 50% of the units owning a motorized vehicle, which could generate up to 3 peak hour trips and 33 total daily trips. This amount of traffic would not have significant impacts on the level of service at nearby intersections.

There is no proposed parking with this development, consistent with Land Use Code requirements. The traffic study indicates that with market rate apartments, there could be a peak parking demand of up to 13 spaces. However, the proposed development anticipates tenants that don’t own motorized vehicles, so the peak parking demand is expected to be far lower.

The proposed development will displace 29 existing parking stalls from the site. These parking stalls are currently used by employees of the existing institution on the northern portion of the site. Existing parking utilization showed the lot is approximately half occupied during the day (peak demand for 16 vehicles). A parking utilization study of nearby on-street parking showed 77% utilization rate, with 85 open parking spaces within 800’ of the site at peak demand times. The City of Seattle defines maximum on-street capacity as 85% or greater utilization. Therefore, there is more than sufficient on-street parking capacity for a peak demand of up to 16 vehicles from the existing institution at this site.

The traffic and parking information has been reviewed by DPD and no adverse impacts have been identified. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

### **DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE**

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

[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 43.21.030(2) (c).

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

- There is no comment period for this DNS.
- 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.
- This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days after the date of issuance of a DNS.

### **SEPA - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

#### **Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit**

1. If the applicant intends to work outside of the limits of the hours of construction described in condition #2, a Construction Noise Management Plan shall be required, subject to review and approval by DPD. The Plan shall include proposed management of construction related noise, efforts to mitigate noise impacts, and community outreach efforts to allow people within the immediate area of the project to have opportunities to contact the site to express concern about noise. Elements of noise mitigation may be incorporated into any Construction Management Plans required to mitigate any short - term transportation impacts that result from the project.

During Construction

2. 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. This condition may be modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, required prior to issuance of a building permit as noted in condition #1.

**DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Prior to Issuance of a Master Use Permit

3. The front gate design shall be revised to present a more welcoming front door appearance consistent with the Design Review Board recommended condition, related to Design Review Guidelines A-2, A-3, A-6, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-1, and D-7.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

4. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Shelley Bolser 206-733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov).
5. The applicant shall provide a landscape professional signed certificate from Director's Rule 10-2011, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Shelley Bolser (206) 733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

6. 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 DPD.

Signature: (signature on file)  
Shelley Bolser, AICP, LEED AP  
Senior Land Use Planner  
Department of Planning and Development

Date: February 9, 2012