



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

Application Number: 3011372
Applicant Name: Douglas Ito, SMR architects for Cathryn Vandenbrink, Artspace Projects
Address of Proposal: 2915 Rainier Avenue South

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a four-story structure containing 10,665 sq. ft. of commercial space with 57 dwelling units above. Green roof planting — includes raised planter beds for urban farming. One vehicle parking is proposed.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review – Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 23.41

SEPA Environmental Determination – SMC 25.05

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

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 3P-65 (NC3P-65)
Nearby Zones: (North) NC3P-65 (South) NC3P-65 (West) NC3P-65 (East) NC3P-65



Lot Area: 23,369 square feet

Current Development: The site is currently an unoccupied single story commercial building (former Firestone Tire Company) with an abutting paved surface parking area. Rainier Ave S is relatively flat between S Forest St and S Stevens St, with a slight slope up to the west toward 27th Ave S.

Access: n/a

Surrounding Development: The Mt. Baker Light Rail Station and public plaza area are located directly to the west and south of the site. North of S Forest St is a one-story commercial building (Pawn X-Change) and East of Rainier Ave S is two, one-story commercial buildings (US Bank and Starbucks Coffee) and Franklin High-School.

ECAs: Liquefaction Prone Area.

#### Neighborhood Character:

The Rainier Valley has become home to cultures and ethnicities that creates diversity in the area. Added onto this diverse population is a multi-cultural arts community that resided along the length of the valley — from writers to dancers, painters to glass blowers, all add to the vibrancy of southeast Seattle.

There is a long history of transit oriented development in the valley. In 1891, a speculative interurban electric trolley was built through the valley to Columbia City, where J.K. Edmiston owned and platted land that was for sale. At stations along the route, communities flourished, including Columbia City, Hillman City, and Mount Baker. In 1907, the city of Seattle annexed most of the Rainier Valley, and in 1911 Seattle voters approved and purchased the Seattle, Renton, & Southern Railway.

In the 1999 neighborhood plans, this area was envisioned as a North Rainier HUB Urban village. In 2010, the plan was updated with the goal: “To create a thriving, safe, attractive, pedestrian and transit-friendly residential /commercial center, which serves as a gateway to Southeast Seattle: supports the residents and businesses currently in Southeast Seattle”.

The updated plan envisions the area as a new transit oriented town center, with the same neighborhood priorities of the initial plan: developing a neighborhood core, creating housing, catalyzing commercial development, offering services, promoting living wage employment opportunities, and offering access to transit and non-motorized travel choices.

In the past year, the City and neighborhood have been meeting to create an urban design framework (UDF), from which a number of recommendations come, including: creating a connected neighborhood and a walkable town center, improving the pedestrian landscape, and reconnecting Cheasty and Mt Baker Boulevards.

This proposal would be the first step in actualizing this plan, and could act as a catalyst for creation of a transit oriented neighborhood town center.

### Public Comments

Public comments were invited at the two Design Review public meetings and the Master Use Permit application. Comments from the Design Review meetings are noted within the Design Review process summaries which follow below. Comments were primarily concerned with the massing of the structure and the exterior materials proposed.

## **ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW**

### Architect's Presentation: (May 24, 2011 and July 10, 2012)

*At the Early Design Guidance meeting, three development options were presented — the ‘Single Boxcar’, ‘Two Boxcar Passing’, and two boxcar passing with a ‘Shaped Leading Edge’. However, all three use a common scheme for the massing and structure siting. The initial massing for the building is a single boxcar. Then, the mass is split into two boxcar masses. A central corridor mass is placed between these two masses to further imply autonomy. To imply direction, the two masses are then shifted in opposite directions from one another. To imply movement on a curved track, the leading corner edges of each mass are tapered, giving the illusion that the building is curving parallel to the adjacent light rail track. On the opposite end of the mass, the exterior walls extend beyond the main boxcar mass giving the impression of the back end of a train. The Mt Baker Station’s visual rhythm of vertical brick piers alternating with open-air breezeways inspired a series of vertical brick piers alternated with transparent storefront glazing on the first floor of the building. These vertical piers provide a strong base to the building and evoke an image of boxcars sitting atop a station track. A horizontal recessed shadow line is placed between the boxcars on top and the track below to emphasize the relationship.*

***The Final Recommendation meeting focused on the two boxcar passing with a ‘Shaped Leading Edge.***

### PUBLIC COMMENT (at the Early Design Guidance)

Four members of the public attended this Early Design Review meeting and one comment letter was received. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- One neighborhood resident was excited about the project and requested the design include more transparency through the building. He also expressed a preference for weather protection.
- One neighborhood resident was excited about the life and activity the project will bring to the area. She liked the building concept, massing and the “spill-out” onto the plaza of the commercial spaces. She also expressed a preference for weather protection along Rainier.
- One Lighthouse for the Blind representative appreciated how The Client and The Architect were working to design the site to be friendly to the sight impaired. He was concerned with the need for a clear buffer between the pedestrian sidewalk and the heavy traffic on Rainier. He suggested that a more defined pathway helps with way finding for the blind. He expressed a need for early warning strips between the sidewalk and the street, especially where there is a bus stop. He also suggested clearly defining the transition between the building site and the public plaza in some way. He also stated that site lighting that isn’t irritating to the blind is also important.

- One Sound Transit representative shared that on other projects near light rail stations, licenses have been obtained to use portions of the light rail plazas by private businesses.

Architect's Presentation: (April 18, 2012)

The design presented at the final recommendation meeting was a further developed version of the work shown at the Early Design Guidance meeting that received a positive response from the Board. All facades and the roof planes have been further developed including materials and colors. Massing moves are reinforced with color/material changes to unify the façades.

Public Comment (at the recommendation meeting)

Four members of the public commented at the Final Recommendation meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Ryan Curran appreciates the annual artspace open houses that are held at Artspace's Hiawatha property. He also liked the garage doors that open in the retail spaces, and at the community room, the use of public art and the roofscape.
- Lee Stanton stated that the materials and façade of the building has improved since EDG. He preferred the smaller scale commercial spaces although he expressed concern for the lack of parking, specifically ADA accessible parking, but understood the concept of the Transit Oriented Design (TOD) and that the building had no parking.
- Cathryn Vandenbrink responded, stating that pullout parking spaces were initially proposed on Rainier Ave South but they were not permitted by SDOT.
- One neighborhood resident was excited about the life and activity the project will bring to the area, specifically the alleyway. He did not like the lone parking space on the NW corner and would prefer to have a pedestrian passageway. He questioned the use of brick, saying it would be a way to save money.
- Susan Cary appreciated the clear access to the light rail station and the commercial feel of the proposal. Also commented that she liked the overall design concept of the building.

**DESIGN GUIDELINE PRIORITIES**

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.

*The packet materials presented at the Early Design Guidance meeting are available online by entering the project number at this website:*

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design\\_Review\\_Program/Project\\_Reviews/Reports/default.asp](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp)  
or contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

**Address:** Public Resource Center  
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98124

**Email:** [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

The Neighborhood specific guidelines are summarized below. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

## 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.

**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 applicant was concerned that the current location of the bus stop may need to be moved north/south of the building to improve the visibility of the commercial spaces. Additionally, the Board was concerned that the curb cut along S Forest St is taking away sidewalk space.*

*The applicant should consider if their design can incorporate wayfinding for the transit station.*

*More direction about this issue is found in Guideline A-3.*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's materials illustrated the future southeast location of the bus stop adjacent to the building. Wayfinding for the transit station has been incorporated into the design. The curb cut on S Forest St has been minimized to add sidewalk space.*

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

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board was concerned that the residential entry as it is currently shown was too diminutive. The Board asked that the applicant explore making more of a statement with the residential entry.*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's material illustrated a clearly identifiable residential entry with a uniquely designed overhead weather protection. The secondary residential entries also provide are clearly identifiable from the street and the transit station entryway.*

**A-4 Human Activity.** New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board asked that the applicant explore adding overhead weather protection along the streets. The Board stated that the corners are considered as the preferred retail locations for businesses and the ability to lease these spaces relies upon a design that encourages human interaction, thus creating an economic viability for the proposal.*

*Generally, the Board has a concern for the visibility of the station from the corner of Rainier and Forest.*

*The applicant should explore outdoor area access for the SE corner commercial space at the plaza.*

*At least one Board member expressed a preference for the plaza as the main entry.*

***At the Final Recommendation Meeting**, the applicant's material illustrated overhead weather protection along the street. The ground level corners are designed to allow for retail locations and are designed to encourage human interaction. The Board is no longer concerned about the visibility of the station. The southeast outdoor area is designed to be accessible for plaza commercial space.*

- 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.

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board asked that two options for residential entry be shown at the next meeting, one at Rainier Ave S façade and one at the S Forest St façade of the building that is also clearly defined.*

***At the Final Recommendation Meeting**, the applicant's material illustrated that the residential entry ways are clearly defined.*

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

- 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 express reservations with short term commercial parking proposed along Rainier Ave S and potential conflict with Metro's ability to stack busses. Vehicle speed and peak volumes make this an unsafe proposal.*

*Since the design review meeting the applicant has been notified by Seattle's Department of Transportation that the pull-out parking design would not be approved through the street improvements process.*

***At the Final Recommendation Meeting**, the applicant's material illustrated that the short term commercial parking has been removed along Rainier Ave S and the potential conflict with Metro's bussing requirements has been removed.*

## **C. Architectural Elements and Materials**

- 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.

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board noted that the residential portion to the building does not appear to display a defined residential composition. More direction about this issue is found in Guideline C-4.*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's material illustrated that the residential portion of the building appears to display a well-defined residential composition.*

- 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.

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board noted they want the applicant to explore more options on the metal siding implementation and to see composition options for the fenestration pattern. The buildings end panel windows should be retain (see D-11 guideline). They did like the rhythm of glazing and columns on the [alley].*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's material illustrated a well-defined composition of materials and fenestration pattern.*

*The Board expects that the brick base will be constructed of a mix of brick color tones.*

## **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 creative lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board noted they want the applicant to explore plaza enhancements, such as outdoor seating.*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's material illustrated a design that potentially enhances the plaza area and creates the opportunity for a lively pedestrian-oriented open space.*

- D-2 Blank Walls.** Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near the sidewalks. Where blank wall are unavoidable, they should receive design treatments to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board expressed an interest in seeing art added to the bike storage exterior wall and the NW corner wall.*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's material illustrated that the NW corner wall area has been reserved for art. No art or artist has been selected. Prior to the issuance of a final certification of occupancy the applicant shall provide this information to DPD staff.*

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

*More direction about this issue is found in Guideline D-10.*

**D-8 Treatment of Alleys.** The design of alley entrances should enhance the pedestrians' street front.

**D-9 Commercial Signage.** Signs should add interest to the street front environment and should be appropriate for the scale and character desired in the area.

*At the next design review board meeting, the applicant should present examples of the commercial signage being considered.*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's material narrated/illustrated the examples of commercial signage that would be available to the building occupants.*

*The Board expects that the signage will add interest to the street front environment and will be appropriate for the scale and character of the building.*

**D-10 Commercial Lighting.** Appropriate levels of lighting should be provided in order to promote visual interest and a sense of security for people in commercial districts during evening hours. Lighting may be provided by incorporation into the building façade, the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and/or on signage.

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board expressed an interest in seeing exterior lighting that gives consideration to the Lighthouse for the Blind's needs.*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's material illustrated an exterior lighting that is considerate to the pedestrian needs.*

**D-11 Commercial Transparency.** Commercial storefronts should be transparent, allowing for a direct visual connection between pedestrians on the sidewalk and the activities occurring on the interior of a building. Blank wall should be avoided.

*More direction about this issue is found in Guideline D-2.*

**D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions.** For residential projects in commercial zones, the space between the residential entry and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and be visually interesting for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops, and other elements that work to create a transition to the public sidewalk and private entry.

*At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board expressed an interest in seeing 'enhanced' entries at the S Forest St and S Stevens St ends to activate the street and street plaza. If the Rainier Ave S residential entry is retained, it needs to be reinforce or enhanced to be clearly differentiated from the commercially entries.*

*At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant's material illustrated 'enhance' entries at the S Forest St and S Stevens St. The Rainer Ave S residential entry has been retained and has been reinforced/enhances to be clearly differentiated from the commercially entries.*

### **Board Recommendation**

The board confirmed that the project has completed Design Review and the applicant can move forward.

The Board recommended all departures need should be granted.

The appliance is not required to return to the Board if the Planner is satisfied with the progression with the design.

### **Summary — at the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting, the Board recommended that:**

1. The Board was concerned with the area devoted to the residential entry lobby on Rainier Ave S. In response, Artspace noted that area is used as a gallery for resident artists displaying sculpture, painting and other visual artwork. It provides the residents with a ‘commercial’ presence on the main street. It also helps to reinforce the commercial nature of the street to help new tenants.
2. The Board expressed their desire to see a bicycle repair tenant in the building along the alley to provide services including bicycle storage to commuters and public.
3. The Board asked that the parapet height be reduce to the minimum required to increase the visibility of the rooftop amenities.
4. The Board asked that the continuous physical barrier of landscaping along Rainier Ave S to act as a buffer between pedestrians and vehicular traffic be maintained — giving a clear path for travel along Rainier Ave S sidewalk.
5. Because of the elevation changes for the NW landscaping area — a pedestrian safety barrier must be provided. Landscaping, the curbing and guardrail must well-designed and detailed in the building permit plans to be issued for construction.
6. The storefront door locations must be retained as shown in the materials illustrated at the recommendation meeting. Additional ‘garage doors’ in the retail spaces would be acceptable, even encouraged on Rainier Ave S.
7. The Board expressed concern about the continuity of commercial signage with different tenants. In response Artspace will implement regulations on signage within the tenant leases to assure signage continuity.
8. The Board expressed concern about the ‘monotone brick sample’ — a slight variety in brick color is desired. In response the applicant has stated the brick sample does not properly show the variety of material, the brick will match the color and variety of Mt Baker Station.
9. The Board was curious about the detailing of the black recessed bands and wants to be certain is reads as a recessed area for the surface of the building. In response the applicant has stated the metal siding will sit proud of the recessed black band which will be a steel channel or break metal shaped in a channel. The recess will be approximately two inches.
10. The Board expresses some concern about the green roof being retained. In response, Artspace is committed to providing the green roof as shown. The green roof is currently budgeted into the project and cannot be removed or reduced greatly in size because of the site drainage requirements.
11. The Board wants to see access to the depressed center section of the roof. In response there will be a maintenance (secured ladder) access to the depressed center section of the roof.

At the Recommendation meeting one departure was required:

A vehicle parking and access departure was requested from the development standards.

The board voted was unanimously in support of any departures need by the proposal. Those departures shall be noted on the MUP plans to be issued.

### **DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW**

After considering the proposed design and design solutions presented in relation to previously prioritized design guidelines and after having heard public comments on the project’s design, the three Design Review Board members present unanimously **recommended approval** of the subject design **with conditions noted below** and unanimously **recommended approval** of the two requested design departures.

The Director of DPD has reviewed the recommendations of the Design Board members present at the final Design Review recommendation meeting and finds that the Board acted within its authority and the Board’s recommendations are consistent with the guideline’s and do not conflict with regulatory requirements.

Therefore, the proposed design is **APPROVED** as presented at the Design Review Board recommendation meeting.

### **CONDITIONS**

Design Review conditions are listed at the end of this report.

### **ANALYSIS – SEPA**

This analysis relies on the *Environmental (SEPA) Checklist* for the proposed development submitted by the applicant which discloses the potential impacts from this project. The information in the checklist, supplemental information provided by the applicant, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The Seattle SEPA ordinance provides substantive authority to require mitigation of adverse impacts resulting from a project (SMC 25.05.655 and 25.05.660). Mitigation, when required, must be related to specific adverse environmental impacts identified in an environmental document and may be imposed only to the extent that an impact is attributable to the proposal. Additionally, mitigation may be required only when based on policies, plans, and regulations as enunciated in SMC 25.05.665 to SMC 25.05.675, inclusive, (SEPA Overview Policy, SEPA Cumulative Impacts Policy, and SEPA Specific Environmental Policies). In some instances, local, state, or federal requirements will provide sufficient mitigation of a significant impact and the decision maker is required to consider the applicable requirement(s) and their effect on the impacts of the proposal.

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, 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 specific circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) mitigation can be required.

The policies for specific elements of the environment (SMC 25.05.675) describe the relationship with the Overview Policy and indicate when the Overview Policy is applicable. Not all elements of the environment are subject to the Overview Policy (e.g., Traffic and Transportation). A detailed discussion of some of the specific elements of the environment and potential impacts is appropriate.

### Short-Term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected; decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from demolition and building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources.

Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general. Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the City.

Most short-term impacts are expected to be minor. Compliance with the above applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment. However, impacts associated with air quality, noise, and construction traffic warrant further discussion.

### Air Quality

The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and will require permits for removal of asbestos or other hazardous substances during demolition. The applicant will take the following precautions to reduce or control emissions or other air impacts during construction:

- During demolition, excavation and construction, debris and exposed areas will be sprinkled as necessary to control dust and truck loads and routes will be monitored to minimize dust-related impacts.
- Using well-maintained equipment and avoiding prolonged periods of vehicle idling will reduce emissions from construction equipment and construction-related trucks.
- Using electrically operated small tools in place of gas powered small tools wherever feasible.
- Trucking building materials to and from the project site will be scheduled and coordinated to minimize congestion during peak travel times associated with adjacent roadways.

These and other construction and noise management techniques shall be included in the Construction Impact/ Noise Impact Management Plan to be submitted for approval prior to issuance of construction permits.

### Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08) is required and will limit the use of loud

equipment registering 60 dBA (not including construction equipment exceptions in SMC 25.08.425) or more at the receiving property line or 50 feet to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekdays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. This condition may be modified by DPD to allow work of an emergency nature or allow low noise interior work after the exterior of the structure is enclosed. This condition may also be modified to permit low noise exterior work (e.g., installation of landscaping) after approval from DPD. Construction noise is within the parameters of SMC 25.05.675.L, which states that the Noise Ordinance provides sufficient mitigation for most noise impacts.

### Traffic and Circulation

Site preparation would involve removal of the existing on-site buildings and asphalt pavement and excavation for the proposed building. Approximately 1,500 cubic yards of material would be excavated and removed from the site.

Existing City code (SMC 11.62) requires truck activities to use arterial streets to every extent possible. Traffic impacts resulting from the truck traffic associated with the removal of the existing building and excavation for the foundation of the proposed building will be of short duration and mitigated in part by enforcement of SMC 11.62. This immediate area is subject to traffic congestion during the PM peak hours, and large trucks turning onto arterial streets would further exacerbate the flow of traffic. Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675 B (Construction Impacts Policy) and SMC 25.05.675 R (Traffic and Transportation) additional mitigation is warranted.

The construction activities will require the export/import of material from the site and can be expected to generate truck trips to and from the site. In addition, delivery of concrete and other building materials to the site will generate truck trips. As a result of these truck trips, an adverse impact to existing traffic will be introduced to the surrounding street system, which is unmitigated by existing codes and regulations. Assuming contractors use double loaded trucks to export/import grade/file material, with each truck holding approximately 20 cubic yards of material, thus requiring approximately 75 truckloads (150 trips) to remove the excavated material.

For the duration of the grading activity, the applicant(s) and/or responsible party(ies) shall cause truck trips to cease during the hours between 4 PM and 6 PM on weekdays. This condition will assure that truck trips do not interfere with daily PM peak traffic in the vicinity. As conditioned, this impact is sufficiently mitigated in conjunction with enforcement of the provisions of SMC 11.62.

City code (SMC 11.74) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that a minimum of one foot of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container) be provided in loaded uncovered trucks which minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed en route to or from a site. No further conditioning of the grading/excavation element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

### 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, they are not expected to be significant.

Long-Term Impacts

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The design guidelines are intended to mitigate height, bulk and scale impacts under SEPA. A project that is approved pursuant to the design review process is presumed to comply with the City's SEPA policies regarding height, bulk, and scale. Through the design and environmental review process, DPD has found no evidence that height, bulk or scale was not adequately addressed through the design review process and compliance with the design guidelines. As such, no additional mitigation regarding height, bulk and scale is warranted or required.

**DECISION – STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (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. 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 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 43.21C.030(2)(c).

The proposed action is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**CONDITIONS – SEPA**

During Demolition, Excavation, and Construction

1. For the duration of the removal of the existing building, excavation of materials, and delivery of construction materials; the owner(s) and/or responsible party(ies) shall cause truck trips to and from the project site to cease during the hours between 4 PM and 6 PM on weekdays.
2. Debris and exposed areas shall be sprinkled as necessary to control dust; a truck wash and quarry spill areas shall be provided on-site prior to the construction vehicles exiting the site if scoop and dump excavation is not used; and truck loads and routes shall be monitored to minimize dust-related impacts.

**CONDITIONS-DESIGN REVIEW**

Prior to Issuance of Building Permit

3. Work with the Land Use Planner to illustrate a vehicle parking design that insures vehicle/pedestrian safety will be in place for the building.

