



**City of Seattle**

**Department of Planning and Development**

Diane M. Sugimura, Director

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

**Application Number:** 3011549  
**Applicant Name:** Thomas Johnson of Tonkin, Hoyne Lokan  
**Address of Proposal:** 6950 Sandpoint Way NE

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION**

Land Use Application to allow a three-story structure containing a total of 39 low income residential units. Project includes the removal of 31 parking spaces and a carport. One existing stall to remain.

The following approvals are required:

**Design Review** – (Chapter 23.41, Seattle Municipal Code)

**SEPA - Environmental Determination** – (Chapter 25.05, Seattle Municipal Code).

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

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Site and Vicinity Description**

The proposal is located within the property boundaries addressed as 7400 Sand Point Way Northeast. The sprawling area of the former Sand Point Naval Air Station is situated along the banks of Lake Washington in Seattle's northeast sector. The area (Sand Point Magnuson Park) is the former Naval Station Puget Sound now under joint ownership with the City of Seattle, University of Washington and the Federal Government. Lake Washington shoreline borders the area to the east, Sand Point Way Northeast to the west, Northeast 65<sup>th</sup> Street to the south and Northeast 85<sup>th</sup> Street to the north. A two hundred foot wide band along the Lake Washington shoreline is regulated by the Seattle Shoreline Master Program.

The larger area occupies approximately 350.1 acres of land, with two residential zoning designations (Multi-family Lowrise 3 (L-3) and Single Family 7200 (SF 7200)) extending over the entire site. Three zoning overlay districts cover a significant portion of Sand Point Magnuson Park: Sand Point Overlay District (SO) comprised of Subareas "A", "B" and "C"; Sand Point Park area (SK); and a combined Sand Point Overlay District/Sand Point Park Area (SP). The Sand Point property is divided into six activity areas: (1) the North Shore Recreation area, (2) the Education and Community activities area, (3) the Arts, Culture and Community Center, (4) the Magnuson Park Open Space/Recreation Expansion, (5) the Residential Area, and (6) the Federal Agency Use Area. The buildings located throughout the entire development site have a variety of styles and functions.

The specific area of the proposed development is located east of 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast and southeast of Parcel A in the former Sand Point Naval Air Station in Magnuson Park. This project is located on the same parcel as Phase 1 of this development (Permit 6168222) which contained 52 units of housing in two buildings and a separate community building. To the east of the site is Sportsfield Road and public playfields in Magnuson Park.

Located within a multifamily Lowrise Three (LR-3) zone, the site once housed a bowling alley, demolished in 2007, two tennis courts, and a surface parking area.

A grove of several mature trees and shrubs exist along the site's southern edge. The site's topography has a terraced downward sloping condition from west to east resulting in an overall 28' grade change occurring from the high western boundary edge of the proposal site. Conversely, a steep downward sloping condition occurs at the southeast middle area of the site. This area has been identified as Environmentally Critical Area (ECA)-Steep Slope. The applicant has been granted a limited exemption (#6176181) from ECA steep slope development standards for all associated project work within this identified area but ECA review is still required for the building permit application(s). Liquefaction and wetland areas identified in Magnuson Park do not cover the specific development site intended for development.

Surrounding property within immediate vicinity of the subject site is zoned SF 7200 and L-3. Existing development near the proposal boundaries includes multifamily housing to the west, north and south; and Warren G. Magnuson Park to the east.

### Proposal

This proposal is the second phase of a low-income multifamily housing development. Specifically, the proposed redevelopment of the site comprises the construction of a three-story building consisting of 39 low-income residential units. The proposed project, known as "Building 5", is located in the western of the former Sand Point Naval Based on the lot designated "Housing Site A".

### Public Comments

Eight members of the public affixed their names to the Early Design Review meeting sign-in sheet. One person spoke and praised both the project and the process. The speaker said that the applicants, DON's landmarks office, and the Northeast Design Review Board have worked well with the neighborhood in both this project and the recently constructed Brettler Family Place Housing.

## **ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW**

### **Design Guidance**

Proposed Building # 5 (Parcel A) sits between two historic buildings from the former Sand Point military base. A parking lot lies between the parcel and Building # 9. Option A formed an “L” shape that mirrors the barracks style buildings on either side of it. These buildings are gabled, three story structures with the upper floor embedded within the roof form. The adjacent brick structures vary in orientation. Option B formed short wings that modulated the longer axis running east/west. Gables mark the end of the various wings emulating the forms established by the former barracks. The “C” shape plan of the final design option forms a courtyard to the south.

By the Recommendation meeting, the applicant had refined the preferred options for the two structures.

### **Guidelines**

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponent, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the siting and design guidance described below and identified highest priority by letter and number from the guidelines found in the City of Seattle’s “Design Review: Guidelines for Multi-family and Commercial Buildings”. The following includes guidance for project #3011549 (known as Parcel A) which was reviewed by the NE Board at the same time as the subject proposal.

## **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.**

In general, the Board members agreed with the preferred schemes for both sites. In plan and massing, the proposal for Site A (Building # 5) relates well to the adjacent historic buildings. Likewise the proposal for Site B (Building #4) fits into the overall conditions at Brettler Family Place Housing.

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

The proposal acknowledges the gathering and play areas outside of the community building at the Brettler complex.

**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 parti for proposed Building # 5 relates to the historic structures on either side of the development site. The Board expressed its interest in how the choice and detailing of materials relate to the adjacent historic structures.

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

The preferred scheme for Building #4 thrusts itself into an implied court. The other schemes respect this court in a more defined manner. The impetus of the preferred scheme is that it preserves views from existing housing toward the fields and Lake Washington.

**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 Recommendation meeting, the Board noted its interest in how the buildings will interface with the parking lots. This is particularly true for Building # 5.

## **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.**

The massing diagram for the Building #5 preferred proposal relates to the nearby historic buildings.

The goal of Building #4 is to sympathetically insert the building into the ensemble at the Brettler Family Place complex. Particular attention should be given to the design of the tower.

**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.**

As design development progresses, the Board will have a better idea of how well the proposed designs meet this guideline. The Board requested that special attention be devoted to the east end of Building # 4 as it faces Sports Field Road. From the road and the fields, this elevation will have considerable exposure.

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

**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.**

The Board did not specifically comment on exterior materials, preferring to wait until the Recommendation meeting; however, the detailing and choice of materials for Building #5 will need to reflect the project's proximity to the adjacent historic structures.

## **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.**

An axis extends (implied at times) between the parking lot near 62<sup>nd</sup> Ave E and approximately Sports Field Road. The terminus of the pedestrian walkway, which runs between Buildings # 1 and 2 and past the community building (#3), should be appropriately landscaped to encourage views to the fields and to denote the end of the walkway.

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

The Board noted the importance of developing the east façade of Building# 4. See guidance C-2.

- D-4 Design of Parking Lots Near Sidewalks. Parking lots near sidewalks should provide adequate security and lighting, avoid encroachment of vehicles onto the sidewalk, and minimize the visual clutter of parking lot signs and equipment.**

The applicant mentioned several times during the EDG meeting the activity of children playing in the park. The proposal dedicates a play area; however, creating a secure landscape for areas near parking lots and streets is an important consideration. The applicant will need to show how the proposal anticipates this issue.

- 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.**

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

See notes from guidance D-4 concerning children playing near parking lots and streets. A lighting plan will need to be presented at the Recommendation meeting. The plan's design should implicitly acknowledge children's play and provide appropriate levels of lighting to ensure a safe environment.

- 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 a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.**

For Building # 4, the location of the primary entrance is not intuitive given the numerous directions that the tenants could potentially access the building. An entry on the north side makes sense based on the proposed location of the play area. Development of the design should focus on the tower and the east façade.

## **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.**

The plaza design at the end of the pedestrian walkway between Building # 4 and the play area/parking area should be well thought out.

**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.**

## **MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION**

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a design review component on August 25, 2011.

## **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

The Design Review Board conducted a Final Recommendation Meeting on March 12, 2012 to review the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to the previously identified priorities. At the public meetings, site plans, elevations, floor plans, landscaping plans, and computer renderings of the proposed exterior materials were presented for the Board members' consideration.

## **Public Comments**

Two members of the public affixed their names to the Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. No public comments were offered.

## 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.**

The Board discussed the relationship of the street system to proposed Building #5, which is located between two streets. The street on the west side of the site functions as a service alley, but this façade is also very visible from Sand Point Way NE. The relationship of Building #4 has a similar condition with a street front on either side. The east side of the Building #4 site is visible from Sports Field Road to the east. The applicant has proposed parking and trash/recycling services at these street frontages, treating 62<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE as the “front” of each site.

The Board understood the rationale for placing trash and recycling at these street frontages, but conditioned the enclosure’s gates to have less transparency than the metal mesh shown in the packet. One solution would be metal louvered gates. The Board noted that ideally, the existing trash collection area gates should be replaced to match this condition.

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

The Board appreciated the attention to using the pedestrian paths to respond to the gathering and play areas and adjacent destinations. The 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 Board commended the applicant on Building #5’s design in relation to the adjacent historic structures. The proposal meets this guideline.

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

The Board noted the attention to using the pedestrian paths and formal and informal play areas to respond to views to the east. The proposal meets this guideline.

- 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.**

The Board didn’t particularly discuss the relationship of the buildings with the parking lots, but expressed overall appreciation for the design. The 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.**

The Board commended the applicant on the design of Building #5 in relation to the adjacent historic structures, and the design of Building #4 in relation to the existing development. The proposal meets this guideline.

- 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.**

The Board noted that the residential entry for Building #4 is not well articulated and blends with the counseling services entry. The height of the residential entry, the lack of glazing, and the height of the canopy work to diminish the identity of the residential entry. The Board's condition revises the residential entry at Building 4 to increase glazing and modify the canopy to enhance the entry. Possible solutions include stepping the height of the canopy at the residential entry, extending the canopy another story in height at the residential entry, or using a different shape canopy above the residential

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

The recommendation reflects the response to Guideline A-5. The proposal meets this guideline.

- 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.**

Recommendations reflect the response to Guidelines A-5 and C-3.

## **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.**

The Board noted the attention to using the pedestrian paths, formal and informal play areas, and landscaping to respond to views to the east. The proposal meets this guideline.

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

Recommendations reflect the response to Guideline C-2.

- D-4 Design of Parking Lots Near Sidewalks. Parking lots near sidewalks should provide adequate security and lighting, avoid encroachment of vehicles onto the sidewalk, and minimize the visual clutter of parking lot signs and equipment.**

The Board appreciated the response to EDG, using fencing and landscaping for security. The 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 Board didn't particularly discuss the lighting plan, but expressed overall appreciation for the design. The proposal meets this guideline.

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

Recommendations reflect the response to Guideline E-1. See D-4 guidance.

- 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 a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.**

Recommendations reflect the response to Guideline C-2.

## **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.**

Recommendations reflect the response to Guideline D-1.

- 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.**

Recommendations reflect the response to guideline E-1.

- 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.**

Recommendations reflect the response to Guideline E-1.

**Board Recommendations:** The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the March 12, 2012 meeting. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plans and other drawings available at the March 12<sup>th</sup> public meeting.

After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the four Design Review Board members present unanimously recommended approval of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below).

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION	RECOMMENDATION
1. Rear Setback. SMC 23.45.518.	15' rear setback.	5' rear setback adjacent to Sports Field Road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site is located between two parallel roads.</li> <li>▪ Property line is set back from Sportsfield Rd.</li> </ul>	Approval
2. Projects into Setbacks SMC 23.45.518H	4' into required setbacks.	Structure and eave would extend 12' into required rear setback.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site is located between two parallel roads.</li> <li>▪ Property line is set back from Sportsfield Rd.</li> </ul>	Approval

The Board recommended the following **CONDITIONS** for the project. (Authority referenced in the letter and number in parenthesis):

1. The gates of the trash and recycling collection areas shall fully screen the interior of the collection areas from adjacent views. (A-1)

### **DIRECTOR'S ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW**

The Director finds no conflicts with SEPA requirements or state or federal laws, and has reviewed the City-wide Design Guidelines and finds that the Board neither exceeded its authority nor applied the guidelines inconsistently in the approval of this design. The Director agrees with the conditions recommended by the four Board members and the recommendation to approve the design, as stated above.

### **DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW**

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.  
**ANALYSIS - SEPA**

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated August 22, 2011. The information in the checklist, public comment, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The Department of Planning and Development has reviewed and annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file; and considered public comments received regarding this proposed action. As indicated in the checklist, this action will result in adverse impacts to the environment.

However, due to their temporary nature and limited effects, the impacts are not expected to be significant.

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, and 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 or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate. Short-term and long-term adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposal.

### Short-term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related activities on this site could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles. Several construction-related impacts are mitigated by existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project such as: the Noise Ordinance, the Stormwater Grading and Drainage Control Code, the Street Use Ordinance, and the Building Code. The following is an analysis of construction-related noise, soils, grading and greenhouse gas emissions.

### Noise

The site abuts 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast and Sports Field Road, which are north-south roadways. Residential properties are situated north, south and west of the project site. Vehicular traffic and outdoor recreation from the neighboring Park property are cited as existing noise sources.

Short-term noise and vibration from construction equipment and construction activity (e.g., backhoes, trucks, concrete mixers, generators, pneumatic hand tools, engine noise, back-up alarms, etc.); demolition of the existing structures; and construction vehicles entering and exiting the site would occur as a result of construction and construction-related traffic. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08) is required and will limit construction noise in Lowrise zones, registering 55 dB(A) or more at the receiving property line or a distance of 50 feet from the equipment, to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. This level can be further reduced by 10 dB(A) between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the weekdays, and between 10:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. on weekends where the receiving property lies within a residential district of the City (25.08.420). The use of impact construction equipment such as jackhammers, pile drivers and other loud noise emitters are restricted further in accordance with SMC 25.08.425.

The Noise Ordinance is sufficient to control construction noise impacts. No potential short term significant adverse impacts to nearby residential uses are anticipated and noise mitigation is not necessary.

### Earth

The ECA Ordinance and Directors Rule (DR) 3-2007 require submission of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction in areas with steep slopes, liquefaction zones, and/or a history of unstable soil conditions. Pursuant to this requirement the applicant submitted a Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report prepared by Gopal A. Singam, P.E. (Krazan & Associates, Inc.) originally dated June 19, 2009 and revised September 17, 2009. The report evaluates the soil and site conditions and provides recommendations for erosion and drainage controls, slope stability, grading earthwork, and foundation construction.

The summary of the Geotechnical Report findings is the following: *"It is our opinion that the proposed buildings may be supported on deep foundation systems extending into the underlying native glacial materials, or on Structural Fill/Controlled Density Fill (CDF) placed on the dense to very dense underlying native glacial soils in slot excavations below the footings."* The submitted report, which is located in the project file, further details the specific requirements for proper installation of foundations; pavements; floor slabs; drainage; excavations; grading techniques; site preparation and seismic considerations.

A DPD Geotechnical Engineer has reviewed the above mentioned soils report in association with submitted plans and has deemed this soils report to be relatively complete for this proposal. The soils report, construction plans, and shoring of excavations as needed, will be reviewed again by the DPD Geotechnical Engineer and Building Plans Examiner who will require any additional soils-related information, recommendations, declarations, covenants and bonds as necessary to assure safe grading and excavation. This project constitutes a "large project" under the terms of the Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code (SGDCC) (SMC 22.802.015 D). As such, there are many additional requirements for erosion control including a provision for implementation of best management practices and a requirement for incorporation of an engineered erosion control plan which will be reviewed jointly by the DPD building plans examiner and geotechnical engineer prior to issuance of the permit. The SGDCC provides extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

### Grading

According to the proposal and the geotechnical study, onsite grading will occur during the excavation phase to establish desired building grades; and to allow for the structures' foundations. Approximately 350 cu. yds. of material will be removed from the subject site and 300 cu. yds. will be used as fill, which could create potential earth-related impacts. The soil removed will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site by trucks. Compliance with SGDCC (SMC 22.804.040) will require the proponent to identify a legal disposal site for excavation debris prior to commencement of construction. 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 manufacturing 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

Potential long-term or use-related impacts anticipated by this proposal include: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased ambient noise associated with increased human activity and vehicular movement; minor increase in light and glare from exterior lighting and from vehicle traffic (headlights); increased traffic and parking demand due to residents and visitors; increased airborne emissions resulting from additional traffic; increased demand on public services and utilities; and increased energy consumption.

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 tightline 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. However, due to the size and location of this proposal, plants, historic preservation, shadow, air quality; and parking impacts warrant further analysis.

### Plants

Per SMC 25.05.675.N, Seattle's SEPA Plants policy aims to "*minimize or prevent the loss of wildlife habitat and other vegetation which have substantial aesthetic, educational, ecological, and/or economic value. A high priority shall be given to the preservation and protection of special habitat types...A high priority shall also be given to meeting the needs of state and federal threatened, endangered, and sensitive species of both plants and animals.*". Additionally, SEPA policy suggests mitigation or denial of a project if it is found, "*...that a proposed project would reduce or damage rare, uncommon, unique or exceptional plant...or habitat diversity for species (plants or animals).*" A row of four Sawara False Cypresses along 62nd Ave NE will be preserved as will another row of Cypresses, apple, birch and English Hawthorne along the driveway that forms the south border of Parcel A. One tree on site, a cypress, will be removed.

In order to guarantee the preservation of the trees, a condition will be added to require the applicant to incorporate an approved tree protection landscape plan with future grading/building permit application plans.

### Historic Preservation

Section 25.05.675 H of the SEPA code describes the City's policies for protecting historical sites. *"It is the City's policy to maintain and preserve significant historic sites and structures and to provide opportunity for analysis of archeological sites...For projects involving structures or sites which are not yet designated as historical landmarks but which appear to meet the criteria for designation, the decisionmaker or any interested person may refer the site or structure to the Landmarks Preservation Board for consideration...When a project is proposed adjacent to or across the street from a designated site or structure, the decisionmaker shall refer the proposal to the City's Historic Preservation Officer for an assessment of any adverse impacts on the designated landmark for comments on possible mitigating measures."*

The proposed project is new construction located within the Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District. The proposal requires a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board (LPB). Although the applicant has applied, the LPB cannot take a formal action on the application until DPD issues the SEPA decision for the project.

The Sand Point Housing Project Phase Two represents the first major project in the new landmark district subject to review by the LPB. The district was designated a city of Seattle landmark district by the Board in March 2011. The landmark's district's collection of buildings and structures was constructed for the purpose of supporting and maintaining the overall function of the former naval air station. The district retains an important collection of Public Works Administration (PWA) and Works Progress Administration (WPA) funded structures and buildings stemming from the nation's pre-war infrastructure, and includes examples of Moderne and Colonial Revival style buildings. Design guidelines have not yet been prepared for the local landmark district.

Although the LPB has not taken formal action on the proposed housing project yet, there has been extensive review by the Board's Architectural Review Committee (ARC), the design subcommittee of the Board, at three public meetings. The applicant also briefed the full LPB in November 2011. The ARC provided guidance to the applicant prior to the Early Design Guidance and Recommendation meetings.

### Shadows

Seattle's SEPA policies are directed at *"minimizing or preventing light blockage and the creation of shadows on open spaces most used by the public."* Areas outside of downtown to be protected include: publicly-owned parks, public school yards, private schools that allow use of school yards during non-school hours, and publicly-owned street-ends in shoreline areas. Magnuson Park (east of the subject property) is the only area protected by Seattle's SEPA policy that could be affected.

Submissions include analysis of shadows cast for the aforementioned Parks evaluated on June 21 and December 21 at the following times: 9:00 a.m., 12:00 p.m., and 3:00 p.m. The study identified the greatest potential for the proposed buildings to cast shadows on Magnuson Park would be during the afternoon of December 21 when the sun shadows to the east. During this date and time, the shadow diagrams demonstrated that shadows cast onto Magnuson Park would be minor.

The affected area of Magnuson Park would be considered proportionally minor in comparison to the expansive area that the Park covers. It is not expected that the proposed development would result in any adverse shadow impacts to Magnuson Park. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted pursuant to SEPA's Shadows on Open Spaces policy (SMC 25.05.675 Q).

### Air Quality

Emissions from the generation of greenhouse gases due to the increased energy and transportation demands may be adverse but are not expected to be significant due to the relatively minor contribution of emissions from this specific project. The other impacts such as but not limited to, increased ambient noise, and increased demand on public services and utilities are mitigated by codes and are not sufficiently adverse to warrant further mitigation by condition.

### Parking

The Land Use Code requires a total of nine parking spaces for the proposal. The submitted MUP plans indicate two accessible parking spaces will be provided on site. An additional seven parking spaces are provided off-site within the Sand Point Overlay District property. Per SMC 23.72.012, required parking may be provided anywhere within the Sand Point Overlay District, including public rights-of-way.

Analysis of the parking demand is necessary considering the context and scope of the project. The *Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) Parking Generation (3<sup>rd</sup> edition)* manual estimates an average demand rate of one parking space per Low/Mid Rise Apartment dwelling unit. Using this multiplier, the estimated parking demand for 17 dwelling units would be 17 parking spaces.

In summary, the balance of the required parking is provided within the Sand Point Overlay District parking plan. At the time of construction of Phase 1 on this site, there were 304 surplus parking stalls in the Sand Point District. As a result, the development should have adequate onsite parking to meet estimated peak parking demand. No mitigation of parking impacts is necessary pursuant to SEPA.

### Summary

In conclusion, several adverse effects on the environment are anticipated resulting from the proposal, which are non-significant. The conditions imposed below are intended to mitigate specific impacts identified in the foregoing analysis, or to control impacts not regulated by codes or ordinances, per adopted City policies.

## **DECISION - SEPA**

The responsible official on behalf of the lead agency made this decision after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the 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 43.21C.030(2)(C).
- [ ] 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(2)(C).

### **CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW**

Compliance with all applicable conditions must be verified and approved by the Land Use Planner, Bruce Rips at the specified development stage, as required by the Director's decision. The Land Use Planner shall determine whether the condition requires submission of additional documentation or field verification to assure that compliance has been achieved. Prior to an alteration of the approved plan set on file at DPD, any specific revisions shall be subject to review and approval by the Land Use Planner.

#### **Prior to Issuance of the Master Use Permit**

1. Update the submitted MUP plans to reflect those architectural features, details and materials described at the Design Review Recommendation meeting; and all of the recommendations made by the Design Review Board and reiterated by the Director's Analysis and Decision.
2. Screen the gates of the trash and recycling collection areas to avoid sightlines to the interior of the collection areas from adjacent views.
3. Embed the 11" x 17" colored elevation and landscape drawings from the DR Recommendation meeting and as updated, into the MUP plans prior to issuance, and also embed these colored drawings into the Building Permit Plan set in order to facilitate subsequent review of compliance with Design Review.

#### **Prior to Building Application**

4. Include the departure matrix in the zoning summary section on all subsequent building permit plans. Add call-out notes on appropriate plan and elevation drawings in the updated MUP plans and on all subsequent building permit plans.

#### **Prior to Commencement of Construction**

5. Arrange a pre-construction meeting with the building contractor, building inspector, and land use planner to discuss expectations and details of the Design Review component of the project.

#### **Prior to Issuance of all Construction Permits**

6. Embed the MUP conditions in the cover sheet for all subsequent permits including updated building permit drawings.

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

7. Compliance with all images and text on the MUP drawings, design review meeting guidelines and approved design features and elements (including exterior materials, landscaping and ROW improvements) shall be verified by the DPD planner assigned to this project (Bruce P. Rips, 206.615-1392). An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at least three (3) working days in advance of field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether submission of revised plans is required to ensure that compliance has been achieved.

For the Life of the Project

8. Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building or the site or must be submitted to DPD for review and approval by the Land Use Planner (Bruce Rips, 206.615-1392). Any proposed changes to the improvements in the public right-of-way must be submitted to DPD and SDOT for review and for final approval by SDOT.

**CONDITIONS - SEPA**

Prior to Issuance of a Demolition, Grading, or Building Permit

9. A construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the beginning of construction. This plan will identify construction materials staging area; truck access routes to and from the site for excavation and construction phases; and sidewalk and street closures with neighborhood notice and posting procedures.
10. Provide a tree protection plan for the two rows of trees indicated on the plans to be preserved on the site.

During Construction

11. Grading, delivery and pouring of concrete and similar noisy activities will be prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, only the low noise impact work such as that listed below, will be permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.:
  - A. Surveying and layout.
  - B. Testing and tensioning P. T. (post tensioned) cables, requiring only hydraulic equipment (no cable cutting allowed).
  - C. Other ancillary tasks to construction activities will include site security, surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance of weather protecting, water dams and heating equipment.

12. In addition to the Noise Ordinance, requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:
  - A. Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
  - B. Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
  - C. Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
  - D. Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
  
13. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.
  
14. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: July 12, 2012  
Bruce P. Rips, Sr. Land Use Planner  
Department of Planning and Development

BPR:drm

ripsb\DOC\Design Review\DEC.3011549 6950 Sandpoint Way NE.docX