



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: 3011957

Applicant Name: Brian Runberg, Runberg Architecture,
for Harbor Properties

Address of Proposal: 4600 36th Avenue S.W.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION:

Land Use Application to allow a five-story, 59,111 sq. ft. multifamily structure containing 62 residential units. Parking for 36 vehicles to be provided below grade. Existing structures to be demolished. Excavation of approximately 5,500 cu. yds. of material will occur.

The following approvals are required:

SEPA – Environmental Determination – (Chapter 25.05 SMC)

Design Review – (Chapter 23.41 SMC)

Development Standard Departure Granted:

1. Depart from the structural building overhang provisions of SMC 23.53.035.A.4 to allow two bay window elements to exceed code proscribed maximum width.

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

DNS with conditions

DNS involving non-exempt grading, or demolition, or involving another agency with jurisdiction.

BACKGROUND DATA

Site and Vicinity Description

The project site is zoned C1-65' and consists of two 50' x 115' parcels, at the corner of 36th Avenue S.W. and S.W. Snoqualmie Street in the West Seattle Triangle Neighborhood. The project site includes 100 feet of frontage on 36th Ave. S.W. and 115 feet of frontage on S.W. Snoqualmie Street. The project site is served by a 16 foot wide alley and slopes downward approximately 14 feet from the S.W. to the N.E. corner. Existing structures on the site include a two-story wood and stucco office building, and a surface parking lot with a large retaining wall at the north side.

The project site is located in the neighborhood known as the Fauntleroy Triangle within the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village. Just across the bridge from the West Seattle freeway, the Triangle is bounded by Fauntleroy, 35th Avenue S.W. and S. W. Alaska Street. The area is transitional in nature, changing from large surface parking lots, auto repair garages, warehouses, and underutilized office spaces, to a vibrant community center and active residential and commercial spaces. Several new development projects are underway in the area, which will add to the vibrancy of the neighborhood.

The larger neighborhood context includes the Admiral Junction, which is one of the heart locations of West Seattle. The Admiral Junction is located 7 blocks to the west of the site and is home to an active, pedestrian-friendly shopping district, with eating/drinking establishments and cultural amenities. Large mixed-use shopping areas, including grocery stores, are clustered around the Junction.

The proposal site is served by the transit hub in the West Seattle neighborhood, which includes service on 9 bus lines and will include the new Bus Rapid Transit line within the ½ mile walkshed.

The immediate site vicinity includes the 68-acre West Seattle Park and Community center, which includes a golf course, stadium, and nature center. The center is located one block east of the project site. Directly south of the site is a two-story masonry motel building dating from the mid-twentieth century. Across the alley to the east is a newer 7-story mixed-use concrete and wood frame senior housing facility. To the north of the site is the YMCA complex, which occupies a full city block. Constructed in 1984, the YMCA complex includes several buildings ranging from one to three stories in height and is surrounded by surface parking. Many of the existing buildings surrounding the project site are setback from the street and from adjacent property lines and include surface parking. The newer buildings in the neighborhood are generally built out to the property lines. Due to the sloping topography of the surrounding area, the site is well-situated for city views to the north/northeast and for general territorial views.

Project Description

The applicant proposes to design and construct a five-story multifamily residential building containing 62 units with parking for 36 stalls below grade. A live work unit is proposed at ground level. The two existing vacant structures on the site would be demolished. Vehicular access to the garage would be from the alley adjacent to the site.

The project would be Harbor Properties' third development in the vicinity (others include Mural and The Link). It is the developer's stated desire is to adhere and contribute to the currently-draft Fauntleroy Triangle Neighborhood Plan, which is under consideration by the City Council at this time. The stated design intent is to meet the street, providing animation and curb appeal at the pedestrian level.

ANALYSIS—DESIGN REVIEW

Public Comments—Early Design Guidance Meeting

Eleven people signed in at the Early Design Guidance meeting held on March 24, 2011. The following comments, issues, and concerns were offered:

- Noted that there is existing traffic in the alley, especially from the seven-story apartment building directly to the west of the proposal site. Access from the proposal needs to be located so as to work with the access from that building.
- Stated that the greenscape design for adjacent streets should be designed in accordance with the Fauntleroy Triangle plan.
- Objected to the low amount of parking proposed noting existing on-street parking congestion in the area and that surface parking now on the site would disappear.
- Observed that the location is not a good one for retail and endorsed the residential-only plan.
- Stated the alley should be an alley, not a pedestrian way.
- Encouraged placement of green features and open space on the roof.
- Concerned with the impact of the proposal on the open space of the Merrill Gardens senior housing to the west, which faces the alley. A building form allowing light to reach the Merrill Gardens deck area would be important.
- Observed that the proposal is good, not too tall.

Design Guideline Priorities

After considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the siting and design guidance described below and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in the City of Seattle's *Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings* of highest priority to this project. However, while the notes below indicate the areas the Board determined to be of highest priority to the project, all of the guidelines apply to the project.

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 features.

At the EDG Meeting, the Board discussed the site with its rectangular shape, street corner frontage and sloping street elevation along S.W. Snoqualmie. They thought there should be a corner presence, especially at the ground level, where the residential entry is best placed.

The sloping site could lead to a “diving first floor” relative to the sidewalk and a blank façade, both of which will need to be carefully addressed in the design. The base story needs to have sufficient height for it to express as a base and an inviting interior area.

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

At the EDG Meeting, the Board indicated that the street improvements and the building architecture addressing it should respond to the West Seattle Triangle Neighborhood Plan with its de-emphasis of the automobile and creation of a landscaped, pedestrian-oriented area.

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

The Board indicated that the corner is the best location for the residential lobby as a glass box or other expression. The presence of the lobby needs to be emphasized.

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.

The Board requested the applicants to re-think the decision to not include live/work units at the sidewalk levels. These could provide an appropriate connection to and transition from the public sidewalk. If live/work units are not incorporated, the transition to apartment units becomes more awkward and will need to be carefully designed.

A-10 Corner Lots—Buildings on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.

The Board indicated that a gracious residential lobby with high ceilings would be appropriate at the corner.

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

The Board did not anticipate that the height, bulk and scale would be out of proportion with the zone or vicinity.

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 façade walls.

The Board noted that the images shown in the graphics packet as driving forces in the design seemed to be appropriate and suggested that the applicants develop the design along the designs shown. On a small lots such s this one, the Board stated that the design should not be overly complex. Green factor features, trees, green walls, etc., will be important and should be used to add interest to the structure. Materials seem to be headed in an appropriate direction.

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 indicated that blank walls which might be present around the garage and other elements need to be addressed carefully to reduce their blank, empty appearances.

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.

The Board discussed how retaining walls along public sidewalks should be avoided if at all possible.

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

The Board indicated that the alley should be used as an alley, for vehicle access and service pick up, not as a pedestrian realm. Thought should be given to the pedestrian sidewalk crossing of the alley to incorporate features to enhance safety, such as pulling the building back to add sight lines. The vehicle access point to Merrill gardens should be considered in relation to the access point to the proposed building and it should be moved far enough away from the street to provide safe vehicle/pedestrian interaction.

Design Review Recommendations

The Design Review Board held a recommendation meeting on July 28, 2011 to review and discuss the project. Two members of the public attended the presentation and presented the following comments, questions, or concerns:

- One member of the public stated that she was at the March EDG meeting for this project and was a member of the public that advocated for retail in this building. Since this will be a transit corridor, she wants to encourage walkability and bikeability. The neighbors (Merrill Gardens, YMCA, and refurbished motel) would like to see some sort of retail, such as a market or green grocer at the first level.
- Agree with the general direction of the project and think it integrates well with the Triangle Plan.

Development Standard Departure

The project requested a departure from SMC 23.53.035.A.4. This code section requires bay windows, balconies, and other similar features that extend into the right of way to meet certain development standards. Compliance with SMC 23.53.035.A.4 would result in a series of smaller bay projections. To maintain the design aesthetic of the building, the project requested a departure from SMC 23.53.035.A.4, which would result in two larger bays on the north side of the building, instead of a series of smaller, code-compliant bays. The larger bay is a long, thin overhang measuring 83'07" long by 10" deep, for a total of 69.9 additional square feet added to the entire building. The second bay (just west of the first bay on the north side of the building) is 26'-6" long and 36" deep for a total of 149 additional square feet added to the entire building. Three bolt-on guard rails add to the dimension of the first bay, adding a total of 13 square feet. The total square footage of both bays and the guard rails is 162 square feet.

The departure was requested to maintain the square box/bay design aesthetic of the building consistent with the format shown in the Early Design Guidance meeting and commended by the Design Review Board. The departed bays as designed will encompass only 162 gross square feet of overhang above the right-of-way, whereas a series of code-compliant bays could encompass 228 gross square feet of overhang. In addition, the longer bay was created as a result of setting the street level of the building back from the right-of-way to allow more pedestrian space at street level, and will provide a degree of weather protection to pedestrians.

Board Recommendation

After considering the site and its context, hearing public comment, considering the previously identified design priorities, reviewing the plans and renderings showing the proposed revisions, and reviewing the requested departures, the Design Review Board members recommended **approval of the project's design and recommended approval of the requested design departure**. All five Design Review Board members attended the recommendation meeting.

In response to the Board's guidance the project team revised the project design in several ways. First, regarding the south façade, the board discussed the inherent blank look of portions of the wall. The project team should be careful about the arrangement of the metal siding joints and flashing on the South façade. The massing and modulation of this façade was maintained via the light well and the expression of the stairwell on the south façade to further bring interest.

It was noted by the Board that the project team had added a live work unit on the ground floor and had designed the building with the potential to make 3 additional adjacent units into live-work units in the future. The Board agreed that this was a reasonable way to approach the idea of adding retail.

The Board's guidance included a direction to consider the possibility of increasing the ceiling height and head height of the windows at the level 5 unit at the southwest corner to further emphasize this corner bay

The Board also directed adding a seating area under the canopy as a pleasant and protected resting space. The project team has designed the canopy at the entry to enhance the comfort and identity of the building entry. The canopy is aligned with similar materials on the west façade of the building and is detailed to allow light and emphasis at the entry door as well as covered weather protection. The project team should add a bench under the canopy and should detail it in such a way as to tie into the overall design.

Finally, the board discussed the alley driveway and garage entry door location. The project team has reviewed the placement of the garage door location, which is 13 feet wide due to the topography of the site and the Board's request at EDG to keep the garage entry set back into the building to avoid cars idling halfway across the sidewalk to wait for the garage door to open, and to avoid conflicting with the Merrill Gardens garage entry across the alley. The Board determined that this setback was an appropriate response to the land use code and to the design review guidelines.

Overall, the Board was pleased with the project team's response to the Board's guidance. The Board appreciated the double-height common space, and liked the playfulness of the brow/roof canopy element and the contemporary response to the design. The corner pop-up was determined to be a good measure.

The Board discussed the departure request, and approved it unanimously, stating that the departure for the bays was very important, essential to the project, and "integral" to the floating box design.

The Board recommended approval of the project design without any conditions.

DIRECTOR'S ANALYSIS—DESIGN REVIEW

The Director finds no conflicts between the Design Review Board's recommendations and SEPA requirements or state or federal laws. The Director has reviewed the Citywide Design Guidelines and finds that the Design Review Board neither exceeded its authority nor applied the guidelines inconsistently in its recommendation of approval of the project's design. The Director agrees with the conditions recommended by the Board members and agrees with the Board's recommendation as stated above.

DECISION—DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed **design and development standard departure** is **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED**, subject to the design review conditions stated at the end of this decision.

DIRECTOR'S ANALYSIS—SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts of this project was made in the first environmental checklist submitted by the applicant and reviewed by the Land Use Planner. The initial Notice of Application was issued June 30, 2011 and the Notice was posted on the project site. The public comment period associated with the Notice of Application ran from June 30, 2011 to July 13, 2011.

The information provided by the checklists, the supplemental information submitted by the applicant, and the experience of the lead agency in reviewing similar projects form the basis of this SEPA analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665.D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, certain neighborhood plans, and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority.

The Overview Policy states in part, “[w]here 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 certain limitations. Under such limitations/circumstances (*see* SMC 25.05.66.5.D.1 through D.7), the City may consider additional mitigation.

Short-Term Impacts

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and stormwater 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 adequately mitigated by existing City codes, ordinances, and regulations applicable to this 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/short-term noise, air quality, earth, grading, construction, traffic and parking impacts as well as the mitigation required to adequately address such impacts.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the project could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area, which include residential and commercial uses. Surrounding uses, particularly surrounding/adjacent residential uses, are likely to be adversely impacted by noise throughout the duration of construction activities. Due to the proximity of the project site to these residential uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigation the potential noise impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675.B), the additional following mitigation is warranted to adequately address such impacts:

- Prior to the issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the applicant will submit a construction noise mitigation plan for review and approval by DPD. The plan will include measures to: 1) limit noise decibel levels and noise duration, and 2) procedures for advanced notice of excessively noisy activities to surrounding properties. In addition to compliance with the Noise Ordinance, which requires the project to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be subject to the following, in order to further reduce noise impacts:
 - Construction activities may take place during the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM on non-holiday weekdays.
 - Quieter construction activities may take place during the hours of 6:00 PM and 8:00 PM on non-holiday weekdays, and on Saturdays during the hours of 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM. “Quieter construction activities” will be defined in the construction noise plan, to be approved by DPD. Such activities during these hours will be subject to DPD approval and will require advanced notice to surrounding neighbors.

- Emergency construction activities (for example, those activities that must take place to coincide with a street closure, utility interruption or other similar necessary event) may take place outside of the approved hours, subject to advanced notice to surrounding neighbors as outlined in the construction noise mitigation plan.

Air Quality

Construction is expected to temporarily add particulates to the air and will result in a slight increase in auto-generated air contaminants from construction activities and equipment and worker vehicles. However, this increase is not expected to be significant. Federal auto emission controls are the primary means of mitigating air quality impacts as stated in the Air Quality Policy (SMC 25.05.675). To mitigate the impacts of exhaust fumes on the surrounding residential uses, trucks hauling materials to and from the project site will not be allowed to queue while idling in the surrounding neighborhood.

Construction activities, including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the project's materials themselves resulting an increase of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which may adversely impact air quality and may contribute to climate change. While the increase in greenhouse gas emissions is adverse, the small increase is not significant and no mitigation is therefore warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Demolition of the existing buildings on site could also increase the amount of airborne dust in the air temporarily. The project is required to comply with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's regulation regarding demolition and abatement of existing buildings.

Earth

The project proponent prepared a Geotechnical Engineering Study that included a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and to provide recommendations for safe construction on this site. The soils report indicates that soil types are approximately 1-4 feet of fill at the southwest half of the site and up to 11 feet of fill at the northeast half of the site supported by retaining walls along the north and east property lines. Below the fill is stiff to hard silty clay, clayey silt and silt. There is a localized small deposit of peat in the fill layer. All fill, peat, and some clay will be excavated. The subject site is not located in a designated environmentally critical area based on City of Seattle maps.

The soils report, construction plans, and shoring and excavation plans will be reviewed by the DPD Geotechnical Engineer and Building Plans Examiner who will require any additional soils-related information, recommendations, declarations, covenants, and bonds necessary to assure safe grading and excavation and compliance with all City codes and regulations. This project is a "large project" as defined by SMC 22.802.015.D. As a result, the project will be required to meet several additional requirements for erosion control including a provision for implementation of best management practices and the creation and approval of an erosion control plan. The erosion control plan will be reviewed by the DPD Building Plans Examiner and the Geotechnical Engineer prior to issuance of the shoring or grading permit. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code provides extensive authority to DPD to require

conditions of approval of the shoring and excavation plans to assure safe and environmentally sensitive construction techniques are used. As a result, the existing City codes and regulations adequately mitigate any potential earth impacts, and no additional conditioning is therefore warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.665.

Grading/Hauling

The project proposes to excavate 5,500 cubic yards of material to construct the project. The soil removed will not be reused on the site and will be disposed of off-site by trucks. Chapter 11.74 SMC requires that material hauled in trucks may not be spilled during transport. The code 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 to eliminate or minimize the amount of dirt or dust spilled from the truck after leaving the project site. Compliance with chapter 11.74 SMC is adequate to mitigate any potential grading or hauling impacts, and therefore no additional conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.665.

Traffic and Parking

Project construction will last approximately 12 months. During construction, parking demand will increase due to the demand created by construction personnel and equipment. It is the City’s policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities and parking (SMC 25.05.675.B and .M).

Project construction will also result in adverse impacts to both pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the traffic site. During construction a temporary increase in traffic volumes to the site will occur due to travel of construction workers and the transport of construction materials and grading activities. Approximately 5,500 c.y. of soil is expected to be excavated from the project site. The soil will be removed and disposed of off-site. Excavation and fill activity will require several truck trips, which will impact the surrounding streets.

In order to mitigate adverse construction impacts to pedestrians and vehicles, the applicant shall prepare a construction management plan, which shall document truck access to and from the project site. The plan shall also document how parking demand will be managed for construction workers. The construction management plan shall be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the commencement of construction. Compliance with Seattle’s Street Use Ordinance is expected to mitigate any additional adverse impacts to traffic or pedestrians which would be generated during construction of this proposal.

Long-Term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of this project including: increased surface water runoff due to greater coverage of the site by impervious surfaces; increased height bulk and scale on the site, increased energy use, increased traffic in the area, increased parking demand, and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes, regulations, and/or ordinances provide mitigation for several of the identified impacts, including the Stormwater Grading and Drainage Control Code, which requires on-site collection of stormwater runoff with provisions for controlled release to an

approved outlet, the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows, and the Land Use code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use, and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes, regulations and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditions is therefore warranted by SEPA policies. However, due to the size and location of this proposal several elements of the environment warrant further analysis:

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities associated with the completed project, particularly vehicular trips generated by the project and the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in an increase in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and may contribute to climate change. While these impacts are adverse, they do not rise to the level of significance and no mitigation is therefore necessary.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The City's SEPA Policy regarding height, bulk, and scale states:

It is the City's policy that the height, bulk and scale of development projects should be reasonably compatible with the general character of development anticipated by the goals and policies set forth in Section B of the land use element of the Comprehensive Plan regarding Land Use Categories...and the adopted land use regulations for the area in which a development project is located, and to provide for a reasonable transition between areas of less intensive zoning and more intensive zoning.

SMC 25.05.675.G.2.a. The Citywide design guidelines are intended to mitigate for height bulk and scale impacts addressed by the City's SEPA policies. A project that is approved pursuant to the design review process is presumed to comply with the City's height, bulk and scale SEPA policies. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that height, bulk and scale impacts documented through environmental review have not been adequately mitigated. Any additional mitigation imposed by the decisionmaker pursuant to these height bulk and scale policies on projects that have undergone design review shall comply with design guidelines applicable to the project.

In the case of this project, the height, bulk and scale of the project is reasonably compatible with the character of development anticipated by Section B of the Comprehensive Plan, which states that Mixed Use/Commercial areas may be zoned with heights that will help promote compatible land use patterns, and help ensure that the scale of uses is compatible with the surrounding commercial area. *See* Policy LU109. In addition, the Design Review Board recommended approval of the project. The Director finds that the Board thoughtfully addressed the issue of height, bulk, and scale, and any height, bulk, and scale impacts have been adequately mitigated through the design review process.

Traffic and Transportation

The applicant's traffic consultant completed a revised traffic impact analysis to determine the traffic and parking impacts that would result from the project.

The analysis determined separately the “person trips” and “vehicle trips” that would be generated by the project. “Person trips” better reflect the number of transit and non-automobile mode trips that the project would generate. The person trips predicted to be generated by the project are 490. Within the 490 total person trips, 40 are projected to be walk and bike trips, 90 are projected to be transit trips, and 360 are projected to be vehicle trips.

The number of vehicle trips generated by the project was estimated by dividing the total number of person trips expected to be made in vehicles by the average-vehicle occupancy rates for an apartment type of land use in the vicinity. Average-vehicle occupancy rates were derived from the Puget Sound Regional Council’s “Journey-to-Work” survey results. From the survey, an average-vehicle occupancy rate of 1.08 was applied for the apartment use. Trip generation estimates for the existing use (existing offices to be removed) was determined using published rates in the ITE Manual. The proposed apartments are determined to generate 330 vehicle trips per day; which will replace the existing 40 trips generated by the existing office land use on the site, or a net new vehicle trips generated of 290 daily trips (26 during the PM peak hour).

The predicted P.M. Peak hour traffic generation of 26 vehicle trip ends is not expected to create a significant or even appreciable negative impact on the level of operation of surrounding streets and intersections. As a result, no SEPA policy based mitigation of traffic impacts is warranted.

The project was analyzed for parking supply and demand. The project is located near a high transit street, so the project has no minimum parking requirement. However, the project proposes to include 36 on-site parking spaces. Recent studies have found that parking demand in residential buildings located close to high-frequency, all-day transit are much lower than the average demand reported in the ITE Manual. In First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center, a recent analysis determined that the number of vehicles per dwelling unit in the neighborhood ranged from 0.33 to 0.82 with a weighted average of 0.52 per unit. An older study included surveys of 62 separate residential sites which ranged in size from 31 to 62 units. These surveys found that the residential uses provided an average supply of 0.8 spaces per unit, but had a parking demand of only 0.6 spaces per unit.

The proposed project, while not required to provide any parking under the Land Use code, would provide 36 parking spaces. Thus, the project will provide parking at a 0.58 stall/unit ratio, which is similar to the average demand found for apartment projects throughout Seattle, particularly those projects found close to major transit routes. Therefore, the parking supply at the proposed project is expected to be adequate, with no overflow parking. As a result, no SEPA policy based mitigation of parking impacts is warranted.

Noise

The residential nature of the project is expected to generate residential-type noises, and major noise impacts are not expected. In addition, the project will be required to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance, which will provide sufficient mitigation for any potential noise impacts. Therefore, no mitigation due to noise is required.

Light and Glare

The residential project will slightly increase the amount of light than currently exists on the project site. However, the increases are expected to be minimal and mainly from interior sources. All exterior lighting will be downshielded to minimize any potential impacts. As such, no mitigation due to light or glare is required.

Summary

In conclusion, some adverse impacts on the environment are anticipated to result from the project, but none will rise to the level of significance. 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

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 (chapter 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).

CONDITIONS—DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Issuance of a Master Use Permit

- 1) The building constructed shall substantially conform to the plans presented to the Board at the recommendation meeting, except for those DPD approved changes necessary to conform to the Board's recommendations and discussion stated at that meeting.
- 2) Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building must be submitted to DPD for review and approval by the Land Use Planner assigned to the project. Any proposed changes to the improvements in the public right-of-way are subject to SDOT's Street Improvement Permit ("SIP") process and must be submitted for DPD and SDOT for review and for final approval by SDOT through the SIP process.
- 3) Prior to issuance of a MUP, the DPD planner assigned to this project, or the Design Review Manager, must verify substantial compliance of the final MUP plans with all images and text presented to the Design Review Board (including but not limited to exterior materials, landscaping, and right-of-way improvements), and compliance with the Design Review Board's recommendations as stated at the recommendation meeting.

Prior to Issuance of all Construction Permits

- 4) Embed the MUP conditions in the cover sheet for the MUP permit and for all subsequent permits including updated MUP plans, and all building permit drawings.

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

- 5) 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 right-of-way improvements) shall be verified by the DPD planner assigned to this project or by the DPD Design Review Manager.

CONDITIONS—SEPA

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

- 6) Submit a construction traffic management plan to be reviewed and approved by SDOT and DPD. The plan shall, at a minimum, identify truck access to and from the site, pedestrian accommodations for sidewalk closures, and a construction worker parking plan.
- 7) Prior to the issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the applicant will submit a construction noise mitigation plan for review and approval by DPD. The plan will include measures to: 1) limit noise decibel levels and noise duration, and 2) procedures for advanced notice of excessively noisy activities to surrounding properties. In addition to compliance with the Noise Ordinance, which requires the project to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be subject to the following, in order to further reduce noise impacts:
 - a. Construction activities may take place only during the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM on non-holiday weekdays.
 - b. Quieter construction activities may take place during the hours of 6:00 PM and 8:00 PM on non-holiday weekdays, and on Saturdays during the hours of 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM. “Quieter construction activities” will be defined in the construction noise plan, to be approved by DPD. Such activities during these hours will be subject to DPD approval and will require advanced notice to surrounding neighbors.
 - c. Emergency construction activities (for example, those activities that must take place to coincide with a street closure, utility interruption or other similar necessary event) may take place outside of the approved hours, subject to advanced notice to surrounding neighbors as outlined in the construction noise mitigation plan.

During Construction

- 8) Conditions to be enforced during construction (including during grading, demolition, and construction and enforcement of the construction noise mitigation plan and the construction traffic management plan) shall be posted at the site in a location on the property line that is visible and accessible to the public and to construction personnel from the street right-of-way. The conditions will be affixed to placards prepared by DPD. The placards will be issued along with the building permit set of plans. The placards shall be laminated with weatherproofing materials and shall remain in place throughout the duration of construction.

- 9) Follow the terms of a DPD approved Construction Noise Mitigation Plan. The plan will include measures to: 1) limit noise decibel levels and noise duration, and 2) procedures for advanced notice of excessively noisy activities to surrounding properties. In addition to compliance with the Noise Ordinance, which requires the project to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be subject to the following, in order to further reduce noise impacts:
 - a. Construction activities may take place only during the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM on non-holiday weekdays.
 - b. Quieter construction activities may take place during the hours of 6:00 PM and 8:00 PM on non-holiday weekdays, and on Saturdays during the hours of 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM. "Quieter construction activities" will be defined in the construction noise plan, to be approved by DPD. Such activities during these hours will be subject to DPD approval and will require advanced notice to surrounding neighbors.
 - c. Emergency construction activities (for example, those activities that must take place to coincide with a street closure, utility interruption or other similar necessary event) may take place outside of the approved hours, subject to advanced notice to surrounding neighbors as outlined in the construction noise mitigation plan.
- 10) Follow the terms of a DPD and SDOT approved Construction Traffic Mitigation Plan.
- 11) Trucks hauling materials to and from the project site shall not idle while queuing in the surrounding neighborhood.

Signature: (signature on file)
Scott Kemp, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development
Land Use Division

Date: October 31, 2011