



City of Seattle

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

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

Project Number: 3012511

Applicant: Demian Minjarez, SMR Architects, for DESC Delridge Supportive Housing LP

Address: 5444 Delridge Way SW

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a four-story structure containing 66 residential units with associated residential common areas and 2,438 sq. ft. of retail space at ground level. Parking for 15 vehicles to be provided below grade and two spaces at grade, one within the structure. The existing structures on site are to be demolished.

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

Design Review - Chapter 23.41, Seattle Municipal Code

SEPA-Threshold Determination -Chapter 25.05 Seattle Municipal Code.

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

DNS with conditions

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

SITE BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The site, previously developed with two single family structures, two one story garages and two wood-storage sheds is rectangular in shape, generally flat, and totals 19,200 square feet in size.

Current access is from both Delridge Way SW and from the alley a half a block east of Delridge Way SW.

The site is zoned NC2-40' and is identified in the Delridge Neighborhood Plan as the "central node" of the Delridge Way spine, a place for smaller commercial and mixed-use commercial and residential development. The NC2-40' zoning extends for one-half block on either side of Delridge Way SW. Directly to the east and west of this spine the zoning is Single Family, with a smattering of LR1 zoning to the north and south of the site. The City of Seattle Delridge Branch Public Library lies just north and west of the site, across Delridge Way SW.



There are no identified environmentally critical areas on or abutting the site. There are several large trees located on the southern portion of the site. One of these trees, a deodar cedar, with a 40 inch caliber girth, has been identified as a City of Seattle "Exceptional" tree and is slated for preservation on the site. Longfellow Creek lies approximately 1,200 feet to the west of the site.

The immediate area has been characterized by small, single-story commercial buildings interspersed with single-family and multifamily residential development. More recent development has been focused on mixed-use development with street-level retail commercial and office uses topped by two-to-three stories of residential units above. The relatively recent development of the local branch public library was designed with the library underpinning multifamily residential units above. While the Delridge spine is marked by a large office building at the northern node and a large box store (Home Depot) at the southern node, recent development along Delridge Way SW within the central node has been premised on mixed-use development of a smaller scale and a finer grain.

Design Review

Early Design Guidance Meeting: December 8, 2011

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The presentation was made before all five the members of the Southwest Board, meeting at the Youngstown Cultural Center on the evening of December 8, 2011.

The applicant proposed a four-story mixed-use, primarily residential, building containing approximately 75 apartments above a ground floor containing approximately 2,500 square feet of commercial use. Space would be provided for parking approximately 13 vehicles within the structure.

Members of the design team made the presentation to the Board and the approximately 20 members of the public attending the meeting. In the course of explaining opportunities offered and constraints of the site and the general objectives of the intended program, the team identified individual design guidelines from the Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Development Guidelines which they judged to be of special importance for the proposal, namely A-1, A-2, A-3, A-6, B-1, C-1, C-2, D-1, D-8, E-1 and E-2.

Three different massing schemes were presented by the applicant. Because the intention was to save the existing cedar tree, however, each of the three schemes was a variation of an L-shaped design, where a portion of the building along the alley, considerably set back from the street, extended southwards behind the protected root zone of the deodar cedar, creating a courtyard at the southwest portion of the site with the tree as its center. In the preferred scheme, lantern-like, illuminated portions of the proposed structure anchored the courtyard surrounding the protected cedar tree, creating a strong “Lanterns in the Park” motif that characterized the direction that the design development might take.

PUBLIC COMMENT

After asking some clarifying questions of the applicant, the Board elicited comments from members of the public (nineteen signed in to become parties of record) attending the Early Design Review meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Requests to keep the structure at thirty feet or three stories (zoning would allow forty feet) so nearby neighbors could retain much of their existing views of the Delridge valley;
- Should neighbors have to exchange their longer views for views of walls, the walls should provide some interest in terms of design or plantings;
- Requests that the design take into account the privacy of neighbors, especially of those living on the other side of the alley;
- Requests to mitigate for shadows that would reduce the sunlight available to neighbors;
- The existing condition of the alley evoked several observations and requests, including: the developer should pave the entire alley behind the building; the new structure should accommodate deliveries and any need for emergency vehicles from Delridge Way and not the alley;
- The building should have a “green roof” and the overall building/landscape design should provide for a rain garden on site;
- Safety, especially along the alley, was of paramount importance and a concern offered by several members of the public; comments ranged from the statement of general concern to specific suggestions, including the quantity of lighting and the installation of cameras. A recurring concern was the problematic nature of open parking at the alley level.
- Specific comments did not enjoy the support of all the members of the public who spoke up. One member of the public suggested that the design should look to the library and nearby newer townhouses that had incorporated significant modulation into the facades and peaked roofs at the skyline. Another urged that the design team should not be constrained by such considerations but be given latitude for a modern and potentially more pleasing design.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance. The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project.

Site Planning

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

The Board acknowledged that circumstances, including the need to protect the cedar, made for a constrained and challenging site condition. Nonetheless, the applicant was urged to move the entry closer to Delridge as part of extending the residential common area to embrace and provide “eyes on the street.” Noting that the actual residential entry did not need to face directly onto Delridge, the Board suggested a design that would clearly embrace, integrate, and announce a courtyard-facing main entry.

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

In addition to providing commercial/retail space that would invigorate the activity on the sidewalk along Delridge Way SW, the board would like the applicant to locate some of the residential common space at the street to provide “eyes on the street” and make a better linkage to the residential character of the building.

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 strongly indicated that they would like to see the massing of the building extended towards the south property line while providing a greater buffer for the properties across the alley on the east (similar to Scheme “B”). The Board indicated their willingness to grant a departure from SMC 23.47A.005 (Street-level uses) in order to accomplish this.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

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

The Board members were generally agreed that the best scheme would be one that extended the rear portion of the structure close to the south property line while providing a setback along the alley adequate to provide a buffer for residences across the alley to the east.

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 acknowledged that this was a challenging site, both because of the exceptional tree and the zoning transition between the NC2-40' of the site and the SF 5000 at the centerline of the alley.

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 context.

The design of the structure should be guided by the “lantern in the park” parti. The design team was encouraged by the Board to “fully embrace” this concept. In doing this effectively, the final design should incorporate communal uses and spaces into the lantern forms to enhance their effectiveness as perceptible objects.

D. Pedestrian Environment

D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures. The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.

In choosing this Guideline as one of highest priority, the Board expressed concern for the appearance of the parking along the alley as presented in Scheme B and C. The Board thought the underground parking proposed as part of Scheme A was the most viable for the project and encouraged the applicant to locate all the parking in a below grade or at-grade garage with a single entrance off the alley. The Board members were adamantly opposed to covered, open stalls facing the alley. In the Board’s view open stalls would be detrimental to safety and provide cover for illegal activities already a problem in the alley. The parking provided should be contained and controlled.

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

(See the comments above under D-5.) The Board also encouraged “eyes on the alley” from windows into staff or common areas and from units facing onto the alley. In addition to providing personal safety and security along the alley, the design of the courtyard and the interface of courtyard and structure provided by the north and east “walls” of the courtyard should ensure a feeling of personal safety and security.

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.

The Board strongly encouraged the applicant to locate a portion of the residential common area facing directly onto Delridge Way SW. This space could be contiguous with a main residential entry which would face onto the courtyard.

E. Landscaping

E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site

Landscaping including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

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.

Provide street trees and an enhanced planting strip along Delridge Way SW as appropriate and as integrated with the landscape design of the proposed courtyard and the southwest portion of the site.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

At the time of the Early Design Guidance meeting, the following departures were discussed:

SMC 23.47A.005, which requires 80 percent of the façade along Delridge Way SW to be in non-residential uses. The Board is willing to recommend a departure in order to provide some accessory residential space on Delridge Way SW and to extend the building mass at the rear of the courtyard toward the south property line.

At the conclusion of the EDG meeting, the Board recommended that the project should move forward to MUP Application in response to the guidance provided at this meeting.

As noted by the Board Chair in summarizing the Board’s deliberations, “the biggest challenge will be how to address the zoning transition to the east of the property.” That challenge would best be met, the Board agreed, by pushing the building towards the south property line. The Board members noted that providing a wider horizontal setback from the alley, one that could be landscaped, might be as effective as stepping the building down a floor on the alley side. Additionally, the Board encouraged the following:

- Provide some common residential space at the street frontage;
- Fully embrace the “lanterns in the Park” theme;
- No covered, exposed parking stalls at the alley;

- Work with SDOT to make major improvements to the alley;
- Provide an interesting design and landscaping to mitigate any blank walls along the alley façade;
- In the landscape design consider providing some active spaces for residents, consistent with arborist recommendations around the exceptional tree that will center the courtyard.

RECOMMENDATION MEETING –March 8, 2011

DESIGN PRESENTATION

Members of the design team made the presentation to the Board and the members of the public attending the meeting, focusing particularly on those elements of the design that had been developed in response to the guidelines identified by the Board and the guidance conveyed relative to those guidelines at the Early Design Guidance meeting.

At the Early Design Guidance meeting, three different massing schemes had been presented by the applicant, each a variation of an L-shaped design, where a portion of the building along the alley, considerably set back from the street, extended southwards behind the protected root zone of the deodar cedar, creating a courtyard at the southwest portion of the site with the exceptional tree, intended to be saved, as its center. In the preferred scheme, illuminated portions of the proposed structure, described as “lantern-like,” anchored the courtyard surrounding the protected cedar tree, creating a strong “Lanterns in the Park” motif that characterized the direction that the design development preferred by the Board as well, had taken.

Scott Starr of SMR Architects explained that the design development had responded to four major concerns. First, the bulk of the structure, as perceived from the single-family area east of the alley, had been minimized to provide a better transition from the single-family zone by being set back slightly more than eleven feet from the alley and by being reduced to 3 stories in height at that point. Second, the residential entry had been given greater transparency to and from Delridge Way and the approach to the residential entry marked by a canopy running from the sidewalk to the doorway along the north edge of the courtyard. Third, the impact of the parking structure had been minimized and windows from the common space within the building looked onto the alley. Fourth, a five-foot fence would enclose the courtyard, imparting greater definition to it and addressing security issues that might be associated with it. Demian Minjarez, also of SMR, then further described the transparent structure base along the north and east edges of the courtyard, a vestige of the “lantern” theme introduced at the Early Design Guidance meeting, gave more details regarding the transitional step in the building at the alley, the entry sequence and the various materials that were proposed for various portions of the structure. Finally, details were offered regarding landscaping features proposed, primarily those elements proposed to complement the tree to be saved at the center of the courtyard.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Following a few clarifying questions directed to the architects by the Board, the Chair opened the meeting to public comment. Comments included the following:

- Neighborhood planning called for this to be a commercial, community-serving node along Delridge Way SW, and questioned whether parking would be sufficient or functional enough for vital commercial development; urged that this be the best building possible for the site; questioned whether building, as designed, would provide adequate “eyes on the street”; did not want to see chain-link fence utilized.
- Questioned whether building was best design for safety and security concerns; objected to un-enclosed surface parking space off the alley and potential for unwanted activities transpiring there; wanted to see higher plantings along the alley; wanted to see more details of a lighting strategy.
- Also asked for more screening along the alley; concerned with safety and security issues and how the design was meeting them; thought the building “more Lake Union than Delridge”; wanted bike racks on Delridge; more variety could occur in the Delridge façade; building needs more detail at the pedestrian scale; rooftop garden would be appropriate; complained that the “lantern” concept had totally disappeared.
- Break up the elevations with balconies; expand courtyard to the alley; it will be a fifty year building, “make sure it does not suck.”
- Comments regarding the proposed colors were opposite one another and of doubtful usefulness for determining a desired direction.

BOARD DELIBERATIONS

The Board’s deliberations began with the observation that between the EDG meeting and the evening’s presentation, there had been something of a loss in the clarity of concept that the design conveyed. That loss of clarity, of the “lanterns in the park” motif celebrated at the Early Design Guidance meeting, it was suggested, resulted in the lack of overall architectural consistency the Board experienced. Additionally, there were other concerns, some of them raised in the public comment portion of the meeting, that the Board felt needed further resolution. Paramount among these were the following:

- The alley-facing (east) façade appeared flat and somewhat listless;
- The tripartite scheme of the Delridge Way SW-facing façade seemed too busy and needed simplification;
- More detailing was needed to provide a sense of transition between the ground floor brickwork and soffit along the west façade; entries along this façade needed a more refined treatment, including a deeper recess; (what provisions had been made for signage?)
- The alley needed more greening, specifically more vertical landscaping;
- The courtyard needed a well-designed fence, providing aesthetic value as well as a sense of security and actual safety;
- The loading space at the southeast corner of the structure off the alley needed to be safe and secure, designed to dissuade nuisance behavior as well as to be functional;
- If there were to be no strong vertical element imparted to the lantern motif, along the ground plane, horizontal lantern elements needed to pop, with lighting from the interior and perhaps with some over-lighting from the overhead soffit/canopy.

In response to the Chair's request to provide the applicants with a concrete and specific list of areas to address in order to refine a project that had many good things going right for it, the Board fastened upon the following items, with the directive that the design team work with the Land Use Planner and DPD to provide alterations that would satisfy the Board's concerns within the parameters of their guidance from the meeting.

1. Make changes to transform the plain alley façade. These should address the need to provide some tactile relief to the concrete base, provide for additional vertical landscape elements, increase the vitality of the windows and skin facing the alley.
2. Address the design of the loading space at the southeast corner of building off the alley, in order to provide a secure area that would not invite nuisance activities.
3. Provide a fence that is both attractive and secure at the perimeter of the courtyard.
4. Provide details that will enhance the pedestrian experience along the west façade, allow for clear, recessed entries with protection from the elements, and adequate and attractive commercial signage.
5. Design a single treatment of the upper west façade (Delridge) that would provide a continuous expression from above the ground floor to the roof line.
6. Provide integral illumination at the ground level of those facades facing the courtyard, soffits, canopies, etc., that would result in an unmistakably perceptible and convincing conveyance of a "lanterns in the garden" motif.

Responses to the above conditions, once approved by DPD, would be incorporated into the Master Use Permit sets of plans prior to issuance of a Land Use permit. With these conditions, the Board unanimously recommended approval of the project as proposed at the Recommendation meeting, with those alterations to be made and approved by DPD in response to the conditions noted above.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

SMC 23.47A.005 requires 80 percent of the façade along Delridge Way SW to be in non-residential uses. The Board unanimously recommended granting a departure from this requirement in order to provide some accessory residential space along Delridge Way SW and to provide eyes on the street from the ground floor accessory residential space.

The proposal recommended for approval at the Design Review Board Recommendation Meeting, after zoning review and programmatic changes, was a four-story structure containing 66 residential units, with 2,438 square feet of retail space at ground level, and with parking for 17 vehicles.

ANALYSIS AND DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW

The Director of DPD has reviewed the recommendations of the Design Review Board and finds that the proposal is consistent with the *City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Multifamily & Commercial Buildings Design Guidelines*. The Director **APPROVES** the subject design and the departure from development standards recommended for approval by the Board, as well as those conditions recommended by the Board which have been incorporated into the plan sets.

This decision is based on the Design Review Board's final recommendations, on the plans, drawings and other materials presented at the public meeting on March 8, 2012, together with modifications to the plans submitted to the Department in response to the Board's comments, conditions, and directives given at that meeting. The design, siting, and architectural details of

the project are expected to remain substantially as presented at the recommendation meeting except for those alterations made in response to the recommendations of the Board or in response to correction notices and incorporated into the plan sets subsequently submitted to DPD.

ANALYSIS - STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant (January 23, 2012). The information in the checklist, the supplemental information submitted by the applicant and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision. This decision also makes reference to and incorporates the project plans submitted with the project application.

The Seattle SEPA Ordinance provides substantive authority to require mitigation of adverse impacts resulting from a proposed project (SMC 25.05.655 and 25.05.660). Mitigation, when required, must be related to specific environmental impacts identified in an environmental document and may be imposed to the extent that an impact is attributable to the proposal, and to the extent the mitigation is reasonable and capable of being accomplished. Additionally, required mitigation must be 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, SEPA Specific Environmental Policies). In some instances, local, state or federal regulatory requirements will provide sufficient mitigation of an impact and additional mitigation imposed through SEPA may be limited or unnecessary.

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 pertinent part that “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, mitigation may be required (SMC 25.05.665.D).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The information provided by the applicant and its consultants, the public comments received, and the experience of DPD with the review of similar proposals form the basis for conditioning the project. The potential environmental impacts disclosed by the environmental checklist are discussed below. Where necessary, mitigation is called for under Seattle’s SEPA Ordinance (SMC 25.05).

Short - Term Impacts

Anticipated short-term impacts that could occur during demolition excavation and construction include: increased noise from construction/demolition activities and equipment; decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased dust caused by construction activities; potential soil erosion and potential disturbance to subsurface soils during grading, excavation, and general site work; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; conflicts with normal pedestrian and vehicular movement adjacent to the site; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources. Due to the temporary nature and limited scope of these impacts, they are not considered significant (SMC 25.05.794).

Many of these impacts are mitigated or partially mitigated by compliance to existing codes and ordinances; specifically these are: Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code (grading, site excavation and soil erosion); Street Use Ordinance (watering streets to suppress dust, removal of debris, and obstruction of the pedestrian right-of-way); the Building Code (construction measures in general); and the Noise Ordinance (construction noise). If any asbestos abatement is required, the project will have to comply with the regulations of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.

Certain construction-related impacts may not be adequately mitigated by existing ordinances. Further discussion is set forth below.

Earth

A study of the site's groundwater and soil conditions, dated July 19, 2011, was prepared by Geotech Consultants, Inc., and was submitted to the Department at the time of Master Use Permit application intake and supplemented on April 3, 2012. According to the study, soil conditions at the site are suitable for support of the proposed development and there are no geotechnical considerations that would preclude development of the site as planned. Excavation dewatering may be necessary depending on the season of construction. The Seattle Stormwater Grading and Drainage Control Code requires that water released from the site be clean and limits the amount of suspended particles therein. Specifically, the ordinance provides for Best Management Practices to be in place to prevent any of the water or spoil resulting from excavation or grading to leave the site inadvertently. No further SEPA policy based conditioning of earth impacts during construction is necessary.

Traffic and Parking

Traffic during some phases of construction, such as excavation and concrete pouring, will be expected to be great enough to warrant special consideration in order to control impacts on surrounding streets. Seattle Department of Transportation will require a construction phasing truck transportation plan to deal with these impacts. The applicant(s) will be required to submit a Truck Trip Plan to be approved by SDOT prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit. The Truck Trip Plan shall delineate the routes of trucks carrying project-related materials.

Noise-Related Impacts

Both commercial and residential uses in the vicinity of the proposal will experience increased noise impacts during the different phases of construction. Compliance with the Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08) is required and will limit the use of loud equipment registering 60 dBA 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.

Although compliance with the Noise Ordinance is required, additional measures to mitigate the anticipated noise impacts may be necessary. The SEPA Policies at SMC 25.05.675.B and 25.05.665 allow the Director to require additional mitigating measures to further address adverse noise impacts during construction. Pursuant to these policies, it is Department's conclusion that limiting hours of construction beyond the requirements of the Noise Ordinance may be necessary. In addition, therefore, as a condition of approval, the proponent will be required to limit the hours of construction activity not conducted entirely within an enclosed structure to non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. and Saturdays between 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Air Quality Impacts

Demolition and construction activities could result in the following temporary or construction-related adverse impacts:

- Erosion from excavation and storm water impacts from ground clearing,
- Decreased air quality due to suspended particulates (dust) from excavation and construction, hydrocarbon emissions and greenhouse gas emissions from construction vehicles, equipment, and the manufacture of the construction materials,

Construction will create dust, leading to an increase in the level of suspended air particulates, which could be carried by wind out of the construction area. Compliance with the Street Use Ordinance (SMC 15.22.060) will require the contractors to water the site or use other dust palliative measures, as necessary, to reduce airborne dust. In addition, compliance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations will require activities, which produce airborne materials or other pollutant elements to be contained with temporary enclosure. Other potential sources of dust would be soil blowing from uncovered dump trucks and soil carried out of the construction area by vehicle frames and tires; this soil could be deposited on adjacent streets and become airborne. The Street Use Ordinance also requires the use of tarps to cover the excavation material while in transit, and the cleanup of adjacent roadways and sidewalks periodically. Construction traffic and equipment are likely to produce carbon monoxide and other exhaust fumes. Regarding asbestos, Federal Law requires the filing of a Notice of Construction with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (“PSCAA”) prior to any demolition on site. If any asbestos is present on the site, PSCAA, the Department of Labor and Industry, and EPA regulations will provide for the safe removal and disposal of asbestos.

Construction activities themselves will generate minimal direct impacts. However, the indirect impact of 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 due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project. No potential short term adverse impact to air is anticipated and therefore air quality mitigation is not necessary.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions primarily from increased vehicle trips but also the projects energy consumption, increased demand for public services and utilities; increased height, bulk, and scale on the site; and increased area traffic and demand for parking. Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Seattle 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, parking requirements, shielding of light and glare reduction, and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development.

Water

As set forth in a civil hydrology plan prepared by Coughlin-Porter-Lundeen (June 8, 2012), the site will use bio-retention planters, and existing/proposed trees to meet the green storm water infrastructure requirements to the maximum extent possible. A detention pipe located in the southwest corner of the site will provide flow control for the site. Flow control will meet the Peak Flow Control Standard per SMC 22.805.080.B.4. No further condition through SEPA authority is required.

Air Quality

The number of vehicular trips associated with the project will increase the quantities of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions in the area. Additionally, the project will create a level of electrical energy demand and natural gas consumption that does not currently exist on the site. Together these changes will result in ambient 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 due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project over its life-cycle.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The proposal does not exceed the height of development (40 feet) allowed in the zone. The height, bulk and scale measures were addressed during the Design Review process. Pursuant to the Height, Bulk and Scale Policy of SMC 25.05.675 a project that is approved pursuant to the design review process shall be presumed to comply with the height, bulk and scale policies. The proposed structures have been endorsed by the Design Review Board as appropriate in height, bulk and scale for the project.

Traffic and Parking Impacts

Primary access for the development proposal will be provided from the alley east of the site. The site is fairly well-served by transit, with frequent King County Metro bus service along Delridge Way SW. Because the project is primarily residential apartments for low income disabled individuals the project is expected to generate approximately 20 total vehicle trips daily. Some localized traffic impacts are anticipated in the daily operation of the building, but local streets have sufficient capacity to handle this increase in traffic and no significant adverse impacts from the proposed project are anticipated to the operation of area intersections and streets.

The retail use is not anticipated to be “destination” retail that would generate significant traffic or parking requirements. The project will provide bicycle parking as required by the Land Use Code and will provide parking for 13 vehicles, which is anticipated to accommodate the project’s estimated parking demand. Any spillover parking is not considered to be significant. Because the project is primarily residential, the parking peak hours would be in the evening, which is off peak from the most intense parking demand for any nearby commercial uses. No significant adverse impacts to parking are anticipated from the operation of the proposed project.

The project will be required to make street and alley improvements along the abutting street and alley as required by the Land Use Code and the Seattle Department of Transportation Street Design Manual. No further conditioning is warranted.

DECISION - SEPA

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

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

CONDITIONS-SEPA

Based upon the above analysis, the Director has determined that the following conditions are reasonable and shall be imposed pursuant to SEPA and SMC Chapter 25.05 (Environmental Policies and Procedures).

The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall:

Prior to Issuance of any Demolition or Construction Permits

1. Provide to DPD a copy of the Notice of Construction filed with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency ("PSCAA") as required by Federal Law prior to any demolition on site. If any asbestos is present on the site, PSCAA, the Department of Labor and Industry, and EPA regulations will provide for the safe removal and disposal of asbestos.

During Construction

2. The following condition(s) to be enforced during construction 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 clear plastic or other waterproofing material and shall remain posted on-site for the duration of the construction:

The hours of construction activity not conducted entirely within an enclosed structure shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., and between 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on Saturdays. All construction activities remain subject to the construction noise provisions of the Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08.425).

CONDITIONS-DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

3. The design, siting, and architectural details of the project shall remain substantially as presented at the Design Review recommendation meeting of March 8, 2012, except for those alterations made in response to the conditions and recommendations of the Board and incorporated into the plan sets re-submitted to DPD prior to issuance of the Master Use Permit. Compliance with the approved design features and elements, including exterior materials, architectural detail, facade colors, and landscaping, shall be verified by the DPD Planner assigned to this project. Inspection appointments with the Planner shall be made at least five (5) working days in advance of the inspection.
4. Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building or other constructed elements on the site must be submitted to DPD for review and approval of the project Land Use Planner (Michael Dorcy, michael.dorcy@seattle.gov). Any proposed changes to approved improvements in the public right-of-way must be submitted to DPD and SDOT for review and final approval by SDOT.
5. All the conditions contained in this decision must be embedded in the cover sheet for updated MUP permit plans.

Signature: _____ (signature on file)
Michael Dorcy, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

Date: June 25, 2012