



City of Seattle

Department of Planning and Development

Diane M. Sugimura, Director

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

Application Numbers: 3012605
Applicant Name: Peter Anderson
Address of Proposal: 14307 Greenwood Avenue North

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use Application to allow a four story, building with 39 residential units, 3,400 square feet of commercial space and parking for 43 vehicles located below grade. Review includes demolition of two commercial structures and a single family residence.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review - Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Section 23.41

SEPA - Environmental Determination pursuant to SMC 25.05

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS
 DNS with conditions*
 DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition or
involving another agency with jurisdiction

* Notice of the Early Determination of Non-significance was published on August 16, 2012.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a four-story structure with 39 residential units and 3,400 square feet of commercial use on the northwest corner of Greenwood Avenue N. and N. 143rd Street. 43 parking spaces would be provided below grade. The proposal would require demolition of a single family residence, small coffee stand and a commercial structure.

The architect proposed three somewhat similar massing options. Each resembles a large rectangular volume with the southwest corner set back near the adjacent single family residence. The particulars, the shape and depth, of the corner change for each option. The garage entrance, also common among the three options, would be accessed from North 143rd St. The strategies for the placement of commercial uses and the residential entry vary from scheme to scheme. Design concept #1, as does option #2, locates both the commercial spaces and the residential

lobby entrance along Greenwood Ave N. Option #3 shifts the residential entry onto N. 143rd St. and increases the depth of the landscaping between the structure and the property line. Option #3 also places the driveway closer to the west property line along N. 143rd.

The design of the Greenwood façade for the three schemes emphasizes a strong symmetry to match the mixed-use building across the street. Each of the three schemes forms an arcade along the commercial storefront in deference to the building at 14300 Greenwood Ave.

By the initial Recommendation meeting, the architect had refined the proposal to meet the Board's earlier guidance.

Presentation of landscape plans, a materials board and revisions to the color schemes for the south and west elevations enabled the Board to complete a full review the project at the Final Recommendation meeting.

SITE & VICINITY

The 15,600 sq. ft. site lies within a Neighborhood Commercial Two (NC 2) zoned corridor from stretching from roughly N. 143rd St. to N. 145th St. Three structures, a coffee kiosk, a flooring showroom and a single family structure occupy the three parcels comprising the development site. The site's declension totals approximately 14 feet from the northeast to the southwest corner. An existing rockery along the west property line separates the site grade from the neighboring grade by eight to nine vertical feet. Two large conifer trees sit near the south property line. The site does not have a mapped environmentally critical area.

The general commercial development pattern in this vicinity has been auto oriented with surface parking and broad driveways fronting Greenwood Ave. Most commercial development occupies small, one or two story structures. Directly across the street stands a sizeable four-story mixed use building. Due to the lowrise zoning south along the Greenwood Ave. corridor, higher density residential development has begun to replace older single family homes. Several recreational opportunities lie within close proximity including Bitter Lake Park, the Seattle Golf Club, Landover Woods, the Interurban Trail and Carkeek Park.

Immediately to the west, the zoning shifts to Single Family, a zoning classification that flanks the Neighborhood Commercial and Lowrise zones lining Greenwood Ave.

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

Public Comments

Six members of the public affixed their names to EDG meeting sign-in sheet. The public raised the following issues:

Programming

- Don't extend the retail or commercial toward the residential neighborhood.
- Consider Guidance A-4, Human Activity. Provide benches and amenities for the elderly and the disabled.
- Create large enough apartments to attract families.
- Access for the disabled is a concern at the residential entry on N. 143rd St.

Respect for Adjacent Sites

- The preliminary project designs don't have enough emphasis on Guidance A-5, Respect for Adjacent Sites.
- Based on Option #3, the driveway and garage should be moved away from the adjacent property.
- The decks overlook the adjacent residential properties. The design and placement of the decks should be respectful of the neighbor's privacy.
- Focus design attention on the residential side.
- Decks on the north side will contend with noise and poor air quality.

Height, Bulk and Scale

- B-1 Height, Bulk and Scale. The mixed use building across the street should not be the only precedent for the proposal. Look at a broader area than across the street for comparable projects.
- New buildings along Greenwood corridor should not form a street canyon. Don't produce a large, un-modulated box.

Aesthetics

- This is the north entrance to the Broadview neighborhood. Provide high quality materials and produce an attractive building. The project should make the area look better.
- Make the proposed building compatible with the mixed use structure across the street. Continuity is preferable.
- The muted natural colors and the non-flashy appearance of the building across the street embody the type of people who live in the neighborhood.

Parking

- The quantity of parking is a concern.
- There is a great deal of competition for parking in the area. The restaurant across the street is popular. Parking spills over from its lot.

Crime Prevention

- Use crime prevention techniques in the project's design. Provide adequate lighting and fencing around open spaces. The open decks appear vulnerable to crime.

Landscaping

- The neighborhood has many older trees, some 40 to 50 feet tall. Removal of the two trees will be a loss of neighborhood character.
- The project should comply with new storm drainage regulations. A lot of water will be coming off the roof.
- Provide easy access thru the planting strip from street parking to the sidewalk.
- Consider human scale. Add benches and other amenities.
- Keep the trees.

Miscellaneous

- Responding to a comment by the architect, the speaker questioned whether the real estate trend is moving away from auto dominated uses.
- The applicant should work with SDOT on the street improvements.
- Views to the north are not particularly good.

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

A Site Planning

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

The Board agreed that the proposed building could be shifted to the south, closer to the right of way. After deliberation, the Board members conveyed a lack of attachment to the two existing conifer trees.

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

The proposed arcade along Greenwood Ave. was discouraged. Board members did not believe that an arcade would facilitate pedestrian activity or encourage commercial development. Locating the commercial space closer to the right of way was encouraged.

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

Design of the commercial level frontage and its relationship to the right of way represents a critical component of future success.

Ensure that the design meets ADA accessibility standards for the formal residential entry. The Board discussed the location of the residential entry and indicated that its placement on either street would meet its expectations for the development.

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.

Design a west façade that defers to the adjacent residence. Placement of decks and fenestration should ensure privacy. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board expects to review two east/west cross sections, to include the neighboring house, and two north/south sections.

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

Noting Option #3, the Board urged the applicant to shift the driveway away from the west property line. The driveway’s proximity to the shared property line seemed to be a burden on the neighbor.

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

The southeast corner of the structure will have considerable visibility from the streets. The Board members conveyed their interest in the architect’s resolution. Keeping with the informal nature of the urban context, there is no need to make a grandiose or obvious architectural statement at the corner.

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 acknowledged the reduction in building scale at the property's southwest corner in response to the transition to a lower scale zone. The treatment of the proposed west façade will be scrutinized at the Recommendation meeting. See guidance A-5. The decks, fenestration and choice of materials should possess a residential scale compatible with the building's surroundings.

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.**

Using an entry arcade to foster a visual relationship between the proposal and the mixed use building across the street did not receive Board support (see A-3 guidance). The two buildings will create a gateway into the small commercial hub. Consider using other architectural techniques to ensure a suitable dialogue between the two edifices.

- 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 architectural gestures, based on the sketches, appear out of scale with the site. During design development, the architect should consider the intimacy of the site's context and neighbors' desire for an unpretentious building.

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

The architect was encouraged to activate the building's Greenwood Ave front, particularly at street level. Consider installing benches, art and other community friendly amenities.

- 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 acknowledged a neighbor's desire for a building with natural, muted colors compatible with the neighborhood context. The Board requested a materials board for the next meeting.

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.

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.

Depending upon the depth of the proposed garage, blank walls facing the property to the west and N. 143rd St. could be problematic.

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.

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.

If placement of the recycling and waste storage area occurs in the garage, the architect should show where the bulk of the residential and commercial waste material will be located during pick-up days.

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

The architect should be cognizant of creating secure open spaces for the patios at or near grade. The placement and type of exterior lighting are also important.

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

The Board expects to review the applicant's concept for the type and location of commercial signage.

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

Provide an exterior lighting scheme for the Recommendation meeting. Include cut-sheets or designs for the most visible fixtures.

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

This is always an important consideration.

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.

As noted above, the Board conveyed its flexibility by acknowledging that the location of the primary residential entry could occur on either street.

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.

The Board encourages the applicant to work with SDOT on the development of the rights of way and to find creative solutions for drainage retention.

MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a design review component on July 27, 2012.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Design Review Board conducted Initial and Final Recommendation meetings on April 8, 2013 and May 20th, 2013 respectively 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

One member of the public affixed his name to the Initial Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. Two members of the public spoke about the impact of the proposal on the neighbors to the west. Comments focused on the lack of privacy from the balconies and roof deck with a western overlook, noise, project bulk on the west elevation and lack of greenery due to the removal of large trees near the property line. Other issues included drainage, parking spillover into the neighborhood, the susceptibility of blank walls as targets for graffiti, and the garishness of the proposed colors.

Two members of the public affixed their names to the Final Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. They spoke about the proposal's impacts. Comments focused on the on-going drainage problems in the neighborhood, potential parking spillover into the adjacent streets, and the desire for more sedate building colors.

A. Site Planning

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: For the Recommendation meeting, the architect had shifted the building toward the south property line fulfilling the Board's earlier guidance.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The applicant eliminated the arcade along Greenwood Ave, meeting the EDG request. A portion of the second floor and canopies extend over the sidewalk providing some weather protection over the commercial entries. An arcade now appears as part of the entry sequence on the south elevation. The Board did not comment on it.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: By the next meeting, the architect should ensure that the entry ramp on the south side beginning at the corner of Greenwood Ave. and N. 143rd St. meets ADA accessibility standards for the formal residential entry.

Final Recommendation Meeting: Based on the architect's presentation, the Board noted its satisfaction that the entry ramp meets accessibility standards.

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.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: After reviewing the cross sections and sight line diagrams provided by the architect, the Board did not request changes to the placement of the balconies and roof deck.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Meeting the Board's earlier request, the applicant shifted the location of the garage access away from the west property line. At the next presentation, the grid comprising the garage door should be clearly delineated.

Final Recommendation Meeting: The architect submitted a revised drawing of the garage door. It met the Board's tacit approval.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board noted the understated treatment of the corner as it appeared to meet the earlier guidance.

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.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board did not object to the design of the building's west façade. However, it raised concerns about the intensity of the colors. See guidance for C-4.

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.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board did not convey much consternation over the color scheme facing the Greenwood Ave commercial corridor.

Final Recommendation Meeting: Based on the success of the revised color scheme for the west elevation, the Board encouraged the architect to slightly tone down the chartreuse and reds on the east and south elevations.

- 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.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The issue of an appropriate contextual scale, which the Board noted at the earlier meeting, did not surface during deliberation.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Although not specifically mentioned during the deliberation, the landscaping along Greenwood Ave should help activate the streetscape. The prior guidance requested that the architect consider installation of benches, art and other community friendly amenities.

Final Recommendation Meeting: The Board did not comment on the landscaping elements along Greenwood Ave N.

- 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.**

Initial Recommendation Meeting: At the previous EDG meeting, the Board acknowledged a neighbor's desire for a building with natural, muted colors compatible with the neighborhood context. The drawings presented at the Recommendation meeting had bold colors on all of the elevations with reduced amounts of the chartreuse metal panels on the west elevation. The Board expressed its reluctance to request a change of colors on the east and north elevations. Just as the background field of white metal panels on the east façade and the portion closest to Greenwood on the south façade changes to grey panels above the garage and on the west elevation, the bolder red and chartreuse accents might be muted in the same way on the areas west of the curved accent wall which acts as a visual demarcation between the more public Greenwood front of the building and the residentially oriented neighborhood half.

The applicant must bring a materials and color board for the next meeting.

Final Recommendation Meeting: The Board praised the revised color scheme of the west façade. See Board discussion on the elevations' colors for guidance C-1.

Considerable deliberation focused on the constructability of the project. The Board expressed its concern about the frequency of transitions or changes in materials and the detailing of the southeast corner balcony (including drainage). The Board encouraged the architect to simplify the materials, to use a bolt on balcony at the southeast corner, and to internalize drainage off this balcony. If the architect elects to modify the elevations, the design should be resubmitted to the planner for review and approval.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Provide a signage concept plan for the next Recommendation meeting, illustrating the type and location of commercial signage. Include the building signage as well.

Final Recommendation Meeting: The signage concept submitted at the Final Recommendation meeting met the Board's approval.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Provide an exterior lighting scheme for the next Recommendation meeting. Include cut-sheets or designs for the most visible fixtures.

Final Recommendation Meeting: The lighting concept plan and the fixtures presented at the Final Recommendation meeting received Board approval.

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

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.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: See A-4 guidance.

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.

Final Recommendation Meeting: See E-2.

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.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The applicant did not provide a landscape plan for the Board's review. A detailed plan with the designation of plant species is required. The screen for the vegetation along the west property line should be shown in cross section to help clarify the relationship of the planting wall to the property line and how it will be maintained.

Final Recommendation Meeting: A revised design presented at the meeting illustrated a new rockery instead of a concrete wall with a green screen. The revision, based on discussions between the architect and the neighbor, received Board approval. The Board recommended a design condition to ensure the installation of a rockery along the west property line.

Board Recommendations: The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the May 20th, 2013 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 May 20th 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.

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

- 1) Install a rockery along the west property line. (E-2)

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 July 25, 2012. The information in the checklist, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this 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: "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 certain limitations and/or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short-term Impacts

Construction activities 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, a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. 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 analyzes construction-related noise, air quality, earth, grading, construction impacts, traffic and parking impacts as well as its mitigation.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the mixed use building and future phases could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area, which include residential and commercial uses. Surrounding uses are likely to be adversely impacted by noise throughout the duration of construction activities. Due to the proximity of the project site to residential uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate 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), mitigation is warranted.

Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the applicant will submit a construction noise mitigation plan. This plan will include steps 1) to limit noise decibel levels and duration and 2) procedures for advanced notice to surrounding properties. The plan will be subject to review and approval by DPD. 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:

- 1) Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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.
- 4) 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.

Air Quality

Construction for this project is expected to add temporarily particulates to the air that will result in a slight increase in auto-generated air contaminants from construction activities, equipment and worker vehicles; however, this increase is not anticipated to be significant. Federal auto emission controls are the primary means of mitigating air quality impacts from motor vehicles as stated in the Air Quality Policy (Section 25.05.675 SMC). To mitigate impacts of exhaust fumes on the directly adjacent residential uses, trucks hauling materials to and from the project site will not be allowed to queue on streets under windows of the nearby residential buildings.

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. In order to ensure that PSCAA will be notified of the proposed demolition, a condition will be included pursuant to SEPA authority under SMC 25.05.675A which requires that a copy of the PSCAA permit be attached to the demolition permit, prior to issuance. This will assure proper handling and disposal of asbestos.

Earth

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code (SGDCC) requires preparation of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction on sites where grading will involve cuts or fills of greater than three feet in height or grading greater than 100 cubic yards of material.

The soils report, construction plans, and shoring of excavations as needed, will be reviewed by the DPD Geo-technical 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 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 geo-technical engineer prior to issuance of the

permit. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code 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

Excavation to construct the mixed use structure will be necessary. The maximum depth of the excavation is approximately 12 feet and will consist of an estimated 7,000 cubic yards of material. The soil removed will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site by trucks. 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 enroute to or from a site. Future phases of construction will be subject to the same regulations. No further conditioning of the grading/excavation element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Construction Impacts

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.

Traffic and Parking

Duration of construction of the apartment building may last approximately 16 months. During construction, parking demand will increase due to additional 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). Parking utilization along streets in the vicinity is near capacity and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction would likely reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity. Due to the large scale of the project, this temporary demand on the on-street parking in the vicinity due to construction workers' vehicles may be adverse. Upon completion of the parking garage, construction workers shall park in the garage. In order to minimize adverse impacts, the applicant will need to provide a construction worker parking plan to reduce on-street parking until the new garage is completed and safe to use. The authority to impose this condition is found in Section 25.05.675B2g of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance.

The construction of the project also will have adverse impacts on both vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the project site. During construction a temporary increase in traffic volumes to the site will occur, due to travel to the site by construction workers and the transport of construction materials. Approximately 7,000 cubic yards of soil are expected to be excavated from the project site. The soil removed for the garage structure will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site. Excavation and fill activity will require approximately 700 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 350 round trips with 20-yard hauling trucks. Considering the large volumes of truck trips anticipated during construction, it is reasonable that truck traffic avoid the afternoon peak hours. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.

Truck access to and from the site shall be documented in a construction traffic management plan, to be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the beginning of construction. This plan also shall indicate how pedestrian connections around the site will be maintained during the construction period, with particular consideration given to maintaining pedestrian access along Greenwood Ave. Compliance with Seattle's Street Use Ordinance is expected to mitigate any additional adverse impacts to traffic 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 approval of this proposal including: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area; increased demand for parking; and increased light and glare.

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. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, due to the size and location of this proposal, green house gas emissions, historic preservation, traffic, and parking impacts.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the project's energy consumption, are expected to 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.

Historic Preservation

A review by the Department of Neighborhoods determined that the existing commercial structures and the single family residence are unlikely, due in part to a loss of integrity, that they would meet the standards for designation as an individual landmark.

Transportation

Due to the project's small scale, DPD does not anticipate any noticeable transportation impacts from the proposal. No SEPA mitigation of traffic impacts to the nearby intersections is warranted.

Parking

DPD does not anticipate any noticeable parking impacts generated by the proposal. No SEPA mitigation of parking impacts to the nearby intersections is warranted.

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 requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public 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 2C.
- [] 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 2C.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to MUP Issuance

- 1) Design a rockery for installation along the west property line.

Prior to Commencement of Construction

- 2) 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

- 3) 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

- 4) 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 five 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

- 5) 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

- 6) Attach a copy of the PSCAA demolition permit to the building permit set of plans.
- 7) A construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the issuance of the permit. 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. The intent of the construction worker parking plan is to reduce on-street parking until the new garage is constructed and safe to use.

During Construction

- 8) 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.
- 9) 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.
- 10) Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.
- 11) Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, and weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.

For the Life of the Project

- 12) Compliance with all applicable conditions must be verified and approved by the Land Use Planner, Bruce Rips, (206-615-1392) 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.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: June 13, 2013
Bruce P. Rips, AAIA, AICP
Department of Planning and Development

BPR:rgc

H:\RIPS\DOC\DESIGN REVIEW\DEC 3012605 14307 Greenwood Ave N.docx