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:	3013264
Applicant Name:	Josh McDonald of Weber Thompson Architects for Wolff Enterprises LLC
Address of Proposal:	4724 California Ave SW

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a new 7-story building with 5,000 square feet of retail area and 13 live-work units at the ground floor and second story, 73 residential units above, and two floors of below-grade parking accessed from the alley. The preferred option includes a mid-block pedestrian connection between California Ave SW and the alley, located on the north side of the site.

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

Design Review with No Departures (SMC Chapter 23.41)

SEPA-Environmental Determination (Chapter 25.05 SMC)

DPD SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-significance

☐ No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.

☒ Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.06.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

Current Development:

One story vacant commercial building (formerly Petco).

Access:

There is no existing parking at this site. Pedestrian access to the building is from the alley and from California Ave SW.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

Surrounding development is a mix of one and two story commercial development, multi-story mixed-use, and multi-story residential buildings. A mid-block pedestrian connection is located on the block to the east, across the alley from the site. A similar mid-block connection exists across California Ave SW from the site.

The site is located in the West Seattle Junction, an area of intense pedestrian and commercial activity along California Ave SW near the intersection of SW Alaska Street. Existing development in this area of California Ave SW is predominantly 1-2 story commercial development. The neighborhood beyond this section of California Ave SW consists of multi-story mixed-use and residential development, with single family residential further to the south and west.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: May 24, 2012

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3013264) at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The EDG packet is also available to view in the 3013264 EDG file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Mailing Address: **Public Resource Center**
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

The applicant noted that the proposal would be built at approximately 75' tall, below the maximum 85' height permitted by zoning.

The proposed mid-block connection would include a high level of glazing at the building face, with open air above and treatments such as caternary lighting to frame the space. A retail/restaurant destination would be located adjacent to the entry to the mid-block connection (similar to The Mural building across the alley). The primary building entry would be located at the mid-block connection, allowing retail for the entire California Ave SW street frontage.

The mid-block connection would be designed with visual interest and maximum visual connections into the building.

Murals could be used on the party wall at the south property line, similar to examples in the neighborhood.

The applicant noted that massing scheme C is preferred because it minimizes blank walls and allows the most glazing on the north and south façades, a three story base is created with upper story setbacks in order to minimize the scale at the California Ave SW street wall and south façade, and it includes additional setbacks at the pedestrian connection entry at California Ave SW.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately 16 members of the public signed in at this Early Design Review meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Mural apartment residents wanted to see more information about the design of the east façade, since the Mural Apartments building is located directly east across the alley from this site.
- Appreciation for the applicant's public outreach efforts and involving nearby residents in the design of this building.
- The upper stories of the building should be designed to minimize the scale and relate the 7-story structure to the 1-2 story structures nearby.
- Would like to see the design go in the 'brave' directions of the West Seattle Triangle combined with the traditional designs of the Junction.
- Concern with adding to the existing alley congestion of delivery trucks, moving trucks, and vehicular traffic, given the narrow alley dimensions.
- Mural Apartments management concerned with blocked views; the design should include setbacks for consideration of some views.
- The design challenge is to blend the existing very low height development with the existing 85' zoning. The direction of this design is good, but more effort is needed.
- The mid-block passage is a good aspect of the proposal and should be maximized. A 15' wide passage would be better, with landscaping.
- Human scaled materials are needed to break up the massing and make the scale relate to people at the street level.
- The design should include high quality materials, such as brick and other traditional durable materials.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: November 8, 2012

The packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3013264) at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

or contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Appreciated the street level retail design for pedestrian activity on California Ave SW.
- Appreciated the mid-block pedestrian connection location and design.
- Appreciated the proposed loading space, to avoid blocking the alley with loading functions.
- Appreciated that the applicant has worked to reach out and get input from the community on the proposed design.
- Appreciated the use of modulation to break down the visual length of the building on California Ave SW.
- The signage should remain subtle. The proposed blade signage is a good idea.
- Expressed a preference that the live-work was designed with direct access to the street, rather than requiring live-work patrons to travel through the residential lobby area.
- Appreciated the pedestrian level detail and quality materials, as well as the street level setback.

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.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE:

1. **Relating proposed development to existing scale**: The existing development is one to two stories tall, and the zoning allows 85' tall structures. The challenge will be to use materials and massing and articulation to relate to the existing development, while keeping in mind that the maximum zoning will likely translate to taller buildings as the context in the near future.

a. Modulate the building beyond the current amount of modulation shown in Option C. (A-2, B-1)
b. Consider further setting back the 7th floor, increase the setback at the 4th floor, and use other modulation and treatment to let the upper portions of the building recede from the street wall. (A-2, B-1, C-2, C-3)
    - Examine the modulation used in the Connor building, as an example of this guidance.
c. A terrace or similar at the fourth level would help to accentuate the division between the three story base and the upper masses. (A-2, B-1)
d. The 3-story base should have a durable material with a human scale that relates to nearby context, such as brick. (A-2, C-2, C-3)
e. Use materials, massing, and articulation to emphasize the differences between live-work/commercial and residential uses. (A-2, B-1, C-2, C-3)

2. **The alley façade**:
    a. Clearly show the distance between the proposed building and the residential balconies and windows across the alley. (A-5)
    b. Include graphics that show how proposed windows and balconies relate to the window and balcony locations across the alley. (A-5)
    c. The alley facing façade should include high quality visually interesting materials at upper and lower levels. (A-5, C-2, D-2)
    d. The pedestrian connection should be designed to be welcoming and safe for pedestrians. The connection across the alley to the adjacent mid-block connection should be designed for pedestrian safety. (D-7, D-8, E-2)

3. **Alley vehicular entry and services**: (A-8, D-6)
    a. At the Recommendation stage of review, the applicant should demonstrate how:
        - The alley entry is designed to provide adequate vehicular turning radii
        - Loading needs such as moving in and out will be accommodated
        - Trash and recycling storage will be accommodated within the building and how these materials will be staged on collection days.

4. **The mid-block connection entry point** provides interesting opportunities for design and can help to activate the passage.
    a. Use landscaping to define and enhance the mid-block connection. (D-1, D-12, E-2)
    b. At the Recommendation stage of review, include detailed graphics and renderings demonstrating the design of the mid-block connection. (D-1, D-12, E-2)

5. **Design concept:**
    a. The preferred Option C is acceptable, and the mid-block crossing is a critical aspect of this Option. (C-2)
    b. The development will be very visible due to the lower adjacent building heights. Therefore, a strong over-arching design concept is needed. (C-2)
    c. Provide information about how a mural on the south façade would relate to the overall design concept. (C-2, C-4)
    d. The twist at the northwest corner is an acceptable move and complements the Mural pedestrian entry at the northeast corner of that building. (A-2, C-2)

e. The street level retail should include maximum transparency, a strong architectural expression at the building base, and high quality human scale materials. (A-2, C-2, C-3, D-11)
f. At the Recommendation stage of review, the applicant should demonstrate with diagrams, sections, and other graphics how the live-work units would function at the second story and at the alley. (C-2, D-9, D-10)
g. The live-work units should be clearly expressed in the exterior façade treatment. This may be achieved with modulation, articulation, fenestration, signage, and materials. (C-2, D-9, D-10)
h. Provide a conceptual signage plan, indicating signage design requirements for tenants and areas on the building designed for future signage opportunities. The plan should indicate the location and design of signage for the building (such as a large graphic building sign indicated in preliminary sketches). (C-2, D-9)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Response to EDG**: The Board was satisfied with the design response to context, the alley façade design, and the vehicular and service entries.

2. **The mid-block connection entry point:** The Board expressed some concern with the design of the mid-block connection expression at the sidewalk surface.
    a. The Board recommended a condition that the mid-block connection pavers should either terminate at the property line, or they should be extended for the entire depth of the sidewalk between the mid-block connection and the brick clad column in California Ave SW. (D-1, D-12, E-2)
    b. The Board noted that extending the pavers into the sidewalk area is within the purview of Seattle Department of Transportation.

3. **Design concept, northwest corner:** The Board was disappointed that the northwest corner element was modified from the 'twist' shown at EDG. The northwest corner needs to be enhanced to emphasize the architectural concept, the corner retail, and the entry to the mid-block connection and the design concept of a northwest corner bay:
    a. The Board recommended a condition that the canopy and corner retail should be enhanced to relate to the significance of the northwest corner. (A-2, C-2, C-3, D-11)
    b. The Board noted that the corner retail level and canopy design could be enhanced through methods such as:
        i. Extending the corner canopy, equal to or beyond the depth of the canopies in the south building module;
        ii. Placing the brick material on the soffit of the northwest corner; and
        iii. Extending pavers into the sidewalk area in front of the building.
    c. The Board recommended a condition that the northwest corner bay should be modified to enhance this as a distinct vertical bay in the building, as opposed to repeating the upper expression of the south module. (A-2, C-2) Possible techniques to achieve this include:
        i. A more transparent northwest corner without the colored bands interrupting the glazed corner; or

ii. Modifying the northwest corner to reference the two story expression of the south building module, to weave the two portions of the building together.

d. The Board recommended that the canopy in the mid-block connection be extended to provide sufficient weather protection for pedestrians. (D-1)
e. The Board recommended that the railing at the rooftop should recede to a setback where it's not visible from the street, to be consistent with the design concept and to reduce the appearance of height. The applicant should consider how to maintain the green roof areas, perhaps by placing railings between the hard scape and green roof. (C-2, C-4, D-1, E-2)
f. The Board noted that the railing at the seventh floor is appropriate, and doesn't need to be modified. (C-2, C-4)
g. The Board commented that the proposed materials are durable and finely textured. The Board noted that the muted color palette may not enhance the design as much as it could, but declined to recommend a condition related to this issue. (C-2, C-4)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Board identified the following Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project.
The Neighborhood specific guidelines are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website.

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

West Seattle Junction -specific supplemental guidance:

A pedestrian-oriented streetscape is perhaps the most important characteristic to be achieved in new development in the Junction's mixed use areas (as previously defined). New development—particularly on SW Alaska, Genesee, Oregon and Edmunds Streets—will set the precedent in establishing desirable siting and design characteristics in the right-of-way.

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.

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

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.

West Seattle Junction -specific supplemental guidance:

Current zoning in the Junction has created abrupt edges in some areas between intensive, mixed-use development potential and less-intensive, multifamily development potential. In addition, the Code-complying building envelope of NC-65' (and higher) zoning designations permitted within the Commercial Core would result in development that exceeds the scale of existing commercial/mixed-use development. More refined transitions in height, bulk and scale—in terms of relationship to surrounding context and within the proposed structure itself—must be considered.

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.**

West Seattle Junction-specific supplemental guidance:

New multi-story developments are encouraged to consider methods to integrate a building's upper and lower levels. This is especially critical in areas zoned NC-65' and greater, where more recent buildings in the Junction lack coherency and exhibit a disconnect between the commercial base and upper residential levels as a result of disparate proportions, features and materials. The base of new mixed-use buildings – especially those zoned 65 ft. in height and higher - should reflect the scale of the overall building. New mixed-use buildings are encouraged to build the commercial level, as well as one to two levels above, out to the front and side property lines to create a more substantial base.

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

West Seattle Junction-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Facades should contain elements that enhance pedestrian comfort and orientation while presenting features with visual interest that invite activity.**

  Overhead weather protection should be functional and appropriately scaled, as defined by the height and depth of the weather protection. It should be viewed as an architectural amenity, and therefore contribute positively to the design of the building with appropriate proportions and character.

- **Signage: Signs should add interest to the street level environment. They can unify the overall architectural concept of the building, or provide unique identity for a commercial space within a larger mixed-use structure. Design signage that is appropriate for the scale, character and use of the project and surrounding area. Signs should be oriented and scaled for both pedestrians on sidewalks and vehicles on street.**

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.**

C-5 **Pedestrian Environment. The presence of appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.**

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.**

West Seattle Junction -specific supplemental guidance:

Design projects to attract pedestrians to the commercial corridors (California, Alaska). Larger sites are encouraged to incorporate pedestrian walkways and open spaces to create breaks in the street wall and encourage movement through the site and to the surrounding area. The Design Review Board would be willing to entertain a request for departures from development standards (e.g. an increase in the 64% upper level lot coverage in NC zones and a reduction in open space) to recover development potential lost at the ground level.

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

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

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.**

E-2 <u>Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site</u>. 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.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

None.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated November 8, 2012, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the November 8, 2012 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures, with the following conditions:

1. The mid-block connection pavers should either terminate at the property line, or they be extended for the entire depth of the sidewalk between the mid-block connection and the brick clad column in California Ave SW. (D-1, D-12, E-2)
2. The canopy and corner retail should be enhanced to relate to the significance of the northwest corner. (A-2, C-2, C-3, D-11)
3. The northwest corner bay should be modified to enhance this area of the building as a distinct vertical bay, as opposed to repeating the upper expression of the south module. (A-2, C-2)
4. The canopy in the mid-block connection should be extended to provide sufficient weather protection for pedestrians. (D-1)
5. The railing at the rooftop should recede to a setback where it is not visible from the street, to be consistent with the design concept and to reduce the appearance of height. (C-2, C-4, D-1, E-2)

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Conditions:

1. The MUP plans show the mid-block connection pavers terminating at the property line. The proposal satisfies condition #1.

2. The canopy and corner retail designs have been modified as shown in the MUP plan sets. The proposal satisfies condition #2.

3. The northwest corner bay has been modified as shown in the MUP plan sets. The proposal satisfies condition #3.
4. The mid-block canopy has been extended as shown in the MUP plan sets. The proposal satisfies condition #4.
5. The railing has been modified at the rooftop as shown in the MUP plan sets. The proposal satisfies condition #5.

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED** subject to the conditions listed below.

SEPA ANALYSIS

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the Seattle State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), WAC 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated January 22, 2013. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant, reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file, and pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered.

As indicated in the checklist, this action may result in adverse impacts to the environment. However, due to their temporary nature or limited effects, the impacts are not expected to be significant.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, and certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced, may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states, in part, *"Where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation"* subject to some limitations.

Codes and development regulations applicable to this proposed project will provide sufficient mitigation for short and/or long term impacts. Applicable codes may include the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on September 5, 2012.

Short Term Impacts

Air

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with development come from multiple sources; the extraction, processing, transportation, construction and disposal of materials and landscape disturbance (Embodied Emissions); energy demands created by the development after it is completed (Energy Emissions); and transportation demands created by the development after it is completed (Transportation Emissions). Short term impacts generated from the embodied emissions results in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases thereby impacting air quality and contributing to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are

adverse they are not expected to be significant. The other types of emissions are considered under the use-related impacts discussed later in this document. SEPA conditioning is not necessary to mitigate air quality impacts pursuant to SEPA policy SMC 25.05.675.A.

Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. These impacts would be especially adverse in the early morning, in the evening, and on weekends. The Seattle Noise Ordinance permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends. Some of the surrounding properties are developed with housing and will be impacted by construction noise.

The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance are not sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore, pursuant to SEPA authority, the applicant shall be required to limit periods of construction activities (including but not limited to grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) to non-holiday weekdays from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM, unless modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, to be determined by DPD prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit, whichever is issued first.

Construction Parking and Traffic

During construction, parking demand is expected to 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.

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, grading, and construction activity. The immediate area is subject to traffic congestion during the PM peak hours on California Ave SW and nearby arterials, and large trucks turning onto arterial streets would be expected to further exacerbate the flow of traffic.

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted.

To mitigate construction parking impacts and other haul truck trip impacts, the applicant shall submit a Construction Haul Route and Construction Parking Plan for approval by Seattle Department of Transportation. This plan may include a restriction in the hours of truck trips to mitigate traffic impacts on nearby arterials and intersections. Evidence of this approved plan shall be provided to DPD prior to the issuance of demolition, grading, and building permits.

Long Term Impacts

Historic Preservation

The Department of Neighborhoods indicated the structures on site is unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Landmarks Preservation Board letter, reference number LPB 443/12). Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for historic preservation.

Parking and Traffic

As part of the environmental checklist, the project submitted a transportation analysis (Transportation Impact Analysis, 4724 California Ave SW Mixed-Use, dated July 2012) :

The project is expected to generate a net total of 315 daily vehicle trips, with 5 net new AM Peak Hour trips and 18 net new PM Peak Hour trips. Level of service analysis was performed for nearby intersections. That analysis showed that the project is expected to add a small amount of delay at each of the study intersections, but is not expected to significantly affect their overall operation.

The parking analysis indicated that the amount of proposed parking (76 spaces) will accommodate the peak residential parking demand (68 vehicles). Visitors for residential and commercial uses on the site may create demand for an additional 14 vehicles. These users are typically not permitted to park in residential underground garages, so it's expected that an overflow of 14 vehicles may be required to find parking on-street or in nearby paid parking lots. The Transportation Impact Analysis indicated there are several opportunities for nearby on-street and paid parking.

DPD's Transportation Planner has reviewed the Traffic and Parking Analysis and determined that the additional peak hour trips and parking demand do not contribute significant adverse impacts requiring mitigation. Accordingly, no mitigation of impacts disclosed in this section is required.

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

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 (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

☒ 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 43.21.030(2) (c).

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355 and Early review DNS process in SMC 25.05.355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

SEPA - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

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

1. The applicant shall provide a copy of a Construction Haul Route and Construction Parking Plan, approved by Seattle Department of Transportation and DPD.

2. If the applicant intends to work outside of the limits of the hours of construction described in condition #3, a Construction Noise Management Plan shall be required, subject to review and approval by DPD, and prior to a demolition, grading, or building permit, whichever is issued first. The Plan shall include proposed management of construction related noise, efforts to mitigate noise impacts, and community outreach efforts to allow people within the immediate area of the project to have opportunities to contact the site to express concern about noise. Elements of noise mitigation may be incorporated into any Construction Management Plans required to mitigate any short - term transportation impacts that result from the project.

During Construction

3. Construction activities (including but not limited to demolition, grading, deliveries, framing, roofing, and painting) shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays from 7am to 6pm. Interior work that involves mechanical equipment, including compressors and generators, may be allowed on Saturdays between 9am and 6pm once the shell of the structure is completely enclosed, provided windows and doors remain closed. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition. This condition may be modified through a Construction Noise Management Plan, required prior to issuance of a building permit as noted in condition #2.

DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

4. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Shelley Bolser 206-733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov).

5. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 10-2011, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Shelley Bolser (206) 733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

6. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Shelley Bolser 206-733-9067 or shelley.bolser@seattle.gov).

Signature: (signature on file) Date: April 4, 2013
Shelley Bolser, AICP, LEED AP
Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

SB:drm

H:\DOC\SEPA\Size of Construction\3013264\3013264.McDonald.Wolff.docx