City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

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

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

Application Number:	3014989
Applicant Name:	Jay Janette of Janette Architecture for Mad Flats, LLC
Address of Proposal:	1523 East Madison Street

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 5-story structure with 55 residential units, 2-live work units (1,155 sq. ft.) and 790 sq. ft. of retail. No parking proposed. Existing building and surface parking to be demolished.

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

Design Review (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

Site:

Site Zone: NC3-65

Nearby Zones:	(North)	NC3-65
	(South)	LR3
	(East)	LR3
	(West)	NC3-65

Lot Area: 4,387 square feet

Current Development:

The site is located in the Capitol Hill/Central District neighborhood at the southern edge of the Capitol Hill Urban Center Village. The site slopes downward from the east to the west.

The site is currently occupied by a surface parking lot and a 2-story vacant office building, which was constructed as a residence in the early 20th century.

Existing vehicular access to a surface parking lot is via a curb cut on 16th Ave and the alley.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

20th century multi-family structures are located adjacent to the site, across the alley, and across the street to the east. Newer mixed-use residential and retail structures are located to the north across Madison Street, in addition to 1-story retail structures. Most of the older structures are 1-3 stories tall. Most of the newer structures are 6-7 stories tall.

Nearby structures represent a mix of ages and building types, including 2-3 story early 20th century multi-family and single family structures, the recently completed 6-story Living Building commercial structure (Bullitt Center), the recently constructed 6-7 story mixed use construction along E. Madison St, and nearby 1-3 story institutional structures (religious institutions and private schools).

The site is located at the southwest corner of East Madison Street and 16th Avenue. East Madison Street is a busy arterial with a wide variety of commercial uses and residential density. 16th Avenue is a quieter residential street, connecting East Madison Street and East Union Street.

An alley borders the south side of the site and connects 16th Avenue with McGilvra Place Park to the south.TT Minor Park is located one block to the south and Cal Anderson Park is located four blocks to the northwest. These parks offer a wide variety of recreational opportunities.

The future Capitol Hill Light Rail Station is under construction and will be located approximately five blocks to the northwest of the subject property, near the northwest corner of Cal Anderson Park. East Madison Street is planned for Bus Rapid Transit service in the near future.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: August 14, 2013

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3014989) at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The packet is also available to view in the 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 any of the east and north façade expressions shown in the massing options could be combined into a plausible design concept. While the packet notes that one option is 'preferred,' the applicant clarified that they would be satisfied to move forward with any of the options.

In response to Board questions, the applicant explained that the trash area would be recessed into the building and screened with fences/trellises on the sides, and decks above.

The design intent for the ground level is to provide a high level of transparency treated for human scale (canopies, window mullions, operable storefronts, etc.). A setback at the street level would provide area for a wider sidewalk on E. Madison Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were offered at the Early Design Guidance meeting.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: June 11, 2014

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3014989) at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The packet is also available to view in the 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

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

In response to the Early Design Guidance, the applicant described how the design concept was further developed. The setback from the neighbors to the west was maintained, as shown at EDG. The large windows at 16th Ave were retained from the early sketches, the solid waste storage was incorporated into the building footprint, and the street level was developed to encourage street level activity through operable storefront windows and sidewalk cafes.

The applicant showed the 'tube and cube' design concept submitted with MUP intake. This concept was further developed to incorporate screening for the solid waste storage and respond to the angled north corner. The 16th Ave façade was modified from a horizontal "tube" expression to a more vertical expression, and the E. Madison St façade was modified to include glazed vertical elements to frame the punched window 'cube' form.

The applicant noted that they met with the neighborhood group (PPUNC) after the Recommendation meeting was scheduled. The neighborhood group gave feedback to revise the design for a more dramatic expression, and preferred a design based more on the original "tube and cube" scheme.

In response to this feedback, the applicant presented drawings at the Recommendation meeting to further develop the design concept shown in the Recommendation packets, incorporating some aspects of the original concept and further developing the evolved design concept. The applicant explained that the changes include a 'drape' at the northeast corner to accent the change from 16th Ave to E. Madison St. The drape would be composed of varied widths of white cement trim board to provide interesting shadow lines. Darker wood siding would be used to transition to the residential areas to the south. Upper level windows were described as having an 8" recess from the siding on E. Madison St. Ground face CMU was proposed at the street level, with an aluminum storefront system and a metal gate to the live-work units. The chamfered north corner was shown with operable storefronts to be open to the sidewalk.

The upper levels include dark areas on the perspectives that are proposed as dark stained cedar. The panel system would be Hardie Reveal, with thicker quality material and options for more detailed flashing and fasteners. A red metal trim band is proposed above the northeast corner storefront and at the balcony railings near the northeast and south corners. The building identification signage would be large letters in protruding cut pieces of aluminum or other metal. The overall intent is to layer materials to provide a transition between the different street contexts on 16th Ave and E. Madison St.

The applicant explained that the large mature street trees on E. Madison St would be retained. The street trees on 16th Ave are in poor health and would be removed, with replacement street trees added. Other landscaping included a landscape buffer near the solid waste storage and along the building on 16th Ave, as well as the landscape strip between the curb and sidewalk.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- The neighborhood group (PPUNC) provided a comment letter advocating for further development of the original "tube and cube" concept. The comments indicated that the original concept presented a clear simplified design concept, a better response to the corner, and better accommodated retail. The group advocated for developing this design, using a limited high quality material palette. The group supported the slim colorful canopy, accent colors at grade, and operable storefronts to relate to the sidewalk activity.

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 (AUGUST 14, 2013):

1. **Massing Options:**
   a. The Board recommended that whichever massing option is chosen, the proposed design should be developed to strongly accentuate the design parti. The Board noted that massing Options B and C appear to offer the strongest potential for enhancing the design concept. (A-1, A-5, A-10, C-1, C-2)
   b. The increased setback from the neighboring residential building is an important feature of Option C. The Board recommended that this aspect of Option C should be incorporated into the proposed design. (A-5)

c. Option B offers the opportunity to strongly differentiate the design expression of the 16th Ave and E. Madison facades. The design concept should incorporate this aspect of Option B. (C-1, C-2)
d. Option C's angled deck design relates to the nearby context and accentuates the bar concept on 16th Ave. The Board recommended that the design concept should incorporate an architectural response to the angled corner and nearby context. This response could be expressed through decks, enclosed angled building area, or other architectural elements. (A-1, A-10, C-1, C-2)
e. The 16th Ave upper level façade should be designed to respond to the residential scale of this street and the building program. The Board noted that this facade should be architecturally treated to provide a transition in scale from the commercial nature of E. Madison to the residential areas to the south. (A-2, B-1, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4)
f. The Board noted that the ground level plan is acceptable for any option. (A-1, A-2, A-4, D-1)

2. **Alley Frontage**:
   a. The solid waste storage area should be tucked under the building and fully screened. The screening should be designed to be consistent with the architectural concept. (A-1, A-2, D-6, D-8)
      1) The Board observed that the decks in option C appear to create the best opportunity for screening the trash from the sides and above, but other methods of screening may also meet this guidance.
      2) The Board advised designing the solid waste screening to provide a transition in scale from the upper building area to the smaller residential scale at the alley and to the south (the feeling of a 'mews').
   b. The alley frontage and solid waste storage should be designed to respond to the pedestrian environment, given the visibility of the alley from the angled 16th Ave street frontage, and the alley connection between 16th Ave and McGilvra Place Park on 15th Ave. This area should include visually interesting materials and landscaping to visually soften the screening and provide pedestrian scale. (A-1, A-2, A-4, B-1, C-4, D-6, D-8, E-2)

3. **Street Frontage:** The street frontages should be designed to maximize human activity and transparency. (A-1, A-2, A-4)
   a. Operable storefront windows should be used for the retail and live-work units. (A-2, A-4, D-11)
   b. The small size of the commercial spaces and the location require careful treatment for scale and interest to encourage pedestrian activity. (A-4, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-9, D-10, D-11)
   c. The Board strongly encouraged stepping the commercial spaces with grade. (A-1, A-2, C-2, D-1)
   d. The design of the live-work units should respond to the need for residents' privacy at the street and the need for commercial transparency. (A-2, A-4, C-3, C-4, D-11)

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS (JUNE 11, 2014):

1. **Design Concept.** The Board considered the design of the option shown in the Recommendation packets mailed to the Board, the 'tube and cube' concept, and the applicant's preferred evolved design concept. The Board discussed all three and recommended that the applicant's preferred final design concept was a sufficient response to EDG, with some changes to the corner materials (described in response to the "Materials" section, below). (A-1, A-2, A-5, A-10, C-1, C-2)

a. The Board acknowledged that the preferred design provides a different response to the two street frontages and provides a transition to the adjacent residential building, in response to EDG. (A-1, A-2, A-5)
b. As a parti, the tube and cube is interesting. However, the Board supported the execution of the preferred concept as a response to Early Design Guidance. (A-10, C-1, C-2)

2. **Materials.** The Board supported certain aspects of the design concept such as the deeply inset windows, the use of wood at the residential entry, the sharply angled corner form, the textured appearance of the north corner drape, and the accent colors. The Board recommended simplifying the material palette by using a different material at the north corner. (C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4)
   a. The large variety of materials aren't reflective of the concept and context. The amount and application of materials should be simplified. (C-2, C-3, C-4)
   b. The Board was concerned that the "drape" cementitious material in a variety of widths and depths detracts from the angled corner expression, may not be durable at the corner, and detracts from the design of the corner massing. (A-10, C-2, C-4)
   c. The Board supported the vertical texture as a response to the vertical cedar siding, but wanted to see a more durable material that related to the design concept at the north corner. (A-10, C-2, C-4)
      1) The Board therefore recommended a condition to clad the corner in a high quality durable material that unifies the overall material palette. (A-10, C-2, C-4)
      2) The Board clarified that standing seam metal (not corrugated profile) could be used at the corner as a possible solution. (C-2, C-4)
   d. The use of cedar at the residential entry on 16th Ave was supported by the Board as a response to the residential character of 16th Ave. (A-2, C-1, C-4)
   e. The Board noted that the operable storefront system at the north corner is an important response to the street level. The Board recommended a condition to retain the operable storefront system at the corner of 16th Ave and East Madison Street. (A-2, A-4, C-4)
   f. The Board also acknowledged that the accent colors as shown on the colors and materials board are an important aspect of highlighting the design articulation and should be retained. The building identification signage should be silver standing letters, as described in the Recommendation meeting presentation. (C-2, C-4)

3. **Live Work.** The Board recommended approval of the design of the live-work units as a transition between the north corner commercial space and the residential building to the west. (A-1, A-2, A-5, C-1, C2, C-3)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Neighborhood specific guidelines are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website.

A-1 **Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.**

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

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Retain or increase the width of sidewalks.**
- **Provide street trees with tree grates or in planter strips, using appropriate species to provide summer shade, winter light, and year-round visual interest.**
- **Vehicle entrances to buildings should not dominate the streetscape.**
- **Orient townhouse structures to provide pedestrian entrances to the sidewalk.**
- **For buildings that span a block and "front" on two streets, each street frontage should receive individual and detailed site planning and architectural design treatments to complement the established streetscape character.**
- **New development in commercial zones should be sensitive to neighboring residential zones. Examples include lots on Broadway that extend to streets with residential character, such as Nagle Place or 10th or Harvard Avenues East. While a design with a commercial character is appropriate along Broadway, compatibility with residential character should be emphasized along the other streets.**

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

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Provide for sidewalk retail opportunities and connections by allowing for the opening of the storefront to the street and displaying goods to the pedestrian.**
- **Provide for outdoor eating and drinking opportunities on the sidewalk by allowing for the opening the restaurant or café windows to the sidewalk and installing outdoor seating while maintaining pedestrian flow.**
- **Install clear glass windows along the sidewalk to provide visual access into the retail or dining activities that occur inside. Do not block views into the interior spaces with the backs of shelving units or with posters.**

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-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.**

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Incorporate residential entries and special landscaping into corner lots by setting the structure back from the property lines.**
- **Provide for a prominent retail corner entry.**

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.**

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Break up building mass by incorporating different façade treatments to give the impression of multiple, small-scale buildings, in keeping with the established development pattern.**
- **Consider existing views to downtown Seattle, the Space Needle, Elliott Bay and the Olympic Mountains, and incorporate site and building design features that may help to preserve those views from public rights-of-way.**
- **Design new buildings to maximize the amount of sunshine on adjacent sidewalks throughout the year.**

C-2 **<u>Architectural Concept and Consistency</u>. 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.**

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Incorporate signage that is consistent with the existing or intended character of the building and the neighborhood.**
- **Solid canopies or fabric awnings over the sidewalk are preferred.**
- **Avoid using vinyl awnings that also serve as big, illuminated signs.**
- **Use materials and design that is compatible with the structures in the vicinity if those represent the desired neighborhood character.**

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

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Incorporate building entry treatments that are arched or framed in a manner that welcomes people and protects them from the elements and emphasizes the building's architecture.**
- **Improve and support pedestrian-orientation by using components such as: non-reflective storefront windows and transoms; pedestrian-scaled awnings; architectural detailing on the first floor; and detailing at the roof line.**

C-4 **<u>Exterior Finish Materials</u>. 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.**

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Use wood shingles or board and batten siding on residential structures.**
- **Avoid wood or metal siding materials on commercial structures.**
- **Provide operable windows, especially on storefronts.**
- **Use materials that are consistent with the existing or intended neighborhood character, including brick, cast stone, architectural stone, terracotta details, and concrete that incorporates texture and color.**
- **Consider each building as a high-quality, long-term addition to the neighborhood; exterior design and materials should exhibit permanence and quality appropriate to the Capitol Hill neighborhood.**

- **The use of applied foam ornamentation and EIFS (Exterior Insulation & Finish System) is discouraged, especially on ground level locations.**

D-1 **<u>Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances</u>. 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.**

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Provide entryways that link the building to the surrounding landscape.**
- **Create open spaces at street level that link to the open space of the sidewalk.**
- **Building entrances should emphasize pedestrian ingress and egress as opposed to accommodating vehicles.**
- **Minimize the number of residential entrances on commercial streets where non-residential uses are required. Where residential entries and lobbies on commercial streets are unavoidable, minimize their impact to the retail vitality commercial streetscape.**

D-6 **<u>Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas</u>. 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.**

Capitol Hill-specific supplemental guidance:

- **Consolidate and screen dumpsters to preserve and enhance the pedestrian environment.**

D-8 **<u>Treatment of Alleys</u>. The design of alley entrances should enhance the pedestrian street front.**

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

D-10 **<u>Commercial Lighting</u>. 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.**

D-11 **<u>Commercial Transparency</u>. 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.**

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

No departures were requested at the Design Recommendation meeting.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated June 11, 2014, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the June 11, 2014 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures, with the following conditions:

1. **Clad the north corner in a high quality durable material that unifies the overall material palette. (A-10, C-2, C-4)**
2. **Retain the operable storefront system at the corner of 16th Ave and East Madison Street. (A-2, A-4, C-4)**
3. **Retain the accent colors as shown on the colors and materials board. The building identification signage should be silver standing letters, as described in the Recommendation meeting presentation. (C-2, C-4)**

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Conditions:

1. The north corner is proposed to be clad with vertical metal box beam siding that would be installed in a pattern of random profile widths, as shown in the MUP plans. The proposal satisfies recommended condition #1.
2. The applicant has indicated that the operable storefront system will be retained at the corner of 16th Ave and E. Madison St. This item will be verified at construction permit review and prior to a final Certificate of Occupancy for the building. The current proposal satisfies recommended condition #2.
3. The applicant has indicated that the accent colors and signage will be built and installed as shown at the Design Recommendation meeting. This item will be verified at construction permit review and prior to a final Certificate of Occupancy for the building. The current proposal satisfies recommended condition #3.

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED** subject to the conditions listed at the end of this document.

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 October 18, 2013. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed and annotated 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 many 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. Additional discussion of short and long term impacts, and conditions to sufficiently mitigate impacts where necessary, is found below.

Public Comment:

The public comment period ended on November 20, 2013. Comments were received in response to the design review aspects of the proposal.

Short Term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: temporary soil erosion; decreased air quality due to increased dust and other suspended air particulates during excavation, filling and transport of materials to and from the site; increased noise and vibration from construction operations and equipment; increased traffic and parking demand from construction personnel traveling to and from the work site; consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources; disruption of utilities serving the area; and conflict with normal pedestrian movement adjacent to the site. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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.

Construction Parking and Traffic

The area includes limited and timed or metered on-street parking. Additional parking demand from construction vehicles would be expected to further exacerbate the supply of on-street parking. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities.

The site is located adjacent to a busy arterial (E. Madison Street) and the adjacent side streets include narrow paved roadways. Therefore, most construction vehicles will likely need to use E. Madison Street to access the site and haul material away from the site.

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted for construction parking and traffic impacts.

To mitigate construction parking impacts, the applicant shall submit a Construction Parking Plan for approval by DPD. This plan shall demonstrate the location of the site, the peak number of construction workers on site during construction, the location of nearby parking lots that are identified for potential pay parking for construction workers, the number of stalls per parking lot identified, and a plan to reduce the number of construction workers driving to the site. This plan shall be reviewed by DPD. Approval of the plan is required prior to the issuance of demolition, grading, and building permits.

To mitigate construction truck trip impacts, the applicant shall submit a Construction Haul Route 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 the approved plan shall be provided to DPD prior to the issuance of demolition, grading, and building permits.

Long Term Impacts

Long term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result 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 and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; loss of plant and animal habitat; and increased light and glare. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse long-term impacts to the environment.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project construction 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, therefore, no further mitigation is warranted.

Height, Bulk & Scale

The project went through a Design Review process which addressed the issue of Height, Bulk & Scale; see the above Design Review Analysis for details of the process and design changes.

Pursuant to SEPA Policy 25.05.675.G.2.c: Height, Bulk and Scale, "the Citywide Design Guidelines (and any Council-approved, neighborhood Design Guidelines) are intended to mitigate the same adverse height, bulk and scale impacts addressed in these policies. A project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review process is presumed to comply with the height, bulk and scale policies. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that height, bulk and scale impacts documented through environmental review have not been adequately mitigated. Any additional mitigation imposed by the decision maker pursuant to these height, bulk and scale policies that have undergone design review shall comply with the design guidelines applicable to the project."

Additional SEPA Mitigation of height, bulk and scale is not warranted.

Historic Preservation

The existing structure on site is more than 50 years old. The applicant nominated the existing structure for a historic landmark. The Landmarks Preservation Board denied the designation of the structure as a historic landmark (Landmarks Preservation Board letter, reference number LPB 665/13). Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for historic preservation.

Parking and Traffic

As part of the environmental checklist, the project submitted a transportation analysis (1523 East Madison Street Apartments Traffic Impact Analysis, by Gibson Traffic Consultants, dated September 2013, and a correction notice response memo dated March 25, 2014).

The Traffic Impact Analysis noted that the residential peak parking demand for this development is 19 vehicles. No off-street parking spaces are proposed with the development. The applicant identified nearby off-street pay parking lots that could provide parking for 117 vehicles in the evening hours within 1,320 feet of the site.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that there is no SEPA authority provided for mitigation of parking impacts in the Capitol Hill Urban Center. This site is located in that Urban Center. Regardless of the parking demand impacts, no SEPA authority is provided to mitigate impacts of parking demand from the residential components of this project, even if impacts were identified.

The Traffic Impact Analysis indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 217 daily vehicle trips, with 14 net new AM Peak Hour trips and 19 net new PM Peak Hour trips. The additional trips would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections. The DPD Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that the additional trips would not have significant adverse impacts to nearby traffic conditions.

Concurrency analysis was conducted for nearby identified areas. That analysis showed that the project is expected to be within the adopted standards for the identified areas.

Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for parking or traffic impacts.

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.

DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Certificate of Occupancy

1. 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).

2. 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

3. 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).

SEPA - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

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

4. The applicant shall provide a copy of a Construction Haul Route, approved by Seattle Department of Transportation.

5. A Construction Parking Plan, approved by the Land Use Planner (Shelley.bolser@seattle.gov), shall be required.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: August 21, 2014
Shelley Bolser, AICP, LEED AP
Land Use Planning Supervisor
Department of Planning and Development

SB:rgc
K:\Decisions-Signed\3014989.docx