



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

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

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

Application Number: 3015143
Applicant Name: Homero Nishiwaki of Johnson Architecture and Planning
Address of Proposal: 3206 Harvard Avenue East

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use Application to allow a five-story structure containing 41 residential units above five live/work units in an environmentally critical area. The west and south façades of the existing structure are to be preserved.

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 November 10, 2013.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a five-story structure with 41 residential units above five live/work units in an environmentally critical area. The west and south facades of the existing structures are to be preserved.

Field investigation of the masonry and terra cotta indicate a critical deterioration of the connection between the brick and the supporting wood structure. The preservation of the south and west facades may not be possible if further investigation continues to show extensive corrosion and damage. If this occurs, the applicant proposes to recreate the walls of the original structure in similarly patterned, colored and finished brick and limestone. Discussion of the merits of this strategy is elaborated upon in the Design Review Recommendation section of this Decision. The SEPA portion also considers this possibility.

The applicant proposes three massing variations all of which include preservation of the Larson Building façade. Scheme A adds two floors above the existing two-story façade along Harvard Ave with an additional floor and clearstory toward the back of the site. An open space at Level Three extends the Union Bay Lofts' courtyard into the site. Concern with noise generated by the interstate informs the idea of a courtyard internal to the building. Balconies from the upper levels overlook the court. Scheme B slightly steps back the proposed addition from existing Harvard Ave and the E. Martin St. facades, then forms a series of two unequal terraces at four to five stories as the structure steps back from Harvard Ave. Roof top open spaces overlook the freeway. The architect carves in Scheme C a courtyard open to the west at the third and fourth levels above the existing two-story façade. The new upper levels wrap around the court. At the back of the site, the structure rises to a fifth level.

A series of façade studies shown on p. 13 of the EDG booklet illustrate various ways of composing the two elevations above the existing building. The effort appears informed mostly by the window and pier spacing of the Larson Building.

At the Recommendation meeting, the project team refined Scheme A which illustrated two upper level wings around a central courtyard all above the existing two-story masonry base. The architect announced that preliminary studies of the connections binding the brick and terra cotta to the existing structure were deteriorating making it potentially impossible to preserve the two primary facades. If it is determined that the majority of connections are corroded, the architect proposes to recreate the façade with new brick and limestone. The ornate entry would be preserved.

SITE & VICINITY

The 8,540 sq. ft. site lies within a multifamily Neighborhood Commercial Two (NC2P 40) Pedestrian zone with a 40 foot height limit within the Eastlake Residential Urban Village. A masonry, two-story commercial structure (circa 1924) occupies the development site. The site's declension totals approximately 18 feet from the highest point along the alley to the lowest point at the northwest corner. The site has a mapped steep slope critical area. The project site received an environmentally critical area exemption due to previous legal, grading in the area in the 1920s.

The subject site sits at the northern precinct of the Eastlake neighborhood and the Roanoke community near the University Bridge. The nearby ship canal, Interstate 5, and the Eastlake Ave corridor represent the vicinity's dominant features. The overwhelming presence in the immediate vicinity is the two levels of I-5, the express lanes of which lie 60 feet above the street level of Eastlake Avenue and whose upper deck sits some 98 feet above the street.

The topography rises as it climbs from the water toward the east and north. This portion of Capitol Hill forms a triangular shaped area with its apex on the north near the intersection of Fuhrman Ave E. and Eastlake E. Ave. The area possesses a mix of single family residential, multi-family and commercial uses. Water related uses line the water course. A number of older commercial structures and more recent midrise office and condominium developments run along both sides of Eastlake Avenue E., to the north and south of E. Allison Street. The site lies within the Eastlake Residential Urban Village overlay.

Three rights of way border the site: Harvard Ave E on the west, E. Martin St. on the south and an alley to the east.

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

Public Comments

Seven members of the public attended the Early Design Review meeting. Attendees raised the following issues:

- The E. Martin St. steps are an important feature of the neighborhood. These need improvement and better visibility.
- Pedestrian and bike movements represent a significant issue. The corner needs visual enhancement.
- Create a landscape buffer between the curb and the sidewalk in order to ensure pedestrian safety and reduce noise.
- Improve the pedestrian crossing at Eastlake.
- The Eastlake Ave crossing is particularly germane as many of the future residents will cross the street to reach their cars.
- The bump-out on E. Martin St. enhances the project.
- The site acts as a mini-gateway between neighborhoods. It links the Eastlake and the Roanoke communities.
- The position of the residential door in the Larson Building can inform the composition of the addition.

DPD received one letter in which the author praised Scheme A and favored a façade with the maximum amount of transparency.

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-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.

The Board endorses the idea of a landscape barrier between the curb and the sidewalk. The generous area between the curb and the building presents an opportunity for a gracious streetscape. Continue the landscaping into the E. Martin St. right of way.

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

Focus attention on the landscaping design for the Harvard Ave streetscape and the E. Martin right of way to ensure a quality pedestrian environment.

- A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.**

The developer has every reason to respect the Union Bay Lofts. The architects of the proposal ought to consider the less intense zoning across the alley.

- A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.**

Produce a visually porous separation between courtyards. The adjoining courtyards do not need access to one another, however, the design should allow for a mostly uninterrupted visual connection.

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.**

In general, the applicant addressed height, bulk and scale issues appropriately for the site. The projection or appendage closest to the E. Martin St. right of way needs careful attention as to its scale and relationship to the larger structure, to the adjoining right of way, and to the properties across the alley. An opportunity exists for this projection to form a gem or jewel like object.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

- 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 Board endorses the architect's preferred option "A" with its third level internal courtyard adjoining the open space at the Union Bay Lofts.

None of the three elevation studies generated much enthusiasm among the Board members. By MUP application, the architect will submit a solution; however, working studies of the façade development need inclusion in the Recommendation packet.

Deliberation focused on several possible organizing principles for the facade including the use of the central residential entry, the hinge at Harvard and E. Martin, the fissure between the Union Bay Lofts and the proposal and the rhythm of the upper floor windows and balconies from the adjoining structure.

Integrate the roof top features into the larger structure rather than creating a set of discrete objects of the penthouses and amenity room.

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

- 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.**

Drawings of the next design iteration will display materials. A color and materials board is required.

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-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.**

The architect's decision to ensure alley access to the solid waste storage area was appreciated.

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

The Board strongly encourages the improvement or enhancement of the E. Martin St right of way to ensure both safety and an attractive means of access between neighborhoods.

- 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.**

Develop a signage concept for the Recommendation meeting.

- 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.**

- 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.**

For the new commercial spaces specify highly transparent windows.

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.

Work with SDOT to improve the E. Martin St. right of way. Ensure adequate lighting and attractive 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.

MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a design review component on October 2, 2013.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Design Review Board conducted the Final Recommendation meeting on July 9th, 2014 to review the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to the previously identified priorities. At the public meeting, site plans, elevations, floor plans, landscaping plans, model and computer renderings of the proposed exterior materials were presented for the Board members' consideration.

Public Comments

Two members of the public affixed their names to the Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. No one from the audience spoke at the meeting; however, the Board chair read a statement from the Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council in support of preserving the archway and recreating the remainder of the façade by using similar materials and colors in keeping with the existing building.

DPD received a letter requesting adequate parking.

A. Site Planning

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.

At the EDG meeting, the Board requested expansion of the landscape barrier to the curb and the sidewalk. The Board, after listening to the landscape presentation, tacitly approved the changes to the design.

- A-4 **Human Activity.** New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.
- 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-7 **Residential Open Space.** Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

Deliberation at the earlier meeting discussed the proposal to visually adjoin the proposed upper level courtyard with the adjacent building's courtyard. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board did not discuss revisions to the courtyard design.

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.

At the EDG meeting, Board attention focused on the projection or appendage closest to the E. Martin St. right of way, citing that its scale and relationship to the larger mass and the right of way were important and that the architect had an opportunity to design a gem or jewel-like object. The Board, responding positively to the proposed design, stated that while not a jewel the tower fit well into the context and with the rest of the proposal. The tower creates a vertical hinge that ties together the masonry base with the more contemporary upper level elevations. According to the Board, the architect's design for the tower did not try to over reach.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

- 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 greater portion of the Board deliberation addressed the merits of rebuilding the two-story brick base if the facades cannot be saved. On one hand, the rebuilding of the base with new materials would be inauthentic and more or less mimic what is a modest building. It would be better to start the process over and design a contemporary looking structure. On the other hand, the recreation of the masonry base would honor a beloved neighborhood building possessing an intimacy of scale and finely crafted detail. The development team would be careful to create the punched windows and thicknesses of the walls as well as provide materials as close as possible to the existing ones. Four of the five Board members affirmed the latter. If the base is to be recreated with new but similar materials, the edifice will need to appear similar to what is shown in the Recommendation booklet.

Based on the review of the upper level design and the alternative façade studies, a majority of the Board recommended approval.

- C-3 **Human Scale.** The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.
- 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 applicant will need to provide DPD staff with a color and materials board to ensure that the materials match the existing base and the materials presented at the Recommendation 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.
- 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.
- Deliberation at the EDG meeting focused on safety issues at the E. Martin St. right of way. Cleaning up the blackberries and re-planting the area will enhance the project along with the addition of the proposed seating area.
- D-8 **Treatment of Alleys.** The design of alley entrances should enhance the pedestrian street front.
- The doors into the alley facing units are represented as entirely glass. The Board asked the applicant to consider an alternative choice with less transparency in order to ensure privacy and safety along the alley.
- 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 did not comment upon the signage concept.
- 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.

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.

For the live/work spaces facing Harvard Ave and E. Martin St. maintain the existing amount of transparency. Ensure that the live/work units are designed to be easily converted into commercial space.

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.

See guidance for D-7.

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.

Board Recommendations: The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the July 9, 2014 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 July 9th public meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, four of the five Design Review Board members present recommended approval of the project.

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 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 October 2, 2013. 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. If the south and west elevations need to be rebuilt, the short term impacts may be slightly augmented.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the mixed use building and future phases could 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. Although there is adjacency to residential uses, the Noise Ordinance is found to be adequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts.

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.

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. Excavation will consist of the removal of an estimated 2,500 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. If the south and west elevations need to be rebuilt, the short term impacts may be slightly augmented. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

Traffic and Parking

Duration of construction of the mixed-use 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. In order to minimize adverse impacts, the applicant will need to provide a construction worker parking plan to reduce on-street parking. 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 2,500 cubic yards of soil represent the amount of excavation and fill at 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 250 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 125 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 Eastlake and Harvard Avenues. 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. If the south and west elevations need to be rebuilt, the short term impacts may be slightly augmented. However, due to the size and location of this proposal, green house gas emissions, historic preservation, traffic, and parking impacts warrant further analysis.

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 structure is unlikely, due in part to a loss of integrity, to meet the standards for designation as an individual landmark.

Transportation

According to the transportation consultant, Transportation engineering Northwest (TENW), the 41 dwelling units and the commercial space would likely generate 135 net new average daily vehicle trips with 23 trips occurring in the PM peak hour. DPD staff believes, based on

experience with similar projects in the project vicinity, that the ADT may be somewhat smaller than estimated by the consultant due to propinquity of transit and the likelihood that a substantial number of residences will be students enrolled at the nearby University of Washington. DPD does not anticipate that the impacts to levels of service on nearby streets would be significant. No SEPA mitigation of traffic impacts to the nearby intersections is warranted.

Parking

The development site lies within the Eastlake Residential Urban Village which, based on the Land Use Code section 23.54.015, does not require residential off-street parking. The applicant, however, proposes to use 30 parking spaces situated across Eastlake Ave.

The transportation consultant estimates in its memo to DPD (dated July 15, 2013) that the estimated peak parking demand is approximately 28 vehicles. This may overstate the amount of parking demand due to the consultant's use of a retail multiplier than an office multiplier more reflective of a live/work space. The applicant has 30 spaces available for use on an existing surface parking lot on the west side of Eastlake Ave. E. With an estimated parking demand of 28 parking stalls, the proposed 30 space parking supply is anticipated to be sufficient and no on-street spillover parking would be anticipated. If the applicant does not secure the 30 spaces, DPD anticipates that spillover parking would occur into the neighborhood.

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 Commencement of Construction

- 1) 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 a Certificate of Occupancy

- 2) 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

- 3) 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

- 4) A construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the issuance of the permit. This plan will identify off-street construction worker parking 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.

During Construction

- 5) Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.

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: August 7, 2014
Bruce P. Rips, AAIA, AICP
Department of Planning and Development