



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: 3015428
Applicant Name: Chad Lorentz, Urbal Architecture for Merrill Gardens
Address of Proposal: 5601 24th Ave NW

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 7-story structure containing 104 assisted living units with approx. 3,470 sq. ft. of retail space at grade. Parking for 61 vehicles to be provided below grade. Existing structures to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review pursuant to Chapter 23.41, Seattle Municipal Code, with Departures:
Development Standard Departure from a residential setback.
(SMC 23.47A.014.B.3.b)

SEPA – Environmental Determination – Chapter 25.05, Seattle Municipal Code.

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 Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 3P-65 (NC3P-65), Neighborhood Commercial 3-65 (NC3-65) and Midrise- Residential Commercial (MR-RC).

Nearby Zones: To the north, south and east of the site along 24th Ave NW are NC3-65 and NC3P-65 zones. Directly to the west is a block of MR-RC zoning. North of this MR-RC zone is a LR3 zone. Across NW 56th St. from the MR-RC zone is a small C1-65 zone.

Lot Area: 19,996 square feet.

Environmentally Critical Areas: None

Access: The site is bordered by NW 56th St. to the south, and 24th Ave NW to the east.



Current Development: The site is currently occupied by a vacated single story commercial structure and two single story multi-family buildings. These structures will be demolished prior to construction of the proposed project.

Surrounding Development: Directly north of the site is a 6-story apartment building constructed in 2006, a two story apartment building constructed in 1964, and two single story small residential structures. To the east across 24th Ave NW is a six story 90 unit apartment structure built in 2007. Directly to the west is a two-story single family residence that was built in 1900 or earlier. Across NW 56th St. to the south, a large seven-story mixed use development is under construction.

Neighborhood Character: The project site is located near the core of the Ballard Municipal Center at a transition point between the denser mixed use development to the east and along 24th Ave NW, and the surrounding lower density residential neighborhoods to the north and west. To the southwest are Ballard’s primary commercial streets, NW Market St and the designated historic district along Ballard Ave. The Ballard Public Library and Ballard Commons Park are one block to the west.

Project Description: The proposed project is for the design and construction of a 7-story assisted living building with 104 units and retail space along 24th Ave NW. Parking for 61 vehicles is to be provided in a below grade garage accessed from NW 56th St. Approx. 12,000 cubic yards of soil will be removed from the site.

The proposed structure will have 4 and a half stories of assisted living units ranging from studios to two bedroom units over the lower two stories. The public will have access to the approximately 3,470 sq. ft. of retail space that will be accessed from 24th Ave NW. The residential pedestrian entry is located mid structure off of NW 56th St. The ground level will house accessory services for the residents such as a dining area, wellness center, library, lounge and a multipurpose room, and support spaces including offices, staff lounge and a full kitchen for the dining room. The second level contains an activity room, support functions for the facility, and 11 “memory care” units with its own living/dining area.

At the ground level the residents will have access to landscaped outdoors space at the ‘back’ and west side of the structure. The south facing units on the third level have access to private patios. A landscaped deck is to be built at the west portion of level 7.

DESIGN REVIEW

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: September 16, 2013

The packet presented at the EDG meeting is available online by entering the project number (3015428) 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 EDG file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised during the public comment portion of the Early Design Guidance meeting:

- Commented that the proposed design is an improvement from an earlier proposal for the site.
- Concerned about a canyon affect being created along NW 56th St.
- Encouraged setbacks along 24th Ave NW as the street is being over built and the view of the sky is being blocked with projects that go right to the property line.
- Supportive of an assisted living facility being built in Ballard
- Encouraged the corner at 24th and 56th St. be softened.
- Concerned about the garbage pickup near the parking entry being an impact along NW 56th St.
- Encouraged the development to respect the garden to the west of the site, and would like to work with the applicant to make the garden available for use by future residents.
- Noted that NW 56th is being widened.
- Encouraged windows on the west façade respect privacy of single family residence to the west.
- Wanted to know when existing tenants will need to move out. (April 2014 earliest, more likely a year.)
- Encouraged the existing mosaic in the ROW be preserved. If needed it should be removed during construction and reinstalled when project is complete.
- Concerned about the relationship of the windows in the condo to the north and the proposed development. (The Board responded that this will be presented and reviewed at the Recommendation meeting.)

- Concerned about a large project transitioning from a commercial to a midrise zone and the precedent it will set.
- Encouraged the design effort to go beyond the sterile structures being built in Ballard.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE:

- 1. Relationship to adjacent structures:** The proposed development will be adjacent to an existing condo development in the NC-65 zoned portion of the site along 24th Ave NW, a single family house to the west, and small apartment structures in the residential zone to the north. The Board expressed that the development will have an impact on the surrounding neighbors. The Board acknowledged and supported the proposed setbacks beyond what the code requires, from the condo development at the upper levels and the single family residence to the west. (A-5, B-1)
 - a. Continue to handle the zone transition with setbacks. (B-2)
 - b. Design and locate the fenestration to respect sightlines, especially in the NC zone. (A-5)
 - c. Locate the proposed roof deck back from the west and north building edges to protect privacy. (A-5)
- 2. Relationship to surrounding context and streetscape:** The Board indicated that given the location of the site, and the different character of the two streets, the massing of the project at street level should be different between NW 56th St and 24th Ave NW. (C-2)
 - a. Maintain the two story base and setback at the upper levels along NW 56th St. (A-2)
 - b. The exterior materials should be of high quality given the prominent corner location. (C-4)
 - c. Maintain a strong corner that is well detailed at 24th Ave NW and NW 56th St. (A-10)
 - d. Consider providing residential uses at grade that can relate directly to the street along NW 56th St. (A-4)
- 3. Landscaping:** Landscaping should be used as a buffer, or to reinforce design continuity, where appropriate. The Board acknowledged that landscaping will be an important aspect of how the project relates to the existing surrounding development. (E-2, A-5)
 - a. Provide a well landscaped buffer as part of the proposed patios within the north setbacks. (A-5)
 - b. Provide lower scale landscaping at the west that will not block solar access to the site. (E-2)
 - c. Explore merging the landscaping with the existing garden to the west of the site. (A-1, E-1)

RECOMMENDATION MEETING: May 19, 2014

The packet presented at the Initial Recommendation meeting is available online by entering the project number (3015428) at this website:

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The Initial Recommendation packet is also available to view in the project file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PRESENTATION:

The applicant presented that the windows between the street and the ground level lounge and library areas will be operable. Exterior materials will include fibre C reinforced concrete planks, with a visual variation which will be achieved by different sandblasting finishes of the planks. The memory care area will have cementitious lap siding. The base will include brick and a vinyl storefront.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised during the public comment portion of the Recommendation meeting:

- Requested clarification of the setback between the proposed structure and the condo building to the north. [The applicant clarified that the proposed structure is setback 16' from the north property line and approx. 23' from the existing building.]
- Supported pavers to mark the location of the west property line.
- Concerned about a designated staff smoking area. [The applicant responded staff are not allowed to smoke on the job so there will be no such area.]
- Supported the existing trees along the north property line being protected during construction.
- Noted the exterior treatment of the memory care wing is different and of a lesser quality than the rest of the façade, and does not appear to be sympathetic to the interior use.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After considering the context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following design guidance.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Board complimented the applicant on the clarity of the packet and presentation. The Board was pleased with the design and encouraged the applicant to proceed with the proposal as presented at the Recommendation Meeting.

1. **Relationship to Adjacent Structures:** The Board expressed appreciation for the generous setbacks provided where the NC3 zoned parcels abut and along the west property line. (A-5, B-1)
 - a. Continue to handle the zone transition with setbacks. (B-1)
2. **Relationship to Surrounding Context and Streetscape:** The Board encouraged the applicant to follow through with the well-modulated, architecturally consistent design presented. (C-2)
 - a. Maintain the presented scale of the streetscape. (A-2)
 - b. Maintain the vocabulary of the “wood style” exterior reinforced concrete planks (fibre C). The Board discussed the color of the materials but gave no direction.(C-4)
 - c. The Board recommended preservation of the “State St.” mosaic located in the sidewalk at the corner of 24th Ave NW and NW 56th St. At the EDG meeting the public had requested the street art be protected during construction and preserved in its current location.

The Board identified the following Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority and expressed the project, as presented, was successfully meeting these guidelines.

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.
- 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-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.

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.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

- C-1 Architectural Context.** New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.
- 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.
- 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 Structured Parking Entrances.** The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.

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-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-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.

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.
- 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.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURE

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure was based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure. At the Final Recommendation Meeting one departure was requested:

- 1. Residential Setbacks. (SMC 23.47A.014.B.3.b):** The Code requires, for a structure containing a residential use that abuts the rear lot line of a lot in a residential zone a 15' setback for portions of the structure above 13' in height and an additional setback at the rate of 2' for every ten feet of height above 40'. The applicant proposed a portion of the structure approximately 50' in length to encroach up to 5' into the required setback for the portion of the building above 40' in height.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines A-5 and C-2. The proposal includes setbacks from the existing development in the NC zone where no setbacks are required, provides privacy for the residents of the existing and proposed structures, and will allow for an architecturally consistent form of the proposed design and development.

The Board recommended unanimously that DPD grant the departure.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated May 19, 2014, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the May 19, 2014 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, four Design Review Board members recommended **APPROVAL** of the subject design and of departures with the following condition:

1. Preserve the existing "State St." mosaic located in the sidewalk at the corner of 24th Ave NW and NW 56th St. (C-2)

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Recommendations:

1. The project MUP plans indicated that the "State St." mosaic will be preserved and

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.014.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the DPD Director’s decision reads in part as follows:

The Director’s decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board, provided that, if four (4) members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to the Director, the Director shall issue a decision which incorporates the full substance of the recommendation of the Design Review Board, unless the Director concludes the Design Review Board:

- a. Reflects inconsistent application of the design review guidelines; or*
- b. Exceeds the authority of the Design Review Board; or*
- c. Conflicts with SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the site; or*
- d. Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.*

Director’s Analysis

Four members of the Northwest Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project’s overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board’s recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board’s recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3). The Director agrees with and accepts the conditions recommended by the Board that further augment the selected Guidelines.

Director’s Decision

The design review process is prescribed in Section 23.41.014 of the Seattle Municipal Code. Subject to the above-proposed conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines. The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting, provided additional review and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings. The Design Review Board agreed that the proposed design meets each of the Design Guideline Priorities as previously identified. Therefore, the Director accepts the Design Review Board’s recommendations and **APPROVES** the proposed design and the requested departures.

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 (SMC) Chapter 25.05).

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated 12/19/2013. The Department of Planning and Development (DPD) has annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the project file submitted by the applicant or its agents; and any pertinent comments which may have been received

regarding this proposed action have been considered. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information, and the experience of the lead agency with the 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, 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.

Under such limitations/circumstances, mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts in appropriate.

Public Comment:

The public comment period began on January 30, 2014 ended on February 12, 2014. Public comments were received.

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 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. The following analyzes construction-related noise, greenhouse gas, air quality, construction traffic and parking impacts, as well as mitigation.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the building could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area, which include a lowrise zone north of the western portion of the site. There will be excavation required to prepare the building site and foundation. The applicant has stated in the SEPA checklist that approx. 12,000 cubic yards of soil will be removed from the site and construction is estimated to last 16 months. Additionally, as development proceeds, noise associated with construction of the building could adversely affect the surrounding residential uses in the adjoining area.

The impacts of construction noise on nearby residential properties warrants additional mitigation. To mitigate construction noise impacts pursuant to SMC25.05.675.B the applicant shall submit a Construction Management Plan for approval by DPD.

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 due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

Construction Parking and Traffic

During construction, which may last 16 months, 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 and parking (SMC 25.05.675. B and M).

The immediate area has been experiencing numerous and successive construction projects. The combined impact and duration of this activity has an impact on nearby traffic and parking. Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, grading, and construction activity. One side of the site is located on an arterial street. Additional parking demand from construction vehicles would be expected to further exacerbate the supply of on-street parking. 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.

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

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.

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, removal of up to 12,000 cubic yards of soil, grading, and construction activity, with haul routes restricted to nearby arterials. Large trucks turning onto arterial streets would be expected to exacerbate the flow of traffic. Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted.

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 is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, greenhouse gas emissions; height, bulk and scale; historic preservation; traffic and transportation; and parking impacts warrant further analysis.

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

There are three existing structures on site more than 50 years old. The Department of Neighborhoods indicated that the existing structures on site are unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (LPB 286/14). No further mitigation is warranted.

Traffic and Parking

The applicant submitted a Transportation Impact Analysis (Traffic and Parking Study, by William Popp Associates, dated March 26, 2014).

The study analyzed the proposed uses and the existing uses to determine the new daily trip generation. The project is estimated to generate 475 daily trips, 20 trips for the AM peak hour, and 36 trips (15 in, 21 out) for the PM peak hour to the surrounding street system. The existing uses on site are estimated to have generated 307 daily trips, 9 AM and 20 PM peak hour trips. Thus, the net new impact to the surround street system is estimated to be 168 daily trips, 9 AM peak hour trips, and 16 PM peak hour trips.

The project's traffic impact on the surrounding streets would remain under the Transportation Concurrency Level of Service for the City.

DPD's Transportation Planner has reviewed the Transportation Impact Analysis and determined additional SEPA mitigation is not necessary.

The project is providing 61 parking spaces for staff and residents of the facility. The Traffic Report noted that the residential peak parking demand for this development is anticipated to be 43 spaces. The peak parking demand for the unspecified retail use is estimated at 6 vehicles with peak demand likely in the afternoon.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that there is no SEPA authority provided for mitigation of residential parking impacts in urban villages within 1,320 feet of a street with frequent transit service. This site is located within the Ballard Hub Urban Village, and is also located within a mapped frequent transit service corridor. 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.

DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

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. Provide a construction management plan (CMP) to the Land Use Planner beth.hartwick@seattle.gov for review and approval. In the CMP include that pedestrian access must be maintained on all frontages during working hours and off-hours, and pedestrian traffic control must meet the City of Seattle In-Street Manual and MUTCD (Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices).

2. Provide a construction management plan (CMP) to the Land Use Planner beth.hartwick@seattle.gov for review and approval. In the CMP include hours of construction and any measures that will be taken to mitigate noise.
3. Provide a Construction Parking Plan, to the Land Use Planner beth.hartwick@seattle.gov for review and approval.
4. Provide a copy of a Construction Haul Route, approved by Seattle Department of Transportation to the Land Use Planner (beth.hartwick@seattle.gov).

DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

5. 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 (Beth Hartwick 206 684-0814 or beth.hartwick@seattle.gov).
6. 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 (Beth Hartwick 206 684-0814 or beth.hartwick@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

7. 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 (Beth Hartwick 206 684-0814 or beth.hartwick@seattle.gov) or a DPD assigned Land Use Planner.

Signature: _____ (signature on file) Date: November 10, 2014
Beth Hartwick, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

BH:drm

K:\Decisions-Signed\3015428.docx