



**City of Seattle**  
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

---

**Department of Construction and Inspections**  
Nathan Torgelson, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE  
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR  
OF THE SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND INSPECTIONS**

**Application Number:** 3016656  
**Applicant Name:** Hugh Schaeffer, S&H Works for Noren Development  
**Address of Proposal:** 6301 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION**

Land Use Application to allow a 4-story structure containing 61 residential units and 2 live-work units with 2,532 sq. ft. of ground level retail space. No parking is proposed. 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 Residential Setbacks  
(SMC23.47A.014.B.1 and SMC23.47A.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 3-40 (NC3-40)

Nearby Zones: Directly to the north and south along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW the zone is a NC3-40. Directly to the west the zoning is LR1. To the east, a half block off of 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW the zoning is LR3.

Lot Area: 10,000 square feet.

Environmentally Critical Areas: None

Access: The site is bordered by 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NW and NW 63<sup>rd</sup> St.

Current Development: A single-story commercial structure built in 2002 and surface parking.



Surrounding Development: Directly to the north are a single-story commercial structure built in 1970 and a three-story apartment building constructed in 1966. Directly to the west is a site with four single family residences built in 2014. To the south across NW 63<sup>rd</sup> St is a single-story commercial structure with an auto-service use. Across 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW is a single-story commercial structure built in 2006.

Neighborhood Character: 15th Ave NW is a busy arterial that connects the northwestern neighborhoods of Seattle to areas south of the Ship Canal and downtown. This section of 15th Ave NW is under-developed and consists of mostly single story, commercial structures. Many of the businesses along 15th Ave NW are not pedestrian oriented. Outside of the commercial zones, the neighborhood is developed with older single family residences and newer townhouses.

The Rapid Ride bus line D runs along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW. Salmon Bay Park is located a few blocks to the northwest and Ballard High School and the Ballard pool are located a couple blocks to the north.

## **DESIGN REVIEW**

### **EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: September 29, 2014**

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3016656) at this website:

<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx>

The EDG packet is also available to view in the project file (project number 3016656), by contacting the Public Resource Center at Seattle DCI:

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

**Email:** [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

## PRESENTATION

At the EDG meeting, the applicant presented the three options shown in the packet, available online.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Noted that the rear entry location of the preferred scheme will create too much activity near the lowrise zone, yet be unsafe as there will no direct eyes on the space.
- Encouraged the applicant to make sure windows of the development do not align with the windows of the residences to the west.
- Preferred the southeast corner location for the roof deck.
- Expressed support for the design and the addition of the project in a changing neighborhood.
- Concerned about the height, bulk and scale of the project near a lowrise zone.
- Questioned if a roof deck along busy 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW will be used.

## 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: September 29, 2014

- 1. Massing and Height, Bulk and Scale: The Board debated the merits of both Schemes B and C, noting that Scheme C provides the most space for the benefit of the lowrise zone to the west. The following guidance was given. (CS2.D.5, DC3.C.2, DC2.C.3)**
  - a. Hold the corner at NW 65th St and 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW. (CS2.C.1)
  - b. Consider a version of scheme B with the required 15' residential setback for the upper levels. (CS2.D.5)
  - c. Increase the setback from the west property line as much as possible. (CS2.D.5)
  - d. Set back the structure so that no departure will be needed for the portion of the structure above 40' in height. (CS2.D.5)
  - e. Maintain the location of the southeast corner roof deck. (DC3.C.2)
  - f. The area between the structure and the Lowrise zone to the west should be used as a landscaped buffer. (DC2.C.3, DC3.C.2)

- g. Consider removing the two units that have only north facing windows that may be blocked by future development. (CS2.D.1)
- 2. Respect for the Adjacent Sites: Much of the EDG Board deliberation centered on the relationship of the proposed development to the Lowrise zoned parcel to the west. (CS2.D.5, DC2.A.2, DC2.C.3)**
  - a. Remove all occupiable decks that face the residential zone to the west. (CS2.D.5)
  - b. Respect the location of the windows of the residential structures to the west when locating the developments windows. (CS2.D.5)
  - c. Set back the structure so no departure will be needed for the portion of the structure above 40' in height. (CS2.D.5)
  - d. The area between the structure and the Lowrise zone to the west should be used as a landscaped buffer. (CS2.D.5)
  - e. Locate the roof deck at the southeast corner. (DC3.B.1)
- 3. Street-Level Interaction: The Board encouraged the commercial space along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW and was not supportive of the residential entry location of the preferred scheme at the back of the structure, expressing safety and privacy concerns. (CS2.B.2, PL2.B, PL3.A.4, PL3.B.3, PL3.C.1, DC3.C.2)**
  - a. Provide the residential entry on 15th Ave NW. (PL3.A.1)
  - b. The ground level west setback area should act as a landscaped buffer not an outside amenity area. (DC3.C.2, DC4.D.1)
  - c. Push back the location of the solid waste storage from NW 63<sup>rd</sup> St. as much as possible. (DC1.C.4)
  - d. Consider the appearance of the blank north wall as it will be highly visible from 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW. (DC2.B.2)

**For the Recommendation Meeting the applicant should provide the following:**

- Provide shadow studies showing the impact on the neighboring properties.
- Provide a rendering of the residential entry.
- Provide floor plans, including the live/work unit's layouts.
- Provide elevations and sections. Provide a detailed elevation of the north façade.
- Provide a study of the window locations in the structures to the west. Use this information to inform the projects window location.
- Provide a materials Board that will be left with the planner.
- Provide a full Landscape plan.
- Provide a lighting plan of the site.

**RECOMMENDATION MEETING: August 17, 2015**

The Recommendation packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3016656) at this website:

<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx>

The Recommendation packet is also available to view in the project file (project number 3016656), by contacting the Public Resource Center at Seattle DCI:

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

**Email:** [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

- Concerned that the location of the solid waste storage area is near the exterior deck of the single family residence to the west.
- Concerned about the lack of parking especially for the retail uses.
- Encouraged landscaping that will act as a buffer.
- Supported the improvement to the design and the location of the residential entry on 15th Ave NW.
- Noted that the project is a good building for 2020 or Seattle in the future.
- Encouraged adding balconies to the exterior to add character to the elevations.
- Encouraged the Board to consider swapping the solid waste storage location with one of the live/work units along NW 63rd St.
- Stated concern about potential reflection from the metal panels.

## **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.

### **RECOMMENDATION MEETING: August 17, 2015**

- 1. Street Level Treatment: The Board questioned the understated residential entry from 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW, and though they appreciated the applicant's explanation of not wanting a large entry statement so the entry is secondary to the retail entries, asked the applicant to consider a stronger residential entry.** (The Board stated this is not a condition.)
  - a. Consider a stronger residential entry design along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW. (PL3.A.1)
- 2. Solid Waste Storage: The Board discussed the location and design of the solid waste storage area. The Board noted that with solid exterior doors, mechanical venting and interior access for the residents, the location of the trash area is a good solution and the doors will most probably be opened only a few minutes a week. (DC1.C.4)**  
**The following conditions were recommended:**
  - a. Provide solid exterior doors, without vents, at the solid waste storage room. (CS2.D.5)
  - b. Mechanically vent the solid waste storage room with the vent away from the adjacent residential uses. (CS2.D.5)

- 3. Elevations and Materials: The Board commented that the design was one of the better looking infill projects they have seen in a while. The Board debated the treatment of the 2nd floor exterior decks that will face the adjoining residential property to the west. The following guidance and conditions were given:**
- a. Design and provide planter boxes similar to the image shown on page 27 of the Recommendation packet on the east side of the deck railing. The planter boxes are to have enough soil for landscaping to thrive and have an automatic irrigation system. (CS2.D.5, DC2.C.2, DC4.D.3)
  - b. Detail the cement board reglets to be the same color as the panels, similar to the image show at the upper right corner on page 30 of the Recommendation packet. (DC4.A.1)
  - c. The Board noted their concern of the proposed wood siding as recent projects with wood siding have not aged well, the applicant stated the siding will be stained and sealed. (DC4.A.2)

### **DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES**

The priority Citywide guidelines identified by the Board as Priority Guidelines are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

#### **CONTEXT & SITE**

**CS1 Natural Systems and Site Features: Use natural systems/features of the site and its surroundings as a starting point for project design.**

##### **CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation**

**CS1-B-1. Sun and Wind:** Take advantage of solar exposure and natural ventilation. Use local wind patterns and solar gain to reduce the need for mechanical ventilation and heating where possible.

**CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.**

##### **CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces**

**CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street:** Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm.

##### **CS2-C Relationship to the Block**

**CS2-C-1. Corner Sites:** Corner sites can serve as gateways or focal points; both require careful detailing at the first three floors due to their high visibility from two or more streets and long distances.

##### **CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale**

**CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions:** For projects located at the edge of different zones, provide an appropriate transition or complement to the adjacent zone(s). Projects should create a step in perceived height, bulk and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zone and the proposed development.

**CS2-D-5. Respect for Adjacent Sites:** Respect adjacent properties with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings.

**CS3 Architectural Context and Character: Contribute to the architectural character of the neighborhood.**

### CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes

**CS3-A-4. Evolving Neighborhoods:** In neighborhoods where architectural character is evolving or otherwise in transition, explore ways for new development to establish a positive and desirable context for others to build upon in the future.

## PUBLIC LIFE

**PL1 Connectivity: Complement and contribute to the network of open spaces around the site and the connections among them.**

### PL1-C Outdoor Uses and Activities

**PL1-C-1. Selecting Activity Areas:** Concentrate activity areas in places with sunny exposure, views across spaces, and in direct line with pedestrian routes.

**PL2 Walkability: Create a safe and comfortable walking environment that is easy to navigate and well-connected to existing pedestrian walkways and features.**

### PL2-B Safety and Security

**PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street:** Create a safe environment by providing lines of sight and encouraging natural surveillance.

**PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety:** Provide lighting at sufficient lumen intensities and scales, including pathway illumination, pedestrian and entry lighting, and/or security lights.

**PL2-B-3. Street-Level Transparency:** Ensure transparency of street-level uses (for uses such as nonresidential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

**PL3 Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human interaction and activity at the street-level with clear connections to building entries and edges.**

### PL3-A Entries

**PL3-A-1. Design Objectives:** Design primary entries to be obvious, identifiable, and distinctive with clear lines of sight and lobbies visually connected to the street.

**PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements:** Design the entry as a collection of coordinated elements including the door(s), overhead features, ground surface, landscaping, lighting, and other features.

### PL3-B Residential Edges

**PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses:** Maintain active and transparent facades in the design of live/work residences. Design the first floor so it can be adapted to other commercial use as needed in the future.

### PL3-C Retail Edges

**PL3-C-1. Porous Edge:** Engage passersby with opportunities to interact visually with the building interior using glazing and transparency. Create multiple entries where possible and make a physical and visual connection between people on the sidewalk and retail activities in the building.

**PL4 Active Transportation: Incorporate design features that facilitate active forms of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and use of transit.**

### PL4-B Planning Ahead for Bicyclists

**PL4-B-2. Bike Facilities:** Facilities such as bike racks and storage, bike share stations, shower facilities and lockers for bicyclists should be located to maximize convenience, security, and safety.

## DESIGN CONCEPT

### **DC1 Project Uses and Activities: Optimize the arrangement of uses and activities on site.**

#### **DC1-C Parking and Service Uses**

**DC1-C-4. Service Uses:** Locate and design service entries, loading docks, and trash receptacles away from pedestrian areas or to a less visible portion of the site to reduce possible impacts of these facilities on building aesthetics and pedestrian circulation.

### **DC2 Architectural Concept: Develop an architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings.**

#### **DC2-A Massing**

**DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass:** Use secondary architectural elements to reduce the perceived mass of larger projects.

#### **DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition**

**DC2-B-1. Façade Composition:** Design all building façades—including alleys and visible roofs— considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all façades are attractive and well-proportioned.

**DC2-B-2. Blank Walls:** Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage façades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

#### **DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features**

**DC2-C-2. Dual Purpose Elements:** Consider architectural features that can be dual purpose— adding depth, texture, and scale as well as serving other project functions.

### **DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the building design so that they complement each other.**

#### **DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities**

**DC3-B-4. Multifamily Open Space:** Design common and private open spaces in multifamily projects for use by all residents to encourage physical activity and social interaction.

### **DC4 Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.**

#### **DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes**

**DC4-A-1. 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.

#### **DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials**

**DC4-D-3. Long Range Planning:** Select plants that upon maturity will be of appropriate size, scale, and shape to contribute to the site as intended.

## **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURE**

The Board's recommendation on the requested departures 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 Recommendation Meeting two departures were requested:

1. **Setback requirements for lots abutting residential zones (SMC 23.47A.014.B1):** The Code requires a 15' by 15' triangular area setback where a NC zoned lot abuts the intersection of a side and front lot line of a lot in a residential zone. The applicant is proposing a 3'-9" x 3'-9" ground floor portion of the structure to be in the required triangle setback area along NW 63<sup>rd</sup> St.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines **CS2-D-4. Massing Choices** and **DC2-B-1. Façade Composition**, by providing a massing more in keeping with the existing neighborhood character. The ground level will be setback 10' from the west property line providing a structure setback in keeping with the abutting lowrise zone. The structure will better interact with the streetscape and the building design as the square massing better reflects the configuration of the existing residential structures than an angled structure would.

The Board voted unanimously to grant this departure.

2. **Setback requirements for lots abutting residential zones (SMC 23.47A.014.B.3.b):** The Code requires structures along a rear or side lot line that abuts a residential zoned lot to be setback 15' for portions of the structure above 13' in height up to 40', and an addition 2' for every ten feet of height above 40'. The applicant proposes a 15' setback from the west lot line including a 3'-6" high portion of the structure above 40'.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guideline **DC2-B-1 Façade Composition**. The Board indicated they were willing to grant this departure as the structure is providing a setback at grade from the lowrise zoned development to the west and the departure will allow for architectural consistency of the proposed west elevation composition.

The Board voted unanimously to grant this departure.

## **BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS**

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated August 17, 2015, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the August 17, 2015 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, three Design Review Board members recommended **APPROVAL** of the subject design and of departures with the following conditions:

1. Design and provide planter boxes similar to the image shown on page 27 of the Recommendation packet on the east side of the deck railing. The planter boxes are to have enough soil for landscaping to thrive and have an automatic irrigation system. (CS2.D.5, DC2.C.2, DC4.D.3)
2. Mechanically vent the solid waste storage room with the vent away from the adjacent residential uses. (CS2.D.5)
3. Provide solid exterior doors, without vents, at the solid waste storage room. (CS2.D.5)

4. Detail the cement board reglets to be the same color as the panels, similar to the image show at the upper right corner on page 30 of the Recommendation packet. (DC4.A.1)

### **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 Seattle DCI 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**

Two members of the Northwest Design Review Board and one substitute Board member 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.

Following the Recommendation meeting, Seattle DCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board. The Director of Seattle DCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the three members present at the Recommendation meeting who approved the design, and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director agrees with the Design Review Board’s conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Conditions:

- 1. This condition has not been met and will be conditioned to be met prior to MUP issuance (see conditions at the end of the decision).*
- 2. This condition has not been met in the MUP set and will be a condition of the building permit plans (see conditions at the end of the decision).*
- 3. This condition has not been met in the MUP set and will be a condition of the building permit plans (see conditions at the end of the decision).*
- 4. This condition has not been met in the MUP set and will be a condition of the building permit plans (see conditions at the end of the decision).*

The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations. Condition 1 will be met prior to issuance of the MUP. Conditions 2-4 will be met prior to issuance of the building permit.

### **Director's Decision**

The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design and the requested departures with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision Board that further augment the selected Guidelines.

### **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 12/31/2014. Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (Seattle DCI) 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 ended on February 4, 2015. In addition to the comment(s) received through the Design Review process, other comments were received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to parking and density. Other comments were received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis per SMC 25.05.

### **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

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. The Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08.425) permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with private development construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays in Neighborhood Commercial zones.

If extended construction hours are desired, the applicant may seek approval from Seattle DCI through a Noise Variance request. The applicant's environmental checklist does not indicate that extended hours are anticipated.

A Construction Management Plan will be required, including contact information in the event of complaints about construction noise, and measures to reduce or prevent noise impacts. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>. The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigation noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

### 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. Therefore no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.F

### Construction Parking and Traffic

During construction, parking demand is expected to increase due to additional demand created by construction personnel and equipment. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities and parking (SMC 25.05.675. B and M).

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted and a Construction Management Plan is required, which will be reviewed by Seattle Department of Transportation and Seattle DCI. The requirements for a Construction Management Plan include a Haul Route and a Construction Parking Plan. The submittal information for a Construction Management Plan and review process for Construction Management Plans are described here: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>.

### 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; 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 pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.F

#### 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 under SMC 25.05.675.G.

#### Traffic and Parking

The applicant submitted Traffic and Parking Impact Analysis by TENW (Transportation Engineering Northwest) dated November 24, 2014, June 23, 2015 and September, 3, 2015. The numbers used by the consultant were 53 residential units, 2 live/work units, and 3,000 sq. ft. of retail space, which is different than the proposed 61 residential units, 2 live/work units, and 2,500 sq. ft. of retail use.

The study analyzed the proposed uses and the existing permitted use to determine the new daily trip generation. The project is anticipated to generate 140 fewer daily trips, with 24 fewer AM trips and 54 fewer PM peak hour trips.

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

The Seattle DCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information, including the small change in number of residential units and retail space, and determined that these transportation impacts are not expected to be significant; therefore, no further mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.R.

The project is not providing any parking spaces. The Traffic Report estimated the parking demand for this development and a cumulative on-street parking impact. It is estimated the development, using the numbers above, would generate a demand for up to 16 parking spaces. The cumulative study anticipated a demand for up to 35 parking spaces. The parking study determined there were approximately 165 on-street parking stalls within 800 ft. of the site with an average daily demand of 87 stalls at peak evening hours. The remaining number of parking spaces are anticipated to accommodate all of the anticipated parking demand, and no additional mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.M.

### **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 that has been approved by SDOT. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>.

**DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.**

Prior to Issuance of the MUP

2. Update the MUP plans to show planter boxes similar to the image shown on page 27 of the August 17, 2015 Design Review Recommendation packet on the east side of the deck railing. Demonstrate that the planter boxes are to have enough soil for landscaping to thrive and have an automatic irrigation system.

Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit

3. The plans shall show a detail to mechanically vent the solid waste storage room with the vent away from the adjacent residential uses.
4. The plans shall show solid exterior doors, without vents, at the solid waste storage room.
5. The plans shall show the cement board reglets to be the same color as the panels, similar to the image shown at the upper right corner on page 30 of the Recommendation packet.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

6. 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](mailto: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](mailto:beth.hartwick@seattle.gov)) or a Seattle DCI assigned Land Use Planner.

Beth Hartwick, Senior Land Use Planner  
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: February 8, 2016

BH:drm

K:\Decisions-Signed\3016656.docx

## IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

### Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

The appealable land use decision on your Master Use Permit (MUP) application has now been published. At the conclusion of the appeal period, your permit will be considered “approved for issuance”. (If your decision is appealed, your permit will be considered “approved for issuance” on the fourth day following the City Hearing Examiner’s decision.) Projects requiring a Council land use action shall be considered “approved for issuance” following the Council’s decision.

The “approved for issuance” date marks the beginning of the **three year life** of the MUP approval, whether or not there are outstanding corrections to be made or pre-issuance conditions to be met. The permit must be issued by Seattle DCI within that three years or it will expire and be cancelled. (SMC 23-76-028) (Projects with a shoreline component have a **two year life**. Additional information regarding the effective date of shoreline permits may be found at 23.60.074.)

All outstanding corrections must be made, any pre-issuance conditions met and all outstanding fees paid before the permit is issued. You will be notified when your permit has issued.

Questions regarding the issuance and expiration of your permit may be addressed to the Public Resource Center at [prc@seattle.gov](mailto:prc@seattle.gov) or to our message line at 206-684-8467.