



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 AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3016745
Applicant Name: Archana Iyengar
Address of Proposal: 219 1st Avenue N

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 6-story structure containing 45 residential units above 1,724.73 sq. ft. of commercial space. Parking for 5 vehicles to be provided. 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** to exceed 20% residential street level use (SMC 23.47A.005 C)

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

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

DNS with conditions

DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition, or involving another agency with jurisdiction.



BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Location: The site is located midblock on the west side of 1st Avenue N between John Street and Thomas Street.

Metro bus routes provide service with stops close to the site providing links to the central downtown core and other areas. 1st Ave N and Queen Anne Ave N provide Rapid Ride lines. First Avenue North is designated as a principal arterial and a major transit street. John Street and Thomas Street have no special classifications.

Zoning: NC3-65

Parcel Size: 7,191 SF

Existing Conditions: The site contains one parcel with two existing 1-story apartment buildings. The lot is substantially flat, with a minor 3 foot slope in the north south direction.

The site is located in the Uptown Urban Center. This neighborhood includes multifamily housing, community services, restaurants, entertainment and shopping. One block to the northeast is Key Arena and the Seattle Center. East of the site on 1st Avenue North there are surface parking lots and one story commercial buildings.

An existing three story apartment building is located to the north. A one story office building and surface parking lot is located to the south. A newer seven story mixed use building is located on the adjacent lot, west across the alley. To the east, across 1st Avenue N is a surface parking lot.

1st Ave character is dominated by Key Arena, monumental scale, and large plazas. The overall area is characterized by strong street walls and some surface parking lots. Ground floor uses in the area are both residential and commercial. Newer mixed use buildings in the area are six to seven stories tall.

ECAs: None.

Proposal Descriptions: Application for a 6-story building with 45 residential units above 1,725 square feet of commercial space. Parking for 5 vehicles is proposed within a garage accessed by the alley. The existing structures are to be demolished.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: April 2, 2014

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3016745) 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 project file (project number 3016745), by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Mailing Public Resource Center

Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000

P.O. Box 34019

Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

The applicant's presentation included a statement of intent to provide brick as a primary material. The ground level setback is intended to be 3 feet consistent with the ground level setback to the north to provide a more gracious sidewalk.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Felt building massing should include amenity areas with gardens facing the alley.
- Expressed concern about the blank north façade which will face the existing residential units.
- Would like to see a courtyard provided on the north façade.
- Concerned about loss of views to Space Needle and surrounding territory.
- Felt additional parking, including street permit parking, should be provided.
- Expressed concern that the proposed building is missing Queen Anne's quaint charm.
- Felt the proposed building did not represent the existing neighborhood context.
- Would like to see a retail space provided, that can later be divided into smaller spaces.
- Noted smaller retail spaces give a rhythm and action to the street.
- Supported design which provides ground level parking only.
- Felt exterior finish material should include brick and masonry.
- Concerned the site plan does not show the bay window for the building to the north.
- Felt that the massing should erode at the corner so that bay windows are not facing a large blank wall.
- Felt commercial space should be provided at sidewalk grade so as to avoid large ramps within the small commercial space.
- Supported greater building height to provide additional setback to the north.
- Felt 900 square foot retail space is a good size.
- Felt additional retail space should be provided at ground level rather than a leasing office.

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 of highest priority for this project.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE April 2, 2014

1. Massing. The Board felt Massing Option A provided the better design solution with a setback along the north façade opposite the existing units. The Board also supported the unit orientation of Massing Option B, which provides units facing the alley.

- a) The Board felt the applicant provided a comprehensive analysis of the massing options for a tight infill site. The Board supported the building layout with the lobby and stair circulation on the north and units oriented to the south (CS2-D5).
- b) Ultimately the Board supported a massing option combining A and B. The combined massing should include a setback on the north façade consistent with massing option A and units facing the alley consistent with Massing Option B. The Board did support

- a taller building, consistent with Massing Option A, to accommodate the additional north setback (CS2-D5, DC2-A1).
- c) The Board agreed there must be a thoughtful treatment of the façade facing the structure to the north. At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board would like to see how the north façade is treated to minimize large expanses of blank wall and maximize light and air opportunities for adjacent units (CS2-D5, DC2-B2).

2. Street Wall. The Board applauded the ground level setback adjacent to the sidewalk. The setback will provide a street wall and setback consistent with the adjacent structure to the north.

- a) The Board noted the setback should be treated to provide a gracious, welcoming approach to the retail and residential entrances (CS2-A2, CS2-B2, CS2-C2).
- b) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested more information about the experience at ground level including ground level transparency, overhead weather projection and lighting. The Board also felt the applicant should explore additional potted landscaping at the residential entry as expressed in the Uptown Design Guidelines. The Board felt the entries should be pedestrian scaled, friendly, gracious, and incorporate sufficient transparency and lighting to provide safe spaces (PL2-B, PL2-C, PL3-A)
- c) The Board felt the first floor level transition to the upper level should align with the bay window datum to the north (CS2-C2).
- d) The Board was concerned that the adjacent bay window will look into a large blank wall in the northeast corner. The Board felt the building should respond to this relationship and treat the corner with a meaningful gesture to provide relief (CS2-C2, CS2-D5).

3. Architectural Context and Materials. The Board noted the building is proposed within a neighborhood with a well-defined material character. The Board agreed the proposed building should be designed as background building rather than a signature piece.

- a) The Board supported the proposed architectural concept which included a more contemporary design. The Board noted that the architectural concept should incorporate material cues from traditional neighborhood context, specifically brick at ground level (CS3-A1).

RECOMMENDATION MEETING: December 17, 2014

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The Recommendation packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3016745) 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 project file (project number 3016745), by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Mailing Public Resource Center

Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

The applicant's presentation included a statement of intent to provide brick as a primary material at the base of the street level facade. The ground level setback is intended to be 5 feet consistent with the ground level setback to the north to provide a more gracious sidewalk.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments, issues and concerns were raised during the public comment portion of the Recommendation meeting.

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 of highest priority for this project.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION December 17, 2014

The Board was very pleased with the thorough presentation from the applicant in response to their guidance previously provided.

1. Massing. The Board was pleased with the design development of the hybrid of Options A and B that included a taller building with a setback on the north façade and units facing the alley. The Board was also supportive of the design of the north façade treatment to minimize large expanses of blank wall and maximize light and air opportunities for adjacent units (CS2-D5, DC2-A1, DC2-B2).

2. Street Wall. The Board continued to appreciate the ground level setback adjacent to the sidewalk. However, the Board agreed that the resolution of the ground level building façade and entrance needed additional work and recommended the following:

- a) The height of the ground floor should be increased by one foot to provide more vertical clearance space and alleviate the pinched feeling of the ground floor retail and residential entrance (DC2-B2).
- b) The proposed utility cage is not well integrated into the building or site and compromises the pedestrian streetscape, as well as a gracious entryway; the utility meter should be recessed into the street wall with the metal screening proposed (CS2-B2, PL2-IIIi).
- c) The maneuvering room around the residential entrance should be widened by removing the planter boxes shown flanking the entrance and instead provide ground level planting (CS2-A2, CS2-B2, CS2-C2, PL3-A2).
- d) Additional landscaping should be provided at this ground level and should include raised planter landscaping located in front of the brick pilasters, rather than at the residential entrance (PL2-B, PL2-C, PL3-A).
- e) The storefront windows should be inset to provide greater depth to this façade (DC2-B2).
- f) To better relate to the context and express a return of the brick veneer of the base, the brick base should extend upwards to match the datum lines of both the brick base of the building to the north, as well as, extend to the first bay of the concrete wall on the south elevation (CS2-C2, DC2-IIIi).

3. Architectural Context and Materials. The Board supported the proposed material palette of a brick base with fiber cement siding for the upper levels. The building body is a white color and the bay windows are a vivid orange color with white framing. Gray metal panels serve as the accents within the front vertical bays. The Board was pleased with the proposed signage and

lighting concepts. The Board noted that if the exterior stairwell is eventually covered (not enclosed), then such an addition would not require a return to the Board. The Board discussed several aspects of the material palette application and recommended the following:

- a) The traditional brick pattern (running bond) and detailing (soldier course) of the base felt incompatible with the contemporary building design, thus should be revised to be more modern, such as using a stacked bond brick pattern and eliminating the soldier coursing and instead use a more modern detail at those locations where the soldier coursing was shown (CS3-A1).
- b) The grey metal should be a flat panel and not corrugated, as mistakenly shown on page 30 (CS3-A1).
- c) A graffiti protection coating should be applied to the concrete expanse of the south wall (PL2, DC2-B2).

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

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

CONTEXT & SITE

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-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

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-2. Mid-Block Sites: Look to the uses and scales of adjacent buildings for clues about how to design a mid-block building. Continue a strong street-edge and respond to datum lines of adjacent buildings at the first three floors.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

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-1. Fitting Old and New Together: Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

PUBLIC LIFE

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.

PL2-C Weather Protection

PL2-C-1. Locations and Coverage: Overhead weather protection is encouraged and should be located at or near uses that generate pedestrian activity such as entries, retail uses, and transit stops.

Uptown Supplemental Guidance:

PL2-II Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances

PL2-II-i. Pedestrian-Friendly Entrances: Throughout Uptown entries should be designed to be pedestrian friendly (via position, scale, architectural detailing, and materials) and should be clearly discernible to the pedestrian.

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-2. Common Entries: Multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors.

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.

DESIGN CONCEPT

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

Uptown Supplemental Guidance:

DC1-VI Treatment of Alleys

DC1-VI-i. Clean Alleys: Throughout Uptown ensure alleys are designed to be clean, maintained spaces. Recessed areas for recyclables and disposables should be provided.

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-1. Site Characteristics and Uses: Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

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

Uptown Supplemental Guidance:

DC2-I Architectural Context

DC1-I-iii. Uptown Urban Character Area: Embrace high quality urban infill, and responds to special relationships with nearby civic institutions. The following features are encouraged:

- a. Consistent street wall;

- b. Engaging the sidewalk / storefront transparency;
- e. High quality, durable materials;

DC2-III Human Scale

DC2-III-i. Proportioned Design: Throughout Uptown human-scaled architecture is strongly preferred. Proportion should be provided by such components as the detail of windows, doorways, and entries. Appropriate scale and proportion may also be influenced by the selection of building materials.

DC2-III-iii. Weather Protection: The use of exterior canopies or other weather protection features is favored throughout the district for residential and commercial uses. Canopies should blend well with the building and surroundings, and present an inviting, less massive appearance.

DC2-III-iv. Integrated Exterior Features: Throughout Uptown size signs, exterior light fixtures, canopies and awnings to the scale of the building and the pedestrian. Signs that add creativity and individual expression to the design of storefronts are encouraged. Signs should be integrated into the overall design of the building. Signs that appear cluttered and detract from the quality of the building's design are discouraged.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation 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.

1. **Street Level Use (SMC 23.47A.005 C):** The Code limits residential use to 20% of the total façade width. The applicant proposes 26% (15.33') of the street façade as residential use.

The Board voted unanimously in favor of the requested street level use departure. The design responded to the Board's previous guidance to better accommodate ground level commercial use and not a leasing office. The Board felt that the resultant design, along with the recommended conditions, better met the intent of City adopted design guidelines by providing a small lobby area that allows for a more gracious residential entry (PL2-III), a more active connection to the street (PL3) and greater natural surveillance (PL2-B1).

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated December 17, 2014, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the December 17, 2014 Design Recommendation Meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended approval of the project with conditions.

Board Recommended Conditions:

At the conclusion of the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board recommended approval of the project with conditions.

1. The height of the ground floor should be increased by one foot to provide more vertical clearance space and alleviate the pinched feeling of the ground floor retail and residential entrance.

2. The proposed utility cage is not well integrated into the building or site and compromises the pedestrian streetscape, as well as a gracious entryway; the utility meter should be recessed into the street wall with the metal screening proposed.
3. The maneuvering room around the residential entrance should be widened by removing the planter boxes shown flanking the entrance and instead provide ground level planting.
4. Additional landscaping should be provided at this ground level and should include raised planter landscaping located in front of the brick pilasters, rather than at the residential entrance.
5. The storefront windows should be inset to provide greater depth to this façade.
6. To better relate to the context and express a return of the brick veneer of the base, the brick base should extend upwards to match the datum lines of both the brick base of the building to the north, as well as, extend to the first bay of the concrete wall on the south elevation (CS2-C2, DC2-IIIi).
7. The traditional brick pattern (running bond) and detailing (soldier course) of the base felt incompatible with the contemporary building design, thus should be revised to be more modern, such as using a stacked bond brick pattern and eliminating the soldier coursing and instead use a more modern detail at those locations where the soldier coursing was shown.
8. The grey metal should be a flat panel and not corrugated (as mistakenly shown on page 30).
9. A graffiti protection coating should be applied to the concrete expanse of the south wall.

This condition will be required to be resolved prior to MUP issuance, as conditioned at the end of this document.

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.

Subject to the following conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines.

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting held on XX, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the meeting summary above.

Four members of the West Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations, as described in the meeting summary, 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, DPD staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board. 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 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.

The applicant provided the following response to the recommended Design Review Board Conditions:

1. The height of the ground floor has been increased by 1'-0".
2. The utility cage has been removed and the gas meter has been integrated into a recessed area on the street façade. The gas meter is set behind doors with perforate metal screened panels for access.
3. Planters have been removed from location near the residential entrance. Additional ground level planting has been provided immediately adjacent to the residential entry.
4. Additional planters have been located at the brick pilasters and along the street façade.
5. Storefront system has been revised to be inset and provide greater depth to the street level façade.
6. The brick veneer has been extended upward on the street façade to match the height of the concrete wall at the south courtyard.
7. The brick pattern has been modified to a stack bond pattern and the soldier course has been eliminated and replaced with a steel channel.
9. The plans have been modified to include a note that graffiti protection coating will be provided on the south facing concrete wall.

Subsequent to the December 17, 2014 meeting, the applicant did not address the following Design Review Board Recommendation Condition as part of the MUP Review:

8. The grey metal should be a flat panel and not corrugated.

The Director is satisfied that recommended conditions 1 through 7 and 9 imposed by the Design Review Board have been met. Recommended condition #8 has not been satisfied and will be made a condition of MUP approval, to be revised prior to MUP issuance.

DIRECTOR'S DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design and Development Standard Departures are **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED** subject to the conditions listed below.

II. ANALYSIS - SEPA

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 7/31/2014. 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 is appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on April 3, 2013. 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 height.

A. 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, air quality, greenhouse gas, construction traffic and parking impacts, as well as mitigation.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

Construction Parking and Traffic

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

The site is located adjacent to the 1st Ave N arterial and near several other arterials and side streets that are often congested, especially at peak travel hours. Construction vehicles can further exacerbate existing traffic congestions, especially during peak travel hours.

To mitigate construction parking impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), a Construction Management Plan for parking and truck haul routes is required.

The Construction Management Parking portion of the 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 is subject to review and approval by the DPD Land Use Planner.

The Construction Haul Route portion of the plan shall identify haul routes and written approval of the haul routes from Seattle Department of Transportation.

Construction Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. These impacts would be especially adverse in the early morning, in the evening, and on weekends. The Seattle Noise Ordinance permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with construction and equipment. Although there are residential adjacencies, the Noise Ordinance is found to be adequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts. Accordingly, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to the SEPA policies.

B. LONG –TERM IMPACTS

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: greenhouse gas emissions; parking; potential blockage of designated sites from the Scenic Routes nearby; possible increased traffic in the area. 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; views from scenic routes; 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.

Parking and Traffic

The applicant submitted traffic study information, including a parking utilization report (“Site Parking Demand Study, William Popp Associates, September 10, 2014; “Update Parking Utilization Study for 219 1st Ave N”, William Popp Associates, March 6, 2015). The report indicates that a peak parking demand of 22 parking stalls is expected. The onsite parking supply is 5 vehicles, thus the spill-over demand to on street parking is 15 vehicles.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that no SEPA authority is provided to mitigate the impact of parking within the Uptown Urban Center. The subject site is located within that Urban Center.

The traffic information has been reviewed by DPD and no significant adverse impacts have been identified. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

Height, Bulk & Scale

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

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

Historic Preservation

The existing structure on site is more than 50 years old. Seattle Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the existing structure and determined that it is not likely to be eligible for historic landmark designation (Landmarks Preservation Board letter, reference number LPB 491/14). No further mitigation is warranted for historic preservation impacts to the existing structures on site.

DECISION - STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (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 requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21.030(2) (c).

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

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

SEPA - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

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

1. The applicant shall provide a copy of a Construction Haul Route, approved by Seattle Department of Transportation.
2. A Construction Parking Plan, approved by the Land Use Planner (katy.haima@seattle.gov), shall be required.

During Construction

3. The applicant or their contractor will ensure that open and safe pedestrian routes adjacent to the site are maintained in a manner approved by SDOT. A SDOT determination that this requirement is not feasible during a period or periods of construction will temporarily override this Condition.

DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to MUP Issuance

4. Revise the grey metal panel siding to a flat panel instead of corrugated profile.

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 (Katy Haima, katy.haima@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 (Katy Haima, katy.haima@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 (Katy Haima, katy.haima@seattle.gov).

Signature: retagonzales-cumnertrubby for _____ Date: July 20, 2015
Katy Haima
Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

KH:rgc
K:\Decisions-Signed\3016745.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 DPD 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 or to our message line at 206-684-8467.