



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: 3016903
Applicant: George Gibbs, Mithun Architects
Address of Proposals: 301 12th Avenue

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 7-story, 75-unit residential building with 2,700 sq. ft. of retail at grade and 20 parking spaces located within the structure. Existing buildings to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

- Design Review** (SMC 23.41)
- SEPA-Environmental Determination** (SMC 25.05)

- SEPA Determination:** [] Exempt [X] DNS [] MDNS [] EIS
 [] DNS with conditions
 [] DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition or involving another agency with jurisdiction.

Site Description

The subject site is located on the southeast corner of E Alder Street and 12th Avenue. The subject lot is zoned Neighborhood Commercial Three with a Pedestrian overlay (NC3P-65). Lots to the north, south and east are also zoned NC3P-65. Lots to the west are zoned Midrise (MR).

The subject lot contains substantial grade change from the low point in the southeast corner to the high point in the northwest corner. In total the grade change is approximately 17 feet. The site is square with access from E Alder Street, 12th Avenue and the platted alley along the west property line.



The immediate context consists of recent multi-family development to the west, early 20th century 1-story commercial to the north, the King County Youth Service Center campus to the east, and a vacant lot across the street to the south. The King County Youth Service Center is proposed for redevelopment in the near future, with new buildings, expanded services, and a pedestrian connection across the site, connecting Alder Street from 12th Ave to 14th Ave.

The overall area includes a mix of early 20th century commercial, multi-family and single family residential, with newer Midrise multi-family development to the west and some newer mixed-use residential and commercial development to the north (near Jefferson St). 12th Ave connects Capitol Hill with the International District, and serves as the dividing line between First Hill to the west and the Central District to the east. The area is served by frequent bus transit routes and will soon be served by the Streetcar, with access nearby at E. Yesler Way and at 14th Ave.

ECAs:

No Environmentally Critical Areas (ECAs) have been identified on site.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: April 23, 2014.

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number(s) (3016903) 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 3016903 file, 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 proposed development is part of a coordinated effort with two other nearby sites. The three sites will include apartments affordable to “workforce housing” levels of income and will include some shared amenities between the three buildings. The other two sites are located one block to the west (11th and E. Alder St), and three blocks to the south (12th and E. Yesler Way).

The proposed development includes a focus on bicycle use, with two entries for cyclists and a dedicated bicycle storage/maintenance room at E. Alder St). The preferred option includes a residential entry at the southeast corner, and an 18-20’ tall “open hall” retail concept with the intent to have a shared open floor area serving retail/restaurant uses and residential lobby uses. The upper floors include modulation at the west property line with a second floor terrace divided into individual residential unit open spaces, and shared residential open space at the roof level. A narrow slot of modulation would be provided at the south façade.

The applicant noted that Alder Street is steeply sloped at this location and the south street level design will be a challenge. The windows to the south residential lobby space would relate to the sidewalk grade near the east edge of the site. The 2nd story bike storage/repair station would include windows to relate to the sidewalk grade near the west edge of the site. Landscaped planters are proposed at the building edge to soften the transition and complement the landscape strip on the south edge of the sidewalk.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Appreciated that the applicant has met with the 12th Avenue neighborhood group to discuss the design, and encouraged the applicant to continue communication.
- Clarified that the King County Youth Services Center redevelopment is quite a few years away at this point. King County is trying to work with the neighborhood on the design development of the site.
- The retail should be designed to be dramatic and appealing. This will be a difficult area for retail to be successful and the design should include something special to attract businesses and patrons to the site.
- Supported the proposed design concept.

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. The Uptown Neighborhood Design Guidelines identify the area where the subject site is located as an Uptown Urban Character Area.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE (APRIL 23, 2014):

- 1. Massing Alternatives.** The majority of the Board supported the preferred massing alternative.
 - a. The Board strongly supported the proposed height of the retail space, which engages the pedestrian realm on 12th Ave and creates a proportional scale with the upper building mass. (CS2.A, CS2.B)
 - b. The Board supported the consistent street wall on 12th Ave. (CS2.B)
 - c. The Board noted benefits and challenges of the massing response at Alder Street.
 - i. Two Board members noted that Alder Street could include better modulation to relate to nearby context. (CS2.C, CS2.D)
 - ii. Three Board members noted that the narrow modulation and consistent street wall enhances the corner and responds well to nearby massing context. (CS2.C, CS2.D)
- 2. Design Concept.** The Board recommended that the design should strive to set an example for future development in the area. (CS3.A)
 - a. The Board supported the conceptual design graphics showing an emphasis on verticality and framed openings, even if the musical theme of framed windows as “notes” in the horizontally expressed upper level facade “staff” isn’t overly evident in the conceptual graphics. (DC2.B, DC2.C, DC2.D, DC2.E)
 - b. The Board recommended that the proposed palette of cementitious siding and concrete base is acceptable, but the application of materials should be thoughtfully detailed and enhance the design concept. (DC4.A)
 - c. The Board suggested reusing the materials in the existing residential buildings on the site, with the intent of expressing the history of the area. (CS3.B)
 - d. The elevator/stair towers at the roof should be integrated into the overall design. (DC2.B)

3. **Alder Street level façade.** The Alder Street façade response to the grade change will be a challenge. The design should locate uses and transparency to maximize activation of the sidewalk at the Alder Street façade. (CS1.C, PL1.B)
 - a. The Board suggested the gym and residential lobby uses could be flipped, allowing human activity to be visible at the street edge and residential lobby to complement the shared retail hall use near the north end of the site. (DC1.A)
 - b. The bike storage/repair space should be designed to encourage human activity and visual interest. The Board noted that the room should include creative visual bicycle themes and large amounts of transparency, in order to provide visual interest at the sidewalk. (PL1.B, PL2.B, PL4.B)
 - c. The Board recommended that the overall bicycle design theme should be maximized at the street level spaces (Alder and 12th Ave). (CS3.B, PL4.B)
4. **Landscape Plan.** The Board supported the south-facing shared rooftop deck and recommended that the street level landscaping enhance the Alder Street pedestrian environment. (PL1.B, DC3.A, DC4.D)
 - a. The design of the rooftop deck should maximize usable space for residents, since this is the primary shared outdoor amenity space. (DC3.A)
 - b. The landscape plan should respond to the sloped Alder Street frontage and enhance the pedestrian experience at that edge. Low plants should be used between the sidewalk and building, in order to enhance human activation of street level uses. (PL1.B, DC4.D)

RECOMMENDATION MEETING: OCTOBER 8, 2014

The packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3016903) at this website:

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

or contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant presented the preferred option, developed in response to the Early Design Guidance, and described the massing, pedestrian experience and material refinement.

The applicant summarized how the massing and façade modulation was modified in response to the Board’s initial recommendations. The applicant explained that part of the design intent is to accentuate the projected frames with a material/color change to give the pedestrian an impression of “dancing musical notes.”

To enhance the pedestrian environment along Alder Street, the street level landscape plan showed increased landscaping and façade-mounted exterior downlights.

The proposed material palette included a range of grey cementitious siding of varying widths between strong horizontal bands. Orange colored cementitious siding was used along the North façade to add additional detail to the blank façade. The project includes ground floor aluminum storefront windows and white vinyl windows on the upper floors.

In response to Board questions, the applicant noted that the ground level fitness room will not have glazing, due to the close proximity of the adjacent building and property line. The applicant clarified that the bike workshop & storage space includes storage for 24 bikes to be used solely by the building tenants. The applicant also acknowledged the combined lobby and commercial space along 12th Ave functions as an open market concept as presented at the EDG meeting. The combined lobby and commercial entry was refined and accentuated with material/color on the adjacent column.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments from members of the public at the Recommendation meeting.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

At the Recommendation meeting, the Board discussed the response to EDG and offered the following recommendations for the proposal to meet the applicable Design Review Guidelines identified at the EDG meeting.

1. **Street Level Uses.** The Board noted that Alder Street and 12th Ave must include active uses and emphasized design expression by the ground level.
 - a. The Board continued to strongly support the proposed height of the retail space on 12th Ave, which engaged the pedestrian realm and created a proportional scale with the upper building mass. (CS2.A, CS2.B)
 - b. The Board was unanimously concerned with the proposed bike workshop & storage space. The Board noted that the constrained width of the space would not allow the passing of two users with bikes. The Board recommended a condition to enlarge the bike workshop & storage space in order to be functional for multiple users and also strongly supported a visual connection from the bike workshop & storage to the club room to provide visual interest and encourage human activity. The Board would also support replacing the bike storage use with a more active use that activates the pedestrian space on Alder Street. (PL4.B, DC1.A)
2. **Materiality.** The Board supported the proposed materials and colors.
 - a. The Board supported the proposed palette of multi-toned grey and orange cementitious siding with the panel width variation and concrete base with the increased scoring pattern. (DC2.B, DC2.C, DC2.D, DC2.E, DC4.A)
 - b. The Board strongly supported the proposed orange accent material to demark the combined lobby and commercial space entry. (DC2.C, DC2.D, DC2.E, DC4.A)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Board identified the following Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project. The specific guidelines are summarized below. The full text of the guidelines is available on the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development website.

CS1-C Topography

CS1-C-1. Land Form: Use natural topography and desirable landforms to inform project design.

CS1-C-2. Elevation Changes: Use the existing site topography when locating structures and open spaces on the site.

CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-1. Sense of Place: Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists, and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

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-1. Site Characteristics: Allow characteristics of sites to inform the design, especially where the street grid and topography create unusually shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

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

CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

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-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-C-3. Full Block Sites: Break up long facades of full-block buildings to avoid a monolithic presence. Provide detail and human scale at street-level, and include repeating elements to add variety and rhythm to the façade and overall building design.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning: Review the height, bulk, and scale of neighboring buildings as well as the scale of development anticipated by zoning for the area to determine an appropriate complement and/or transition.

CS2-D-2. Existing Site Features: Use changes in topography, site shape, and vegetation or structures to help make a successful fit with adjacent properties.

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-4. Massing Choices: Strive for a successful transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone.

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-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.

CS3-B Local History and Culture

CS3-B-1. Placemaking: Explore the history of the site and neighborhood as a potential placemaking opportunity. Look for historical and cultural significance, using neighborhood groups and archives as resources.

CS3-B-2. Historical/Cultural References: Reuse existing structures on the site where feasible as a means of incorporating historical or cultural elements into the new project.

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

PL1-B-1. Pedestrian Infrastructure: Connect on-site pedestrian walkways with existing public and private pedestrian infrastructure, thereby supporting pedestrian connections within and outside the project.

PL1-B-2. Pedestrian Volumes: Provide ample space for pedestrian flow and circulation, particularly in areas where there is already heavy pedestrian traffic or where the project is expected to add or attract pedestrians to the area.

PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities: Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian oriented open spaces to enliven the area and attract interest and interaction with the site and building should be considered.

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.

PL4-B Planning Ahead for Bicyclists

PL4-B-1. Early Planning: Consider existing and future bicycle traffic to and through the site early in the process so that access and connections are integrated into the project along with other modes of travel.

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.

PL4-B-3. Bike Connections: Facilitate connections to bicycle trails and infrastructure around and beyond the project.

DC1-A Arrangement of Interior Uses

DC1-A-1. Visibility: Locate uses and services frequently used by the public in visible or prominent areas, such as at entries or along the street front.

DC1-A-2. Gathering Places: Maximize the use of any interior or exterior gathering spaces.

DC1-A-3. Flexibility: Build in flexibility so the building can adapt over time to evolving needs, such as the ability to change residential space to commercial space as needed.

DC1-A-4. Views and Connections: Locate interior uses and activities to take advantage of views and physical connections to exterior spaces and uses.

DC2-B Architectural and Façade 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-1. Visual Depth and Interest: Add depth to façades where appropriate by incorporating balconies, canopies, awnings, decks, or other secondary elements into the façade design. Add detailing at the street level in order to create interest for the pedestrian and encourage active street life and window shopping (in retail areas).

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.

DC2-C-3. Fit With Neighboring Buildings: Use design elements to achieve a successful fit between a building and its neighbors.

DC2-D Scale and Texture

DC2-D-1. Human Scale: Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building facades, entries, retaining walls, courtyards, and exterior spaces in a manner that is consistent with the overall architectural concept

DC2-D-2. Texture: Design the character of the building, as expressed in the form, scale, and materials, to strive for a fine-grained scale, or “texture,” particularly at the street level and other areas where pedestrians predominate.

DC2-E Form and Function

DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility: Strive for a balance between building use legibility and flexibility. Design buildings such that their primary functions and uses can be readily determined from the exterior, making the building easy to access and understand. At the same time, design flexibility into the building so that it may remain useful over time even as specific programmatic needs evolve.

Beacon Hill Supplemental Guidance:

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

DC3-A-1. Interior/Exterior Fit: Develop an open space concept in conjunction with the architectural concept to ensure that interior and exterior spaces relate well to each other and support the functions of the development.

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-A-2. Climate Appropriateness: Select durable and attractive materials that will age well in Seattle’s climate, taking special care to detail corners, edges, and transitions.

DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

DC4-D-1. Choice of Plant Materials: Reinforce the overall architectural and open space design concepts through the selection of landscape materials.

DC4-D-2. Hardscape Materials: Use exterior courtyards, plazas, and other hard surfaced areas as an opportunity to add color, texture, and/or pattern and enliven public areas through the use of distinctive and durable paving materials. Use permeable materials wherever possible.

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.

DC4-D-4. Place Making: Create a landscape design that helps define spaces with significant elements such as trees.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

No departures were requested at the Final Recommendation meeting.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated October 8, 2014, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the October 8, 2014 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context,

hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, six Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design. The Board recommends the following CONDITION (Authority referred in the letter and number in parenthesis):

1. Enlarge the bike workshop & storage room to be functional for multiple users and provide a visual connection to the Club Room. The Board also supported replacing the bike workshop & storage to a different use to provide visual interest and encourage human activity on Alder Street. (PL4.B, DC1.A.)

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director's Analysis

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 condition described below, 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 October 8, 2014, the Board recommended approval of the project with the following condition:

1. Enlarge the bike workshop & storage room to be functional for multiple users and provide a visual connection to the Club Room. The Board also supported replacing the bike workshop & storage to a different use to provide visual interest and encourage human activity on Alder Street. (PL4.B, DC1.A.)

Six members of the East 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.

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 three 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.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Condition:

1. Master Use Permit sheet DR3.03 and DR3.04 have been updated to show the revised bike storage space. The space has been increased to be approximately 15 feet deep. The bike storage room will include graphics, lighting, seating and a bike repair stand to help activate the space. The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. These items shall be shown on the construction plans, and the installation of these items will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new construction, as conditioned below.

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 six members present at the decision meeting, provided additional review and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Design Review Board agreed that the proposed design, along with the conditions listed, meets each of the Design Guideline Priorities as previously identified. Therefore, the Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision.

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

SEPA ANALYSIS

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the Seattle State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), WAC 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated May 16, 2014. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed and annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant, reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file, and pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered.

As indicated in the checklist, this action may result in adverse impacts to the environment. However, due to their temporary nature and limited effects, the impacts are not expected to be significant.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, and certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced, may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states, in part, "Where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" subject to some limitations.

Codes and development regulations applicable to this proposed project will provide sufficient mitigation for many short and/or long term impacts. Applicable codes may include the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use

Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. Additional discussion of short and long term impacts is found below.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on July 9, 2014. Multiple comment letters were received.

Short Term Impacts

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

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. Properties located to the west of the site include residential units and will be impacted by construction noise. The impacts including duration of construction noise in this area, and amount of noise-generating grading and construction activity warrant additional mitigation to reduce the impacts of construction noise on nearby residents.

To mitigate construction noise impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), the applicant submitted a Construction Management Plan with a noise mitigation element, which has been reviewed and approved by DPD. No further mitigation is warranted for construction noise impacts.

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.

No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to specific environmental policies or the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665).

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.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Drainage Code which requires on site detention of Stormwater with provisions for controlled tight line release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will

require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code and Design Review process which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long term impacts, although some impacts warrant further discussion.

Greenhouse gas emissions - Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the projects' 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 due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to specific environmental policies or the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665).

Parking & Traffic- The applicant submitted a Transportation Impact Analysis (Heffron Transportation, Inc., dated May 13 and November 21, 2014 and January 14, 2015).

The proposed development is anticipated to generate 270 new daily vehicle trips, 16 new AM peak-hour trips and 24 new PM peak-hour trips per ITE data.

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

The Transportation Impact Analysis noted that the residential peak parking demand for this development is 32 vehicles. The proposal includes 20 below grade parking spaces. The overflow peak parking demand is therefore 12 spaces.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that there is no SEPA authority provided for mitigation of residential parking impacts in the 12th Avenue Urban Center Village. This site is located in that Urban Center Village, and the project is mostly residential. 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.

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 Resources - The proposed development includes the demolition of two existing buildings over 50 years old. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for

potential impacts to historic resources, and indicated that the existing structures on site are unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (LPB 750/14).

Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for historic preservation.

Summary

In conclusion, several adverse effects on the environment are anticipated resulting from the proposal, which are anticipated to be non-significant. The conditions imposed below are intended to mitigate construction impacts identified in the foregoing analysis, or to control impacts not regulated by codes or ordinances, per adopted City policies.

DECISION – SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the 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.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

None.

CONDITIONS - DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

1. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).
2. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 10-2011, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

3. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

Signature: (signature on file) Date: February 9, 2015
Lindsay King, Senior Planner
Department of Planning and Development

LMK:rgc
K:\Decisions-Signed\3016903.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.