



**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:** 3017074  
**Applicant Name:** Peter Tallar, Caron Architecture for Mark Gordon  
**Address of Proposal:** 3639 Linden Avenue N

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL**

Land Use Application to allow a three-story structure containing 35 residential units. Existing structures to be removed.

The following approvals are required:

**SEPA Environmental Threshold Determination - (SMC Chapter 25.05)**

**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 AND VICINITY**

Site Location: The site is located On Linden Avenue North between North 36<sup>th</sup> Street and North 38<sup>th</sup> Street just south of the entrance to the Aurora Bridge in the Fremont neighborhood.

Zoning: Lowrise 2 (LR2).

Parcel Size: 6,720 square feet (2 sites combined; 3639 and 3643 Linden Avenue North).

Existing Uses: Single family residence and a triplex apartment building.

Public Comment: The Notice of Application comment period began on May 15, 2014 and was extended to June 11, 2014. Several written comments were received during the comment period.

### **ANALYSIS - SEPA**

The proposal is to establish a thirty-five unit structure in a Lowrise 2 (LR2) residential zone, thus the application is not exempt from SEPA review. 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) because the proposed project is located in a Lowrise zone and exceeds the unit threshold.

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated April 16, 2014 and annotated by the Land Use Planner. The information in the checklist, pertinent public comment, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed and annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans, including site survey, and any additional information in the file. 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 environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" subject to some limitations. Under such limitations or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate. Short-term and long-term adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposal.

Codes and development regulation applicable to this proposed project will provide sufficient mitigation from short and/or long term impacts. Applicable codes may include the Stormwater Code (SMC22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08).

#### **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.

### 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; loss of plant and animal habitat; traffic and transportation impacts. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse long-term impacts to the environment. However, a closer look at parking impacts is warranted.

### Parking

The subject property is located in a multifamily zone (LR2), the Fremont Hub Urban Village and in a frequent transit service area. No vehicular parking is required for the project per the Land Use Code (SMC 23.54). The submitted MUP plans indicate no vehicular parking will be provided onsite for the 35 unit residential apartment project proposal.

Several comment letters were received by DPD expressing concern about the lack of parking in the area of the proposal. The applicant submitted a Parking Utilization Study, dated June 26, 2014, prepared by William Popp Associates, Transportation Engineers. The study area included all streets where parking was reasonably allowed, within 800 feet of the proposal. The results showed that during evening and overnight hours (Tuesday through Thursday) the parking utilization was approximately 67%. The City of Seattle determines parking capacity to be at 85%. Therefore, the study asserts there is existing surplus parking available in the vicinity of the proposal.

A suitable tool to estimate the parking demand for this project is the King County Right Size Parking Calculator. This method, which estimates parking demand taking number of units, project location and unit size (300 sq. ft. studios) into account, results in a parking demand rate of .75 vehicles per unit. Using this rate, the project is expected to generate a parking demand of approximately 26 vehicles during peak (overnight) hours. The project is proposing no parking, indicating that parking spillover will be approximately 26 vehicles. It is anticipated that these vehicles will seek parking on nearby streets on which parking is allowed. Adding these vehicles to existing on-street parking demand would result in a utilization rate of 78%.

In summary, it is estimated that there will be a total parking demand for approximately 26 parking spaces during peak hours. No parking will be provided onsite for the residents' use. It is anticipated that these vehicles will seek parking on nearby streets on which parking is allowed, resulting in a modest impact to on-street parking availability. The parking study indicates that

there is capacity to accommodate this parking on neighboring streets. Additionally, SEPA Policy 25.05.675.M.2.b states no SEPA authority is provided for the decision maker to mitigate the impact of development on parking availability for residential uses located within urban villages and a frequent transit area, as in this case. Therefore no conditioning or mitigation is warranted or required.

### 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).

### Historic Landmarks

The triplex apartment building and single family structure at 3639 and 3643 Linden Avenue North were built in 1902 and 1901 respectively. The applicant submitted documentation per CAM 3000 to the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) for potential nomination as historic landmarks. DON subsequently determined that the structures did not warrant nomination as historic landmarks.

## **DECISION - SEPA**

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- [X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 2c.
- [ ] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030 2c.

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment and complies with ECA regulations. 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.

**CONDITIONS - SEPA**

None required.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ (signature on file) Date: December 4, 2014  
Tami Garrett, Senior Land Use Planner  
Department of Planning and Development

TG:drm

K\Decisions-Signed\3017074.docx