



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: 3018670

Applicant Name: Brenda Barnes, Clark Design Group, PLLC, for Lennar Multifamily Communities, LLC

Address of Proposal: 1701 NW 56th Street

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 7-story, mixed-use building with 155 residential units, 21 ground floor live-work units and 4,183 sq. ft. of retail space. Parking for 163 vehicles will be provided at and below grade. Review includes demolition of five residential structures (12 dwelling units).

The following approvals are required:

SEPA Environmental Determination – Chapter 25.05 SMC.

Design Review – Chapter 23.41 Seattle Municipal Code (SMC)

SEPA Determination: [] Exempt [] DNS [] MDNS [] EIS

[X] DNS with conditions

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

Departures Granted:

SMC 23.47A.008.B.3. Street-level Development Standards: The Code requires a floor-to-floor height of at least 13 feet for non-residential street-level uses. The applicant is proposing a floor-to-floor height under a mezzanine of 9'-9" at the retail space on the corner, 10'-4" at the live-work spaces between lobbies, and 12'-4" at the 3 live-work spaces at the west end.

SMC 23.47A.008.B.3. Street-level Development Standards: The Code requires and an average depth of 30 feet and a minimum depth of 15 feet for non-residential street-level uses. The applicant proposes a reduction in minimum and average depths.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The proposed development site consists of six parcels, five of which are occupied by small residential buildings, all facing onto NW 56th Street, just to the west of 17th Avenue NW. The development site, which sits north of an east/west running alley ten-feet in width 48 which provides vehicular access to the site, is located a half block north of NW Market Street and the Swedish Medical Center-Ballard. Some multi-family structures of more recent vintage are intermingled with older single-family homes throughout the general immediate area. A mix of institutional buildings, associated with the Swedish-Ballard Medical Center are located along NW Market Street and streets just to the south of the site. The site is located within the Ballard Urban Center Village.

The site totals approximately 28,500 square feet, and is zoned NC3 with an 85-foot height limit. Sites north, south, east and west of the development site are also zoned NC3-85.

The topography of the area is generally flat, stepping down slightly from the northeast to the southwest.

Project Proposal

The development objectives for the site located at 1701 NW 56th Street is to erect a seven story mixed-use structure with 4,400 square feet of retail space and 10 live-work units at grade. Six upper floors would contain 177 residential units. Parking for 114 vehicles would be provided below and at grade, with access from the alley directly south of the development.

Public Comment

The official public comment period for this proposal ended on March 18, 2015. The City received approximately seven letters commenting on aspects of the proposal. Additional public comments were elicited at each of the Design Review meetings. Specific comments from those meetings are included under the Design Review analysis discussed below.

ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

Early Design Guidance Meeting –December 22, 2014

Architects' Presentation

The preferred option, Option C, as presented by the design and development team, would be a seven-story structure with a ground floor containing two residential lobbies, a retail space (3,917 sq. ft.) at the corner of 17th Avenue NW and NW 56th Street, 11 live-work units along the street front, and parking for 117 vehicles underlying 6 stories of residential units, containing a total of 163 residential units. Amenity areas would be provided on the second and third levels as well on the rooftop. There would be additional live-work units as well as some of the residential units

oriented to the south, activating the alley façade. The middle portion of the NW 56th Street façade would be recessed between “bookends” which would be pushed forward to the street front. The rear of the structure would be pushed to the alley. Option B, would be pushed to the street front and generally unmodulated, with top five floors recessed from the alley. Option A would likewise be pushed to the street above the live-work units and otherwise be generally unmodulated along this face.

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (Error! Reference source not found.) at this website:

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

The packet for the meeting is also available to view in the 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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sixteen members of the public attending the meeting signed in to become parties of record and several expressed concerns regarding a number of issues. These included:

- the undesirability of a pattern of big buildings with small apartments characterizing recent development in Ballard;
- the disappearance of green space for the neighborhood;
- the disappearance of the historic and established “feel” of Ballard;
- the proliferation of large apartment buildings in general;
- the impacts on the availability of neighborhood parking;
- the Ballard infrastructure was stretched to the breaking point;
- lamenting the disappearance of small retail spaces that actually serve the neighborhood.

Following 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.

- It was noted that this was a big (long at 300 feet) building that needed to be broken up according to a finer scale. Although the preferred option divided the massing along NW 56th Street into three parts, the Board noted that there was no compelling design reason for the symmetry of the north façade of the structure; the “book ends” or towers on either end need not be equal in breadth and bulk; the west end, for example might better transition to the building to its side by losing some height. The Board requested further exploration of the massing that would diminish the perception of height, bulk and scale.
- The proposed north-facing facades did not clearly address the zone change that ran down the middle of NW 56th Street, nor the smaller residential structures currently across the street.
- The Board asked the design team to consider the impact on existing smaller structures, in particular the smaller structure to the west of the development site. This consideration

would examine blank walls, window adjacencies, the effectiveness of voluntary setbacks, etc.

- It was unclear to the Board how the so-called amenity areas proposed would actually function as “amenities.”
- It was not clear how the live-work spaces were intended to work and function as live-work spaces: would they provide a porous edge, with transparency, along the sidewalk? How could they effectively engage the sidewalk and enhance the pedestrian experience on NW 56th Street while still maintaining an element of privacy?.
- NW 56th is a commercial street, even if it doesn’t feel as such at the moment; the design should be such as to make the live-work units readily convertible to commercial at some point in the future.
- Think glass for overhead weather protection so as to allow ample lighting for safety, vitality of plantings, etc.
- For the landscaping, play with an integrated water element tying the building and ground plane together.
- The Board supported the desire to create a contemporary look, utilizing quality materials and careful detailing. Reference was made during the presentation to the Scandinavian heritage of the locale, and some subtle reference was evident in the materials presented; —if the reference is appropriate, it should be exploited and made more prominent and not totally subtle.
- The entries should be clearly readable and the primary residential entry should receive treatment as “primary.”

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

At the time of the FIRST Early Design Guidance meeting the following departure was requested:

1. *SMC 23.47A.008.B.3. Street-level Development Standards: The Code requires an average depth of 30 feet and a minimum depth of 15 feet for non-residential street-level uses. The applicant proposes a reduction in minimum and average depths.*

The Board indicated a desire for the applicants to more clearly demonstrate the disposition and functioning of the units and clearly articulate the request as better meeting the intention of the Design Guidelines.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

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

CONTEXT & SITE

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

CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

CS1-B-2. Daylight and Shading: Maximize daylight for interior and exterior spaces and minimize shading on adjacent sites through the placement and/or design of structures on site.

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.

CS1-E Water

CS1-E-1. Natural Water Features: If the site includes any natural water features, consider ways to incorporate them into project design, where feasible

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

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

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

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-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-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-2. Contemporary Design: Explore how contemporary designs can contribute to the development of attractive new forms and architectural styles; as expressed through use of new materials or other means.

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

PUBLIC LIFE

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

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

PL3-A Entries

PL3-A-3. Individual Entries: Ground-related housing should be scaled and detailed appropriately to provide for a more intimate type of entry.

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

PL3-B Residential Edges

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

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

PL4-B Planning Ahead for Bicyclists

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

DESIGN CONCEPT

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

DC2-A Massing

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

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

DC2-B-1. Façade Composition: Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs—considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades 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 facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

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

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

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

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

DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes

DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials: Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

DC4-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-B Signage

DC4-B-1. Scale and Character: Add interest to the streetscape with exterior signs and attachments that are appropriate in scale and character to the project and its environs.

DC4-B-2. Coordination with Project Design: Develop a signage plan within the context of architectural and open space concepts, and coordinate the details with façade design, lighting, and other project features to complement the project as a whole, in addition to the surrounding context.

Board Recommendations

- Show and explain how the proposed amenity areas function as true amenity areas. Show the choice of location of these spaces as optimizations among options.
- Show and explain how the building form addresses concerns regarding height, bulk and scale relations to the smaller existing structure to the west.
- Show and explain how the proposed structure puts a best face toward the structure to the west.
- Explain the function and performance of the live-work units and clearly show how requested departures in their regards better meet the intentions of the Design Guidelines.
- Consider steps for achieving pedestrian safety at the alley.
- Give clear expression to the residential entries with the primary entry appropriately scaled and appointed.
- Consider each of the Board’s concerns as listed on pp. 3 and 4 of this report.

At the conclusion of the Early Design Guidance Meeting, after identifying those Guidelines of particular and highest applicability to the proposal, the Design Review Board recommended (3-0) that the proposal proceed to design development and MUP application.

Recommendation Meeting –June 15, 2015

Design Development

The applicant described the design concept of the proposed development, which included a massing divided into four parts. Since the EDG Meeting, the proposed design has been further developed to incorporate refined design expressions for each portion of the massing. The east corner features overlapping horizontal bands of flat metal panel and vertical bands of metal panel with profile and synthetic wood siding over a background of glazing to emphasize the prominence of the corner. The middle portion of the massing is pulled back from the street and punctuated with vertical bays. The corner and middle portion rest on a highly transparent “stilted” base. The west portion of the massing is pushed to the street, and is intended to visually anchor the building. This portion is narrower than the corner mass, and features a vertical expression through the use of thick vertical bands of dark cement fiber and heavier concrete framing at the base.

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3018670) at this website:

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

The packet is also available to view in the 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

In response to Early Design Guidance and DPD direction, the applicant presented a modified design at the Recommendation meeting, including a continuation of the design language to each portion of the massing along the alley elevation, and refined the entries, overhead weather protection, and relation of ground-level units to the sidewalk to create a legible and varied pedestrian experience. The main retail entry is inset from the main corner of the building; a large canopy wraps the corner to provide weather protection and demarcate the entry. The residential lobby is located just to the west of the retail entry, also set back from the property line. This entry is sheltered by a canopy, similar to the retail entry. A two-story vertical architectural concrete pillar with signage is located adjacent to the residential entry. The mid-block ground floor units are set back from the pedestrian street with private stoops raised above street level, and separated with screens and planters. Above the live-work units, the building steps back to create a private terrace space.

To address privacy concerns for the residential building to the west, the proposed development locates windowless facades facing the decks of the adjacent structure.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Appreciated the changes made to the design since the EDG Meeting, and felt that the design is overall greatly improved.

- Supported the materials and color palette as presented by the applicant.
- Felt the massing appears less garish, and more subtle than presented at EDG.
- Appreciated the rooftop amenity space and landscaping.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS: JUNE 15, 2015

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

- 1. Massing and Design Concept.** The packet was clear and informative in demonstrating the design concepts used to break up the long façade and reduce the perceived mass. (CS2- D, DC2-A)
 - a. The Board appreciated the clear demonstration of each side of the building and overall massing concept and architectural composition of four distinct portions.(DC2-A, DC2-B)
 - b. The refinements to the massing scheme, especially in regards to the west end, provide a more sensitive transition to adjacencies. (CS2-B, CS2-D, DC2-A)
 - c. The Board felt that the applicant was successful in distinguishing the design language of the two “ends” of the building as to not appear symmetrical. (CS2-C, CS3-A, DC2-A, DC2-B)
- 2. Materials & Façade Composition.** The Board appreciated the composition of materials, attention to detailing, and high quality finishes on all facades. (DC2-A, DC2-B, DC4-A)
 - a. The Board supported the vertical bands of finely textured horizontal paneling. (CS3-A, DC2-B, DC4-A)
 - b. The Board appreciated the treatment of the alley with the same high-quality finishes and materials as the rest of the building facades. (DC2-B, DC4-A)
 - c. The selection and composition of materials, especially the warm wood toned color, create an articulated design language. (CS3-A, DC2-B)
 - d. The Board had some concern over the dark shade of grey panels facing the balconies of the adjacent building to the west, and the potential impact on light quality. The Board requested that the applicant consider a lighter shade, but not at the expense of compromising the overall design composition and color palette. (CS2-D, DC2-B)
- 3. Amenity Space.** The Board was pleased with the large amenity space and lush planting on the rooftop. (DC3-B)
- 4. Streetscape & Entries.** The Board endorsed the progression of streetscape expressions along NW 56th Street, and felt it created variety in the pedestrian experience. (PL3-A, PL2-B, CS2-C)
 - a. The Board supported the lush landscaping along NW 56th Street. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS3-A)
 - b. The Board felt the rhythm and scale of the live-work unit entries had a residential expression was an appropriate response for this streetscape; however, the units should retain their transparency and remain flexible to accommodate commercial uses. (CS3-A, PL2-B, PL3-A, PL3-B, DC1-A)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based on the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s)

At the time of the FINAL Recommendation meeting the following departures were requested:

1. **SMC 23.47A.008.B.3. Street-level Development Standards:** The Code requires a floor-to-floor height of at least 13 feet for non-residential street-level uses. The applicant is proposing a floor-to-floor height under a mezzanine of 9'-9" at the retail space on the corner, 10'-4" at the live-work spaces between lobbies, and 12'-4" at the 3 live-work spaces at the west end.

The Board unanimously supported the departure, noting that raising ceiling height would result in a taller base which would be out of proportion with the residential scale and expression that the Board approved. In addition, the Board felt that the departure allows for an arrangement of interior uses that is flexible for residential or commercial uses. Providing ample living space on the mezzanine allows the first floor to adequately accommodate retail/commercial uses. (PL3-B, DC1-A, DC2-B)

2. **SMC 23.47A.008.B.3. Street-level Development Standards:** The Code requires an average depth of 30 feet and a minimum depth of 15 feet for non-residential street-level uses. The applicant proposes a reduction in minimum and average depths.

The Board unanimously supported the departure, which is directly related to the floor-to-floor height departure. The Board felt that the depth of the mezzanine provides ample living space, creating the flexibility to accommodate both residential and commercial activities on the ground floor as needed in the future. (PL3-B, DC1-A)

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated June 15, 2015, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the June 15, 2015 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members unanimously recommended APPROVAL of the project design with no conditions.

ANALYSIS & DECISION- DESIGN REVIEW

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.014F of the Seattle Municipal Code and 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 recommendation:

- a. Reflects inconsistent applications 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*
- e. Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.*

Director's Analysis and Decision

Five members of the Design Review Board provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines that would be critical to the project's overall success. The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made at the Recommendation meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings. The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project as presented at the June 15, 2015 meeting would result in a design that best meets the intent of the applicable Design Guidelines. Therefore, the Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations regarding the removal of the trees on site and their approval of the design, and **APPROVES the proposed design and the requested departures from development standards.**

Design Review Conditions

None.

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 Chapter 25.05) because the proposed project exceeds the 12,000 square foot size threshold.

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant, dated January 23, 2015. The information in the checklist, supplemental documentation, 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 the environmental checklist which was submitted by the project applicant and reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file. As indicated in this analysis, this action will result in 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 (SM C 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 and environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation,*" subject to some limitations.

Short-Term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from demolition and building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased dust caused by drying mud tracked onto streets during construction activities; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and nonrenewable resources. Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts:

- The applicant estimates approximately 22,750 cubic yards of excavation for construction, with 32,000 cubic yards of soil to be removed from the site. Excess material to be disposed of must be deposited in an approved site.
- The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction.
- The Street Use Ordinance requires watering streets to suppress dust, on-site washing of truck tires, and removal of debris and regulates obstruction of the pedestrian right-of-way.
- PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general.
- Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the city.

Most short-term impacts are expected to be minor, and compliance with existing applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most short-term impacts to the environment. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most short-term impacts to the environment. However, given the amount of building activity to be undertaken in association with the proposed project, additional analysis of drainage, grading, traffic, circulation and parking, noise, and greenhouse gases is warranted.

Drainage

Soil disturbing activities during site excavation for foundation purposes could result in erosion and transport of sediment. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code provides for extensive review and conditioning of the project prior to issuance of building permits. Therefore, no further conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Earth - Grading

Construction plans will be reviewed by DPD. Any additional information showing conformance with applicable ordinances and codes will be required prior to issuance of building permits. Applicable codes and ordinances provide extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code requires preparation of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction on sites where grading will involve cuts or fills of greater than three feet in height or grading greater than 100 cubic yards of material. The current proposal involves excavation of approximately 4,500 cubic yards of

material. A Geotechnical Report by GeoEngineers, dated March 16, 2012, was submitted with this application and was reviewed and approved by DPD. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code provides extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used, therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Traffic, Circulation and Parking

Construction activities are expected to affect the surrounding area. Impacts to traffic and roads are expected from truck trips during excavation and construction activities. The construction activities will require the removal of material from the site and can be expected to generate truck trips to and from the site. In addition, delivery of concrete and other materials to the site will generate truck trips.

During demolition and construction, the existing City code (SMC 11.62) requires truck activities to use arterial streets to the greatest extent possible. For the removal and disposal of the spoil materials, the Code (SMC 11.74) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that a minimum of one foot of “freeboard” (area from level of material to the top of the truck container) be provided in loaded uncovered trucks to minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed en route to or from a site.

The Street Use Ordinance requires sweeping or watering streets to suppress dust, on-site washing of truck tires and removal of debris, and regulates obstruction of the pedestrian right-of-way. This ordinance provides adequate mitigation for these construction transportation impacts; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

On-street parking in the neighborhood is limited, and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction could exacerbate the demand for on-street parking and result in an adverse impact on surrounding properties. The owner and/or responsible party shall assure that construction vehicles and equipment are parked on the subject site or on a dedicated site within 800 feet for the term of the construction, whenever possible.

To facilitate these efforts, a Construction Management Plan will be required as a condition of approval identifying construction worker parking and construction materials staging areas; truck access routes to and from the site for excavation and construction phases as approved by SDOT; and sidewalk and street closures with neighborhood notice and posting procedures.

Noise

Mitigation for construction impacts is subject to the SEPA Overview Policy. Construction activities are subject to the Noise Ordinance. In order to require SEPA mitigation there must be unusual circumstances that result in adverse impacts that “substantially exceed” those anticipated by City codes and regulations. No such unusual circumstances have been identified and, therefore, no additional mitigation is warranted.

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.

Long-Term Impacts — Use-Related Impacts

Height, Bulk and Scale

The SEPA Height, Bulk and Scale Policy (25.05.675.G) states that:

“...the height, bulk and scale of development projects should be reasonably compatible with the general character of development anticipated by the goals and policies...for the area in which they are located, and to provide for a reasonable transition between areas of less intensive zoning and more intensive zoning.”

In addition, the Policy states that:

“A project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review Process shall be presumed to comply with these 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.”

The proposed development would proceed according to Land Use Code standards for the proposed zone. The development as a whole will be in keeping with the scale of development anticipated by the goals and policies for the existing zoning and the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, in approving the project, the Design Review Board gave particular attention to the height, bulk and scale relationship of the proposal to its surroundings. There is no evidence that height, bulk and scale impacts have been inadequately mitigated through the Design Review Board process. Therefore, no mitigation of height, bulk and scale impacts is warranted pursuant to SEPA.

Traffic

According to the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) completed by the Transpo Group in July, 2015, and submitted by the applicant, the proposed development is estimated (for 2018) to generate 880 net new daily trips, with 75 new trips occurring during the PM peak hour. While these impacts may be adverse, they are not expected to be significant as they affect existing and future conditions. The traffic volume impacts are relatively low at the study intersections, all but one of which will operate at Level of Service (LOS) B or better. Only the intersection at 15th Avenue NW and NW Market Street is expected to degrade from a LOS D to LOS E. As noted in the traffic analysis, this intersection is forecast to operate in 2018 at the LOS E even without-project conditions. The project would meet the City’s transportation concurrency requirements. No off-site mitigation measures would be required to offset the transportation related impacts of the project.

Parking

Parking for the proposed project would be provided by an on-site parking garage with 163 vehicle parking stalls. The parking garage is anticipated to be utilized by residents of the development only. Additionally, 48 long-term, covered bicycle parking spots will be provided on the development site. Per Seattle Municipal Code (SMC 23.54.015), there is no minimum

parking requirement for the development as it is located within the Ballard Hub Urban Village and within 1,320 feet of a street with frequent transit service. An anticipated parking demand for 165 vehicles attributable to the proposed residential component of the development has been estimated by *Transpo* in the TIA prepared for the project, based upon data provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) *Parking Generation, 4th Edition*, as well as local mode of travel data consistent with the trip generation analysis.

Based upon proposed retail use, a peak parking demand is estimated at 20 vehicles. Visitor parking demand would total 26 vehicles, totaling a peak 7PM parking demand for on-street or off-street parking lot parking of 46 vehicles. An anticipated parking demand for 2 vehicles, with the peak parking demand occurring overnight, is attributable to the proposed residential component of the development and is based upon data provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) *Parking Generation, 4th Edition*, as well as local mode of travel data consistent with the trip generation analysis.

The demand for 2 additional parking spots for residents and parking for retail customers and visitors will not be accommodated in the proposed garage and would need to be accommodated off-site. Residents with vehicles not accommodated within the parking garage, retail customers, and visitors would likely use on-street parking spaces and public, off-street garages. The TIA analysis concludes that it is anticipated that the existing infrastructure surrounding the proposed project will be sufficient to accommodate the off-site vehicles with negligible impacts in the study area. Given the traffic and parking impacts identified in the report, no off-site mitigation measures would be necessary to offset the transportation related impacts of the project.

Greenhouse Gas

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. Over the life of the project the total greenhouse gas emissions are expected to equal 5,848,869 MTCO₂e. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

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. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21 C), including the requirement to inform the public of 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 43.21 C.030(2)(c).

CONDITIONS -SEPA

Prior to MUP Issuance

1. The applicant shall submit to DPD a copy of the “Letter of Intent to Dedicate Public Right of Way” sent to SDOT Real Property Section, detailing the intent to dedicate property along the extent of the north margin of the alley between 17th Avenue NW and 20th Avenue NW that abuts the development properties.

Prior to Issuance of Any Building Permits

2. The applicant shall initiate coordination with SDOT regarding an allowed Truck Traffic Route to be reviewed and approved by SDOT prior to issuance of any construction permits. Contact Don Smith at SDOT for all requirements needed for SDOT review (206-684-5125).
3. The applicant shall record dedications of the property along the north margin of the alley abutting the development site as required by SMC 23.53.030.
4. The applicant shall provide for DPD and SDOT approval a Construction Management Plan which shall include anticipated hours of construction, any anticipated street, alley or sidewalk closers, details of SDOT approved hours and truck access routes to and from the site, efforts at noise attenuation, contractor contact information for neighbors to the project, as well as other pertinent information regarding the projected course of construction.

CONDITIONS-DESIGN REVIEW

None.

Michael Dorcy, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

Date: November 9, 2015

MMD:rgc
K:\Decisions-Signed\3018670.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.