



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: 3019051
Applicant Name: Jodi Patterson-O'Hare
Address of Proposal: 1016 Republican St

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow an 8-story, 146 room hotel with a restaurant on the ground level. Existing one story building to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)

Development Standard Departure to allow no primary pedestrian entrance or street-oriented courtyard along Boren Ave N. (SMC 23.48.014.A.1)

SEPA - Environmental 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 25.05.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site and Vicinity Description

Site Zone: Seattle Mixed with heights limits of 160 feet for structures containing nonresidential uses; the base height limit for residential uses is 85 feet with a maximum height of 240 feet (SM 160/85-240) located in the South Lake Union Urban Center.

Nearby Zones: The Seattle Mixed (SM) zone extends north toward Valley St, east to I-5, south toward Denny Way, west to Aurora Ave N. Across Mercer St to the north, the height limit changes, Seattle Mixed (SM 85/65-160).

Lot Area: Located on the corner of Republican St and Boren Ave N, the 7,200 sf project site has 120 feet of street frontage along Republican St and 60 feet along Boren Ave N.

Access: The subject property currently has vehicular access from Republican St and Boren Ave N.

Current Development:

A one-story, commercial/storage building currently exists on the site. Originally constructed in 1914, the concrete masonry building features no window openings.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

Located on the corner of Republican St and Boren Ave N, the project site is within the South Lake Union Urban Center and the Westlake Commercial Core subarea as mapped in the South Lake Union Guidelines. Bounded by Mercer St to the north, Fairview Ave to the east, Denny Way to the south, and 9th Ave to the west, this subarea is undergoing rapid reconstruction; many of the nearby structures have been built in the last 10 years and many other developments are in the permit process or under construction. Recent projects have been predominately full block or half block in size, however as large developable sites have become increasingly rare, smaller infill projects, such as the project site, are being proposed.

The immediate context is primarily commercial buildings, characterized by a repetitive bay façade composition. Across the alley to the west and north, is a seven story, L-shaped, office building built in 2011. The adjacent site to the north contains a three-story, masonry office building built in 1926. Further north, a one story storage warehouse, is currently undergoing the permitting process for a seven-story residential building, project number 3016969. Across the street to the east, is a five-story office building built in 2010. To the south, is a full block office development built in 2010; the development is integrated with the Van Vorst historic landmark structure. Across the corner of Republican St and Boren, a residential project is currently under construction, project number 3013013.



This area includes blocks with a rich variety of uses, institutions, and transportation connectivity and is served by transit routes and major roadway corridors. To the west, the South Lake Union streetcar runs northbound along Terry Ave. Republican St and Boren Ave N are relatively quiet streets, with the busier arterials and transit routes at Mercer St to the north and Fairview Ave N to the east.

Project Description

The proposal is for an eight-story hotel featuring 146 rooms above a street-level restaurant; no parking is proposed. Existing structure to be demolished.

Public Comment

No written comments were received during the application public comment period ending on March 25, 2015. Several members of the public attended the Early Design Guidance Review meeting held on February 4, 2015 and the Recommendation meeting held on June 17, 2015. No public comments were offered at either meeting

ANALYSIS-DESIGN REVIEW

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: February 4, 2015 DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

At the Early Design Guidance meeting, the applicant provided two varied zoning studies and three massing schemes. All massing options propose similar square footage and use; an eight-story hotel above a street level restaurant. Massing Option 1 is configured in a C- shape plan. The resulting massing creates a monolithic presence along Republican St and compared to the other options, is the defining characteristic of the scheme. Since entrances along Boren Ave are the pattern in the neighborhood, this option locates the entry off Boren Ave.

Option 2 shows an eight story structure, organized in an I-shape plan. The massing provides a strong street presence; a setback along Republican provides interest to the façade and also defines each corner. To further break up the façade, the proposed entry is located off Republican St.

Option 3, the preferred option, resembles Option 1, as it is organized in a C shape. Massing is further refined in this scheme and characterized by a repetitive bay element. The applicant explained that for boutique hotel projects, it is common to convey the repetition of interior uses on the outside. Integral to the proposed option, a strong articulation of the exterior skin with repetitive bays communicates the interior uses and creates depth to the façade with a sense of human scale. Similar to Option 2, the proposed entry is located off Republican St. All schemes are code compliant.

Public Comment

No public comments were offered at the Early Design Guidance meeting.

Meeting Materials:

The design packets submitted to the DPD Land Use Planner prior to each Design Review meeting included materials presented at the EDG and Recommendation meetings. They are available online by entering the project number (3019051) at this website:

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

or 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

FINAL RECOMMENDATION June 17, 2015
DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The applicant described changes since the EDG meeting, including a modified bay window configuration and corner design. The applicant acknowledged the EDG direction to set back the street level restaurant space, but responded that NANA doors were proposed in place of a setback, in order to visually connect the restaurant with street frontage and allow year round use of the space.

Lighting was described as an integral part of the design, with in-pavement lighting proposed at the main entry and LED lighting in the facades to emphasize the accent colors.

Public Comment

No public comments were offered at the Final Recommendation meeting.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE (FEBRUARY 4, 2015):

- 1. Massing Options:** The Board unanimously preferred massing Option 3 as it provides the most interesting articulation of the façade. (Guidelines DC2-B, DC2-C) The Board directed the applicant to proceed with the preferred option.
 - a. Cognizant of the applicant's approach to display the repetition of interior uses on the outside, the Board unanimously supported the asymmetrical bays. As part of moving the design forward, the Board would like to see a more playful and intentional

- approach to designing the façade; design the bays to provide a cohesive and unified architectural concept. (Guidelines DC2-B, DC2-C)
- b. On the west façade, the Board suggested further study of the notch/ seam expression to communicate a cohesive architectural concept. As currently shown, the vertical slot signifies an entry. (Guidelines DC2-B, DC2-C)
 - c. The Board strongly urged the applicant to use material detailing and color to convey the particular type of boutique hotel. (Guideline DC4-A)
- 2. Ground floor:** The Board commended the applicant for organizing their back of house uses away from the street. The resulting ground floor encourages pedestrian interaction and activity with transparency and active uses, such as the proposed restaurant. (Guidelines CS2-B-2, PL3-II, DC2-C)
- a. The Board supported the 15' ground floor height and setback and recommend further study of relationship between the setback and massing above. The setback at the restaurant location could also be studied further to allow for more spillover sidewalk space. (Guidelines PL3-II, DC2-C)
 - b. The Board unanimously supported the continuous overhead canopy. (Guideline PL2-C)
 - c. PL2-C)
- 3. Entry:** Related to the ground floor, the Board deliberated over the proposed entry location and questioned whether or not there should be an entry along Boren as this is the pattern established in the neighborhood. Ultimately, the Board supported the entry as shown, since it breaks up the south façade which is lengthy and would otherwise have little relief, and the added columns along Boren provide variation. (Guidelines PL3-A, PL3-II, PL4-A)
- a. For the hotel, the entry is a node of activity. The Board supported the at-grade planting and street furniture near the entry which recognizes this node of activity. (Guidelines PL3-A, PL3-II)
 - b. The Board recommended studying the entry and taxi drop off relationship to accommodate both uses and circulation. (Guidelines PL3-A, PL3-II, PL4-A)

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS (JUNE 17, 2015):

- 1. Massing and Design Concept.** The Board noted that the revised bay and corner design was improved over the EDG conceptual design. (CS3-A, DC2-B, DC2-C)
- a. The Board approved of the modified design of the glass 'notch' on the east façade, including the better resolution with the base expression and the revised design to avoid confusion about the building entry location. (DC2-B)
 - b. The Board also specified support for the asymmetrical bay configuration in the preferred option shown in the packet. (DC2-B)
 - c. Most of the Board agreed that the lighter top floor emphasized the design concept and was a better design solution than extending the corner bay to the roofline. (DC2-B)
 - d. The Board approved of the use of an accent color, but recommended a condition to modify the vertical strips of color to better align with the bay window soffits and other elements on the south façade. (DC2-B, DC2-C)
 - e. The Board encouraged the applicant to consider additional accent color on the south façade (window headers, etc.), but declined to recommend a condition for this change. (DC2-C)

2. **Street Level Design.** The Board was concerned that the street level design could create confusion about the building entry, and recommended conditions to resolve the confusion. (CS2-B, PL3-A, PL3-II, PL4-A)
 - a. The Board noted that a NANA wall that could be opened to allow pedestrian access at the south edge conflicts with the applicant’s stated intent to direct all restaurant patrons through the main lobby entry at the corner. To resolve the potential confusion for pedestrians, the Board recommended a condition to modify the south edge of the restaurant space with a stem wall and NANA storefront windows, or some other solution to visually connect the human activity with the street frontage. The Board noted that a leaning rail across the storefront would not be an acceptable solution to resolve this item. (CS2-B, PL3-A, PL3-II)
 - b. The Board discussed the entry location and revised drop-off zone to the west of the entry, and agreed that the configuration will likely reduce conflicts between loading and pedestrians. However, the Board recommended a condition to place bike racks closer to the entry, in addition to the bike racks shown at the southwest corner of the site. (PL4-A)
 - c. The Board strongly supported the in-pavement lighting as proposed. If Seattle Department of Transportation does not permit in-pavement lighting in the public right of way, the Board recommended a condition to use colored paving for a similar effect. (PL3-A)
 - d. The Board approved of the proposed special paving, wood curved canopy element, and street furniture to identify the entry at the south façade, but recommended a condition to continue this expression around the corner to emphasize the entry at the east façade. (PL3-A)

3. **Signage.** The Board recommended approval of the signage plan as shown, with upper level signage approximately 24” high. The Board recommended a condition that the size of the upper level signage should not exceed the 24” high size shown in the Recommendation meeting. (DC4-B)

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

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

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

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

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

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

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.

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-C Weather Protection

PL2-C-2. Design Integration: Integrate weather protection, gutters and downspouts into the design of the structure as a whole, and ensure that it also relates well to neighboring buildings in design, coverage, or other features.

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

PL3-A Entries

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

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

South Lake Union Supplemental Guidance:

PL3-II Human Activity

PL3-II-i. Public/Private Transition: Create graceful transitions at the streetscape level between the public and private uses.

PL3-II-ii. Active Facades: Design facades to encourage activity to spill out from business onto the sidewalk, and vice-versa.

PL3-II-iv. Activity Clusters: Create businesses and community activity clusters through colocation of retail and pedestrian uses as well as other high pedestrian traffic opportunities.

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

PL4-A Entry Locations and Relationships

PL4-A-1. Serving all Modes of Travel: Provide safe and convenient access points for all modes of travel.

PL4-A-2. Connections to All Modes: Site the primary entry in a location that logically relates to building uses and clearly connects all major points of access.

DESIGN CONCEPT

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

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.

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-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-C Secondary Architectural Features

DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest: Add depth to facades 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.

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-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.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board’s recommendations on the requested departures was be based upon the departures’ potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departures.

- 1. General Façade Requirements – Primary Pedestrian Entry (SMC 23.48.014.A.1):** The code requires a primary pedestrian entrance or street-oriented courtyard along the street. The applicant proposes one entry on Republican St near the corner, rather than an entry on both Republican St and Boren Ave.

The Board acknowledged that the applicant had moved entry closer to the corner to resolve conflicts with the drop off zone, but struggled to verify how the proposed design better met the intent of the Design Review Guidelines. The Board recommended a condition to modify the south street level design to clarify the entry at the southeast corner and emphasize street level human activity at the south street frontage, in order to justify this departure.

This departure, along with the recommended conditions, would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines CS2-B-2, DC1-A-1, and PL3-II, by incorporating a visible entry near the intersection, with operable storefronts that emphasize human activity but avoid confusion about the entry location.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated June 17, 2015, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the June 17, 2015 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design with the following conditions. Applicable Guidelines are noted in parentheses after each condition.

1. Modify the vertical strips of color to better align with the bay window soffits and other elements on the south façade. (DC2-B, DC2-C)
2. Modify the south edge of the restaurant space with a stem wall and NANA storefront windows, or some other solution to visually connect the human activity with the street frontage. The Board noted that a leaning rail across the storefront would not be an acceptable solution to resolve this item. (CS2-B, PL3-A, PL3-II)
3. Place bike racks closer to the entry, in addition to the bike racks shown at the southwest corner of the site. (PL4-A)
4. If Seattle Department of Transportation does not permit in-pavement lighting in the public right of way, the Board recommended a condition to use colored paving for a similar effect. (PL3-A)
5. Extend the special paving, wood curved canopy element, and street furniture around the corner to emphasize the entry at the east façade. (PL3-A)
6. The size of the upper level signage shall not exceed the 24” high size shown in the Recommendation meeting. (DC4-B)

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.014.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the DPD Director’s decision reads in part as follows:

The Director's decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board. Except for projects accepted in the Living Building Pilot Program established in Section 23.40.060, if four or more members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to the Director, the Director shall issue a decision that makes compliance with the recommendation of the Design Review Board a condition of permit approval, unless the Director concludes that the recommendation of the Design Review Board:

- a. Reflects inconsistent application of the design review guidelines; or*
- b. Exceeds the authority of the Design Review Board; or*
- c. Conflicts with SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the site; or*
- d. Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.*

Director's Analysis:

Four members of the West Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations 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.F.3). The Director agrees with and accepts the conditions recommended by the Board that further augment the selected Guidelines, as described in the Board Recommendation section above.

Subsequent to the June 17th, 2015 Recommendation meeting, the applicant worked with DPD staff to respond to the Design Review Board Recommended Conditions as follows:

1. The applicant's plans demonstrate that the vertical strips of color align with the bay window soffits, comparable to design offered in the Recommendation meeting design packets and presented at the Recommendation meeting. This response satisfies recommended condition #1.
2. The approved plan set shows the addition of a stem wall and storefront windows at the restaurant space. This response satisfies recommended condition #2.
3. Bike racks are added and moved closer to the entry in the approved plan set. This response satisfies recommended condition #3.
4. The applicant noted that if Seattle Department of Transportation does not permit in-pavement lighting in the public right of way, then colored paving will be used to create a similar effect. This item will be required as a condition of the MUP approval, in order to satisfy the Board's recommended condition #4.
5. The extension of special paving, wood curved canopy element, and street furniture around the corner is shown in approved plan set. This response satisfies recommended condition #5.
6. A condition of MUP approval will require that the size of the upper level signage shall not exceed the 24" high size shown in the Recommendation meeting. This MUP condition will satisfy the Board's recommended condition #6.

The plans on file reflect the updated design and will be included in the issued MUP plan set.

The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the Design Guidelines. The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board. The Director is satisfied that the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met, as described in the Board Recommendation section above.

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 four 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 and requested departure (General Façade Requirements) with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The proposal is to establish a 58,000 gross square feet of hotel use in a Seattle Mixed Zone (SM 160/85-240), thus the application is not exempt from SEPA review. Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the 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 Seattle Mixed 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 and signed February 25, 2015. A geotechnical report, dated July 14th, 2015 was provided under Building permit project # 6474068. A transportation impact study, dated June 30, 2015 and cultural resources assessment report, dated July 27, 2015 were also submitted. 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 Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08)

Short Term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: 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).

Noise- Construction activities ('source') including demolition, site excavation, truck and equipment idling and use, materials movement, and construction personnel could adversely affect residents in the vicinity ('receiving property'). The Noise Control Ordinance is intended to control the level of noise to '*protect, promote and preserve the public health, safety and welfare*'... '*in a manner which promotes commerce; the use, value and enjoyment of property; sleep and repose; and the quality of the environment*' (SMC 25.08.010). The Ordinance contains regulations for sound level limits from construction equipment, allowing exceedances from non-construction limits during limited hours and days. The noise levels are based on the zoning of both the source and the receiving property, and the hours that the exceedances are allowed is based on the zoning of the source property.

The proposal site is located in a commercial zone and nearby properties are zoned commercial. The Noise Ordinance limits exterior sound levels to 60, but allows construction-related activities to exceed limits by 15-25 dB(A), depending upon the type of equipment. The Ordinance allows the exceedances only during certain hours and days, depending upon the zoning of the construction site. The proposal site is located in a Seattle Mixed (SM) zone; thus, the Ordinance allows the higher noise levels between 7am-10pm weekdays and 9am-10 pm weekends and legal holidays..

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

Construction-Related Streets, Parking, and Pedestrian Circulation- Minor grading is proposed (10 cubic yards total cut and fill of material). This material would be trucked from the site. Construction vehicles would mainly enter and exit the project site from the existing alley.

Construction of the project is proposed to last for several months. The applicant's materials do not disclose the estimated amount of construction workers that will be onsite throughout the construction process. The amount of on-street parking available to construction workers appears limited due to no parking and time restrictions on several of the nearby block fronts. The demand for parking by construction workers during construction is anticipated to further reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity.

The Street Use Ordinance includes policies that regulate dust, mud and circulation within the public right-of-way. Any temporary closure of the sidewalk and/or traffic lane(s) and alley is controlled with a street use permit through the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). Construction activities may result in sidewalk closures or other obstacles to pedestrians.

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed grading, and construction activity. The immediate area is subject to traffic congestion during the peak hours on nearby arterials in association with construction activity at nearby sites. Large trucks turning from and onto nearby arterial streets would be expected to further exacerbate the flow of traffic. There are no City codes or ordinances to address the impact of large vehicles on highly congested streets. As a result, mitigation is warranted as described below.

It is the City's policy to minimize or prevent adverse traffic impacts which would undermine the stability, safety, and/or character of a neighborhood or surrounding areas (25.05.675 R). The Street Use Ordinance includes regulations which mitigate dust, mud, and circulation. Any temporary closure of the sidewalk and/or traffic lane(s) is adequately controlled with a street use permit through the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). Due to construction related demand affected by construction worker parking and increased trip generation; additional mitigation is warranted pursuant to the Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675.B). Pursuant to this policy, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) addressing construction worker parking will be required to mitigate identified impacts. The requirements for a CMP include a Construction Parking Plan that will reduce construction worker parking demand on surrounding streets and it should also consider methods to minimize construction impacts to the greatest extent possible. The submittal information for a CMP and review process for CMPs are described here: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>. The approved plan will be required prior to the issuance of any future demolition, grading and/or building permit.

Historic and Archaeological Resources- The project is within the U. S. Government Meander Line buffer that marks the historic Lake Union shoreline – an area with the potential for discovery of pre-contact and early historic period resources. If resources of potential archaeological significance are encountered during construction or excavation that Director's Rule requires the owner and/or responsible parties to:

- Stop work immediately and notify DPD and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). The procedures outlined in Appendix A of Director's Rule 2-98 for assessment and/or protection of potentially significant archeological resources shall be followed.
- Abide by all regulations pertaining to discovery and excavation of archaeological resources, including but not limited to Chapters 27.34, 27.53, 27.44, 79.01 and 79.90 RCW and Chapter 25.48 WAC, as applicable, or their successors.

The applicant submitted a cultural resources assessment report by SWCA Environmental Consultants, dated July 27, 2015. The report recommended professional archaeological monitoring of geotechnical borings and review of available boring logs and that any further professional archaeological monitoring or permitting would be based on results of geotechnical boring and review of boring logs. The Director and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) concur with the recommendations. Available boring logs have been sent to DAHP.

Consistent with the recommendations in the report and with the Director's Rule 2-98 requirements for mitigation of potential archaeological artifacts in the Meander Line Buffer and mitigation warranted by SMC 25.05.675.H, the following conditions are recommended:

Prior to Issuance of Master Use Permits:

- The owner and/or responsible parties shall provide DPD with a statement that the contract documents for their general, excavation, and other subcontractors will include reference to regulations regarding archaeological resources (Chapters 27.34, 26.53, 27.44, 79.01, and 79.90 RCW, and Chapter 25.48 WAC as applicable) and that construction crews will be required to comply with those regulations.

Prior to Issuance of Construction Permits:

- The owner and/or responsible parties shall submit an archaeological monitoring and inadvertent discovery plan (MIDP) for review prior to additional geotechnical borings. The MIDP should be sent to DAHP and the interested Tribes prior to boring.

During Construction:

If resources of potential archaeological significance are encountered during construction or excavation, the owner and/or responsible parties shall:

- Stop work immediately and notify DPD (Magda Hogness at magdahogness@seattle.gov or 206-727-8736) and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). The procedures outlined in Appendix A of Director's Rule 2-98 for assessment and/or protection of archaeological resources shall be followed.
- Abide by all regulations pertaining to discovery and excavation of archaeological resources, including but not limited to Chapters 27.34, 27.53, 27.44, 79.01 and 79.90 RCW and Chapter 25.48 WAC, as applicable, or their successors.
- Obtain all archaeological permits as required by RCW 27.53

Long - term Impacts

Long term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of this proposal, including: increased bulk and scale on the site; increased ambient noise associated with increased human activity and vehicular movement; increased traffic in the area and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; increased airborne emissions resulting from additional traffic; increased energy consumption; and increased light and glare. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse long-term impacts to the environment.

Parking- The subject property is located in a Seattle Mixed zone (SM 160/85-240) and the South Lake Union Urban Center. The submitted MUP plans indicate no vehicular parking will be provided onsite. The project expects to have a shared parking agreement with the neighboring office parking garage to use during the evenings.

The applicant submitted a transportation impact study prepared by Transportation Engineering Northwest, dated June 30, 2015. A suitable tool to estimate the parking demand for this project is the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation manual (4th edition, 2010). This method estimates the suburban parking demand rate for a hotel based on the number of occupied rooms during the weekday peak period. The model does not account for specific elements of the proposed project such as the expected client base and does not account for an urban location. Therefore, given the expected users and lack of on-site parking, the parking demand rate could be reduced by 65% and continue to reflect a reasonable peak parking demand for the subject project. As a result, the reduced peak demand rate applicable to this project is estimated at 0.31 vehicles per occupied room. Using this rate, the project is expected to generate a parking demand of approximately 46 vehicles with 100 percent occupancy.

In summary, it is estimated that there will be a total parking demand for approximately 46 parking spaces during 100% occupancy. While the project is proposing no on-site parking, a shared parking agreement with the neighboring office building will be used to accommodate evening peak demand. It is anticipated that guests with parking needs will seek parking on nearby streets where parking is allowed or nearby pay-parking lots within a few blocks of the site, or any parking lots with which the hotel may have a shared parking agreement in the future. 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 in the Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Centers; as in this case. Therefore no conditioning or mitigation is warranted or required.

Traffic- The submitted transportation impact study noted that the project is expected to generate a total of 376 net new daily vehicle trips, with 29 new trips occurring during the weekday AM peak hour, and 25 new trips during the weekday PM peak hour. Level of service analysis was performed for the Boren Avenue N / Republican Street intersection and showed that the project is expected to add a small amount of delay at the study intersection, but is not expected to significantly affect their overall operation.

The project will also mitigate traffic impacts by participating in the City of Seattle transportation mitigation program for South Lake Union as outlined in DPD Client Assistance Memo (CAM) 243. Pursuant to that mitigation payment system, the project proposes to pay a pro rata contribution of \$11,304 in order to help reduce project transportation impacts. This fee shall be paid prior to building permit issuance, consistent with DPD business rules.

With those mitigation measures, the project is not anticipated to cause significant adverse impacts to parking or traffic.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions- Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant 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 existing structure on site is more than 50 years old. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for potential impacts to historic resources, and indicated the existing structure on site is unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Landmarks Preservation Board, reference number LPB 261/15). Therefore, no mitigation is warranted for historic preservation.

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.

- [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 (2)(C).
- [] 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 (2)(C).

SEPA CONDITIONS

Prior to Issuance of Master Use Permits:

1. The owner and/or responsible parties shall provide DPD with a statement that the contract documents for their general, excavation, and other subcontractors will include reference to regulations regarding archaeological resources (Chapters 27.34, 26.53, 27.44, 79.01, and 79.90 RCW, and Chapter 25.48 WAC as applicable) and that construction crews will be required to comply with those regulations.

Prior to Issuance of Any Demolition, Grading and Building Permit:

2. The owner and/or responsible parties shall submit an archaeological monitoring and inadvertent discovery plan (MIDP) for review prior to additional geotechnical borings. The MIDP should be sent to DAHP and the interested Tribes prior to boring.
3. In order to address construction related transportation and parking impacts, a Construction Management Plan is required. This plan shall be reviewed and approved by SDOT and shall include methods that will reduce construction worker parking demand on surrounding streets; and minimize construction impacts to the greatest extent possible. Submittal requirements and review process are described here: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>.

Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit

4. The applicant shall make a pro rata mitigation payment pursuant to CAM 243 in the amount of \$11,304 to the City of Seattle.

During Construction

5. If resources of potential archaeological significance are encountered during construction or excavation, the owner and/or responsible parties shall:
 - a. Stop work immediately and notify DPD (Magda Hogness at magdahogness@seattle.gov or 206-727-8736) and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). The procedures outlined in Appendix A of Director's Rule 2-98 for assessment and/or protection of archaeological resources shall be followed.
 - b. Abide by all regulations pertaining to discovery and excavation of archaeological resources, including but not limited to Chapters 27.34, 27.53, 27.44, 79.01 and 79.90 RCW and Chapter 25.48 WAC, as applicable, or their successors.
 - c. Obtain all archaeological permits as required by RCW 27.53.

DESIGN REVIEW CONDITIONS

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

6. The Land Use Planner (Magda Hogness at magdahogness@seattle.gov or 206-727-8736) shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at least seven (7) working days in advance of field inspection. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown in the Master Use Plan (MUP) set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner. The Land Use Planner will determine whether submission of revised plans is required to ensure that compliance has been achieved.
7. If Seattle Department of Transportation does not permit in-pavement lighting in the public right of way, then colored paving shall be required to create a similar design.
8. 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 (Magda Hogness at magdahogness@seattle.gov or 206-727-8736).

For the Life of the Project

9. The size of the upper level signage shall not exceed the 24" high size shown at the Recommendation meeting. (DC4-B)

10. 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 (Magda Hogness at magdahogness@seattle.gov or 206-727-8736).

Signature: Denise R. Minnerly for Date: October 15, 2015
Magda Hogness, Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

MH:drm

K:\Decisions-Signed\3019051.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.